

**Promotion and Tenure
(to Full or Associate Professor)
Dossier Checklist
Standard Format**

Promotion and tenure decisions, both positive and negative, follow this format: (use the sample dossier supplied to your department for more detailed information). The candidate is responsible for the CV, personal statement, teaching materials (except course evaluations) and service activities. The candidate can solicit other letters as can the department with the candidate's approval. Possible "other" letter writers include co-authors, advisors, students who have been mentored by the candidate. The department is responsible for the remainder of the binder.

1. Promotion and Tenure Summary Sheet, specifying:
 - a. Name, Rank, Department, College or School
 - b. Rank/Tenure, action to be considered
 - c. Date of original appointment at SMU
 - d. Date of previous appointment at SMU
 - e. List of all courses taught at SMU for the last five years, with dates and enrollments.
 - f. List of publications
 - g. List of student evaluations
 - h. Index of notebook contents
2. Recommendation of Dean, Chairperson, Faculty Promotion Committee, Advisory Committees, etc. with supporting documentation
3. Updated *curriculum vitae*
4. Personal statement from the candidate – Candidates must submit a written statement concerning aims and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and research, and other activities within the University and the candidates' profession.
5. Record of Grant Proposals

Break your activity into the following sections as applicable:

- I. Current/Active Funded Grants or Awards
- II. Completed Funded Grants or Awards
- III. Proposals Submitted and Reviewed or Submitted and Pending Review

For proposals that have been reviewed, please provide a copy of the review if there is one.

6. Candidate's Publications – provide list and an explanation of "first author" convention. All publications for the candidate **must** be identified by: (1) Quality of the scholarly publication and (2) Scholarly standing within the Candidate's field **In a separate container, please provide:**
 - a. Original publication, the whole publication or off-prints are preferred to photocopies (published reviews for all books)
 - b. For accepted work, letter of acceptance together with most recent state of manuscript; for books, contract and readers' reports

7. Information about Journals: any journal cited as a publication source for the candidate **must** be identified by: impact and selectivity, area (field) or discipline.

8. Citations List, if used. All citations for the candidate **must** be identified by: (1) quality of the scholarly publication and/or peer reviewed journal; (2) scholarly standing within the Candidate's field; and (3) Type: self-citation, co-author citation, and any other citation.

9. Outside Peer Evaluations. A minimum of six letters from outside the University assessing the candidate's accomplishments is required: Department chairs should expect to provide the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs with a list of ten names together with brief CV's obtained from the web – no reviewer should be directly contacted at this point. Only eight will be contacted initially. The chair of the department should discuss the list of eight potential peer reviewers with the Senior Associate Dean before letters are solicited. If the original list should prove unsuccessful, the chair of the department should consult further with the Senior Associate Dean.

1. The candidate should offer a short list of potential reviewers (at least three) to the department chair. Potential reviewers will be contacted by the department, not the candidate.
2. The tenured faculty at the rank above the rank of the candidate should develop a separate list of its own involving no consultation with the candidate.
3. At least three letters must be procured from the departmental list. Preferably three letters should be procured from the candidate's list.

External reviewers should be sent an appropriate sample of the candidate's published (including accepted but not in print) work. For candidates with a book publication this must include the book and should include a small sample of other published work since arriving at SMU. For candidates with peer reviewed journal articles only (no book), a substantial portion of their published work since arriving at SMU should constitute the body of work sent to the reviewers. In some cases it may be appropriate to send out unpublished work. This could include the unpublished portions of a second book or manuscript or a single submitted journal article. The primary purpose of including this material in the sample sent to the external reviewers is to indicate future research directions. Both the candidate and the department must agree on the body of work sent out to the external reviewers.

