

FACULTY MANUAL

Guidelines, Practices, and Procedures

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

2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Definitions	
1.2	Changes from Previous Edition	
2	Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	3
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	Letters from External Referees in Tenure and Promotion Cases	
2.8	Confidentiality in Fourth-Year Review, Tenure, and Promotion Cases	
3	Clinical and Other RTPC Faculty	14
3.1	Designations	
3.2	Recruitment	
3.3	Professor of the Practice	
3.4	Third-Year Review	
3.5	Promotion	
3.6	Reappointment and Nonrenewal	
3.7	Adjunct and Part-time Faculty	
3.8	Joint and Courtesy Appointments	
4	Workload Profiles	26
4.1	Standard Profiles for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	
4.2	Profiles for RTPC Faculty	
4.3	Expectations for Teaching	
4.4	Expectations for Research	
4.5	Expectations for Service	
4.6	Expectations for Professional Development	
4.7	Teaching Schedules	
5	Annual Performance Review	35
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	Guidelines for Evaluating Professional Development	
5.8	Feedback and Appeals	
5.9	Review of Department Chairs	
5.10	Salary Adjustments	
6	Teaching	46
6.1	General Principles	
6.2	Overload Teaching	
6.3	Executive Education	
6.4	Teaching for Outside Institutions	
7	Mentoring	51
7.1	Formal Mentoring Procedures	
7.2	Matching Mentors and Mentees	
7.3	Recommendations for Department Chairs	
7.4	Recommendations for Mentors and Mentees	
8	Committees	56
8.1	Committee on Clinical/RTPC Faculty (CCF)	
8.2	Committee on Clinical/RTPC Faculty Promotions	
8.3	Committee on Doctoral Programs (Ph.D.)	
8.4	Committee on Graduate Instruction	
8.5	Committee on Technology	
8.6	Committee on Named Chairs and Professorships	
8.7	Committee on Promotion and Tenure (Personnel)	
8.8	Committee on Research and Faculty Recognition	
8.9	Committee on Undergraduate Programs	
8.10	Faculty Council	
8.11	Committee on Communication	
9	Leaves	61
9.1	Family Leave	
9.2	Sabbatical Leave	
9.3	Unpaid Leave	
10	Outside Consulting and Conflict of Interest	63
10.1	Outside Consulting	
10.2	Use of University Name and Affiliation	
10.3	Conflict of Interest	
10.4	Reporting	
10.5	Part-time Faculty	
11	Named Chairs and Professorships	66
11.1	New Appointments	
11.2	Renewals	

11.3	Perquisites Associated with Named Positions	
12	External Funding	69
12.1	Workload Adjustment	
12.2	Summer Research Funding	
Appendix A.	Calendars	71
A1	Year at a Glance	
A2	Tenure-Track Faculty Promotion and Fourth-Year Review	
A3	Clinical and RTPC Faculty Promotion	
Appendix B.	Dossiers	75
B1	Dossier Sample Title Page	
B2	Dossier for Tenure-Track Faculty	
B3	Preparation of the Cohort Analysis for 4th Year Reviews and Promotions	
B4	Dossier for Clinical and other RTPC Faculty	
B5	Template Invitation Letter for External Reviewers in Clinical Faculty Promotion Cases	
B6	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 members understand the 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 policy.usc.edu.

1.1 Definitions

Unless otherwise noted, the following definitions are used throughout.

“Department” includes the Department of Finance and Business Economics (FBE), Department of Data Sciences and Operations (DSO), Department of Marketing (MKT), Department of Management and Organization (MOR), Department of Business Communication (BUCO), Lloyd Greif Center for Entrepreneurial Studies (ENT), and Leventhal School of Accounting (ACC).

“School” is the Marshall School of Business.

“Chair” includes the chairs of BUCO, DSO, FBE, MKT, MOR, the Director of ENT, and the Dean of the Leventhal School of Accounting.

“Vice Dean” refers to the Vice Dean for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

“Assistant Vice Dean” refers to the Assistant Vice Dean for Academic Affairs.

“USC Faculty Handbook” refers to the 2015 version. If there is a more recent edition, the most recent edition governs. See <http://policy.usc.edu/faculty/faculty-handbook/>.

“UCAPT Manual” refers to the *Manual of the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure*. All references are to the 2013 version, but if there is a more recent edition, the most recent edition governs. See www.usc.edu/policies.

1.2 Changes from the Previous Edition

This version in many respects is the same as the previous version. Major changes from the 2013 version include:

- Updating of terminology to refer to Research, Teaching, Practice, and Clinical (RTPC) faculty who were previously called non-tenure track faculty.
- Inclusion of a Professor of the Practice designation (3.3).
- Information on the new Third Year review for all junior RTPC faculty (3.4).
- New procedures for hiring and evaluating adjunct and part-time faculty as required by the Provost Office (3.7).
- Updating of Chapter 4 to reference the 100 point workload profile that Marshall has now adopted.
- New sections on Professional Development (4.6) and its evaluation (5.7).
- Some updating of information on Marshall Committees in Chapter 8.
- New Appendix (B3) with information on preparing a cohort analysis for promotion cases.

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 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 (also “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 and the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure. 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 are 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, an Instructor designation converts 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, Finance and Business Economics, Data Sciences and Operations, Management and Organization, or Marketing. Faculty members appointed to named chairs or professorships retain their other 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, the candidate's contract is renewed for another year, with the expectation of repeated renewal through the mandatory tenure decision date (conditional on the candidate continuing to have reasonable prospects for tenure; see UCAPT Manual, Section 3.5). In the case of an unfavorable review, the candidate typically receives a one-year terminal contract.

According to the UCAPT Manual (Section 3.5), one purpose of the review "is to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments to date and prospects for tenure, in order to determine if the candidate is making sufficient progress toward tenure to have his or her contract renewed through the mandatory tenure decision date." Marshall's practice is that, in order to be renewed, a faculty member should have a reasonable prospect of satisfying the University's tenure standards by the tenure decision date. A candidate's prospects for tenure are assessed based on published and forthcoming research, working papers, research in progress, and his or her overall pattern of productivity. A successful case typically would display some record of publication in high quality refereed journals as well as a portfolio of working papers and research in progress that, if published, would constitute a successful promotion case. A candidate may be renewed even if the prospects for tenure are not high if the reviewers conclude that a feasible path to tenure still remains. In cases where a candidate is renewed but whose tenure prospects are not good, the candidate will be informed of his or her prospects, and typically advised to consider seeking an appointment elsewhere.

The review process parallels the promotion and tenure process except that external letters of reference 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 with a primary appointment 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 no more than 10 pages, curriculum vitae, five or fewer published or working papers, annual performance review scores since joining the faculty, a 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 and other materials prepared by the PEG itself.

The PEG prepares a cohort comparison for the dossier. The purpose of the cohort comparison is to provide concrete evidence on tenure standards in the field for reviewers and the candidate.

See Appendix B3 for the required structure of the cohort analysis.

The PEG prepares a confidential report that addresses the four purposes of the review, itemized as (i)-(iv) above, provides an assessment of the candidate's current prospects for tenure, and recommends whether or not to renew the candidate's appointment. The PEG report should not be an advocacy document, but rather an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the case. An important part of the PEG report is an analysis of the candidate's working papers and projects in progress. The PEG report should assess the quality of this unpublished work, its prospects for publication, possible timing of acceptance, and its likely impact and reception by scholars in the field. An extremely important part of the PEG report is a discussion of what the candidate would have to accomplish in the remaining years before the tenure decision in order to meet the university's standards, and constructive suggestions for the candidate to consider over the subsequent years leading up to the tenure decision.

The Chair should hold a meeting of the tenured faculty in the Department to provide them with an opportunity to comment on the PEG report. The PEG report should be made available to all tenured members of the department at least one week in advance of the Department meeting. At the meeting, the faculty discuss the PEG report and suggest changes where appropriate. After the meeting, the PEG should revise the report in light of the Department's discussion. All tenured members who read the PEG report and participated in the Departmental discussion should vote on whether to renew the candidate's appointment. Faculty members who did not participate in the discussion are discouraged from voting because they are not fully informed. The discussion and vote are confidential and should not be communicated to the candidate.

After the meeting and vote, the Chair prepares a letter that reports the Department vote and summarizes the discussion. The Chair should offer his or her own opinion on the case, and may discuss strategic needs the candidate may address in the department. The chair's letter is added to the dossier, which is then forwarded to the Vice Dean.

Marshall's Committee on Promotion and Tenure 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 Committee member belonging to the candidate's Department should participate at the Departmental level, but may not vote or participate in the review of the candidate at the School level. The Committee report should address the same set of issues as the previous reviewers and state the results of the vote on contract renewal. The Committee report is then added to the dossier, and the dossier is forwarded to the Vice Dean.

The Dean and Vice Dean review the dossier and the Dean 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee. The memo is also 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. 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 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 mandatory tenure decision date is indicated in his or her offer letter. The mandatory 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, 2021, the tenure decision date is May 15, 2020, and the tenure review process would begin in the summer of 2019.

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 2.9(e)). A request for an extension on these grounds must be made early in the probationary period.

Leave of absence in a position that did not permit the continuation of research and publishing projects.

An extension request 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 <https://faculty.usc.edu/apt/>. 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 the University. The Provost receives advice from the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (UCAPT). Candidates should keep in mind that his/her home department is only one part of the decision process, and not the ultimate decision maker.

Criteria

The UCAPT Manual states (p. 2): “The primary factors considered in tenure, promotion, and appointment decisions are excellence and creativity in both scholarly research and teaching, as documented in the dossier, with outstanding performance required in one — almost always research — and at least solid performance in the other. The University values scholars who have made important and original contributions, who have had an impact on the field, and whose work shows a clear arc of intellectual and creative development.” 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 his/her fields.

