Santa Clara University
Office of the Provost
September 9, 2026 *(rev. November 23, 2026)*

University Procedures for Mid-Probationary Review 2026-27

Purpose: The primary purpose of the mid-probationary review is to provide developmental advice to best support the candidate during the probationary period. The following procedures outline the process of careful consideration by the department and review by the dean and Provost to ensure fairness and consistency across the school and University. The procedures reflect the developmental intent of the mid-probationary review as described in Section 3.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook and do not change the standards for tenure and promotion as defined in Section 3.4 of the Faculty Handbook and as described in discipline-specific standards for scholarship. The mid-probationary review, as stated above, examines the professional trajectory of the candidate rather than directly measuring how close a candidate might be to meeting the standards. These procedures guide and ensure consistency in the review process.

Overview: According to Section 3.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook,

> *A probationary faculty member shall receive a thorough evaluation by the tenured faculty of their department after completing approximately half of the probationary period and at least two years of active service. The candidate shall submit their materials by the deadline announced annually by the Provost. The written evaluation shall include an assessment of the faculty member's performance and development in each of the three categories of review.*
>
> *The mid-probationary review is intended to be developmental and should ordinarily culminate in an advisory letter expressing the views of the tenured faculty as to what the candidate might do in the remainder of the probationary period to enhance their candidacy for tenure. However, in those instances where it is evident that a candidate's prospects for meeting tenure expectations are remote, the mid-probationary review may culminate in a recommendation of non-retention addressed to the dean. A favorable mid-probationary review does not bind the University to grant tenure. Tenure-track faculty in the Jesuit School of Theology are subject to a different evaluation procedure.*
>
> *Faculty will be ineligible for the mid-probationary review during or after the academic year in which they petition for tenure.*

Procedures: Mid-probationary reviews are typically conducted during the third year of a seven-year probationary period. If a tenure-clock extension has been granted within the first two years of the probationary period, or the first term of the third year, the mid-probationary review will typically be conducted during the *fourth year of an eight-year probationary period*. Faculty Development Program resources for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, available in an online repository, may be helpful in preparing MPR material.

Procedures for the mid-probationary review are described below. ***Interfolio will be used for the MPR process.***

Important Dates and Deadlines

Due	Action
October 5, 2026	Provost notifies pre-MPR faculty with 2 or more completed years of service as Assistant Professor to complete intent to file form
November 2, 2026	Deadline to indicate intent to file MPR in January 2027, and to identify relevant discipline-specific scholarship standards
November 5, 2026	Provost confirms candidates for review
December 1, 2026	Case created in Interfolio and shared with candidate *
December 7, 2026	Info Session for MPR candidates 12:15-1:15 Williman Room, Benson
January 20, 2027	MPR Procedure Meeting for chairs & deans 3:00-4:00 • Benson Parlor B
January 28, 2027	Candidate submits material in Interfolio
March 5, 2027	Chair submits departmental evaluation in Interfolio
March 23, 2027	Dean submits evaluation to Provost in Interfolio
April 6, 2027	Provost notifies candidate via email of reappointment decision following the MPR, copying the dean and chair
April 16, 2027	Chair shares draft departmental advisory letter with the dean for review and approval (on Google Drive)
April 30, 2027	Chair gives final departmental advisory letter to candidate (in hard copy)
May 17, 2027	Candidates who received a successful review submit a request for a Junior Faculty Development Leave, using the submission form provided by the Office of Research

* *The Interfolio tile on MySCU is accessible to you 24/7/365 for you to enter your courses and other teaching evidence, scholarly/artistic work, and service records in the Faculty180 module. The date listed here refers to the availability of your "case" in the Interfolio RPT module, which pulls your records for the period under review from Faculty180 and moves your materials through the evaluation process.*

Procedures for the Candidate

The candidate should carefully review the *Standards for Promotion and Tenure* in section 3.4.2 of the Faculty Handbook, the department scholarship standards, as well as any other relevant College, School, or departmental documents. The current versions of the discipline-specific scholarship standards are posted online at the DSS Tracker. Probationary faculty may request to use any version of the standards approved from the time of initial appointment at rank by requesting an exception from the Provost (facultyaffairs@scu.edu).