Guidelines for external reviewer choices: No co-authors, no close collaborators, no thesis/dissertation committee members, no former instructors, no more than two from the same University, no fewer than 6 Universities. In the case of promotion to Full Professor: no one below the rank of Full Professor. In the case of promotion to Associate Professor: no newly minted Associate Professors and at the most two Associate Professors. Reviewers should hold tenure in an institution with research standards at least as high as SMU's. Exceptions to these requirements will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

A brief statement should be included which includes:

1. How the outside reviewers were selected;
2. The relevant qualifications of the outside reviewers;
3. Which reviewers did not write letters along with explanations of why (never responded to the initial request, agreed to write but never did, . . .);
4. A copy of the letter soliciting the recommendation;

5. A CV of each reviewer (reviewer CV's should provide sufficient information to determine qualifications but need not be exhaustive – a condensed version of the CV will suffice). The CV should immediately follow all the peer review letters in and should be preceded by color coded paper (see example binder).

Ask reviewers to:

1. Describe your relationship/interaction with the candidate;
 2. Assess the quality of the candidate's publications and significance of his/her research and contributions to the field.
 3. Compare the candidate with others at a similar career stage;
 4. Assess the likelihood of continued development and productivity by the candidate.
10. Third year review letter.
 11. Other Letters, Not required. These could include letters written by co-authors, advisors, students who have been mentored by the candidate
 12. Department Faculty Letters (alpha order)
 13. Evaluation of Teaching/Student Letters (Departments should begin soliciting these letters from students who took courses with candidate no later than June 1st. It is recommended that all students who took courses with the candidate be solicited. A second solicitation is recommended in early August.
 - a. A description of the department's peer review process, including all written reports that grow out of the process
 - b. The department should solicit letters from all classes taught or co-taught by the candidate during the last five years at SMU. Letters from students who have multiple classes with the candidate may appear once, with the most recent course, along with a spreadsheet than keys such letters to the multiple courses taken. Students may also be solicited via e-mail. The letters should be put in alpha order according to the class and semester taken.
 - c. A sample letter of solicitation.
 - d. **IN A SEPARATE DOSSIER:** all student course evaluations of teaching, originals only, no summary forms, all written comments as well as multiple choice. See example.
 14. Teaching Materials (PLEASE PLACE IN SEPARATE DOSSIER)
 - a. Any materials the candidate can supply to indicate high quality or outstanding teaching (e.g., syllabus, major exams, most important class handouts, etc.)
 15. List of service activities, including all examples of service work accomplished by the candidate.
 16. Summary of course evaluations – summary sheets for each course with averages for each question and number of students.

Dedman College

Faculty Promotion Summary Sheet

Name

Rank (rank currently held)

Department Department of xxxxxx
Dedman College

I. To be considered for:

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
Or Full Professor

Date and nature of original appointment at SMU:

September ____xx Assistant Professor

Dates of rank(s) subsequent to original appointment at SMU:

May ____xx Associate Professor

**II. Courses taught at SMU, with dates and enrollments; dissertations/theses supervised:
(provide last 5 years or all years at SMU, whichever is smaller).**

<u>Semester/Year</u>	<u>Course</u>	<u>Final Enrollment</u>
Spring 1998	SPAN 5336-001 Spanish-American Novel	14
	CF 3358-001 Masterpieces of Western European Literature	25
Fall 1997	on leave without pay—teaching at University of Puerto Rico	
Spring 1997	MATH 4351 The Theory of Numbers	23
	MATH 3334 Introduction to Applied Mathematics	29
Fall 1996	MATH 3308 Introduction to Discrete Mathematics	15
	MATH 4338 Analysis	22
Spring 1996	ECO 1310 Exploring Economic Issues	60
	ECO 2320 Introduction to Public Policy	25
Fall 1995	ECO 3355 Money and Banking	18
	ECO 4351 Labor Economics	23
Spring 1995	BIOL 1401 Introductory Biology	29
	BIOL 3223 Physiology Laboratory	15
	BIOL 3307 Ecology	20
Fall 1994	SPAN 5338-001 Spanish-American Short Story	12
	SPAN 5380-001 Tutorial for Jrs. and Srs.	3
	SPAN 1401-N12 Beginning Spanish Practicum	17
	SPAN 1401-N15 Beginning Spanish Practicum	14
Spring 1994	on leave	
Fall 1993	SPAN 4395-002 Introduction to Hispanic Literature	20
	SPAN 5338-001 Spanish American Short Story	19