The most important factor for promotion is a candidate’s contribution to knowledge, and the

reviewer process seeks to identify the nature and impact of the candidate's work. A critical part 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 members 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 also involves consideration of quantitative metrics, such as:

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.

External funding, to the extent it is important in the candidate's field.

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 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 within 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

At the beginning of each academic year, the Vice Dean establishes a promotion calendar for the year and distributes it to the Chairs. The University requires dossiers to reach the Provost by February 1. A sample calendar is given in Appendix A.

At the end of the year prior to their tenure decision, the candidate should meet with his/her Chair or the Vice Dean to discuss whether they should go forward for tenure evaluation or seek other career paths. See UCAPT Manual, Section 3.5.

The promotion process begins in the summer with the Chair, in consultation with the Vice Dean, appointing 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 PEG 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 manages all correspondence with them.

The candidate, in consultation with the PEG, prepares material for inclusion in the dossier that includes a personal statement, evidence of research and teaching accomplishments, 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, Section 7.5, observes, "The personal statement is important, but need not be more than five pages long. The candidate is provided this opportunity to convey to others the excitement and importance of his or her scholarly work thus far, as well as plans for the future." If the candidate has a significant amount of collaborative work, the personal statement should discuss the candidate's individual contribution to the projects. While the candidate is responsible for submitting certain documents, the PEG and Chair are responsible for preparation of the dossier and should ensure 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 the 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 should be communicated to the tenured faculty in the Department, but may not be communicated to the candidate or any other person 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, Marshall's Committee on Promotion and Tenure (Personnel Committee) considers the case. In addition to reviewing the dossier, the Committee may meet with the Department Chair and PEG chair. The Committee then votes in favor or against promotion and tenure, and prepares a memo summarizing its deliberations. 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. 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 memo is added to the dossier.

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."

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 1.1 of the UCAPT Manual on expectations for tenure and promotion and Section 3.3 on standards for tenure. *In addition to summarizing the external referee 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 an assessment of the importance of that work. 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 description should be sufficiently nontechnical so that a scholar not in the field can understand the nature of the contribution

The main strengths and weaknesses of the case, and a weighing of their importance.

Referees: A short bio for each referee that explains why the referee was selected, 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. Direct quotation from letters is not permitted.

Assessment of tenurability at peer institutions.

Cohort comparison: number of publications and citations for a group of scholars recently tenured at peer institutions. The group should ideally include at least 15 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 over the last five years at top 20 schools as identified in Marshall's Research Productivity Expectations and Metrics for Promotion and Tenure document. 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 co-authorship, nature of the candidate's contribution to joint projects, significance of the ordering of names in coauthored work, frequency of co-authorship 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.

2.6 Promotion to (Full) Professor

The UCAPT Manual (Section 4.2) states: "The promotion to full professor is based on achievement rather than promise. The candidate should have made additional substantial contributions that have had a significant impact in the field, beyond the contribution that earned tenure. . . . The candidate for full professor should have achieved recognition as an expert in his or her field at a national and international level." Although promotion decisions involve reviews at the Departmental and School level, the final decision is made by the Provost. The Provost receives advice from UCAPT. Candidates should keep in mind that his/her home department plays a role in the decision, but is not the final decision maker.

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 co-authorship with junior colleagues and classroom observation.

The candidate is expected to have taken on leadership roles in the Department, School, University, or Profession. Evidence in support of this might include membership on key committees with significant accomplishments.

The process for promotion to Professor is also in most respects 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 External Referees in Tenure and Promotion Cases

Section 7.8 of the UCAPT Manual discusses the role of external 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 12 to 15 letters from arms-length referees because some may decline to write, or provide a report that does not engage the substance of the research. In addition, letters may be requested from coauthors if a candidate frequently collaborates.

Referees should be eminent scholars with the expertise and judgment to provide an authoritative assessment of the candidate's contributions, and whose leadership is recognized in the discipline. The list of referees should be created 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 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?

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, vote in Department and Personnel Committee, and discussion in Department and Personnel Committee meetings 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 RTPC Faculty

The University refers to full-time faculty who are neither tenured nor on a tenure track as Research, Teaching, Practitioner, and Clinical-Track (RTPC) faculty. Most Marshall full-time RTPC faculty are designated as either Clinical, Professor of the Practice, or Lecturer. Clinical faculty and Professors of the Practice are primarily engaged in teaching and service, although some also conduct scholarly research. Lecturers generally have somewhat higher teaching expectations and correspondingly lower service requirements. All full-time RTPC faculty are eligible to participate in the governance of the School and to serve on all committees except those involved in tenure and promotion of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Adjunct Professors are part-time faculty members who have external careers in industry or practice and teach part-time in their particular area of expertise. Part-time lecturers do not have significant external employment in industry or practice.

See Section 3.7 for specifics on Adjunct and Part-time faculty members.

3.1 Designations

Marshall uses multiple titles to designate full-time RTPC faculty. The titles Assistant Professor of Clinical [AREA], Associate Professor of Clinical [AREA], and Professor of Clinical [AREA] form a career ladder that recognizes accomplishments in teaching, service, leadership, and in limited cases, scholarship. In most cases, clinical professor appointments will be reserved for those holding a terminal degree in the area in which they will teach. The titles Lecturer and Senior Lecturer form a two-step career ladder that primarily recognizes accomplishments in teaching. The title Professor of the Practice is reserved for highly experienced professionals who have reached a pinnacle within their careers and have transitioned to full-time teaching.

Assistant Professor of Clinical [AREA]. Designates an entry-level position focused on teaching, with moderate service responsibilities. A new Assistant Professor receives a two-year appointment followed by a one-year appointment leading up to the Third-Year Review. (See 3.4) Successful Third-Year Reviews result in a two-year appointment with the possibility of renewal.

Associate Professor of Clinical [AREA]. Designates a full-time mid-level appointment focused on teaching with significant service responsibilities and increasing leadership responsibilities. Associate Professors generally hold a full-time appointment of three years with possibility of renewal.

Professor of Clinical [AREA]. Designates the highest clinical faculty rank, focused on teaching, with significant service, mentoring, and leadership responsibilities. A Professor generally holds a full-time appointment of four years, with the possibility of renewal.

Professor of the Practice of [AREA]. Designates a full-time appointment of up to three years, with possibility of renewal. The position is reserved for highly experienced professionals at the pinnacle of their profession with recognized expertise in the field in which they teach. Service expectations are similar to those in the Associate and Professor of Clinical ranks. Such appointments are rare, intended only for individuals with the highest accomplishments in practice, and require preparation of a dossier and consultation with a faculty committee as discussed below.

Lecturer in [AREA]. Designates a full-time appointment focused primarily on teaching, typically with reduced service expectations and expanded teaching expectations. May be the first step of a two-step career ladder. A new Lecturer receives a two-year appointment followed by a one-year appointment leading up to the Third-Year Review. (See 3.4) Successful Third-Year Reviews result in a two-year appointment with the possibility of renewal.

Senior Lecturer in [AREA]. Designates a full-time teaching appointment focused primarily on teaching, typically with reduced service responsibilities and expanded teaching expectations. A Senior Lecturer typically has years of significant teaching or practitioner experience beyond that of a Lecturer. Senior Lecturers generally hold a full-time appointment of three years with possibility of renewal.

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.

Clinical faculty members are generally expected to hold a terminal degree in their field of instruction and to have demonstrated excellence in teaching. A Lecturer position is for an individual without a terminal degree in their field who does not have a professional background justifying an appointment at the rank of Professor of the Practice.

New hires on the clinical faculty track typically begin at the rank of Assistant Professor. If a new hire previously served as a full-time 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. Requests for appointments at the rank of Associate Professor of Clinical, Professor of Clinical, Senior Lecturer, or Professor of the Practice will be reviewed by the Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion. In very rare circumstances involving a particularly skilled individual, the department Chair may request a waiver from the normal rank expectations; such a request will be considered by the Vice Dean who will seek the advice from the Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion.

The title Executive/Entrepreneur in Residence may be used for practitioners who do not have teaching responsibilities (are not instructors of record in a class), upon recommendation of the Chair and approval of the Vice Dean. Executive/Entrepreneur in Residence is not a faculty position, although it may be used jointly with a Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or other faculty appointment if the person is an instructor of record e.g. "Lecturer and Executive in Residence."

3.2 Recruitment

All full-time RTPC faculty searches are authorized by the Vice Dean and follow practices and procedures established by the Department and School. The process involves a faculty search committee (appointed by the Chair) and a national or international search. The search committee should include full-time RTPC faculty members from within the Department, or other Departments, and may also include tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The committee, in consultation with Chair and faculty of the unit, prepares a memo outlining the search process that describes the timeline, how candidates will be identified, how recruiting decisions will be made, and how the search will be conducted to ensure a broad and diverse applicant pool.

Each unit develops its own timeline, but a typical process is the following: In summer, the committee works with the Office of the Vice Dean to advertise the position according to University requirements. In Fall Semester, the search committee reviews applications and conducts initial interviews, which may take place locally, by phone, and/or at national conferences. Following the initial interviews, the committee selects a list of finalists. The search committee is encouraged to seek a large pool of candidates that can be narrowed to three to five finalists per position. The search committee should maintain confidentiality with respect to all discussions and communications about the search. In Spring Semester, finalists are brought to campus for interviews with the faculty and a presentation and/or an in-class teaching demonstration. Dinner or lunch may be arranged to provide the faculty an additional opportunity to meet the candidates. Faculty feedback on finalists is collected either remotely or through a Department meeting and vote and a recommendation is made to the Chair. In light of the faculty recommendation, the Chair meets with the Vice Dean who will make the final appointment on behalf of the Dean.

