



Tenure & Promotion

Principles, Standards, Procedures & Best Practices

Korin Wheeler
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Kitty Murphy
Associate Provost for Faculty Personnel & Policy

March 18, 2026



Principles Underlying R&T Review

- SCU's process for evaluating a candidate's petition for tenure/promotion should be:
 - **Rigorous** – Ensure that the candidate has met or exceeded University standards in teaching, scholarship and service
 - **Well-informed** – Base judgments on strong evidence in the file and the expert opinion of highly qualified scholars in the field
 - **Fair and impartial** – Follow University processes meticulously and conduct deliberations free of bias and potential conflicts of interest
 - **Confidential** – Ensure that deliberations, recommendations, and evaluative materials have confidential status and are not divulged to persons outside the review process.
- Those charged with evaluating a candidate's petition for tenure/promotion should not advocate for a particular outcome but formulate their recommendation after completing a balanced assessment of the evidence.



University Standards for Tenure and Promotion

- “[T]he University evaluates candidates for promotion and tenure under three criteria: (1) teaching, (2) scholarly or artistic work and other professional accomplishments, and (3) service to the University, the profession, and the community.” (3.4.2)
- “It is the responsibility of a candidate to demonstrate superior, not merely competent, performance in the criteria listed.” (3.4.2)
- “In general, advancement in rank and the conferring of tenure are based upon the recognition by a candidate's peers of academic and professional achievement and upon their judgment that such achievement will continue.” (3.4.2)



University Standards for Promotion to Professor

- The University shall hold to especially high standards for promotion to the rank of Professor. It is expected that candidates for promotion to Professor shall have distinguished themselves in teaching, in scholarship or artistic creativity, or preferably in both, and that they shall have served the University, their profession, or the community in proportion to their experience, their competencies, and their seniority. They shall have demonstrated achievement of high quality in all three Faculty Handbook criteria in addition to evidence submitted in the petition for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, whichever is more recent. Petition-year evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service performed during the tenure and/or promotion petition year, and scholarship that was not counted in the earlier petition for tenure and/or promotion, shall be included in the petition for promotion to Professor.” (3.4.2.2)



Evaluation of Teaching

- “Teaching is to be judged in a teacher's total effect upon the education of his or her students. Teaching includes not only classroom instruction, but also academic advising and curriculum development.” (3.4.2)
- “Those entrusted with evaluating a candidate’s teaching are to consider all evidence of achievement in each of the three components....The candidate’s course materials form part of this evidence.” (3.4.2)



Evaluation of Teaching

- Evaluation of teaching should be based, at a minimum, on two distinct sources of evidence: student evaluations and peer evaluations. (Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching)
- Best Practice - Evaluation based on multiple sources of evidence, including classroom observations and review of relevant teaching materials.
- For additional resources, see the [Teaching Effectiveness Standards and Evaluation \(TESE\) Guidelines](#).



Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET)

The Provost's Office will provide each candidate with a summary SET report.

- For tenure candidates: Summary includes data from their initial appointment to the tenure-track.
- For promotion to full: Summary report includes data from 2016 or the petition year— whichever is later—through Spring 2026.
- For everyone: Summary SET reports **exclude** class sections taught Winter and/or Spring 2020. This follows the Provost's announcement March 2020:

"Given the extenuating circumstances... [of Covid-19], faculty may opt out of conducting course evaluations in Winter and Spring 2020; however, faculty who wish to proceed with course evaluations are welcome to do so."

- Faculty also have the option of excluding Winter and/or Spring 2020 narrative evaluations.
- Evaluators will be reminded of the circumstances during these terms.



Discipline-Specific Standards for Scholarship

- "Because the nature of teaching, scholarship or artistic creativity, and service differs in some respects among academic disciplines, the faculty of the college, schools, and division develop, adopt, and publish their respective clarifications of the three criteria. Candidates for tenure or promotion are referred to these publications, as amended from time to time, for a detailed explanation of the standards and procedures by which they will be evaluated."
(3.4.2)
- Current standards are available on the Provost's website; candidates choose the version and indicate it on their external referee list and petition cover sheet



Discipline-Specific Standards for Scholarship

- School- or discipline-specific standards cannot weaken or dilute university standards. Rather they elaborate how the university standards should be applied in the context of the discipline.
- All internal and external evaluators shall evaluate the candidate's scholarly record with regard and with reference to the appropriate discipline-specific standards for scholarship document and the University standards (in FH 3.4.2)

"These standards should inform and guide, but not dictate, the professional review of a candidate's portfolio."

Discipline-Specific Scholarship Standards: Background and Implementation (2015)



Best Practices for Selecting External Referees

- Those chosen to serve as external referees should have a "strong record of accomplishment in the candidate's field" and generally hold a position at or above the rank to which the candidate is being considered for promotion.
- "Faculty members who participate in the evaluation of candidates for promotion and tenure must strive to avoid any conflict of interest, real or perceived, in order to ensure a fair and objective evaluation." (3.4.4.9)
- Department/School should provide an explanatory page on selection and qualifications of external evaluators (a **form** is available on the **Evaluation, Reappointment & Promotion** page).