Dissertations/Thesis Supervised

<u>Year</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Thesis title</u>	<u>Graduation Date</u>	<u>Post Degree Study</u>
2008	Spanish	Satre –Truth or Dare	expected 2011	
2001-2004	Biology	Pillbugs Feast Or Famine	2004 (with honors)	Post-doctoral studies at Rice University

III. The following publications(s) and student evaluations have been provided under separate cover:

Publications – Please indicate whether candidate was solo author, first author or co-author:

(Papers)

“Measures of Collusion and Market Power in the U.S. Airline Industry,” The Review of Industrial Organization, Vol. 15, (1997): 254-333.

“Measuring Changes in Multiproduct Market Structure: An Application to U.S. Airlines,” The Review of Industrial Organization, Vol. 11 (1996); 493-509.

“Bureaucratic Choice and Non-optimal Provision of Public Goods: Theory and Evidence,” Public Choice, Vol. 82 (1995): 69-83.

(Books)

Some New Methods for Measuring and Describing Economic Inequality, 1994, New York: Oxford University Press.

Measuring the Quality of Life Across Countries, 1991, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

The Generalized Fechner-Thurstone Direct Utility Function and Some of Its Uses, 1998, New York: Columbia University Press.

Student Evaluations (show course number/title/semester taught)

SPAN 5336-001	Spanish-American Novel	spring 1998
CF 3358-001	Masterpieces of Western European Lit.	spring 1998
SPAN 4395-002	Introduction to Hispanic Literature	fall 1997
SPAN 5338-001	Spanish American Short Story	fall 1997
MATH 4351-001	The Theory of Numbers	spring 1997

MATH 3334-003	Introduction to Applied Mathematics	spring 1997
MATH 4338-001	Analysis	fall 1996
ECO 1310-002	Exploring Economic Issues	spring 1996
ECO 2320-001	Introduction to Public Policy	spring 1996
ECO 3355-002	Money and Banking	fall 1995
ECO 4351-002	Labor Economics	fall 1995
SPAN 5338-001	Spanish-American Short Story	fall 1994
SPAN 5380-001	Tutorial for Jrs. and Srs.	Fall 1994
BIOL 1401-003	Introductory Biology	spring 1994
BIOL 3232-001	Physiology	spring 1994

IV. Index of Notebook Contents

1. Promotion Summary Sheet
2. Recommendation of Dean
3. Recommendation of Dean's Advisory Committee
4. Recommendation of Chair
5. Curriculum Vitae
6. Personal Statement
7. Record of Grants Proposed/Received (if used)
8. Candidate's Publication List (Books Under Contract are included in this section)
9. Information on Journals (impact and selectivity, area (field) or discipline)
10. Citations List (if used)
11. Outside Peer Evaluations (see explanation)
12. Third Year Review Letter
13. Other Letters, Not Required (see explanation)
14. Department Faculty Letters
15. Student Letters Evaluating Candidate
16. Teaching Materials (place in separate binder – one copy only)
 - (a) Sample Syllabi
 - (b) Sample Tests
 - (c) Sample Homework
 - (d) Other
17. Service Activities

18. Course Evaluations (Summary Sheet)

In a separate binder or box:

- Teaching materials (to include sample syllabi, tests, homework, etc.)
- Completed Course Evaluation forms (Place all original student evaluations of teaching in separate dossier; however, if are using copies, make sure front and back are copied so handwritten comments are not excluded, no summary forms, all written comments as well as multiple choice)
- Publications

“Recommendation of Dean”
To be added by Dean’s Office
At conclusion of College-level review

“Recommendations of Dean’s Advisory Committee”
To be added by Dean’s Office
At conclusion of College-level review

“Recommendation of Chair”

To be written by the chair at the conclusion of the department’s deliberations. The recommendation should summarize the department’s review process and its conclusion. Should the chair choose to differ with the department’s majority conclusion, the difference should be explained. The letter must include a vote count on all Promotion and Tenure cases to the Dean or it will be returned to you (the number voting in favor, the number voting against).