Candidates are expected to use the university online application system to submit a letter of application that describes how they meet the qualifications for the position, a resume or CV, a statement of their teaching philosophy, and a list of three references.

Successful candidates for RTPC positions are expected to have significant scholarly or practitioner expertise that qualifies them as experts in the subject matter of the specific classes they will teach. Concretely, this means that a candidate should have a terminal degree in the area of instruction, or significant professional management/executive level experience in the area of instruction that would qualify the individual to teach undergraduate and masters students.

3.3 Professor of the Practice

Professor of the Practice appointments are intended for senior professional practitioners who are exceptionally accomplished, exhibit a career of great distinction, have acquired skills with significant educational and research value, and whose association with USC will enhance the university's reputation. Such individuals will have held national or global leadership positions in industry or their professions, such as a senior partner, top executive, or high ranking regulatory official.

Because the title Professor of the Practice is intended to be used rarely and only for individuals with the most distinguished professional accomplishments, a distinct appointment process is required. An ad hoc faculty committee in the unit seeking the appointment should prepare a dossier, as discussed below, under procedures established by the Chair, in consultation with the Vice Dean. Once prepared, the dossier should be examined by all full-time faculty members in the unit. A meeting should be held to discuss the case, and a confidential vote for or against the appointment should be taken. The Chair then adds a letter to the dossier describing the faculty discussion and reporting the vote, and forwards the dossier to the Assistant Vice Dean. The dossier is then reviewed by the Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion which provides a written recommendation to the Dean. The final decision on an appointment is made by the Dean. As with all faculty positions, candidates must be identified and reviewed through a search that satisfies university policies with regard to academic posting, casting the net widely, and so forth.

The unit proposing an individual for appointment should prepare a dossier containing the following information:

- Three or more letters of recommendation testifying to the candidate's accomplishments and stature in the profession. Letters should be solicited by the ad hoc committee. External reviewers should be in a position to speak authoritatively about the nominee's professional accomplishments and stature. Such reviewers may be senior executives from previous employers or professional associations.
- Current curriculum vitae.
- Prior teaching credentials, reviews, or experience.
- Sample of publications, white papers, or other written work, if available.
- Statement from the ad hoc committee describing the candidate's accomplishments and stature, with supporting evidence, if available. The statement should also describe the anticipated nature of the candidate's activities if appointed.

The title of Professor of the Practice is established with the expectation that it will be used only

in rare circumstances. An individual holding this title will be reviewed annually through the normal APR process.

3.4 Third-Year Review

The third-year review is conducted in the third year of a lecturer or clinical assistant professor's full-time employment at USC Marshall. The review has four goals: 1) to evaluate the candidate's teaching and service contributions, plus research if it is a part of the workload profile; 2) to assess the candidate's prospects for satisfying the criteria for promotion to associate professor of clinical or senior lecturer; 3) to provide suggestions to help the candidate develop as an instructor and enhance their service and/or scholarly contributions; and 4) to determine whether to renew the candidate's contract. The expectation is that, given satisfactory performance, the candidate will receive a favorable review. A favorable review will result in the candidate being eligible for a two-year renewable contract going forward to promotion. In the case of an unfavorable review, the candidate's contract may not be renewed after the third year.

Documentation required for the third-year review is as follows: 1) The prior year's APR report updated to include all teaching evaluation scores and service activities that have occurred since the prior APR was submitted; 2) The most recent APR score; 3) current CV; 4) a classroom visit report. These materials plus a summary memo from the Chair are then submitted electronically to the Assistant Vice Dean for review by the Clinical Promotion Committee

The process and timing of the third-year review are generally as follows. In the summer before the candidate begins a third year of full-time employment, the Chairs submit to the Assistant Vice Dean a list of the clinical assistant professors and lecturers subject to the third-year review and notify those faculty of the review process, timing, and required documentation. The faculty member submits the required documentation early in the fall semester. The Chair may appoint a department peer committee to review the documentation and submit a summary memo to the Chair. Alternatively, the Chair prepares a recommendation memo and submits an electronic file including the candidate's materials and the recommendation memo to the Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion (CCFP) for review in October. The CCFP will discuss the case and may agree or disagree with the Chair's recommendation. The CCFP will then provide a memo which should include a contract extension recommendation and any suggestions the committee has to help the candidate develop as a teacher and to fulfill the criteria for promotion. In some cases, the Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion may recommend postponing a decision until after the upcoming APR process is concluded and teaching evaluations for the Fall semester and another APR score are available.

The CCFP sends recommendations to the Assistant Vice Dean who discusses the case with the Vice Dean and Chair. The Chair and Assistant Vice Dean meet with the candidate to communicate the results of the third-year review.

3.5 Promotion

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

The amount of time spent in each rank for clinical professors and lecturers mirrors the practice for tenure track faculty. Typically, promotion to Associate Professor is considered during the seventh year, after six or more years of experience at USC or a similar institution. However, a faculty member may request early consideration based on extraordinary performance. Promotion to (full) Professor typically is considered after four or more years as an Associate Professor. Time served in a similar rank and similar position at a peer institution may be counted as time served in rank.

For promotion in the clinical track, time served as a lecturer or adjunct professor at USC generally does not count as time served in rank, in part because the service expectations of those positions are different than for a clinical professor. In rare circumstances, credit for 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 may be considered for promotion again after two years.

The timing for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer mirrors that described above for promotion to Associate Professor; that is, typical candidates would pursue promotion to Senior Lecturer during their seventh year at USC. There is no automatic path to move from Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Part-time Lecturer or Adjunct Professor to a Clinical Professor position. Individuals holding the position of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Part-time Lecturer or Adjunct Professor may apply for appointment to a Clinical Professor position if a search is being conducted and they meet the minimum qualifications.

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

A successful candidate for promotion is expected to have made a demonstrable contribution in teaching, service, and (where applicable) research, as indicated in the workload profile. In particular, the candidate is expected to meet or exceed the following standards:

Met or exceeded Departmental and School expectations for teaching and service, as evidenced by earning strong annual performance reviews and scores;

Demonstrated excellence in teaching, based on in-class peer assessment, evaluation of course materials, student ratings, awards, and other external recognition;

Taught courses that are rigorous, innovative, employ learner-centered methods; reflect current theory, practice, and empirical research on teaching effectiveness; and integrate research from the discipline;

Demonstrated innovation in teaching, including updating existing courses, developing new courses, and contributing to the development of curricula;

Maintained consistent enrollments in his or her course offerings;

Developed the capacity to teach multiple courses;

Made significant and ongoing service contributions to the School, University, and/or profession. (Please see section 4.5 for details).

Evidence that a 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

A successful candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to satisfy the criteria for promotion to Associate professor and, in the time since the last promotion, the candidate is expected to meet or exceed the following promotion standards:

Met or exceeded Departmental and School expectations for teaching and service, as evidenced by earning strong annual performance reviews and scores;

Served as a mentor and enhanced the teaching skills of colleagues;

Developed the ability to teach courses beyond those taught when initially appointed Associate Professor, and to teach at both the undergraduate and graduate levels;

Assumed leadership roles in the School or University. Full professors should demonstrate the ability and willingness to provide leadership service, for example, by chairing a major School or Department committee, task force, center, or serving in a senior administrative capacity.

Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

A successful candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer is expected to have demonstrated

significant accomplishments in teaching, similar to those for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor. Lecturers typically have lower service expectations. Candidates are expected to meet or exceed the following standards:

Met or exceeded Departmental and School expectations for teaching and (to a more limited extent) service, as evidenced by earning strong annual performance reviews and scores;

Demonstrated excellence in teaching, based on in-class peer assessment, evaluation of course materials, student ratings, awards, and other external recognition;

Taught courses that are rigorous, innovative, employ learner-centered methods; reflect current theory, practice, and empirical research on teaching effectiveness; and integrate research from the discipline;

Demonstrated innovation in teaching, including updating existing courses, developing new courses, and contributing to the development of curricula;

Maintained consistent enrollments in his or her course offerings;

Developed the capacity to teach multiple courses;

There is no path for promotion from a lecturer or senior lecturer position to a clinical professor position; individuals with sufficient qualifications must apply for and be hired into a clinical professor position as part of a search process.

Process and Calendar

At the beginning of each academic year, the Vice Dean establishes a promotion calendar that is distributed 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 Chair appoints a Peer Evaluation Group (PEG) in consultation with the Assistant Vice Dean. The PEG is composed 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 chair is responsible for assembling the dossier. See Appendix B for more on dossiers.

During the summer, the candidate prepares materials that include a personal statement of not more than five pages; curriculum vitae; all annual performance review scores; sample of course materials; one table listing all courses taught, with student ratings and enrollment for each course; evidence of service contributions and professional development; and (where relevant) a sample of published research or any other evidence of contributions to the profession or discipline. The candidate provides all of the preceding materials to the PEG chair.

The PEG solicits letters related to the candidate's **service contributions** from reviewers outside the candidate's department. 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 not recommend potential reviewers but 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 fewer than two substantive letters should be included in the dossier. Unsolicited letters, such as from students, should not be included in the dossier.

The PEG chair receives from the department chair data on the average teaching ratings by other faculty who teach courses similar to those taught by the candidate. 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 Fall Semester, the PEG reviews the dossier and prepares a report. The PEG report is a detailed evaluation of the candidate's record of teaching, service, professional development, and (where appropriate) research that concludes with a recommendation on promotion. The PEG report should present a balanced analysis of the case, identifying both the strengths and weaknesses, and should not engage in advocacy. The most useful report is organized around the stated criteria for promotion. In preparing the report, the PEG should consult with the Department Chair and include in its report any relevant contextual information concerning how the candidate's teaching assignments were determined, how service activities were arranged, and so forth.

