

Southern Methodist University
Edwin L. Cox School of Business

Tenure Policy and Procedures

Revised October 2020

Overview

A primary goal of the Edwin L. Cox School of Business (Cox) is to be considered among the top business schools in the nation. Its objective is to educate and train practitioners, teachers, and researchers, while pursuing research to increase knowledge. The attainment of this objective is dependent upon the strength of the school's faculty.

The quality of the academic community at Cox depends upon its ability to attract and retain high caliber faculty at all levels. Accordingly, faculty tenure appointments are awarded on the basis of current performance and expectations of future contributions. A candidate for tenure must exhibit research expertise that is unquestionably outstanding and be in the top echelon of his or her professional field. The evidence of outstanding research is weighed in the light of the candidate's stage of career development and the performance of the candidate's professional cohort. The candidate's performance is determined by his or her senior academic colleagues both within Cox and outside it.

To evaluate research for promotion to tenure, the school looks for outstanding work that is independently reviewed and published in top-tier journals, and in which the professor's contributions are clearly evident. Further, there should be very good reason to expect that the candidate's productivity and professional development will continue following the award of tenure. Thus, we also examine the candidate's portfolio of working papers, including their progression over time. An active "pipeline" of papers/projects at the time of the tenure review is therefore important. Finally, the impact of the professor's overall research portfolio should be seen as noteworthy by schools in our peer group as well as those above our peer group.

To evaluate teaching for promotion to tenure, the school looks for evidence of high-quality instruction, where the professor brings to the classroom unique aspects of their own training and education that enhance the intellectual development of students. Course evaluation ratings are an important element of the evaluation process but alone do not determine an outstanding teaching record. A candidate's unique contribution in teaching are also determined by course development, the creation of new, high quality materials, and unique approaches to instruction that enhance the learning of our students.

In evaluating service, the school recognizes that the departments make very limited service demands on the junior faculty. We do look for active participation in our seminar series, faculty recruiting, as well as high quality service to the profession in terms of conference discussions and journal reviews. The weight assigned to service obviously increases substantially for tenured professors seeking promotion to full professor.

A person considered for full professor will normally be tenured, having been previously evaluated for tenure at Cox or elsewhere. Meeting the standards for tenure at a prior time, however, is not sufficient grounds for promotion to full professor. The faculty member must have demonstrated a

consistent record of professional achievement in the post-tenure period. The candidate for promotion should be clearly an outstanding faculty member, one who has made significant scholarly and professional contributions to his/her field and whose teaching is of high quality. Lack of research development after achieving tenure would be grounds for withholding promotion. A professor should also be a person who has served the University effectively and who has contributed to a scholarly community as a whole.

The criteria and components for the evaluation of research, teaching and service are found in Appendix I.

Probationary Period

The probationary period is the time period during which a faculty member is employed under a term contract. Term contracts normally are for three years. As specified in the initial three-year contract at the time of employment, the department conducts a review of an assistant professor's progress toward tenure during the spring semester of the candidate's third year. Candidates that have successful third-year reviews are awarded a second contract. Thus, assistant professors in the Cox faculty serve a probationary period of six years (i.e., two 3 year probationary contracts) before a tenured appointment is considered.

Candidates that are not renewed for employment at the end of their first three-year contract are granted an additional year (a grace year) after their contract is over. Also, candidates that do not receive tenure are entitled to a grace year. Finally, candidates that choose not to go through the tenure review process will also be granted an additional year beyond their current contract.

Individual faculty members or their department chairperson may request an early review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Early reviews are encouraged only in cases where candidates are making unusually rapid progress toward satisfying the criteria for tenure as outlined above. The case should be clear and compelling. The request to be considered for tenure early must be approved by the Dean and Provost. If the request is granted, the usual tenure procedure will be followed and the recommendation submitted will be evaluated as though it were made at the end of the probationary period. If the decision on the early review is negative, the individual may request one additional review at the end of the probationary period. Such reviews should be at least one year apart.

The probationary period for tenure will consist of full-time service at the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, or Associate Professor at SMU, and, to the extent determined by the Department Chairperson and the Dean, full time service at these ranks at another college or university, if such service exists. An agreement may be made in writing to reduce the probationary period in recognition of service at other institutions. Further, if a faculty member, after being employed for more than three years at one or more other institutions, accepts employment at SMU, it may be agreed in writing that the new appointment is for a probationary period of up to six years. Such a faculty member will be advised, in writing, at the time of appointment, or no later than the completion of the first year of service, of the maximum length of the probationary period at SMU.