Department faculty will have access to all letters available at the time of their review.



Optional Collaborator Letters

FH 3.4.4.2

- In some instances, when the candidate's contribution to scholarly or artistic work is unclear, the tenured faculty may also identify a list of individuals who have closely collaborated with the candidate on their work whom the dean will contact for an account of the nature, extent and quality of the candidate's contribution to their work.
- Possible use cases:
 - when individual contributions within team-based research need clarification
 - when the work is co-authored with a dissertation advisor
 - when it involves interdisciplinary collaborations that may be unfamiliar to external reviewers
 - when it includes artistic or design projects created jointly with others



Optional Collaborator Letters

FH 3.4.4.2

- “Prior to requesting collaborator letters, the chair must notify the candidate of the list of collaborators whom the tenured faculty might consult, and provide an opportunity for the candidate to file a written objection regarding any of the names on the list. The tenured faculty should honor the candidate's objection unless they are unable to determine the candidate's contribution using other means.”
- Steps
 - tenured faculty identify whether one or more collaborators are needed
 - process chair shares list with candidate and solicits written objection (if any)
 - chair checks collaborator availability/willingness
 - **April 15:** chair submits **list** to dean with candidate objection (if any)
 - dean solicits letters



Evaluation of Service

- “Service is activity other than teaching and scholarship or artistic creativity that fosters and advances the missions and goals of the department, the college or school, the University, or the profession.” (3.4.2)
- “The service expected of probationary faculty will be appropriate to their expertise and experience and will respect their need to devote most of their energies to teaching and scholarly or artistic work.” (3.4.2)



Evaluation of Service *for promotion to full*

The University shall hold to especially high standards for promotion to the rank of Professor. It is expected that candidates for promotion to Professor shall have distinguished themselves in teaching, in scholarship or artistic creativity, or preferably in both, and that they shall have served the University, their profession, or the community in proportion to their experience, their competencies, and their seniority. They shall have demonstrated achievement of high quality in all three Faculty Handbook criteria in addition to what they had attained when tenured or appointed to the rank of Associate Professor, whichever is more recent. (3.4.2.2)



Collegiality

Collegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of scholarship, teaching, and service. It is rather a quality whose value is expressed in the successful execution of these three functions. Collegiality means that faculty members cooperate with one another in sharing the common burdens related to discharging their responsibilities of teaching, scholarship or creative work, and service, and do so in a conscientious and professional manner. Collegiality is not the same as conformity or intellectual agreement and may not be interpreted in a way that violates the principles of academic freedom. In those rare instances in which lack of collegiality becomes an issue in the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure, it may be considered only insofar as it has a negative effect on the functioning of the department, college or school, or University. (3.4.2)



Submission of Materials

Spring materials

Submitted by candidates

- referees and non referees
- scholarly works to be evaluated
- professional CV

Submitted by departments

- 2 department referees (**form**)
- **collaborator list** (with candidate objections, if any)
- department conflicts of interest

Fall petition

Faculty180/Interfolio

Backup documentation

All candidates for Tenure & Candidates petitioning for full who chose Interfolio only

Candidates petitioning for full who chose GDrive for backup documentation

All candidates provide by posting to a restricted Google drive file prepared by the Dean’s Office (using template provided by Provost’s Office)

All candidates upload the petition cover sheet, personal statement, and FAR/MPR evaluation letters to Faculty180

Interfolio creates the annotated CV (the “vita”)

Faculty create and upload annotated CV to Fac180

Dean adds spring materials to Interfolio after candidate submits case

All other supporting material → Fac180

All other supporting material → GDrive



Letters from Tenured Faculty Members in Department

- Chair invites all tenured members of department to participate in review.
- All faculty who participate in departmental discussion shall submit evaluation letter that includes a numerical score.
- Faculty on sabbatical or other leave may choose not to participate in R&T process.
- A faculty member who chooses not to participate shall not be involved in any part of the process.
- A faculty member who is unable for good reason to participate in the departmental discussion may write a letter if they have reviewed candidate's file. The letter must explain why the faculty member could not participate in the discussion.



Ranking of Candidates

(Duggan Report)

Each member will assign a value, ranging from 5 to 0, to a candidate's petition. Use full integers.

- 5** – The candidate is uniformly excellent in meeting all three Faculty Handbook criteria.
- 4** – A strong “yes” but acknowledges minor weakness in one or two criteria.
- 3** – A weak “yes,” indicating that the candidate has met all criteria but has appreciable though not disqualifying weakness in some.
- 2** – A “no,” indicating that the candidate's record, whatever its strength, is sufficiently weak in one or more of the criteria to justify denial of tenure or promotion.
- 1** – A strong “no” indicating serious weakness in one or more of the three criteria.
- 0** – The strongest “no,” indicates that there is little or no merit in the candidate's record.



Evaluative Letters from Tenured Faculty in Department

Good practices:

- Refer to specific evidence in the file, and evaluate it objectively.
- Informed by the reviews of the external evaluators, assess the candidate's scholarship in reference to the appropriate Discipline-Specific Standards for Scholarship document.
- Use multiple sources of evidence in evaluating teaching.

