

**Criteria and Procedures  
Promotion and Performance Reviews  
Professional Track Faculty  
Department of Philosophy**

**Definitions**

Faculty: University personnel who are engaged in research, instruction both inside and outside the classroom, service and/or administration. Faculty can be further classified as having tenure-track, professional-track, or honorific appointments (ACAF 1.06).

Professional track: designation for faculty members who are engaged in research, instruction both inside and outside the classroom, service and/or administration but who are not eligible for tenure (ACAF 1.06).

Instructors: designation for faculty who are full-time employees and whose primary duties are teaching.

**1. Procedures for Annual Review**

1.1. In accordance with ACAF 1.16 C2, Professional Track Faculty will receive an annual performance review by the Chair of the Department.

1.1.2. Professional Track Faculty will receive peer evaluations of teaching every year during the first two years of their appointment and thereafter once every other year. The evaluations will be performed by two full time faculty members. The reviewing faculty members must be at least equal in rank to the reviewed faculty. Professional Track Faculty rankings of Instructor, Senior Instructor, and Distinguish Instructor are equivalent to the Tenure Track Faculty rankings of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor. Peer evaluations of teaching will be conducted with the other teaching observations that are required by the philosophy graduate program and the Department Criteria on Tenure and Promotion.

1.1.3. Professional Track Faculty are required to submit an Annual Report of Activities and copies of any peer observations of teaching. The Chair of the Department with the support of the Philosophy Program Coordinator will collect student evaluations of teaching.

1.1.4. A committee comprised of the Senior Instructors, the Distinguished Instructors, and the Chair of the Department will conduct an annual review of Professional Track Faculty. Based on this review, the Chair of the Department will write a letter of evaluation for each instructor and forward a copy to the Dean. Faculty will be given the opportunity to discuss their evaluation with the Chair of the Department. Under exceptional circumstances, for instance, if there are no senior instructors, the chair has the discretion to appoint a committee from the Department Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

**1.2. Procedures for Appointment and Promotion**

1.2.1. The calendar for collecting and reviewing promotion files will match the calendar for tenure and promotion set by the College of Arts and Sciences.

1.2.2. The Chair of the Department will write a letter of evaluation for each instructor seeking promotion and forward a copy to the Dean. Faculty will be given the opportunity to discuss their evaluation with the Chair of the Department.

1.2.3. The maximum duration for an initial appointment in CAS is typically one academic year. Generally, faculty are hired on annual appointments for the first two years. Upon a successful second year review, faculty will be reappointed for a 3-year term. Upon successful promotion, faculty may be reappointed for 5-year terms.

1.2.4. Appointments may not exceed five academic years at a time. They are renewable at the discretion of the Dean and are subject to annual performance reviews, teaching needs, and availability of funding. Renewal regardless of appointment term is contingent upon satisfactory annual performance and availability of funds.

1.2.5. Professional Track Instructors who have been full time employees for six years are eligible for promotion to Senior Instructor. It is not required that the candidate have six years of teaching at USC, but there must be six years of teaching after earning the PhD. Instructors hired at entry level should generally complete the 1-year probationary period before being eligible for promotion. Instructors who have been full time employees for six years at the rank of Senior Instructor are eligible for promotion to Distinguished Instructor.

1.2.6. Candidates for promotion will compile a file containing all annual reviews conducted since being appointed as an instructor or since their last promotion. Candidate files will also contain a personal narrative describing their professional development during the evaluation period.

1.2.7. The Annual Review committee (described in 1.1.4.) will evaluate the promotion file as outstanding, excellent, good, fair, or unacceptable.

1.2.8. In accordance with ACAF 1.16 C3, promotion is recommended by the dean and approved by the executive vice president for academic affairs and provost.

1.2.9. Non-reappointment and Termination for Professional Track Instructors: In accordance with ACAF 1.16 C4, appointments of professional-track faculty will be in writing and will specify the beginning and ending date of appointment. Appointments will terminate on the date specified. Notice of non-reappointment is recommended but not required. If a professional-track faculty member is appointed without a specified ending date, notice of non-reappointment shall be given in writing to the faculty member at least twelve months prior to the termination date. Termination of employment before the end of the contract period can be for lack of satisfactory performance, just cause and/or insufficient funds.