The candidate for tenure has the option to select which version of the department's discipline-specific scholarship standards apply to their evaluation and promotion decisions throughout their probationary period:

Revisions of these standards approved by the dean will be immediately effective for all faculty evaluation, tenure, and promotion cases that begin after the approval date, unless a faculty member requests an exception from the Provost to use the prior standards. Exceptions will be granted for probationary faculty who request any version of the standards approved from the time of initial appointment at rank, and for tenured faculty who request any version of the standards in place within three years of the date that their evaluation or promotion materials are due. (Faculty Handbook 3.4.2)

You will be asked to indicate the version of the standards you have chosen on the intent to file form. Current approved standards are available on the Provost's website, and the Provost's Office has an archive of prior approved versions (for assistance with earlier versions, please contact facultyaffairs@scu.edu). If you wish to use a prior approved version, please fill out the Request for Provost Exception form and send to facultyaffairs@scu.edu. Provost's Office staff will upload the version you have chosen to your Interfolio case.

The candidate shall provide appropriate materials in Interfolio by the given deadline. The materials should include supporting documentation from the probationary period that provides evidence of the candidate's developing a strong record of superior teaching and scholarly or artistic work and service that shows promise for the candidate meeting tenure expectations at the conclusion of the probationary period.

Supporting materials may be uploaded to the appropriate Faculty180 Activities section at any time during the year. The list below is organized by Faculty180 section. The materials should include:

Personal Statement

- Not to exceed 8 double-spaced pages or 2,000 words
- Examples can be found on the Faculty Development website under resources for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

CV Uploads

- Include a current CV; older CVs should be removed or dated to fall outside the period of review

Historical FARs & FAR Evaluation Letters

- Include your original FAR reports or vitas **and** your annual evaluation letters from the department

Teaching

- Include evidence of teaching for each distinct course under the teaching section including non-redundant syllabi[1], course evaluations (SETs and, if available, narrative evaluations), peer evaluation, other materials that demonstrate teaching effectiveness (consult your department TESE [Teaching Effectiveness Standards and Evaluation])

Advising Load

- Include the number of students you have advised in your tenure at SCU thus far and descriptions of advising activity

[1] PDF format for course materials is recommended; see the guide for Converting Camino course materials to PDF format. If you link to online materials, we recommend pointing reviewers to specific artifacts using a Word document with links (cf. the video guide for uploading materials to Faculty180 [at 3.17]).

Mentoring of students

- Include evidence of mentorship (research, career)

Other Teaching

- Include ways you have contributed to teaching, learning, curricular development, and the learning environment for students
- Describe any improvements to your teaching you have already made or plan to make during the next year
- Include evidence of pedagogical development (workshops, short courses and events designed to help faculty improve their teaching)
- Note any teaching awards

Course Reduction

- Include copies of course reduction letters or evidence of course reductions given

Scholarly Contributions and Creative Productions

- Include copies of scholarly or artistic work; designate status (published, accepted or forthcoming, or submitted)

Scholarly Plans

- Include plans for future scholarly work and descriptions of work in progress

Grants-External

- Include grant award letters from external sources

Grants-Internal

- Include grant award letters from internal sources

Other Professional Activity

- Include scholarly or creative work, professional practice, or other active engagement in a discipline or field that falls outside of the publications, creative work, presentations, grants and patents captured in the above categories

University, School, or Department Service

- Include descriptions of service contributions (committee, role, amount of time, resulting document, if any)

Major Professional Service

- Include descriptions of service contributions (organization, role, amount of time)

Major Community Service

- Include descriptions of service contributions

Administrative Service

- Include administrative assignment letters

Professional Development

- Include evidence of professional development (workshops and short courses designed to keep faculty up-to-date in their discipline)

Academic Honors & Awards

- Include copies of award letters (if you have received them)

Evidence of scholarship or creative activity published or completed prior to appointment as an Assistant Professor at Santa Clara University may be included in the case, in the "Pre-Appointment Evidence" section. Please note that this section is not available in the Faculty180 module, but appears in the Review, Promotion and Tenure module of Interfolio when your MPR case is created about a month before your deadline. If you signed a memorandum of understanding when you were hired allowing a specific period of pre-appointment work to be included in your tenure review (this applies only to a small number of people hired in 2023-2025), you will have an opportunity to indicate this on your intent to file form. The Provost will solicit it from the dean and will upload it to your Interfolio case.