There is no set time for promotion to full professor after receiving tenure. An associate professor with tenure may request to be considered for promotion by submitting a request to their department chairperson. The chairperson, after consulting with the full professors in the department, may choose to deny the request if it is clear that the faculty member does not meet the standards for promotion. If the request is denied, the department chairperson must provide feedback to the faculty member on the steps that are necessary for the

case to go forward at a later time. In addition, the associate professor may appeal the decision to the Dean who will make the final decision on whether to initiate the promotion process. The faculty member may not be considered for promotion in consecutive years.

Extension of the Probationary Period

Faculty members may request extensions of their probationary period in cases where circumstances have arisen to interfere substantially with their research or creative activity. Such circumstances may include personal or family emergencies (e.g. life-threatening illness of the faculty member or a member of his/her immediate family) or problems beyond the faculty member's control relating to his/her research or creative activity (e.g. delay of one semester or more in access to committed laboratory space in which to conduct research).

Extensions due to childbirth and/or parental leave are in a different category and are discussed in University Policy 2.14, Faculty Family and Medical Leaves. The total extension of the probationary period may not exceed two years, regardless of the combination of circumstances that resulted in the extension(s). These extensions include those that result from childbirth or parental leave. No additional productivity is expected when a faculty member extends the probationary period.

Requests to extend the probationary period for reasons other than childbirth and/or parental leave will be granted if they are deemed to be both fair to the faculty member making the request and the University and consistent with personnel practices generally applicable to other candidates for tenure in the University. These requests must be made by the faculty member in writing and must be submitted before the tenure review process has begun. The request must state clearly the circumstances in the faculty member's situation that might justify an extended probationary period. The request is to be forwarded, in most cases via the Department Chairperson, to the Dean. If the Dean supports the request, the request, along with the Dean's formal endorsement, is then sent to the Provost for further review. If the Dean does not support the request, the faculty member will be notified and will be free to seek further review of the request by the Provost. In all cases, a decision to extend the probationary period will be made by the Provost. The faculty member will receive written notification when the request is approved.

In a previous policy (former SMU Policy 6.13.1), the Untenured Faculty Unpaid Leave Program allowed a faculty member to extend the probationary period by one year by taking a leave without pay for either one semester or one year as determined by the school/college. The faculty member was eligible for this type of leave after the third year renewal. This former policy will be honored for leaves taken before or during the 2022-2023 academic year. A description of the process for applying for a leave without pay may be found in SMU Policy 2.13, Faculty Leave Programs. This paragraph will be removed when it is no longer possible to receive an extension of the probationary period under this program.

Abbreviated and Accelerated Tenure Review

When a candidate is being considered for hire at an advanced rank with tenure, an abbreviated or accelerated tenure review is required. The process for these reviews is similar to a normal tenure review. An abbreviated review is used in cases where the prospective faculty member's proposed rank is the same as the faculty member's current rank and the stature of the institution where the prospective faculty member achieved the current rank is at the level of SMU or higher. In this case, three reference letters from reviewers suggested by the candidate are used as the external letters in the review process.

An accelerated review is used in cases where the prospective faculty member's proposed rank is higher than the faculty member's current rank or the stature of the institution where the prospective faculty member achieved the current rank is not at the level of SMU or higher. In this case, evaluations from at least three independent external reviewers selected by the department is required in addition to the three letters from reviewers or references selected by the candidate.

To expedite the recruitment process, abbreviated or accelerated reviews may occur at any time of year and the members of the Dean's or Provost's advisory committees may provide their evaluations to the Dean or Provost respectively solely through written communications. Meetings to discuss the case may be called at the discretion of the Dean or Provost.

Procedures

Appointment. The initial letter of appointment to a faculty position in Cox should contain the exact terms of the appointment. Specifics such as rank, salary, and the length of the initial contract should be clearly specified.

Promotion and Tenure Committee. A Promotion and Tenure Committee will be formed for the purpose of reviewing all data pertinent to the tenure decision. The Committee is an independent advisory group to the Dean.

- a) Committee Composition. The Committee will be composed of tenured faculty persons who are respected by their colleagues. They should have broad knowledge of SMU and Cox, including an understanding and acceptance of the Cox School's academic standards. They should be individuals who will make decisions in the best interest of SMU and Cox. The composition of the membership shall be as follows:

One tenured, full professor shall be elected from each department by a majority vote of the tenured faculty of the department. In the event that there are no tenured full professors in the department, an associate tenured faculty member shall be elected. However in the case of promotions to full professor this committee member is not eligible to vote. Elected representatives shall serve for a **two year period**. It is recommended that elections be completed by the end of the spring semester. Each year, upon notification of the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chairperson will be selected by the Senior Associate Dean.