Curriculum Vitae

Should be the most current and up to date

Personal Statement

Candidates must submit a written statement concerning accomplishments in teaching, research, scholarship, and service, both in the University and in the profession.

Record of Grants Proposed/Received

Break your activity into the following sections as applicable:

- I. Current/Active Funded Grants or Awards
- II. Completed Funded Grants or Awards
- III. Proposals Submitted and Reviewed or Submitted and Pending Review

For proposals that have been reviewed, please provide a copy of the review if there is one.

Provide the following for all proposals, grants, or awards:

1. Funding source		
2. Date submitted		
3. Project/proposal Title		
4. Status (funded, pending review, not reviewed, not funded)		
5. Score and %ile (if applicable)		
6. Award type (e.g., R15, K award, Fellowship, Subcontract), if applicable		
7. Award period (entire duration)		
8. Principal Investigator(s) identified by grantor, and PI's institution ¹		
9. Your role (according to the grantor's records) and your effort for each year ²		
10. Your role according to the SMU Office of Research Administration ^{1,3}		
11. Budget to PI identified by grantor:	Total Direct Costs	Total Indirect Costs
12. SMU's budget (e.g., for a subcontract):	Total Direct Costs	Total Indirect Costs

Footnotes

¹Define your role according to funding source guidelines.

²If the effort on the grant varies across years please use the following format:

Role: Co-Investigator (10%, 5%, 9%, 15%)

³For cases in which an SMU faculty member serves as the PI on a subcontract to SMU, but is not the PI identified by the funder.

If the candidate has not received any grants, please use the following language:

Professor _____ has not received any grants at this time.

Candidate's Publications

All publications for the candidate **must** be identified by:

1. Quality of the press
2. Press standing within the Candidate's field

List:

- A. All publications in reverse chronological order. For multiple-author publications, indicate those where the candidate is the first author.
- B. All works accepted but not yet published.

Include in dossier:

- A. Accepted but not published work; for each publication, letter of acceptance, contract to publish (for books), and reviewers' reports

In a separate container:

- A. Original publications; prefer whole publication or off-print to a photocopy;
- B. Accepted but not published work; for each publication, include most recent manuscript,

Books in Press Contract

Contract Materials in Dossier

Manuscript in Separate Container with Publications

O x s h i r e
University
Press*Books
and Journals
Box 1234
Oxshire England

8 October, 1998

John Z. Doe
Department of _____
Southern Methodist University
P.O. Box 123
Dallas, TX 75275

Dear Professor Doe:

This letter confirms our commitment to publish your book, *The Economic Status of Portugal*. Depending upon the need for revisions, we plan to produce the work in simultaneous cloth and paperback edition in fall 1999 or spring 2000.

Sincerely,

JP Morgan
Executive Editor

Oxshire University Press
Publication Contract

Agreement made this twentieth day of May, nineteen hundred and ninety-eight between Oxshire University Press, of Oxshire, England, or its assigns hereinafter call the Publisher, and

John Z. Doe
Department of _____
Southern Methodist University
P.O. Box 750xxx
Dallas, Texas 75275

Whose home address is:

Citizenship: Who is a citizen of: _____

Social Security Number: Whose social security number is: _____

Rights of Publication: XX
XX
XX

Copyright: XX
XX

etc., etc., etc.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have duly executed this agreement on this twentieth day of May, nineteen hundred and ninety-eight.

AUTHOR

OXSHIRE UNIVERSITY PRESS

By: _____
John Z. Doe

By: _____
Rex Gillum
Editor in Chief

By: _____
Stephen Dunn
Director of Publications

Book in Press
Reviewers' Reports

Attach with manuscript, not in the dossier

READER #1

Sam Shepherd, Editor
Oxshire University Press
P.O. Box 90660
Oxshire England

Dear Mr. Shepherd:

I have now read *The Economic Status of Portugal*, and I can make the following report

READER #2

Sam Shepherd, Editor
Oxshire University Press
P.O. Box 90660
Oxshire English

Dear Mr. Shepherd:

I have now read *The Economic Status of Portugal*, and I can make the following report

Candidate's name. *Name of Publication*

Press' Name.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Journal Information

Any journal cited as a publication source for the candidate **must** be identified by:

1. Quality of peer-reviewed journal
2. Scholarly standing within the Candidate's field

Example of description of journals in which papers appeared:

The *Journal of Biological Chemistry* is published by the American Society of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. It is considered one of the two top journals in biochemistry.