## **2. Expectations and Criteria Regarding Performance and Promotion**

### **2.1. Criteria for Annual Performance Review**

2.1.1. Evaluation of instructors is based primarily on teaching, which includes developing new classes and revising previously taught classes. Instructors are also expected to perform the administrative duties of participating in peer observation of teaching, occasionally serving on search committees for Professional Track Faculty in the department and participating in faculty meetings and department retreats. Once promoted, Professional Track Faculty are also expected to serve on the annual review committee (see 1.1.4.). The terms of appointment determine whether and to what extent research and further administrative duties are considered.

2.1.2. In cases where instructor appointments do not include research, evidence of research and of service duties beyond those mentioned in 2.1.1, may be used as evidence for a positive review. In these cases, lack of evidence of these activities cannot be used as evidence for a negative review.

2.1.3. Annual Performance Reviews will be based only on evidence collected during the evaluation period, although prior performance reviews can be used as a basis for comparison.

2.1.4. Annual Performance Reviews will be based on information provided by the instructor's Annual Report of Activities, peer evaluations of teaching, and student evaluations of teaching. The Annual Report of Activities will collect information on new course development, curriculum development, teaching development, advising, teaching beyond one's assigned duties, teaching beyond the classroom, and an optional narrative of one's teaching performance over the evaluation period. Evaluations may also consider student reports or complaints delivered to the Department Chair. Evaluations may also consider evidence of research (e.g., presentations and publications), service, administrative duties, and other evidence of job performance, such as awards.

## **2.2. Terminology for Evaluating Teaching Performance.**

2.2.1. The annual performance of professional track faculty will be evaluated as outstanding, excellent, good, fair, or unacceptable with regard to teaching.

2.2.2. Unacceptable teaching performance falls below the level of teaching competence. Evidence of incompetent teaching includes a pattern of failing in one's basic teaching duties, for instance, failing to attend class without notice, failing to grade and return student work when required, or inappropriate and unprofessional behavior toward students.

2.2.3. Fair teaching performance meets but does not exceed the basic level of teaching competence. Fair performance may occasionally but not consistently provide evidence of incompetent teaching.

2.2.4. Good teaching performance meets and exceeds the basic level of teaching competence. This means that good teaching does not provide evidence of incompetent teaching. In addition to evidence of teaching competence, good teaching displays some qualities of excellent teaching with room for improvement. Qualities of excellent teaching include but are not limited to the following: revising courses and pedagogical practices in response to assessment; developing new

courses and/or contributing to the development of new curriculum (for instance, helping to develop a new concentration within the major); mentoring and advising of students (for instance, serving as advisor on a senior thesis); effective classroom management or performance; high levels of student engagement; teaching writing-intensive courses or other courses that place special demands on the instructor in order to achieve significant learning outcomes; innovative teaching practices.

2.2.5. Excellent teaching performance meets and exceeds the standards for good teaching and consistently possesses many qualities of excellent teaching (see 2.2.4.).

2.2.6. Outstanding teaching performance meets the criteria for excellent teaching performance and displays qualities of exceptional teaching. Qualities of exceptional teaching include but are not limited to the following: winning teaching awards or honors; teaching that goes beyond one's usual teaching duties, for instance, teaching in venues outside the university; teaching with impact or reach beyond the university.

2.2.7. The Chair of the Department will evaluate job performance overall by considering the instructor's teaching performance and taking account of additional service, research, or administrative duties, in accordance with 2.1.1. and 2.1.2.

2.2.8. An evaluation of at least good is required for continued employment for subsequent years of the current appointment period.

### **2.3. Criteria for Promotion**

2.3.1. A good promotion file will contain annual reviews that consistently rate the candidate's job performance as good.

2.3.2. An excellent file will contain annual reviews that consistently rate the candidate's job performance as excellent or that show a clear trajectory towards job performance that warrants an excellent evaluation.

2.3.3. An outstanding file will meet the criteria for an excellent file and will also contain annual reviews that rate the candidate's job performance as outstanding or that show a clear trajectory towards job performance that warrants an outstanding evaluation.

2.3.4. Promotion to Senior Instructor or to Distinguished Instructor requires that the file be evaluated as excellent or outstanding.

Approved, December 6, 2023