

Mid-probationary Academic Progress Review

It is the responsibility of every department in the USC Viterbi School of Engineering to evaluate each of its tenure track probationary faculty midway through their probationary period (i.e., usually in the third of six years, unless a tenure decision date (TDD) extension has been approved by the Provost). This normally applies regardless of the faculty member's rank. Consistent with the [UCAPT Manual](#) (2022 version), Section 3.3.2, the review is intended to facilitate communication and understanding of expectations for tenure. The review evaluates the faculty member's accomplishments and progress to date, in order to determine if sufficient progress is being made toward tenure, to continue on the track. It is hoped that this evaluation will allow the faculty member to improve and/or re-focus efforts for the remainder of the probationary period, if/as necessary, making continual progress. Reviews cannot conclude that the faculty member will or will not receive tenure at some later date as it is the Provost, not the department or school, that decides on tenure. There is no guarantee that a positive review will result in promotion, and a negative review does not necessarily result in immediate dismissal. It is important that all tenure-track, probationary faculty be fully informed as to their progress relative to prospects for tenure and whether their efforts to date are satisfactory. In conducting the review, the following steps normally are followed.

1. The department Chair initiates the Mid-Probationary Academic Progress Review for every tenure-track probationary faculty member whose primary appointment resides within that department. The review normally commences when the faculty member is in the semester immediately prior to the midway point of their probationary period at USC and should be completed before the end of midway point.
2. The Chair informs the faculty member that the review will be undertaken and that the faculty member will be made fully aware of its conclusions before the completion of the review within the department.
3. The department creates a mini-dossier for review. The faculty member is responsible for providing an up-to-date CV in the format described in the [UCAPT Manual](#) and [VSoE APT Guidelines](#), and a Personal Statement that describes their research and scholarship, as also described in the [UCAPT Manual](#). The faculty member's department is responsible for providing the faculty member's Annual Faculty Reviews (AFRs), teaching performance (including student evaluations and any other relevant evaluation material, as applicable), and any additional information relevant to assist in the review, as deemed appropriate.
4. The Chair normally appoints a three-member committee consisting of tenured faculty members to review the mini-dossier. The committee may solicit additional information if/as appropriate (including outside letters, if needed). The committee returns to the Chair in a timely manner its report, in the form of a memo, which includes a summary of its assessments, constructive feedback, and recommendations regarding the faculty member's research, teaching, and service activities and accomplishments to date. The members of the committee remain anonymous to the faculty member.
5. The Chair writes a memo that captures all key elements of the department committee's report and, after Dean's approval, meets with the faculty member to discuss the summarized findings captured in the Chair's memo, which includes the Chair's constructive feedback and recommendations from the review.
6. After the Chair's meeting with the faculty member, the finalized summary department committee's report and Chair's memo are submitted to the Dean's Office. The faculty member may send, if so desired, any written comments to the Dean in response to the findings of the review. Optionally, the Dean may write a memo with additional constructive feedback and recommendations that will be added to the mini-dossier and which would be discussed with the faculty member in a separate meeting with the Dean.