When evaluating candidates for promotion to professor, judge whether the candidate's record has reached the level of "distinguished" in teaching and scholarship, and whether their service is of high quality and in proportion to their rank, competencies, and seniority.

- End your letter with an overall score (0-5 from Duggan Report) and a brief summary of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.

Cautionary notes:

- Do not advocate for a candidate to be tenured or promoted.
- Do not ignore one of the external letters, even if you disagree with the contents of the letter.
- Do not argue that the candidate should be evaluated against a lower set of standards because of personal circumstances.
- Do not average a candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. Rather, judge whether the candidate has met the standard in each area of evaluation.



Extensions of Tenure Clock

The Faculty Handbook ([3.4.1.1](#)) allows candidates to apply for an extension of the tenure clock under certain circumstances. In 2020 the deadline for requesting an extension was made more flexible and the disruptions caused by COVID-19 were identified as a legitimate cause for a request for an extension.

Tenure candidates who have been granted an extension of the probationary period will be reviewed under the same academic standards as candidates who have not had an extension. (see [3.4.1.1](#))



Confidentiality

- Deliberations, recommendations, and evaluative materials shall have confidential status and shall not be divulged to persons outside the review process. (3.4.6)
- Committee conversations should be conducted in person or on zoom; no discussion should take place on email.



Reference to Discipline-Specific Scholarship Standards & University Standards

- All evaluators—department faculty, and school and University R&T Committee members—should refer to the discipline-specific scholarship standards (DSS) and the University standards (FH 3.4.2) when reviewing a case
- Evaluation of a candidate's performance in evaluation reports at all levels should reference the DSS and University standards
- Candidates choose which version of the DSS to apply to their case. All evaluators must use the version chosen by the candidate.



Contextual Summary Letter

- Written by the process chair, addressed to the dean
- Summarizes the individual faculty letters and provides a context to the candidate's petition and to the faculty letters
- Contains the numerical evaluations found in the individual letters (e.g., "the individual votes are 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 3, 3")
- Notes if there is a letter from a person absent from the department discussion
- Other possible contents
 - information about the field of research or creative endeavor
 - disciplinary practices of evaluation and publishing not covered in the DSS
 - other items of relevance that may not be known outside the discipline
- The contextual summary *letter is not shared* with participating faculty, but the unattributed *numerical votes may be shared with participants* (confidential and may not be shared with anyone else)

University Procedures for Departmental Review of Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion



School & University R&T Committees



Recusal for Committee members from a candidate's department

Rank and Tenure Committee members from a candidate's department must recuse themselves entirely from the committee's review of the candidate's case. They shall not view any materials associated with the candidate's case, beyond what they examined as a participant in the department review. They shall not be present in the room, participate in the committee's deliberations, answer questions, vote, or sign the committee's report. They participate fully and cast a ballot only at the department level. (3.4.4.4, cf. 3.4.4.6 for University Committee)



Expansion and Subdivision of School Committee in years with a heavy caseload

Should the Provost, the Faculty Senate President, or the relevant dean believe that a committee will have eight or more cases in a year, that committee may be divided into two committees and supplementary committee members may be elected. When a committee is divided into two, the chairs of those two committees will work with each other so as to maintain uniform standards. Each committee shall consist of no fewer than three, and no more than seven members, all of whom shall be tenured Professors or Associate Professors. All committees shall have at least one member at the rank of Professor.

(excerpted from 2.11.2.1)



Policies, Procedures, & Timeline for Rank and Tenure Processes

<https://www.scu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/evaluation-promotion/>



Santa Clara Provost and Executive Vice President

Faculty Development | Research | Faculty Affairs | About Our Faculty | Institutional Effectiveness | About The Provost

Evaluation, Reappointment & Promotion

Home | Office of the Provost and EVP | Faculty Affairs | Evaluation, Reappointment & Promotion

Evaluation
Faculty Handbook 3.3 describes the standards and processes for the periodic evaluation of faculty. Periods of review and forms and requirements for the Faculty Activities Report (FAR) may differ by rank and school.

Faculty Activities Reporting

Reappointment
Expand all items +

Assistant Teaching Professor Reappointment

Mid-Probationary Review (MPR) and Junior Faculty Development Leave (JFDL)

Promotion
Expand all items +

Rank & Promotion, Teaching-track Faculty

Tenure & Promotion, Tenure-stream Faculty

Faculty Affairs

Faculty Handbook
Collective Bargaining Agreement
Recruitment & Appointment
Evaluation, Reappointment & Promotion
Standards
Incentives
Other Policies & Procedures
Compensation & Support
Contact Us

Upcoming Events

10/15 **Tenure & Promotion Procedure Meeting**
Noon + Executive Conference Room, St. Joseph's
A review of procedures for department and process chairs, deans, and Rank & Tenure Committees, hosted by the Provost's Office.

10/17 **Tenure & Promotion: Final List of Referees to Chair and Dean**
11:59 p.m. +
Provide your final list of external referees and non-referees to your dean and department or process chair or program director, using this [form](#).
View the full [Faculty Affairs Calendar](#)