After a draft of the PEG report is prepared, the Department's faculty (tenured and RTPC) holding a rank higher than the candidate meet to discuss the report and the promotion case. 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 because they lack full information about the case. 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 Assistant 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 Assistant Vice Dean. Any faculty member may submit a supplemental letter to the Chair or Assistant Vice Dean that becomes part of the dossier.

The dossier is then reviewed by the Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion (CCFP) that advises the dean. The committee meets to discuss the case, may meet with the PEG chair and Department Chair, and votes whether or not to recommend promotion. Committee members

from the candidate's Department should participate and vote in the Department but may not participate or vote on the case as part of the CCFP.

The CCFP prepares a memo for the Assistant 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 CCFP 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 Assistant 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 CCFP's memo is added to the dossier.

The Dean and Assistant Vice Dean review the dossier, and the Dean decides whether or not to promote the candidate. The Assistant 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 Assistant Vice Dean.

Confidentiality

The PEG report, Chair's memo, CCFP's memo, votes in the Department and CCFP, and discussions in Department and CCFP 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.

3.6 Reappointment and Nonrenewal

RTPC 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 an RTPC appointment" and nonrenewal does not require advance notice of nonrenewal. Typically, Assistant Professors, and Lecturers, are issued a two-year appointment to start, followed by a one-year appointment for the third year at USC Marshall in advance of their third-year review. Assistant Professors and Lecturers who receive a favorable third-year review are issued a two-year appointment that can be renewed when it ends; Associate Professors, and Senior Lecturers, are issued a three-year appointment that can be renewed when it ends; and (full) Professors are issued a four-year appointment that can be renewed when it ends.

The Department Chair may recommend to the Assistant Vice Dean that an RTPC faculty member's contract not be renewed by sending a memo 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.

When deciding on a nonrenewal, the Assistant Vice Dean will seek the advice of a faculty committee, in compliance with provisions of the USC Faculty Handbook. The Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotion usually serves in that role, sometimes supplemented by ad hoc members appointed by the Dean, but the Assistant Vice Dean may also constitute an ad hoc committee. The committee may advise the Vice Dean to solicit a statement from the faculty member, notify 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 Assistant 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 Assistant Vice Dean on the Dean's behalf.

If an RTPC faculty member is considered for promotion and is not promoted, the Dean may decide not to reappoint the individual without further Committee consideration.

3.7 Adjunct and Part-time Faculty

Adjunct and part-time faculty members play an important role in the university and School, and new policies are now in place for hiring, compensating, and evaluating these individuals. **Designations** are as follows:

Part-time Lecturer of [AREA]. Designates a part-time teaching appointment that may include limited service expectations. Does not have concurrent significant employment in industry or practice.

Adjunct Professor of [AREA]. Designates a part-time teaching appointment, usually with no service responsibilities. Usually has concurrent full-time or significant work commitments elsewhere in industry or practice.

Appointment: Part-time faculty appointments are made by the Department Chair after consultation with Department faculty and the Assistant Vice Dean.

Recruitment: Part-time and adjunct faculty recruiting should include input from one or more departmental faculty in addition to the Chair. In emergency situations, the Chair may need to identify and hire a part-time or adjunct faculty member in consultation with the Assistant Vice Dean. Such an individual must then be reviewed by a departmental faculty committee prior to their third semester of teaching. Part-time and adjunct faculty are not allowed to teach full-time. They may apply for a full-time position if one is open and they meet the minimum qualifications.

Compensation: Compensation for Part-time faculty varies depending on the qualifications and

experience they bring, as well as the market rates for the department or area. Adjunct and part-time faculty are not to be paid “by the course,” as that would mean they were being paid the same amount to teach regardless of their background, performance, or length of time with us. Instead, Marshall has developed a compensation scale that is based on salaries of the top 25 business schools, by functional area and by level of qualifications and experience. In addition, some adjuncts and part-time faculty may participate in committees, meetings, and workshops, or other service for which they should receive compensation. A typical workload profile for a part-time faculty member would be 12% teaching and 0.5% service per course taught.

Evaluation: Adjunct and Part-time RTPC are evaluated at least once every three years. A single Marshall Part-Time Faculty Review Committee generally composed of one full-time and three part-time faculty will conduct these reviews during the Spring semester. Early in the academic year, Chairs will provide a list of approximately one-third of the active part-time/adjunct faculty subject to review that year. The candidates for review will provide a current CV, a list of the courses they have taught over the past three years and copies of their teaching evaluations. Those who have been involved in service activities will also provide a one-page description of those activities.

The PT Review Committee will review the evaluations and any other materials and assign committee members or other faculty or staff to conduct a classroom visit for each candidate under review. Following the classroom visits, the committee will prepare a brief report with a performance rating for each candidate and any recommendations for improvement. A successful review may result in a merit increase in future semesters. A negative review may result in no compensation increase or the faculty member’s contract not being renewed for future semesters. These reports will be submitted to the Assistant Vice Dean and the Department Chairs, for discussion with the faculty.

3.8 Joint and Courtesy Appointments

Occasionally, it may be appropriate to consider faculty members with primary appointments in other units of USC for joint appointment in the Marshall School, sometimes called a “courtesy” appointment. Such appointments do not confer tenure. The criteria for a joint appointment to the Marshall School are either: (1) the nominee has achieved “eminence” that will enhance the reputation of Marshall or (2) the nominee will significantly enhance the intellectual environment of the School through participation in activities such as seminars, PEG committees, and collaborative research.

The process for joint appointment involves a vote by the faculty in the nominee’s proposed Department. Following that vote, the department chair submits a nomination letter to the Dean that describes the rationale for the appointment, reports the vote, and summarizes the Department discussion, as well as a current CV for the nominee. The final decision is made by the Dean.

4 Workload Profiles

Each faculty member has a workload profile that apportions his or her effort during the year across teaching, research, service, and professional development. The workload profile is expressed using a 100-point scale in which each point corresponds to 1% of effort for the academic year. Twelve points of teaching typically represents one full semester class, while a half semester class would generally correspond to six points. The 100-point system offers flexibility to design a workload that matches a faculty member’s effort to the School’s mission, clarifies how performance will be evaluated, and permits change in activities over time as a career evolves. Workload profiles are sometimes stated in an abbreviated form, such as 36-44-20, which means 36 points of teaching (i.e. 3 full courses), 44 points of research, and 20 points of service. Workload profiles cover an academic year; they are prepared in the spring of the preceding year and approved by the Vice Dean and Department Chair.

4.1 Profiles for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to engage in teaching, research, and service. The default profile for strong research-active tenured professors is:

Activity	Points
Teaching	36
Research	44
Service	20

Tenure track assistant professors are typically on a 2.5 course load with lower service expectations. A common profile for these faculty is:

Activity	Points
Teaching	30
Research	60
Service	10

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members with reduced research effort typically have greater weight on teaching. One profile for tenured professors with reduced research intensity is:

Activity	Points
Teaching	48-72
Research	0-32
Service	20-28

For the purpose 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 nonacademic books are valuable, but considered service rather than research for purposes of workload profiles.

A faculty member with a 48-32-20 profile should be actively engaged in research, and exhibit a pattern of regular publication in high quality refereed journals. The faculty member should also be 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 36-44-20 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 36-44-20 profile is also expected to be editing or reviewing for the very best journals and spending significant time supervising doctoral students.

Failure to publish in a 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 for idiosyncratic reasons associated with the editorial and publication process. In practice, workload decisions are usually made by examining activity over a four-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 with less effort assigned to research and more to teaching. Conversely, a multi-year pattern of regular publication in higher tier journals may suggest a workload profile with more effort assigned to research and less to

teaching.

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.

The workload profile for a faculty member with more than twenty points of service should include a detailed list of service activities for the year. Any significant change in the workload during the year should be recorded on a revised workload profile form.

4.2 Profiles for RTPC Faculty

Clinical faculty and Professors of the Practice are expected to contribute to the School's mission through teaching service, professional development and in some cases, through research. The default profile for these professors is:

Activity	Points
Teaching	72
Research	0
Service	20
Professional Development	8

Some clinical faculty members engaged in research may have 12 points apportioned to that category, if approved by the Chair and Vice Dean. The workload profile in such cases would be:

Activity	Points
Teaching	60-72
Research	12
Service	8-20
Professional Development	8

In most cases where clinical faculty members have points assigned to research, service expectations are reduced commensurately, but in exceptional instances teaching points may be reduced. For the purpose of assigning workload profiles and assessing performance, research is defined the same for clinical faculty members as for tenured and tenure-track faculty members: 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 nonacademic books are valuable, but are included as service or professional development for the purposes of determining workload profiles.

In order to establish clear expectations of service contributions, each faculty member’s workload profile form should include a detailed list of service activities for the year. Any significant changes in the workload should be recorded on a revised workload profile form.

RTPC faculty also have eight points allocated for professional development activities, which might include attending conferences and workshops (either teaching or research related), case writing activities, publishing of practitioner related articles, serving on corporate boards etc. These activities are an important part of ensuring that our faculty both continue to excel in their teaching mission and retain their standing with the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Marshall’s tenure track and tenured faculty generally maintain their professional development through research activities such as attending professional conferences and completing scholarly publications.

Some faculty members in the Greif Center remain active in the entrepreneurial community and spend time outside USC pursuing entrepreneurial activities that enhance their teaching and service at USC. These faculty members have a workload profile that includes “external activities” as a separate category. The typical profile is:

Activity	Points
Teaching	48
Service	20
External Activities	24
Professional Development	8

Only faculty members in the Greif Center may have a workload profile with points on external activities, and such profiles must be approved by the Vice Dean. The expectation is that faculty members engaged in external activities will be engaged in regular, ongoing activities in the entrepreneurial community in the form of consulting, board membership, investment, and so on.