Department Chairpersons are eligible to serve as members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. However, when an individual from their department is a candidate for tenure or promotion, the Department Chairperson must cast his/her vote at the Department level.

- b) P&T Committee Responsibility. The Committee is advisory to the Dean. The Chairperson of the Committee shall deliver a written report of its recommendation (including the vote) regarding the awarding of tenure for each candidate to the Senior Associate Dean. All voting members must sign the recommendation report as evidence that the contents of the recommendation express the committee's deliberations and opinions.

The Chairperson of the Committee shall orally inform the candidate of its decision as soon as possible after the committee deliberations have been completed. The Committee shall consider all data pertinent to the decision which have been received and catalogued.

- (c) Evaluation of the Candidate's Research by External Reviewers. A central part of the P & T committee's evaluation process consists of reviews of the candidate's research by prominent scholars outside of Cox in the candidate's field of inquiry. The scholars who evaluate the candidate are nominated by both the candidate and the candidate's department. The candidate will propose six external reviewers. Reasonable effort should be made to insure that each potential reviewer is familiar with the nature and scope of the candidate's scholarly and/or professional contributions and is a respected senior contributor to the candidate's field. The candidate is free to contact these reviewers to gauge their willingness to participate in the process. In addition, in consultation with the tenured members of the department at or above the rank of the tenure and/or promotion candidate, the department chairperson will nominate a list of at least six other external reviewers. The P & T committee will then choose at least six reviewers from these two lists. The final list of reviewers must be approved by the Dean taking into account the quality of the reviewers and their institutions. The list of reviewers should not include mentors, former professors, direct collaborators, or co-authors.

The reviewers are told that their evaluations will be seen by the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and eligible (voting) members of the candidate's academic department but that their evaluations will not be shared with the candidate. Upon completion of the tenure process, the candidate may request an oral summary of the external reviewers' comments from the Dean. External reviewers will remain anonymous.

External reviews are expected to be received by the end of September. In the event fewer than six reviews are received, or in the opinion of the Committee an inadequate sampling of reviews is obtained, additional reviewers may be contacted.

The Departmental Process. The timeline for the department's review of an assistant professor over the course of his or her probationary period is shown in Appendix II. At the end of this period, the professor would normally come up for tenure and be evaluated by his or her department as the first step in the process for granting tenure.

The Department Chairperson will form a committee within the department for this purpose. The department evaluating committee must include at least three members. If less than three members of a department are eligible, the Department Chairperson should appoint additional eligible faculty from other departments for the review. All tenured faculty at the rank of associate professor or above are eligible to vote.

In the case of a promotion to full professor, only full professors in the department are eligible. In the event that a Department Chairperson is a candidate for promotion, in consultation and approval of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the candidate shall nominate a tenured full professor from the candidate's department to serve as a resource person for the Promotion and Tenure Committee. If the department does not have any tenured full professors, a tenured full-time faculty member from Cox shall be selected.

The candidate's Department Chairperson shall serve as a resource to the P & T Committee and the candidate during the tenure review process. The Department Chairperson will introduce the case to the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee to clarify any issues related either to the

candidate's record or the department's recommendation report.

It is recommended that the Department finish its evaluation process by the end of October. The Department Chairperson will submit a report of the committee's evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for tenure, including its recommendation along with the vote of all the tenured faculty members of appropriate rank (e.g., full professors evaluate full professor candidates). All voting members must sign the report as evidence that its contents express the committee's deliberations and opinions. The substance of the departmental recommendation shall be communicated orally to the candidate by the Department Chairperson as soon as possible after the recommendation is delivered to the Senior Associate Dean and the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Individual tenured faculty members may submit separate letters supporting or not supporting the candidate to the office of the Senior Associate Dean by the last Friday in October.

Tenure Candidate. The candidate being considered a tenure is expected to conform to the timeline shown in Appendix III and to submit the list of materials shown in Appendix III.

The candidate is required to inform the Senior Associate Dean of his/her intention to be considered for promotion and/or promotion and tenure by second Friday in May, in the spring semester of their 5th year of service. Failure to notify will be taken as a statement that the professor declines to be considered for promotion or promotion with tenure.