The journal *Biochemistry* is published by the American Chemical Society. It is also considered one of the two top journals in biochemistry.

The *Journal of Bacteriology* is published by the American Society for Microbiology. It is considered the pre-eminent journal for current research in microbiology.

INFORMATION ON JOURNALS

Dr. Doe's articles are all in refereed journals, sponsored by professional societies and government agencies. In addition to the usual specialized journals in the Candidate's field, papers have appeared in Science, the nation's most prestigious journal of research; Geology and the Geological Society of America Journal, the nation's most high-impact geological periodicals; Journal of Geophysical Research, of similar importance in geophysics; and Icarus, a highly respected general journal of planetary science.

**Citations List
(if used)**

If you do not use citations, please use the following language:

Citations are not used in the Department of _____

(SMU Library can help you gather this)

All citations for the candidate **must** be identified by:

1. Quality of the scholarly publication and/or peer reviewed journal
2. Scholarly standing within the Candidate's field
3. Type of citation, i.e., self-citation, co-author citations, other citations.

Example

Citations List

201 citations total: 1992-1998

- Smith, Kathy and Jones, R.A. (1998) Budget constrained measures of fiscal equality and efficiency in schooling. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 16, 5755-5759

3 citations 1992-1998

Cited in	Quality	Standing	Type
----------	---------	----------	------

Shackett-EJ *Journal of Banking and Finance* 1997,
Vol 42, Iss 3, pp H1544-H1554

Sherbert-V *European Economic Review* 1997,
Vol 116, Iss 4, pp 281-290

Oakley-A *Review of Income and Wealth* 1992,
Vol 67, Iss 17, pp 2822-2827

- Chaucer, V.E., Barlow, E.S., and Smith, K (1996) A new method for detecting individual and group labor market discrimination. *Journal of Monetary Economics* Vol 33, Iss 10, pp 520-538.

5 citations 1994-1998

Cited in	Quality	Standing	Type
----------	---------	----------	------

Anderson, H., Outlander, C.H., and Smith, K (1994)
Output allocative and technical efficiency of banks.
Southern Economic Journal Vol 33, Iss 10, pp 3128-3141.

Etc.....

Outside Peer Evaluations

A minimum of six letters from outside the University assessing the candidate's accomplishments is required: Department chairs should expect to provide the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs with a list of ten names together with brief CV's obtained from the web – no reviewer should be directly contacted at this point. Only eight will be contacted initially. The chair of the department should discuss the list of eight potential peer reviewers with the Senior Associate Dean before letters are solicited. If the original list should prove unsuccessful, the chair of the department should consult further with the Senior Associate Dean.

4. The candidate should offer a short list of potential reviewers (at least three) to the department chair. Potential reviewers will be contacted by the department, not the candidate.
5. The tenured faculty at the rank about the rank of the candidate should develop a separate list of its own involving no consultation with the candidate.
6. At least three letters must be procured from the departmental list. Preferably three letters should be procured from the candidate's list.

External reviewers should be sent an appropriate sample of the candidate's published (including accepted but not in print) work. For candidates with a book publication this must include the book and should include a small sample of other published work since arriving at SMU. For candidates with peer reviewed journal articles only (no book), a substantial portion of their published work since arriving at SMU should constitute the body of work sent to the reviewers. In some cases it may be appropriate to send out unpublished work. This could include the unpublished portions of a second book or manuscript or a single submitted journal article. The primary purpose of including this material in the sample sent to the external reviewers is to indicate future research directions. Both the candidate and the department must agree on the body of work sent out to the external reviewers.