The specific activities should be approved by the Director of the Greif Center and should be reported in the annual performance review.

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are expected to contribute to the School's mission primarily through teaching and with limited service responsibilities. There are a variety of different profiles for lecturers but the default profile is:

Activity	Points
Teaching	84
Research	0
Service	10
Professional Development	6

This profile reflects a seven course load with correspondingly lower service expectations.

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, librarianship, 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, readings, 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, including mid-semester changes if needed. Assignments will be made 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 students on 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

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 or professional development.

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 journals 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. All faculty members, regardless of workload profile, are expected to perform core service that includes maintaining a regular presence on campus; participating in meetings and seminars; being accessible and helpful to colleagues; advising, mentoring, and coaching students; 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 attending Commencement activities when possible.

In addition to core service, faculty members are expected to engage in non-core service activities. Each faculty member should invest an amount of time in service commensurate with the number of points assigned to service in his or her workload profile. When service points exceed twenty, expected service activities should be specified in the workload profile. Faculty members are expected to choose activities that materially contribute to the mission of the School. Tenure-track assistant professors are not expected to make significant service contributions beyond the core activities.

Service involves activities that contribute to academic programs, the School, the University, and 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 typical 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 the Annual Performance Review committee;
- Planning and developing major curriculum changes;
- Delivering keynote or major addresses at professional conferences;
- Mentoring Marshall Ph.D. students in teaching, speaking, or writing;
- 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 top-tier journal;
- Serving as an executive officer of a leading professional organization;
- Organizing a scholarly conference;
- Publishing textbooks, cases, and practitioner material.

Very Good Impact

- Coordinating co-curricular academic programs, multi-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 of 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;
- 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.

These groupings are only rough guidelines; the actual impact of service activity depends on individual effort and abilities. This is not a complete list of service opportunities; many faculty members are engaged in service activities that are not listed above. Faculty members should consult with their Chair if they have questions about whether a particular opportunity is a potentially valuable contribution. Faculty members seeking additional service opportunities should consult with their Chair and the undergraduate and graduate programs.

Expected service contributions and opportunities vary with rank. Junior faculty members are expected to engage in lower impact activities early in their careers. Senior faculty members are expected to focus on higher-impact activities and take on significant leadership roles.

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

4.6 Expectations for Professional Development

All faculty are expected to continue to develop themselves professionally during their careers at USC, and this is particularly true in professional schools. The expectations are that faculty will remain current and knowledgeable about cutting-edge developments in their academic and professional fields, and increase their knowledge and skills about teaching and pedagogy. Professional development activities help ensure that faculty members continue to develop and grow, and they help satisfy accreditation standards promulgated by AACSB International, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business.

To accomplish these goals, Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty members are expected to maintain currency and demonstrate “ongoing and sustained scholarly engagement” through their scholarly research, presentations at academic conferences, publishing activities, and attendance at workshops related to pedagogy, teaching, and mentoring. The vast majority of these efforts are catalogued through the research-related segments of the CV.

For RTPC faculty, however, teaching and service activities may not adequately serve the goal of maintaining currency in their academic and professional fields or provide the documentation

necessary to meet accreditation standards related to faculty qualifications. To assist in the documentation, most RTPC faculty will have eight points of their workload profile dedicated to professional development. The professional development expectation for RTPC faculty is “continued professional experience and engagement” related to their professional field, the subjects they are teaching, as well as pedagogy, teaching, and mentoring. It may also be appropriate for an RTPC faculty member to be familiar with the latest research in their discipline.

4.7 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 36-44-20 or 30-60-10 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 members 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.

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*.

Junior faculty are evaluated every year. However, senior faculty at the rank of associate professor, full professor, professor of the practice or senior lecturer, complete an evaluation every second year.

5.1 Materials Supplied by Faculty

Each faculty member submits a report of his or her activity during the previous calendar year (APR Report) and a curriculum vitae. A faculty member engaged in research may submit a supplementary research statement if an explanation of his or her research program would be helpful to the reviewers. 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 late January. The APR report itself is completed using the online Digital Measures system that faculty members can update at any point during the year. *Each faculty member is responsible for fully documenting his or her performance when submitting the APR Report; the reviewers are not responsible for evaluating activities that are not documented in 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), service, and professional development (where appropriate). The scores may be an absolute number, a grade, or a ranking. Because the official final scores are determined based on evaluations at the Department and School levels, the Department's internal scores should be understood as an input into the

assessment and they are not part of the official record.

In addition to the material supplied by the faculty, assessments are based on material supplied by the Vice Dean and other administrators, typically related to service. Most School administrators will supply supplementary assessments of faculty contributions in their roles as members of School committees, academic directors of programs, and so on.

APR Committee

The Department Chair appoints an APR Committee for peer evaluation consisting of faculty members who are productive scholars and fine teachers. Departments may create separate committees for tenured/tenure-track and clinical faculty. 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. Probationary faculty members should not serve on the APR Committee. RTPC faculty may be members for the purposes of evaluating other RTPC faculty. A senior professor 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, service, and professional development, with categories determined by the workload profile. 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 assessments.

The APR Committee produces a memo summarizing its assessments and submits it 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, an explanation of how student ratings were used, and how other information was used to arrive at an overall teaching assessment.

For research, a description of what formulas, if any, were used to evaluate research, and a statement of how publications were adjusted for co-authorship.

A description of how the Committee members evaluated each other.

B. Individual faculty

For each faculty member, a numerical score for teaching, research or professional

development (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 members whose work meets the highest aspirations of the Department, in both qualitative and quantitative terms.

The APR Committee should review each person's contributions over the last three 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 not evaluated and the reason.

Identification of faculty members whose performance is not meeting minimum expectations.

Scores should take into account the workload profile. If final scores are constructed as a weighted average of separate teaching, research, and service scores, with weights equal to workload profile points, the separate scores must be calculated taking into account the different expectations implied by the workload profile weights. A faculty member with 50 points assigned to research should have made a greater research contribution than a faculty member with 30 points assigned to research in order to receive the same score as the 30 point faculty member. Similarly, the final score for a faculty member with a heavy weight on teaching should depend significantly on teaching performance.

The committee's scores should be used to produce a ranking of faculty from highest to lowest performance. Mechanical scoring systems based on workload weights and internal scores may lead to final scores that are questionable; after the rankings have been produced, the committee should examine the rankings to ensure that rigid adherence to a formula has not produced results contrary to common sense. If the formula-driven scores are not reasonable, they should be adjusted to appropriately reflect performance. *In assessing performance, it is more important for the committee to use its best judgment than to adhere to a rigid numerical formula.*

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, the Chair may have information unavailable to the APR Committee about 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 based on department assessments as well as information provided by programs and others that may not be available to APR committees (such as service contributions to a Marshall Center), and may be adjusted or "normalized" to ensure consistency across units in cases where departments appear to use different scales. The Vice Dean reviews all scores to ensure fidelity with School guidelines. Each faculty member is assigned to one of nine performance categories: (5.0) meets highest aspirations, (4.0) excellent/exceeds expectations, (3.0) good/meets expectations, (2.0) needs improvement/below expectations, and (1.0) unacceptable; the intermediate scores 1.5, 2.5, 3.5, and 4.5 are also used.

Performance category 3.0 is a baseline indicating good performance; such a score implies that the individual met the (typically high) expectations for a Marshall faculty member. Performance categories 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5 indicate performance above a good level. To achieve an overall score of 3.0, a faculty member should have met expectations in *all* activities: teaching, research, and service.

Performance category 5.0 is reserved for work meeting the highest aspirations of the School. In some years no person may have performed in a way that meets the highest aspirations.

Performance categories 2.0 and 2.5 represent performance that needs improvement and fails to meet expectations. It is possible that in some years, no person may have performed in these categories. A faculty member falling into these categories should meet with the Chair to formulate a development plan to improve performance. A faculty member with repeated performance in these categories may be considered for nonrenewal of appointment.

Performance categories 1.0 and 1.5 are reserved for performance that is unacceptable. A faculty member receiving a score of 1.0 or 1.5 should meet with the Chair to formulate a development plan. A faculty member with performance in this category may be considered for nonrenewal when his or her contract expires. Earning four consecutive evaluations in these categories suggests neglect of duty or incompetence, constituting grounds for dismissal for cause. (Note that there are other reasons for dismissal — this is not exclusive — as discussed in the USC Faculty Handbook.)

Aside from the reserved category 5.0, performance scores for faculty members meeting 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 single category. Performance scores for faculty members failing to meet expectations (1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5) are assigned on an absolute standard.

Faculty members are expected to provide teaching, research, and service according to their workload profiles. A faculty member whose performance is unacceptable in any one area (teaching, research, service) has not met his or her employment obligations, and should not receive an APR score of 3.0 or greater, even if performance in other areas is exceptional. APR scores of 3.0 or greater indicate that expectations are being met or exceeded in all categories.

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. 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 that are 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. Teaching assessment may also include information from collegial classroom observation, but if used, such assessments should be designed to ensure consistency and reliability and the process should be approved by the Vice Dean. Departments should consider whether using collegial classroom observation for assessment purposes will conflict with development purposes.

To provide consistency in evaluating teaching, each faculty member's teaching performance should be assessed in two separate ways, and assigned separate scores labeled T1 and T2. The final score should be based on T1 and T2, with T1 contributing no more than 50 percent to the overall score.

The T1 score should be based on student ratings on questions 11 and 12. In most cases, responses to Q11 and Q12 should be given equal weight. Reviewers should take into account variation in average student ratings for similar courses. For example, if MBA electives typically earn a score 0.1 higher than MBA core classes, the reviewers might consider adjusting student ratings for core classes upwards by an appropriate amount. T1 may also consider number of students in the class (if a low class enrollment is indicative of poor performance), average class size, and other factors such as required versus elective class, new versus established class, and so on.