The candidate will then be invited to create a dossier in Interfolio and begin the submission of documents. Each candidate is required to submit to the office of the Senior Associate Dean, via Interfolio, a list of at least six names of external reviewers and a dated, tentative curriculum vitae by the last Friday in May.

Subsequently, the candidate is required to submit an updated curriculum vitae, research statement and at least three (3) articles (either published or working papers) to the office of the Senior Associate Dean, by the last Friday in July.

It is the sole responsibility of the Candidate to upload all materials included in the dossier into Interfolio <https://account.interfolio.com/sso> by the dates specified in this document.

Each candidate being considered for tenure is expected to gather performance data that covers his/her professional career. The Department Chairperson and the Office of the Senior Associate Dean can provide guidance and suggestions on what information to include. However, the candidate is responsible for assembling their dossier on Interfolio.

As each section of the dossier is submitted, it will be closed for editing by the candidate. The final submission deadline is the last Friday in September. Until the first Friday in May, or before the Provost's P&T committee meets, new information can be submitted as an Addendum in Interfolio. The Chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the candidate's Department Chairperson will be informed that new data have been received. Pertinent new data received after the Department and P & T Committee have submitted their recommendation reports will be included in the candidate's formal tenure dossier which is forwarded to the Dean and Provost. However, new information will not affect any previous promotion and tenure recommendation decisions that have been submitted.

The Dean. After receiving the recommendations from the Department and the P & T Committee,

the Dean will make a tenure recommendation. As soon as possible, the Dean, or his/her designated representative, will confer with the candidate and communicate the decision. The Dean's decision, together with the reports of the Committee, and the tenured faculty in the department and all other supporting material, shall be forwarded to the office of the Provost via Interfolio.

Provost Committee. The candidate's tenure dossier and all tenure-related documents are submitted through appropriate channels to the Vice President/Provost, the President and the Board of Trustees for final action usually by May.

Board of Trustees. The candidate will receive an official notification of the Board's decision from the Provost shortly after the May Board meeting.

Appeal

A negative recommendation by the Dean must be appealed within three weeks to the Provost. A negative recommendation by the Provost must be appealed within three weeks to the President. A negative decision by the President shall be final and cannot be appealed to the Board of Trustees. The administrators named above may use their advisory committees or *ad hoc* committees to provide advice on the matter of the appeal.

Appendix I

Overview of the Criteria for Evaluating Research, Teaching and Service

Research Evaluation

Both the quality and the quantity of research are evaluated, along with consistency in effort. The standards of excellence by which a faculty member's research is evaluated should be in accordance with the quality of research attainable in the faculty member's field. Significance, impact on the field, innovation, and creativity are important tests. Being theoretically sound, empirically validated, and capable of application are all valuable characteristics. Cox requires research performance to be outstanding for promotion to tenure.

The significance of where and how research is disseminated should be evaluated during peer review. Consequently, published work outweighs unpublished work; refereed work outweighs non refereed work. However, work in progress should also be considered with careful consideration of a faculty member's ability to bring work to closure. In the case of joint publication and research, the specific role of the faculty member w being considered for tenure must be established as clearly as possible.

Research accomplishments are shown by:

- 1) Publications in refereed journals;
- 2) Citations in scholarly works.
- 3) Papers in established working paper series;
- 4) Monographs;
- 5) Books;
- 6) Serving as an editor, on an editorial board, or as a referee of a major journal in the candidate's field is also considered as important evidence of research capacity.
- 7) Unpublished papers;
- 8) Publications in non-refereed journals;
- 9) Papers delivered at colloquia, symposiums, academy meetings, or meetings of professional groups;

Teaching Evaluation

Teaching performance rests on a candidate's ability to motivate and encourage students toward learning. To evaluate teaching, the focus in on the ability of the professor to effectively deliver state of the art knowledge (i.e., discipline-related content) in an organized and understandable way which can enhance the intellectual development of students. It is expected that the professor will bring to the classroom unique aspects of their own training and education which foster an understanding of both the theory and practice of business and which are consistent with specific student learning objectives. Importantly, professors should be open to testing newly established teaching pedagogies, to participate in designing and testing new pedagogies, and to seek the use of the most advanced teaching technology.