Guidelines for external reviewer choices: No co-authors, no close collaborators, no thesis/dissertation committee members, no former instructors, no more than two from the same University, no fewer than 6 Universities. In the case of promotion to Full Professor: no one below the rank of Full Professor. In the case of promotion to Associate Professor: no newly minted Associate Professors and at the most two Associate Professors. Reviewers should hold tenure in an institution with research standards at least as high as SMU's. Exceptions to these requirements will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

A brief statement should be included which includes:

6. How the outside reviewers were selected;
7. The relevant qualifications of the outside reviewers;
8. Which reviewers did not write letters along with explanations of why (never responded to the initial request, agreed to write but never did, . . .);
9. A copy of the letter soliciting the recommendation;
10. A CV of each reviewer (reviewer CV's should provide sufficient information to determine qualifications but need not be exhaustive – a condensed version of the CV will suffice). The CV should immediately follow all the peer review letters in and should be preceded by color coded paper (see example binder).

Ask reviewers to:

5. Describe your relationship/interaction with the candidate;
6. Assess the quality of the candidate's publications and significance of his/her research and contributions to the field.
7. Compare the candidate with others at a similar career stage;
8. Assess the likelihood of continued development and productivity by the candidate.

Selection Procedure for External Evaluations

Names of distinguished specialists for external evaluations were solicited from Professor XYZ and members of the department. All names submitted are listed below.

Professor XYZ submitted the following list of potential external reviewers:

Professor Astronomy John Stargazer, University of Michigan
Professor of Astronomy Sam Slate, University of Washington, Seattle
Professor of Astronomy Ernst Young, Stanford University
Professor of Astronomy Susan Fielden, Washington University
Research Scientist, Stanley Steamer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Professor of Astronomy Diane Lander, University of New Orleans

Of these, Professors Stargazer and Young agreed to write while the other four declined. Professors Slate and Fielden declined because of too many existing obligations, while Dr. Steamer declined due to health issues. Professor Lander declined as she was on sabbatical.

After reviewing Professor XYZ's list, the department and/or full professor review committee, submitted the following list:

Professor of Astronomy Mick Kirk, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Professor of Astronomy Burke Williams, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Professor of Astronomy Jose Kalua, University of California, Los Angeles
Professor of Astronomy Linda Leverton, University of Pennsylvania
Professor of Astronomy Ethridge Miles, Emory University

All of the above reviewers accepted the invitation to review Professor XYZ's research.

The final group of xxxx scholars who agreed to write evaluation letters for Professor XYZ appears below:

Final List

- *Mick Kirk, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
- *Burke Williams, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
John Stargazer, University of Michigan
- *Jose Kalua, University of California, Los Angeles
Ernst Young, Stanford University
- *Linda Leverton, University of Pennsylvania
- *Ethridge Miles, Emory University

*Chosen by tenured faculty of the department and/or full professor committee

Sample Letter

May 7, 2008

Professor Mary Beth Gonzales
Department of XXXX
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802

Dear Professor Gonzales:

I am writing to ask you to evaluate the scholarship of Professor John Z. Doe, who is a candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure at Southern Methodist University. We are interested in your assessment of Professor Doe as a scholar. What is the quality of the Candidate's publications? What contribution has the Candidate made in the field? How would you rate the Candidate's scholarship as compared to that of others at a similar stage in their careers? Does the Candidate seem to be building a research career that can and will continue? Additionally, please describe your relationship to the Candidate, if any. I am enclosing a copy of Professor Doe's recent book, *The History of America*, together with the Candidate's four most recent scholarly articles. I also enclose the Candidate's *curriculum vitae*, and I will be happy to send to you a copy of anything listed on it.

Within the limits of the law, SMU will do all in its power to keep your letter confidential.

Thank you very much for your willingness to undertake this most important task. It is a true service both to SMU and to the field of Astronomy. To complete our deliberations on time, we will need your letter by XXX, 2007. Also, with your letter, please include a current curriculum vitae, a condensed version is acceptable.

