

Executive Summary of the work of the Service Evaluation of TTT FAC 2020-2021

Co-chairs:

Steven L. Lamy, Professor of International Relations, Environmental Studies and Spatial Sciences
Violina P. Rindova, Captain Henry W. Simonsen Chair in Strategic Entrepreneurship

The committee chairs requested all committee members to share available information about formal evaluation procedures of TT faculty service. Only a couple of schools appeared to have formalized criteria for valuing service through the APR process –Dworak-Peck School of Social Work, Gould School of Law, and the Marshall School of Business.

The committee met in the fall of 2020 to discuss.

The committee discussed the diversity of service assignments that exist in different schools, as well as the differences in the extent to which service expectations for different ranks of tenure faculty are explicit. The committee articulated several recommendations:

1. Given the diversity of service assignments, it may important to create a system that records and tracks service assignments, and allows for systematic comparisons and cumulative assessments. For example, in the Viterbi School of Engineering, a committee has developed a way of quantifying faculty service efforts. Faculty enter service activities in the myviterbi portal. Department chairs and Deans populate any committee requests they make from faculty. The system captures type of service and importance on a scale.
2. Given the diversity of service expectations and assignments across schools, it would be valuable to catalogue the different types of service tasks faculty in the different schools perform and how they are valued in promotion and in performance (APR) evaluations.
 - a. The service catalog should clarify the importance/value of different service assignments for promotion and APR evaluations separately.
 - b. The catalog should clarify which of these service assignments are expected for junior faculty.
 - c. The catalog could serve to assess the extent to which university-level standards could be established.
 - d. The catalog should be developed on the basis of consistent inputs solicited from the Deans for Faculty.
3. The committee discussed that junior faculty participation in service assignments has both upsides and downsides for junior faculty, which should be weighed in proposing policies about junior faculty service. On the downside, service assignments take time and effort away from the core responsibilities for research and teaching. On the upside, service assignments provide junior faculty with opportunities to understand the systems and processes in place in their schools, to express voice, and contribute to desirable change, and to develop governance skills. The committee recommends that this item is

incorporated in the mandate for the committee on junior faculty mentoring as participation in service is an important component of mentoring.

4. The committee noted the importance of recognizing that the USC diversity index shows that faculty racial diversity is significantly lower than student racial diversity (<http://oir.usc.edu/faculty-and-student-diversity/>). The diversity index (chance that two randomly picked individuals have difference race/ethnicity) of USC undergraduate students is 72% and that of USC faculty is 51%. The selection of diverse faculty in the service assignments is important to ensure that committees reflect our student body. Such an approach supports USC values, innovation, and community; and strengthen global research. We would like to recommend to present this diversity index profile at <http://oir.usc.edu/faculty-and-student-diversity/>.

Undergraduate Student	Graduate Students	Overall Faculty	Tenure Faculty
72%	73%	51%	52%

Table 1. Racial Diversity Index