The T2 score should be based on examination of teaching materials beyond the course and instructor numerical evaluations. Such materials may include course syllabi; teaching

awards; attendance at or leadership of teaching workshops or activities designed to improve teaching; classroom visit reports, if available; firsthand knowledge about course offerings possessed by reviewers; and other miscellaneous material that may be available to the reviewers. Possible factors that may be used to assess each faculty member include: (1) course innovation and use of cutting edge pedagogy or research, (2) rigor, (3) relevance and applications to practice, (4) connections to other elements of Marshall and USC curriculum, and (5) relation to Marshall and USC strategic objectives. These factors need not be weighted equally; assessment involves a judgment of priorities, taking into account specific circumstances. For example, at a point in time when the school is implementing strategic initiatives, greater emphasis might be placed on (5). If a faculty member's department was making a concerted effort to include more applications in its classes, more emphasis might be placed on (3). Other (unnumbered) factors that may be considered are the difficulty of the teaching assignment, the number of preparations, and special circumstances such as a faculty member stepping in at the last minute to teach a class in place of a colleague who was unexpectedly incapacitated. Teaching effectiveness also involves a set of professional behaviors that should be taken into consideration when they contribute to teaching effectiveness, including treatment of faculty, staff, and students with dignity, courtesy, and respect; maintaining a regular presence on campus; and adhering to policies, guidelines, and deadlines (e.g. submitting midterm evaluations when required, adhering to grade targets, and submitting final grades on time). Finally, T2 should include instruction that takes place outside the classroom such as serving on dissertation committees, advising undergraduate students, and other forms of student mentoring.

Enrollment may be taken into account if it appears to have resulted from student satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the class. 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.

5.5 Guidelines for Evaluating Research

Research assessment should consider both quality and quantity of work in order to evaluate the faculty member's overall scholarly contributions during the assessment period. Quantitative information should play a role in evaluating research, but should not be the sole basis for evaluation. Assessments should not simply count publications or accepted papers. Evaluation is important, and reviewers are encouraged to read a sample of recent research in order to assess its quality. Books, published reviews, prizes and awards should be taken into account. In most cases assessments of research productivity should be based on published and forthcoming work. However, for probationary faculty recently out of school, assessments may include work in progress and working papers. External grants and external funding proposals that receive high ratings in national peer review processes should also be considered.

It is important to adopt a multiyear perspective when evaluating research productivity. Assessments that focus exclusively on the current year may discourage faculty members 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 upside may take more than a year to move forward and may entail significant risk.

Marshall practice is to assess research productivity over the last three years, by considering all published or accepted work over this time period. Each field has its own norms for the number and quality of publications that would constitute good and excellent performance, and productivity should be assessed with reference to norms in the field. Historically, for some (but not all) fields, faculty members in the highest performance category have averaged at least one publication in a premier journal per year, with more than that typical if the work has coauthors. Of course, the quality of the work is as, if not more, important than the quantity, and journal reputation is not a perfect indicator of quality.

Co-authorship is increasingly common in many fields where Marshall faculty members conduct research, and collaboration between scholars can lead to higher quality work. Assessment of co-authored research should take into account a faculty member's individual contribution to the work. The individual contribution of a faculty member is likely to be greater on a project with few coauthors than a project with many coauthors. Faculty members are encouraged to explain in their APR reports the individual contribution of the authors in collaborative work, when the relative contributions are not equal.

Assessment of individual contributions in collaborative work should be guided by the following principles. A strictly formulaic or mechanical approach to assessing individual contribution is not desirable; reviewers should not assign credit solely by dividing by number of authors nor should they entirely ignore the number of authors. Reviewers should take into account norms in each field when assessing individual contributions, for example, the ordering of author names should be considered in fields where the ordering conveys information on relative contribution. Because of the importance of interdisciplinary research, collaboration between scholars across fields or disciplines is generally considered a greater contribution than collaboration between scholars in the same field, all else equal. Collaboration between a faculty member and a doctoral student is particularly encouraged.

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. Senior faculty are expected to contribute more service than junior 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 should also be considered, and demonstrated accomplishment is most important. For example, membership in a committee is a contribution even if the faculty member's participation is limited to attending a monthly meeting, but the contribution is much more significant 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 then 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 members 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. Such information can and should be a factor in service assessment, where relevant.

5.7 Guidelines for Evaluating Professional Development

Beginning with the Spring 2017 APR cycle RTPC faculty will submit evidence of professional development activities, and starting with the Spring 2018 APR cycle these activities will be assessed and form part of the faculty member's final APR score. As with service, both quantitative and qualitative measures are important in evaluating professional development. Attending one, 90-minute teaching workshop or brown-bag discussion is a measurable item, but

organizing and leading a half-day workshop deserves more weight or credit. Attending a professional conference is evidence of professional development, and participating as a panelist or member of the organizing committee may deserve additional credit.

5.8 Feedback and Appeals

Once final APR scores are determined at the School level, the Chair communicates the outcome to faculty members in a written memo. The memo should indicate (1) the faculty member's final, official overall APR category, and (2) a distribution of scores, or some other information that allows the faculty member to place his or her performance in perspective with respect to the department as a whole (or for small departments, the school as a whole. Individual faculty members have the option of meeting with the Chair to discuss the outcome of the review, and face-to-face meetings are recommended for probationary faculty members. Since one purpose of the review is to provide guidance to faculty members, it may be helpful to convey some of the underlying raw data to the faculty member; this information is conveyed at the Chair's discretion. If the internal scores produced by the Department APR Committee are communicated, the Chair should note in writing that those scores are unofficial and only partial assessments of performance, and that final scores may have factored in information that was not observed by the departmental APR Committee.

To appeal an evaluation, a faculty member must submit a written request to the Chair within two weeks 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.

5.9 Review of Department Chairs

The Vice Dean may ask the APR Committee to review the performance of the Chair. Such a 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 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.

5.10 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 25 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 members should pay special attention to University guidelines concerning final exams and academic integrity. Faculty members 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 must 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, course readers, 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.

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, service and professional development 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 exerting commensurate “extra” effort, or instead reducing regular teaching, research, or 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 members with nine-month appointments.

Faculty members 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 30-50-20) should not teach on an overload basis during the year. A 30-50-20 workload profile is designed to allow time for research, and additional teaching would be contrary to the spirit of the profile. Faculty members who wish to teach more than three courses with a commensurate reduction in research effort should seek an appropriate workload profile, such as 48-32-20.

Full-time faculty members should not teach more than a maximum of 2.5 classes on overload during the academic year (August to May), and no more than 1.5 classes on an overload basis in one Fall or Spring semester. Summer overloads are limited by the 3/9 rule (3-D(2) USC Faculty Handbook); that is, no faculty member may earn more than 3/9 base pay during the summer months, regardless of the source of the compensation.

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 Assistant 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, Global Branding Center, 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 members 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 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.

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, Assistant Vice Dean, and Provost in advance.

Probationary faculty members 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 Assistant 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 (unpaid) may teach at the institutions where they are in residence, subject to University restrictions and approval by the Vice Dean. Teaching at another institution during a sabbatical is discouraged.

Occasionally, another school 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, and approval by the Vice Dean.

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 members may work as outside consultants. To avoid confusion, note that none of the material in that section applies to outside teaching.

The University requires the School to inform the Provost in a timely manner of faculty members

who are 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 Mentoring

Mentoring is an important activity for mentees, mentors, students, and the School. Mentoring helps the mentee assimilate, enhances career success, and can lead to greater organizational commitment; and helps mentors gain a sense of contribution, personal satisfaction, and exposure to fresh ideas. Because the mentoring needs of RTPC and tenured/tenure-track faculty can be different, Marshall provides separate mentoring programs for these two groups.

Mentoring takes many forms and involves 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.

7.1 Formal Mentoring Procedures

Marshall's mentoring strategy involves the formal procedures listed below. Much mentoring is informal and faculty members are encouraged to form mentoring relations beyond those established by the School's formal program. The formal program is not intended to discourage or replace informal mentoring.

Department chairs assign a mentor to each new junior RTPC professor 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.

Department Chairs assign a mentor to each tenure-track assistant professor 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.

Mentors report their mentoring activities in their annual performance reports, and APR committees consider mentoring contributions when assessing performance.

Each Chair organizes an annual meeting of the tenured faculty to assess the progress of all probationary faculty members in the Department. After the meeting, the Chair and mentors meet with the probationary faculty members and provide feedback and guidance based on the meeting. The feedback and guidance should address the faculty member's development as a scholar and teacher, as well as his or her progress toward meeting promotion and tenure criteria.

The Vice Dean and chair of the Personnel Committee meet yearly with Department Chairs to discuss lessons from the past year's promotion, tenure, and fourth-year review cases, including developments at the University level. Chairs communicate this information to mentors.

7.2 Matching Mentors and Mentees

RTPC Faculty

Chairs should consider the following criteria when selecting mentors: the mentor's teaching and service accomplishments and knowledge of policies, procedures, and customs; the fit between the mentor's and the mentee's teaching areas; and the mentor's commitment to mentoring and ability to serve effectively. If the mentee is research-active, an attempt should be made to find a mentor with appropriate research expertise. If there is not an appropriate mentor within the mentee's unit, the Chair should seek a mentor from another unit.

Successful mentors typically are experienced and respected teachers who are familiar with institutional policies, practices and customs. Successful mentors are interested in the mentee's professional development, are willing to devote time to the mentoring relationship, are willing to share knowledge, and are capable of providing constructive and honest feedback. New professors are encouraged to establish informal mentoring relationships in addition to the formal mentoring relationships.