Sincerely,

Marion Smith, Professor
Chair

green sheet

Outside Peer Reviewers

Letter

Wendy B. Faris (Ph.D. Harvard University, Professor, Department of English, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Teaching fields: British, American, World, and Comparative Literature

Attach the letter behind the green sheet

Yellow sheet

Outside Peer Reviewers
Curriculum Vitae

Wendy B. Faris (Ph.D Harvard University, 1975) Professor, Department of English, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Teaching fields: British, American, World, and Comparative Literature

Attach the *vitae* behind the yellow sheet **(Please try to obtain a condensed version of the CV – otherwise the complete CV must be included)**

Third Year Review Letter

The department should include a copy of the candidate's third year review letter from the Dean's Office stating the expectations for the candidate to achieve tenure.

Other Letters

At his or her discretion, the candidate may provide letters from co-authors, advisors, students who have been mentored by the candidate to support the case for tenure.

Department Faculty Letters

Include all faculty letters in alpha order

Include only letters from tenured faculty for candidates for consideration for associate professor with tenure

Include only letters from full professor faculty for candidates for consideration for full professor

Faculty Letters must state a positive or negative vote for the candidate.

Evaluation of Teaching

And Student Letters

Include

1. A description of the department's peer review process, including all written reports that grow out of the process.
2. The department should solicit letters from all classes taught or co-taught by the Candidate during the last five years at SMU. This should be done twice, in early June and early August. Letters from students who have multiple classes with the candidate may appear once, with the most recent course, along with a spreadsheet that keys such letters to the multiple courses taken. Students may also be solicited via e-mail. The letters should be put in alpha order according to the class and semester taken, separated by a cover page on color coded paper (see example).
3. A sample letter of solicitation.

In a separate dossier:

4. All student evaluations of teaching, originals are preferable and will be returned at the conclusion of the Provostial review (if you make copies, be sure to copy front and back so that handwritten comments are not excluded), no summary forms, all written comments as well as multiple choice. See example.

Sample Letter

May 2007

<<Name>>

<<Address>>

<<City/State>>

Dear <<Salutation>>

The Department of XXX at SMU is considering the candidacy of Associate Professor John Doe for promotion to full professor. Since you were a student in Professor Doe's course, XXX 5336-001, The Great American Novel, during spring 2005 semester, we would appreciate your assistance in evaluating the Candidate's effectiveness as a teacher.

Would you take the time to send us your thought, candid, and detailed opinion of Professor Doe as a teacher? It would be most helpful if you would comment on such matters as:

- organization and preparation
- effectiveness of classroom presentation
- ability to stimulate thought
- willingness to work with students outside of class
- fairness in grading
- your overall evaluation of this instructor

As faculty in a private university, we are committed to excellence in teaching. Student assessments, such as yours, play an important role in our evaluation process. I hope that you will give us your candid opinion. Your remarks will remain confidential. I would appreciate receiving your comments by October 20, 2007, and I have enclosed a return envelope for your convenience. Thank you for your cooperation in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Marion Smith, Professor
Chair

<u>Semester/Year</u>	<u>Course</u>	<u>Final Enrollment</u>	<u>No. of Letters</u>
Spring 1998	SPAN 5336-001 Spanish-American Novel	14	4
	CF 3358-001 Masterpieces of Western European Literature	25	5
Fall 1997	on leave without pay—teaching at University of Puerto Rico		
Spring 1997	MATH 4351 The Theory of Numbers	23	7
	MATH 3334 Introduction to Applied Mathematics	29	7
Fall 1996	MATH 3308 Introduction to Discrete Mathematics	15	8
	MATH 4338 Analysis	22	4
Spring 1996	ECO 1310 Exploring Economic Issues	60	10
	ECO 2320 Introduction to Public Policy	25	4
Fall 1995	ECO 3355 Money and Banking	18	5
	ECO 4351 Labor Economics	23	3
Spring 1995	BIOL 1401 Introductory Biology	29	3
	BIOL 3223 Physiology Laboratory	15	2
	BIOL 3307 Ecology	20	4
Fall 1994	SPAN 5338-001 Spanish-American Short Story	12	3
	SPAN 5380-001 Tutorial for Jrs. and Srs.	3	0
	SPAN 1401-N12 Beginning Spanish Practicum	17	5
	SPAN 1401-N15 Beginning Spanish Practicum	14	7
Spring 1994	on leave		
Fall 1993	SPAN 4395-002 Introduction to Hispanic Literature	20	4
	SPAN 5338-001 Spanish American Short Story	19	4