Letters from external reviewers obtained by the candidate are not normally part of the file unless approved in advance by the dean. The dean may specify additional materials to be provided by the candidate in College- or school-specific protocols.

Materials entering the process after it has begun shall be transmitted directly to the candidate's dean or, if the evaluations have proceeded beyond the dean, to the Provost. Such late materials need not be reviewed by the authors of completed evaluations unless, in the opinion of the dean or the Provost, they ought to be.

If the outcome of the MPR review is positive, the candidate will receive 1) a letter from the Provost congratulating the candidate on a successful MPR, and 2) an advisory letter from the department expressing the views of the tenured faculty members as to what the candidate might do in the remainder of the probationary period to enhance their candidacy for tenure (Faculty Handbook 3.3.1). [Please upload this letter in Faculty180 Activities at "MPR & MPR Advisory Letters," so it is available for subsequent reviews.]

If it is evident that a candidate's prospects for meeting tenure expectations are remote, the Provost shall notify the candidate in writing, and the candidate shall receive a final one-year appointment for the next academic year following section 3.5.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook. The candidate may request a meeting with the dean to receive the fullest and frankest statement of reasons that is consistent with the confidentiality of the specific recommendations and votes of those who have participated in the evaluation process.

Procedures for the department, dean, and Provost

All tenured faculty members in the candidate's department are eligible and expected to participate in the review. Each tenured faculty member is expected to read the candidate's materials, participate in an evaluation meeting at the invitation of the chair, and contribute to an advisory letter as appropriate. Faculty members on sabbatical or other leave may choose not to participate in the review process. A faculty member who chooses not to participate shall not be involved in any part of the process.

Before reviewing the candidate's materials, all faculty members participating in the review should carefully review *Standards for Tenure and Promotion* in Section 3.4.2 of the Faculty Handbook, the department scholarship standards, teaching and service standards (if any have been approved by the dean), and any appropriate College, school, or departmental documents.

To ensure a rigorous and thorough review of the candidate's materials, the chair, in consultation with the dean, shall appoint a committee from the tenured faculty members of the department.[2] The committee will draft, in consultation with the tenured faculty, a written evaluation of the candidate's materials for the department to discuss as part of the review meeting. The chair may serve as a member of the committee and may appoint, in consultation with the dean, appropriate faculty members from outside the department to assist in drafting the evaluation. The evaluation letter should reference the discipline-specific standards for scholarship identified by the candidate, and teaching and service standards (if any have been approved by the dean).

The chair shall schedule a review meeting of the tenured faculty to discuss the candidate's record and what the candidate might do in the remainder of the probationary period to enhance their case for tenure. The chair will distribute a draft of the written evaluation to all of the participating faculty members before the meeting. Since the intent of the mid-probationary review is developmental, a retention vote is normally not needed to formulate the departmental recommendation. However, in those instances where it is evident that a candidate's prospects for meeting tenure expectations are remote, any faculty member in the meeting can call for a vote at the conclusion of the meeting. If the motion for a vote is seconded, the faculty should engage in further discussion before a ballot is distributed with two options: "recommend," or "do not recommend" retention. A faculty member must be at the meeting to vote. After the review meeting, the committee should revise the draft written evaluation to reflect the faculty discussion and the recommendations of the department. If a retention vote is conducted, the unattributed results are reported in the written evaluation. The committee members drafting the evaluation must review and sign the final evaluation document. The chair will prepare a cover page with signature lines for all participating faculty. The final written evaluation and ballot results, if applicable, are confidential and not shared with the candidate; however, aspects of the written evaluation may be used in the departmental advisory letter to provide context as appropriate.