Tenure-Track Faculty

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 institutional procedures and customs 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. In addition to tenured mentors, chairs should consider assigning clinical professors as mentors to tenure-track faculty members. Clinical professors can be particularly helpful mentors in matters related to teaching.

Chairs may change a mentee's mentor over time or assign a single mentor throughout the probationary period. The former exposes the mentee to a greater range of 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. Most probationary faculty members will also establish one or more informal mentoring relationships.

7.3 Recommendations for Department Chairs

While mentoring is a collective responsibility of the faculty, 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. 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, Marshall Research Productivity Expectations and Metrics for Promotion and Tenure, 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 <http://www.marshall.usc.edu/faculty/faculty-resources>.

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. Chairs should also monitor the service and number of course preparations for probationary faculty to ensure that their obligations do not unduly interfere with their research.

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.

Faculty members joining the School in the Spring Semester lack the formal orientation programs available to faculty members joining in the Fall. Chairs should be aware of their special needs and make appropriate arrangements to ease their transition.

7.4 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 development and mentoring portal (<http://faculty.usc.edu/mentoring/>).

Orientation meeting. Mentors are encouraged to meet with new faculty members to facilitate their assimilation into the University. Possible topics for discussion include:

- Culture of the Department and School, e.g. expectations for collegiality; attendance, preparation, and participation in meetings, seminars, and workshops; importance of maintaining a presence on campus; reasonable use of STARS funds.
- 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, Marshall and University grading policies and procedures, student ratings, 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, online rosters and grade submissions, and library databases. This should also include a quick look at technology available in classrooms.
- Research support and how research is evaluated internally.
- Service opportunities and responsibilities.
- Promotion procedures and annual performance review.

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, interpreting student ratings and feedback.
Service opportunities and responsibilities.

Coaching. Some mentees may benefit from active coaching by the mentor. The mentor may offer in-class observation of the mentee's teaching and review of course materials. The mentor may invite the mentee to observe the mentor's class sessions. The mentor may reach out to other faculty members for course materials or to arrange meetings or other coaching.

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.

8 Committees

Marshall has several School-wide standing committees. Many Departments also have standing committees. Committee appointments typically last for one year, beginning August 16 and ending August 15. 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. Many committees have one member from each Department, especially when members from different Departments are expected to bring a different perspective to the issues before the committee, but there is no requirement that each committee have one and only one person from each Department.

8.1 Committee on Clinical/RTPC Faculty (CCF)

The CCF advises the Dean on School guidelines, procedures, and practices related to clinical and other RTPC faculty. Full-time RTPC, tenured, and tenure-track faculty members are eligible to serve, but typically most members hold an RTPC appointment. Members are appointed by the Assistant Vice Dean in consultation with Chairs. The CCF is co-chaired by the Assistant Vice Dean and a member of the committee appointed by the Assistant Vice Dean.

The CCF exercises leadership in matters affecting RTPC faculty. It also serves as Marshall's lead committee on matters pertaining to professional development of RTPC faculty. It is expected that the committee will form a subcommittee each year to plan and organize School-wide activities focused on teaching and mentoring such as:

- Professional development workshops on topics such as (i) how to become a valued member of Marshall without focusing on research; (ii) improving effectiveness in the classroom; and (iii) identifying rewarding opportunities for service contributions in the School and in the University at large. The committee may wish to partner with other groups on some of these workshops, such as the undergraduate and graduate programs.

- The CCF may organize an annual "Teaching Fair" similar to the Research Fair that is organized by the Committee on Research & Faculty Recognition.

- The CCF may take responsibility for reviewing proposals and recommending grant funding that promotes community, teaching, mentoring, and the professional development of all faculty.

8.2 Committee on Clinical/RTPC Faculty Promotions (CCFP)

The CCFP oversees the Third-Year Reviews of Lecturers and Assistant Professors of Clinical, and offers recommendations to the Assistant Vice Dean and Chairs. See Section 3.5 for details. The

CCFP also advises the Dean, Vice Dean, and Assistant Vice Dean on promotion cases involving RTPC faculty members, and on school procedures and guidelines related to promotion. The committee is composed of faculty members holding the rank of (full) Professor, usually with a clinical faculty appointment. See Section 3.6 for details.

8.3 Committee on Doctoral Programs (Ph.D. Committee)

The committee advises the Dean and Vice Dean on standards and procedures pertaining to the doctoral programs, including admissions and curriculum. The committee is chaired by the Associate Dean for Doctoral Programs. The Ph.D. directors from each Department with a doctoral program are ex officio members. Other members may be appointed from the faculty.

8.4 Committee on Graduate Instruction

The committee advises the Dean and Vice Dean for Graduate Programs 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.

8.5 Committee on Technology

The committee advises Marshall's Institutional Technology Office on issues pertaining to the School's technology strategy. The Committee is chaired by Marshall's Chief Information Officer.

8.6 Committee on Named Chairs and Professorships

The committee advises the Dean and Vice Dean on new appointments and renewals to named chairs and professorships, and on procedures pertaining to named chairs and professorships. The Committee is typically comprised of a small number of faculty members (3-5) who 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.

8.7 Committee on Promotion and Tenure (Personnel Committee)

The Personnel Committee advises the Dean and Vice 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.

8.8 Committee on Research and Faculty Recognition

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

The Committee is formally in charge of organizing Marshall's Research Fair which is usually held at the beginning of March each year. The Research Fair generally consists of five to seven short research talks from among Marshall's leading scholars and is open to all faculty and PhD students.

The Committee also oversees the School's Research, Teaching and Mentoring awards:

Dean's Awards for Research Excellence are given for research that meets the highest aspirations of the School and University. Indicators of such research include but are not limited to: (1) publishing articles in premier academic journals, (2) publishing books in premier academic presses, and (3) earning prestigious awards or being recognized outside the university for scholarly work. Typically emphasis is placed on research published or produced and awards and recognition received during the previous three years. However, because the true impact of research may take longer to be understood, work produced more than three years previously will also be considered if its importance has only recently been recognized (e.g. by a prestigious award or an unusually high citation count). Awards are based on direct examination of faculty work as well as quantitative metrics.

Evan C. Thompson 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, substantial revision of existing courses, and development of new teaching materials or methods. Award recipients typically will be identified as exemplary in their teaching work. In assessing teaching excellence, the committee considers quantitative metrics such as student ratings, but also peer reviews, curriculum and pedagogical innovation, and other relevant and course materials.

Evan C. Thompson Awards for Faculty Mentoring and Leadership are given for excellence in mentoring and leadership, demonstrated by mentoring of faculty, graduate students, or undergraduate students, and by contributions to a culture of mentoring. Evidence of excellence in and commitment to mentoring and leadership may include providing the support and resources to help those mentored to be successful, giving of time and talents to assist those mentored with their work, and serving as a role model of excellence for students and junior colleagues.

Dr. Douglas Basil Award for Junior Business Faculty is provided to an assistant professor for excellence in either teaching (odd years) or research (even years). The criteria is generally similar to that for the Dean's Research or Evan C. Thompson Teaching awards, except that they are restricted to junior faculty.

8.9 Committee on Undergraduate Programs

The committee advises the Dean and Vice Dean for Undergraduate Programs on matters pertaining to the School's undergraduate programs. The committee is chaired by the Vice Dean for Undergraduate Programs. The committee reviews proposals for new courses, course revisions, changes in degree requirements, and other curricular changes. The committee also advises the Dean and Vice Dean for Undergraduate Programs on matters pertaining to the undergraduate student experience, including admissions, advising, internships, and career services.

8.10 Faculty Council

The Faculty Council is an elected body that participates in 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-B(3)). 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, and RTPC faculty) 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 August 16 and ending August 15.

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 office of the Academic Senate by July 1 (start of term), and shall notify the Senate of any changes in a timely manner.

8.11 Committee on Communication

The committee advises Marshall's Office of Communications on issues pertaining to the School's communication strategy. The Committee is chaired by the Associate Dean for Communications.

9 Leaves

Much of this section is intended to direct faculty members to the relevant sections of the USC Faculty Handbook, <http://policy.usc.edu/faculty/faculty-handbook/>. 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.

9.1 Family Leave

The University seeks to assist faculty members 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.

9.2 Sabbatical Leave

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(2). RTPC faculty members are eligible for a sabbatical leave to conduct research only if research is a normal part of their workload profile; such leaves are unpaid for RTPC faculty under current university policy.

Applications for sabbatical leaves are solicited early in the calendar year. In most cases, a leave is expected to result in scholarly research that is publishable in a high quality academic outlet or that will have a significant impact on practice. Leaves with a well-defined study plan that will allow a faculty member to update his or her skills may also be considered. 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 Committee on Promotion and Tenure that advises the Dean. The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost who makes the final decision.

A sabbatical leave can be for (i) a full year at half pay, or (ii) half of a 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. A faculty member must return to the university for at least one academic year after conclusion of the sabbatical leave.

Faculty members on sabbatical leave remain eligible for STARS and summer research support. 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.

9.3 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. Faculty members on an unpaid leave are not usually eligible for summer research support in the summer before the leave.

10 Outside Consulting and Conflict of Interest

10.1 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 one day per week on average during the contract period of service.” 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 stature 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 in Professional and Business Practices, and Conflict of Interest in Research, at <http://policy.usc.edu/>. 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 6.4 of this Manual, and a different set of University policies and School guidelines apply to this activity.

10.2 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 members 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.

10.3 Conflict of Interest

Conflict of interest is discussed in the USC Faculty Handbook, Section 3-I(1), and in the University policies on Conflict of Interest in Professional and Business Practices, and Conflict of Interest in Research, at <http://policy.usc.edu/>. 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 <http://policy.usc.edu/>.