Candidate Name

Department of _____

Student Evaluation Letters

*Where student took more than one course with professor, the course in **BOLD** indicates placement of student evaluation letter

NAME	COURSES	SEMESTER(S)/YEAR(S)
Brown, Stuart	ECO 1310 Exploring Economic Issues	Spring 1996
Jones, Cherie	SPAN 5336-001 Spanish-American Novel	Spring 1998
Smith, Tom	MATH 4351 The Theory of Numbers	Spring 1997
	MATH 3308 Introduction to Discrete Mathematics	Fall 1996

Yellow paper

John Z. Doe
Department of xxxx

Student Letters

Chemistry 1303/General Chemistry
Fall 2001

Teaching Materials

Contained in Separate Binder

Include any materials the candidate can supply to indicate high quality teaching (e.g., syllabi, major exams, most important class handouts, etc.).

List of Service Activities

Provide a list of service activities, (if applicable) for candidate, with examples of same.

Served on XXX search committee for Assistant Professor

Volunteered at AARO (New Student Orientation Session) in Summer 2007

Served as undergraduate advisor for department academic year 2006-2007

Served on University Distinguished Professor Award Committee

Example of Organization of Course Evaluations

(to be compiled in a separate container – but summary sheet needs to be in dossier)

Semester/Year	Course	Final Enrollment	# of Evaluations
Spring 1998	SPAN 5336-001 Spanish-American Novel	14	12
	CF 3358-001 Masterpieces of Western European Literature	25	23
Fall 1997	on leave without pay—teaching at University of Puerto Rico		
Spring 1997	MATH 4351 The Theory of Numbers	23	23
	MATH 3334 Introduction to Applied Mathematics	29	20
Fall 1996	MATH 3308 Introduction to Discrete Mathematics	15	12
	MATH 4338 Analysis	22	20
Spring 1996	ECO 1310 Exploring Economic Issues	60	45
	ECO 2320 Introduction to Public Policy	25	22
Fall 1995	ECO 3355 Money and Banking	18	16
	ECO 4351 Labor Economics	23	23
Spring 1995	BIOL 1401 Introductory Biology	29	29
	BIOL 3223 Physiology Laboratory	15	13
	BIOL 3307 Ecology	20	20
Fall 1994	SPAN 5338-001 Spanish-American Short Story	12	12
	SPAN 5380-001 Tutorial for Jrs. and Srs.	3	3
	SPAN 1401-N12 Beginning Spanish Practicum	17	17
	SPAN 1401-N15 Beginning Spanish Practicum	14	12
Spring 1994	on leave		
Fall 1993	SPAN 4395-002 Introduction to Hispanic Literature	20	19
	SPAN 5338-001 Spanish American Short Story	19	19

Yellow sheet

John Z. Doe
Department of xxxx

Student Evaluations

Chemistry 1303/General Chemistry
Fall 2001

Include all student evaluations for the class noted above behind each color coded sheet

Yellow sheet

John Z. Doe
Department of xxxx

Student Evaluations

Chemistry 1317/Organic Chemistry
Spring 2002

Professor Doe was on leave spring 2002

Yellow sheet

John Z. Doe
Department of xxxx

Student Evaluations

Chemistry 1359/Inorganic Chemistry
Fall 2002

Student Evaluations Not Available

The department chair writes a memo explaining the absence of evaluations not on file (see example)

If student evaluations are not available for a course that was taught by a candidate, the departmental chair must put in writing that those evaluations cannot be found and why.

Example:

January 11, 2007

Dean
Dedman College
Campus

Dear Dean:

Student evaluations for Professor John Z. Doe for Chemistry 3359, fall 2002, cannot be found in the files.

Cordially,

John Smith, Chair

Department of xxxx

John Z. Doe
Department of xxxxxxxx

Student Evaluations for