

University Committee on Professional-track Faculty

Criteria and Procedures Recommendations

The University Committee on Professional-track Faculty (UCPTF) is concurrently developing guidance for unit criteria for the promotion of professional-track faculty and reviewing criteria documents submitted to the Office of the Provost following the old procedures of policy [ACAF 1.16 Professional-track Faculty](#).^{*} The recommendations below are organized around areas of assessment currently under consideration. **PTF must be involved in the revision of promotional criteria and included in the unit decision processes for promotion.**

1. Unit criteria is required for all PTF position types employed in the unit.
2. Clear specifications of major standards for achievement are needed for promotion in the position (research/teaching/service/etc).
3. Promotion must be linked to the specific percentage of the position duties. For example, if position is 15% research, 65% teaching and 20% service, then promotion should be primarily based on teaching achievement.
4. Unit criteria need to state clearly how much time in rank is required before an individual can be considered for promotion.
5. In general, there is an expectation of higher or sustained levels of achievement for promotion to clinical professor, research professor, and distinguished instructor compared to the level of achievement required for promotion to clinical associate professor, research associate professor and senior instructor.
6. Examples and types of evidence required to meet the promotion standards should be detailed in the document rather than using general or vague terminology.
7. Unit criteria need to be consistent with USC terminology, policies, and the Faculty Manual. For example, if unit criteria use adjectival standards to rate candidates' performance, the following terminology should be used: outstanding, excellent, good, fair, and unacceptable. Definitions of these terms may be varied to meet the needs of the individual unit, but should be generally consistent with the language in the June 2023 *Faculty Manual* (page 25).
8. Unit criteria need to specify the use of external reviewers, if applicable to the given position type
9. Unit criteria need to include an explanation of the process for review of candidates for promotion. Additionally, criteria need to address the formation and composition of the unit promotion committee as well as voting procedures within the committee as well as within the unit.

***Policy change in process to align with the Faculty Manual**

ACAF 1.16 is now being rewritten to delete the phrase “unless otherwise specified in the academic unit/sub-unit policies or bylaws.”

New language on voting rights for ACAF 1.16:

Voting rights within a college, school, or department shall be based upon the same standards as for the university faculty, except that only tenured faculty can vote on matters concerning tenure and promotion guidelines and advancement of tenure-track faculty.