The chair will submit a single document in Interfolio containing: 1) a cover sheet that contains the signatures of the participating faculty to record those who participated in the review and 2) the final written evaluation signed by the chair and the committee members. A template is available on the Provost's website, on the Evaluation, Reappointment & Promotion page. The chair will then send the case forward to the dean.

The dean will review the materials provided by the department. If the dean agrees with the department's recommendation, the dean submits a written recommendation in Interfolio and sends the case forward to the Provost.

In the rare case where the dean is considering a decision different from the recommendation of the department, the dean will discuss the case with the chair and other participating tenured faculty members before submitting a written recommendation to the Provost.

In the rare case where the Provost is considering a decision different from the recommendation of either the dean or the department, the Provost shall meet with the chair, participating tenured faculty members, and the dean to discuss the case. The Provost will render the final decision regarding retention and shall notify the candidate of the decision in writing.

[2] The committee may be composed of the participating, tenured faculty members in a department, particularly in small departments.

If the chair is notified that a positive decision has been made, the tenured departmental faculty serving on the evaluation committee along with the chair shall prepare a draft departmental advisory letter. The departmental advisory letter should include an assessment of the faculty member's performance and development in each of the three categories of review (teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service) as well as the views of the tenured faculty as to what the candidate might do in the remainder of the probationary period to enhance their candidacy for tenure (section 3.3.1). The advisory letter should reference the discipline-specific standards for scholarship, and any dean-approved teaching or service standards, if appropriate. The dean shall review the draft advisory letter and may also provide comments as needed. The final departmental advisory letter is reviewed and signed by all departmental faculty members participating in the mid-probationary review. Only the advisory letter is given to the candidate.

If a candidate's prospects for meeting tenure expectations are remote and a decision of non-retention has been made, the Provost shall notify the candidate in writing. A departmental advisory letter is *not* prepared in this case. A candidate's prospects for meeting tenure expectations may be judged as "remote" in cases where it is evident, after careful and thorough review of a candidate's materials by department, dean, and Provost, that the candidate has a disqualifying weakness and is unlikely to meet the tenure and promotion standards in the remaining probationary period. The candidate may request a meeting with the dean to receive the fullest and frankest statement of reasons that is consistent with the confidentiality of the specific recommendations and votes of those who have participated in the evaluation process.

Procedure for the Reconsideration of a Negative MPR decision

Whenever a candidate receives in writing a negative decision by the Provost concerning their mid-probationary review, the candidate has 30 calendar days to file with the Provost a petition for reconsideration by the Provost. The petition shall be submitted in writing and list the reasons for the request for reconsideration. The Provost shall respond within 30 days of receipt of the request. Requests for reconsideration of a negative mid-probationary review decision are restricted to the following grounds:

1. the existence of significant and relevant new material that has become available since the candidate's application was considered; or
2. significant inconsistency in the application of standards or procedures between the candidate's evaluation and others within the same college or school and during the same year.

Upon receiving a valid request to reconsider a negative mid-probationary review decision, the Provost shall ask for recommendations on whether to reverse or to reaffirm the decision from the participating faculty members from the candidate's department, the chair, and the dean.

The participating faculty members from the candidate's department, the chair, and the dean shall make their recommendations in writing directly to the Provost, who, at their discretion, may discuss the case with any or all of them or with anyone else, including the candidate. The Provost shall then form and communicate their decision in writing to the candidate, which shall be final.

The burden of proof for a reconsideration request rests with the candidate.

Other Situations Related to Mid-Probationary Review

If a faculty member applies early for tenure without the benefit of a mid-probationary review, and the application is denied, the department will write an advisory letter similar to the letter that is produced as part of mid-probationary review. The letter will express the views of the tenured faculty as to what the candidate might do in the remainder of the probationary period to enhance their candidacy for tenure.

If a mid-probationary review is cancelled in lieu of an early application for tenure, and that application is subsequently withdrawn, a mid-probationary review will be required in the following annual cycle (Faculty Handbook 3.4.3.2).