

**Santa Clara University
Office of the Provost**

University Procedures for Mid-Probationary Review¹ 2019-20

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 clarify 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 do not change the developmental intent of the mid-probationary review as described in Section 3.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook and do not reflect any change in 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. In fact, 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 clarify and bring consistency to the review process.

Overview: According to Section 3.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook,

A probationary faculty member shall receive an especially thorough evaluation by the tenured faculty of his or her department after completing approximately half of the probationary period, at a time to be determined by the department chair in consultation with the dean. 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 his or her 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.

Procedures: Mid-probationary reviews are typically conducted during the third year. If the probationary period is more or less than the standard seven years (Section 3.4.1), then the candidate should discuss with the dean and chair whether there is any change in the mid-probationary review timing. The Faculty Development Program has resources available in an online repository that may be helpful in preparing materials (<http://www.scu.edu/provost/facultydevelopment/index.cfm>). Procedures for the mid-probationary review are described below. ***Faculty180 will be used for the MPR process and may introduce some slight procedural variations to adapt to constraints of electronic system and ensure confidentiality.***

¹ Process: A preliminary draft was reviewed by the Faculty Affairs Committee in Fall 2012. Based on that initial feedback, as well as comments and suggestions from the Council of Deans, Department Chairs, and the Faculty Senate Council, the procedures were revised by the Provost's Office and reviewed by the Faculty Affairs Committee. Additional comments were obtained when a draft was disseminated to the faculty for comment, and a town hall meeting was held on January 31, 2013. After a discussion and review of the comments expressed at Faculty Senate Council on February 13, the Faculty Affairs Committee recommended the MPR procedures to the Provost on February 14, 2013 for his approval. Further refinements were introduced at a February 27, 2013 town hall meeting. In 2014, a Taskforce established by the Faculty Senate Council reviewed the procedures and made recommendations. In June of 2014, the Faculty Senate Council sent the taskforce recommendations to the Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration. The Faculty Affairs Committee consulted with member of the taskforce and developed revisions to the MPR procedures that were shared with the Faculty Senate Council in June 2015 and in October 2015. After consultation with the Faculty Senate Council, the Faculty Affairs Committee sent the revised MPR procedures to the full faculty for consultation on November 11, 2015. After considering the comments, the final recommendations for the revised MPR procedures were made to the provost on February 9, 2016.

Target Dates

January 17, 2020	Candidate completes Faculty180 training
February 3, 2020	Candidate submits mid-probationary review materials in Faculty180
March 13, 2020	Chair submits departmental evaluation in Faculty180
March 27, 2020	Dean submits a written recommendation to the Provost in Faculty180
April 3, 2020	The Provost notifies the candidate in writing and in Faculty180 of the reappointment decision following the MPR, copying the dean and department chair
April 20, 2020	Chair prepares and submits draft advisory letter in Faculty180
May 4, 2020	Chair provides the candidate with the departmental advisory letter
May 22, 2020	Candidates who received a successful review submit a request for a Junior Faculty Development leave following target dates for JFDLs

Procedures for the Candidate

The candidate should carefully review the *Standards for Tenure and Promotion* in Section 3.4.2 of the Faculty Handbook as well as any appropriate College, School or departmental documents.

The candidate shall provide appropriate materials in Faculty180 by the given deadline. The materials should include supporting documentation from the probationary period that will provide 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. The materials within Faculty180 should include:

- personal statement,
- annotated CV (to be replaced by Faculty180 application),
- a listing of courses taught by year for probationary period including enrollments (to be prepopulated in Faculty180),
- course syllabi,
- copies of student evaluations,
- major course materials, such as exams, handouts, and customized course readers,
- copies of scholarly or artistic work including grant proposals,
- descriptions of work in progress,
- plans for future scholarly work,
- service contributions,
- annual evaluation letters, and
- faculty activity reports.

Other supporting materials might include peer evaluation letters including reports on the direct observation of teaching, documentation of advising and mentoring, a summary of student research, instructional development activity, other contributions to the learning

environment, and any awards or honors. 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 his or her candidacy for tenure (Section 3.3.1)

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

The department chair must keep all mid-probationary review materials in a secure location.

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 department 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 as well as 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. 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.

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 his or her 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 department 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 an advisory letter to provide context as appropriate.

The chair will submit to the dean the following documents within Faculty180: 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. (Note: signatures may be electronic within Faculty180). Candidate materials will flow through Faculty180.

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 to the Provost in Faculty180.

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 department 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 department 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.

If the chair is notified that a positive decision has been made, the tenured departmental faculty serving on the evaluation committee along with the department 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 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 his or her candidacy for tenure (Section 3.3.1). The advisory letter should reference the discipline-specific standards for scholarship. 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. An 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 his or her 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. the existence of evidence suggesting that the evaluation of the case was inconsistent with established procedures or standards or was substantively unfair, such as being adversely impacted by significant personal or professional bias.

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, department chair, and dean.

The participating faculty members from the candidate's department, department chair, and dean shall make their recommendations in writing directly to the Provost, who, at his or her 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 his or her decision, which shall be final, in writing to the candidate.

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