10.4 Reporting

On an annual basis, as part of the annual performance review process, all faculty members should report 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.

10.5 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.

11 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 in consultation with a faculty committee. Within Marshall, the primary faculty consultative body is the Committee on Named Chairs and Professorships.

11.1 New Appointments

Nominations for appointment to a named chair or professorship may be submitted to the Vice Dean by any faculty member at any time. Once a year, the Vice Dean invites nominations from Department Chairs. At the request of the Vice Dean, a nominee submits a CV 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 evaluates the nominee’s accomplishments and stature in the field, and discusses expectations for the future. The memo also discusses the intent of the donor who established the chair or professorship, when the chair or professorship is reserved for scholars working in a particular area. 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.

11.2 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 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 CV, a report of 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. At the request of the Vice Dean, the Chair of the holder's Department may be asked to submit a recommendation. The Committee on Named Chairs reviews the materials and 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.

Renewal of named positions associated with an administrative appointment (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.

11.3 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. Perquisites associated with a named position are approved 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 \$2,500 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. Awards of summer stipends are conditional on continued high research productivity.

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. Awards of teaching reductions are conditional on continued high research productivity.

12 External Funding

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

12.1 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 amounting to between 15 and 25 percent of the faculty member’s total workload (depending on the grant’s overhead rate), and corresponding compensation (base salary plus benefits), which is roughly equal to between 20 and 32 percent of core salary, 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. Such 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, teaching reduction usually 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 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.

12.2 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.

APPENDIX TABLE A1 Year at a Glance

August	<p>Most faculty contracts begin. Chairs assign mentors. New faculty orientation (usually week 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.</p>
September	<p>Personnel Committee considers promotion cases to Professor (tenured). Candidates for tenure submit dossier materials. Departments submit recruiting proposals.</p>
October	<p>Departments consider tenure cases. Departments consider clinical faculty promotion cases. Dossiers for promotion to Professor (tenured) due at UCAPT (Oct. 15). Chair submits memo to CCFP for 3rd-year reviews (RTPC)</p>
November	<p>Personnel Committee considers tenure cases. Committee on Clinical Faculty considers clinical faculty promotion cases.</p>
December	<p>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.</p>
January	<p>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. Individual APR reports and workload profiles submitted.</p>
February	<p>Dossiers for tenure and promotion to Associate Prof. due at UCAPT (Feb. 1). (Late Feb.) Department APR reports completed. Departments submit 4th-year review dossiers to Vice Dean.</p>
March	<p>Personnel Committee considers 4th-year reviews (tenure-track). Annual Performance Review process completed. Chairs submit salary proposals.</p>
April	<p>(Early Apr.) Salary proposals due to Provost. Workload Profiles developed.</p>
May	<p>Most faculty contracts end. PEG formed for promotion cases to Professor (tenured). Spring Semester classes end.</p>
June	<p>Candidates for Professor (tenured) submit materials, letters solicited.</p>
July	<p>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.</p>

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

The following calendars for the 2016-2017 academic year illustrate typical timing of events. Actual calendars are issued by the Vice Dean each year.

Promotion to Full Professor

May 2016	PEG formed
June 1, 2016	Deadline for candidate to submit dossier materials
June 8, 2016	Invitations sent to outside referees
July 20, 2016	Deadline to receive letters from outside referees
August 2016	Department considers case
Sept. 7, 2016	Department sends dossier to Vice Dean
Sept. 14 – 23, 2016	PC Considers case
Sept. 26, 2016	Deadline for PC to send dossier and letter to Vice Dean
October 15, 2016	University deadline for dossier to reach UCAPT

Promotion to Associate Professor

July, 2016	PEG formed
July 27, 2016	Candidate submits dossier materials
August 3, 2016	Invitation letters sent to outside referees
Sept. 14, 2016	Deadline to receive letters from outside referees
October 2016	Department considers case
November 2, 2016	Deadline for Department to send dossier to PC
Nov. 9-23, 2016	PC Considers case
November 28, 2016	Deadline for PC to send dossier and letter to Vice Dean
December 2016	Dean prepares letter for UCAPT
Feb. 1, 2017	University deadline for dossiers to reach UCAPT

Fourth-year review

Dec. 2016	Department PEG finalized
Dec. 15, 2016	Faculty member submits dossier to PEG
Jan. 11, 2017	PEG submits report to Department chair

Jan. 2017	Department considers cases
Feb. 8, 2017	Chair submits report to PC
Feb. 9-20, 2017	PC reviews cases
Feb. 22-24, 2017	PC meets to review cases
Feb. 27-Mar. 3, 2017	PC meets to review cases
Mar. 15, 2017	Personnel Committee submits report to Vice Dean

APPENDIX TABLE A3 Clinical and RTPC Faculty Promotion

The following calendar for the 2016-2017 academic year is 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 2016	PEG committee formed
Sept. 1, 2016	Invitation letters sent to outside referees
Sept. 2016	Deadline for candidates to submit dossier materials
Oct. 3, 2016	Deadline to receive letters from outside referees
Oct. 2016	Department considers case
Oct. 31, 2016	Deadline for Department to send dossier to Assistant Vice Dean
Nov. 2016	CCF considers case
Dec. 1, 2016	Deadline for CCF to submit memo to Assistant 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 2016

APPENDIX PART B2 Dossier for Tenure-Track Faculty

Instructions for preparation of the dossier are included in the UCAPT Manual. See especially Section 7 and the checklist for dossier preparation in the appendix. The PEG chair is responsible for preparation of the dossier; the candidate's responsibility is restricted to provision of the CV, personal statement(s), and assembly of supporting documentation, such as summaries of student ratings, publications, and working papers. The dossier should consist of a three-ring binder 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. 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, Section 6.2):

Section I-A. Administrative and Faculty Assessments

- Statement by the Dean, Marshall School of Business (UCAPT Manual 7.2(f))

- Note whether Dean approved list of referees

- Memo from Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCAPT Manual 7.2(e))

- Memo from Department Chair and PEG Report (UCAPT Manual 7.2(d))

Section I-B. Quantitative Data (UCAPT Manual 7.3)

Section II. Curriculum Vitae (UCAPT Manual 7.4)

Section III. Personal Statement (UCAPT Manual 7.5)

- Personal statement and Personal statement from fourth-year review

Section IV. Teaching Record (UCAPT Manual 7.6)

- Memo comparing candidate's teaching quality to Department and School norms

- Teaching statement

- Summary of evidence

Section V. Service Record (UCAPT Manual 7.7)

Section VI. Background on Referees (UCAPT Manual 7.8)

- Sample solicitation letter

- Chart of referees indicating who suggested referee, relationship to candidate, and whether all questions were answered, referees who declines

- Explanation of choice of referees, with short bio explain referee's status

Section VI-A. Letters from arms-length referees that meet all criteria

Section VI-B. Letters from collaborators, suggested by candidate, do not meet all criteria

Section VII. Selected Evidence of Scholarship and Teaching (UCAPT Manual 7.9)

APPENDIX PART B3 Preparation of the Cohort Analysis for 4th Year Reviews and Promotions

- In general all comparison faculty should be from top 20 schools as identified in Marshall's Research Productivity Expectations and Metrics for Promotion and Tenure document. For any faculty outside these schools, the PEG should include an explanation. For example, the department may be strong even if the school is not, but in this case some quantifiable evidence should be provided for the strength of the department.
- Only people already tenured should be included.
- Typically all people promoted in the last 5 years should be included but this can vary somewhat depending on how many people have been promoted in the area. Ideally a cohort should include at least 15 faculty. If fewer than this number have been promoted then the PEG may include more years.
- Every person promoted in the time period being considered must be included in the cohort, regardless of sub-area. However, the PEG may note the sub-area and point out any differences in typical publication counts etc. between the different sub-areas.
- All publications up to and including year of promotion should be included in the analysis, so if the faculty member was promoted in 2016 count anything published in 2016 or before.
- All citations up to but not including year of promotion should be included in the analysis, so if the faculty member was promoted in 2016 count all citations in 2015 or before.
- There is no mandatory structure for the cohort table, although the university asks to see Web of Science citations (UCAPT 7.3). However, a typical structure would include top-tier level publications in the faculty member's core area, top-tier publications in other areas, total top-tier, total publications, Web of Science citations, Google Scholar citations, and major awards/grants etc. For full professor cases the PEG should separate each column into pre and post tenure statistics, since the university needs to understand the candidate's trajectory since tenure.
- Each table should include summary statistics for each column
 - Mean
 - Median
 - 25th percentile (lower quartile)
 - 75th percentile (upper quartile)

APPENDIX PART B4 Dossier for Clinical and other RTPC Faculty

Guidelines for the promotion process are in Section 3.5 of this Manual. The PEG chair is responsible for assembling the dossier; the candidate is responsible for providing a CV and personal statement, and assembling supporting documentation, such as summaries of student ratings and syllabi. The dossier should be included in one binder with labeled tabs for each section in the order prescribed below. The dossier should be organized with the following section numbers and materials:

Section I. Administrative and Faculty Assessments

- Memo from Committee on Clinical Faculty Promotions

- 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. Quantitative Information

- Table listing all APR scores since candidate joined the faculty.

- Table listing every class taught and for each class: student ratings, enrollment, and (for comparison) average student ratings across the School in similar courses.

Section V. Teaching Record

- Copies of each one-page summary of student ratings for each class taught.

- Documents related to teaching innovation and effectiveness, such as syllabi and class materials.

- PEG memo reporting on in-class evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Section VI. Service Record

Section VII. 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

APPENDIX PART B5 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 CV.

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 B6 Template for In-Class Teaching Evaluation

The following approach is offered to faculty evaluators as a way to structure in-class teaching 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.

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 beginning the 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 class answers (what would happen if you did it that way?)