Teaching Activities

Examples of teaching include, but are not limited to, the following activities (not rank ordered):

- 1) Classroom teaching in programs leading to academic degrees;
- 2) Teaching in university-related executive education programs and comparable programs developed for professional organizations;
- 3) Directing undergraduate or graduate courses or projects;
- 4) Working with students outside the classroom on course materials, and counseling students on course selection, career choices, and related matters of student concern;
- 5) Serving as a member of a committee advising a student on a thesis or honors paper;
- 6) Preparing teaching materials such as textbooks, books of readings, cases, course syllabi, bibliographies, and computer programs;
- 7) Developing a course, sequence of courses, curriculum changes, or new and effective techniques of instruction for academic programs, university-related continuing education programs, and educational programs of professional organizations;
- 8) Publications or the presentation of papers or seminars on teaching.
- 9) Textbooks, cases, reports, and similar publications will be considered evidence of teaching ability or service contributions, unless they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research.

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness is complex; consequently, it is not reasonable to identify a single metric for this purpose. Recognizing that teaching performance is multidimensional, the Cox School will evaluate teaching performance in terms of several pedagogical elements that to varying degrees determine teaching effectiveness and student learning. The following should be included in this evaluation process:

- 1) A review of syllabi, teaching materials, projects, quizzes and exams in terms of their organization, currency, coherence, style, rigor and compliance with school and university standards.
- 2) A review of the university standard student course evaluations with particular attention to the student generated open-end responses.
- 3) Input from ex-students in response to a request from the appropriate department chairperson requesting information on the faculty member's class and teaching effectiveness with particular focus on the relevance and usefulness of the course to the ex-students career success.

Also, senior faculty will observe the classroom teaching performance of non-tenured assistant professors in their first, third and fifth years of service at Cox. An instrument has been developed (see immediately below) to guide classroom observation and provide qualitative feedback. More than one senior professor in each department should participate in this evaluation process. Departments may choose to quantify these criteria.

Framework for assessing teaching effectiveness through classroom observation

- Course offers the appropriate degree of challenge and rigor – The course challenges students consistent with the level of the degree program (undergraduate vs. graduate) and consistent with their advancement through the program; the higher the level and farther the students’ advancement, the more challenging the course.
- Instructor teaches the class at the appropriate level – The level and manner of instruction is consistent with the level of the degree program (undergraduate vs. graduate) and consistent with the students’ advancement through the program; the instructor requires commensurate level of subject knowledge and maturity.
- Course and individual class sessions are well-organized and flow logically – The course reflects a coherent and organized approach to the subject matter; the course flows logically from class to class, and individual classes are also organized and flow logically.
- Class sessions are well-introduced and framed – To provide useful context and help students learn, class sessions are introduced and positioned within the broader framework of the course and the subject matter.
- There is a high level of student engagement – Consistent with a commitment to engaged learning, the instructor and course design encourage students to actively participate and interact during class sessions.
- Instructor has a strong grasp of course content – The instructor has command of the course’s subject matter and deep knowledge of the course material.
- Course content is current – The concepts, materials, and examples used in the course are up-to- date, reflecting the current state of thought and practice.
- Course materials add value and are used effectively – The course materials extend beyond textbooks and generally available content; rather, the course materials reflect the instructor’s knowledge and expertise, and thus the instructor’s unique contribution to the learning experience.

Non-tenured clinical professors, professors of practice and adjunct faculty will be evaluated similarly but at the discretion of the department chairperson and in line with course needs. The same protocol will be used for non-tenured associate professors seeking the rank of full professor although the number of classroom observations will likely be limited to the year before going through the tenure evaluation process. For associate professors being considered for promotion to the rank of full professor a similar protocol will be used if there are indications of any “red flags” related to the professor’s teaching performance.

Service Evaluation

Faculty members have service obligations to academic departments, the Cox School, the University, their academic disciplines or professional fields, and the larger community. Faculty members are expected by the University and the public-at-large to make available their professional knowledge and expertise in service beyond that provided through research and teaching.

Service obligations and committee work is a normal function and expectation of an academic institution; however, the mere membership on committees is not in itself a criterion for evaluating service activities when they are offered as evidence of performance. When service activities are offered as important performance criteria for tenure, letters or other documentation of this productivity or creativity may be requested. This information may come from persons at various levels within the University, other universities, other organizations, or other recipients of the service

Illustrations of service include, but are not limited to, the following activities (not rank ordered):

- 1) Making a significant contribution as a chairperson, administrator, or facilitator for an academic group or committee, organized at the faculty, division, school, college, or university levels -- appointed or elected;
- 2) Making contributions through service on student-faculty committees or as an adviser to student organizations;
- 3) Serving as an officer of an academic or professional association -- appointed or elected;
- 4) Serving as a speaker or presenter at non-university meetings in areas of professional competence;
- 5) Serving as an organizer or liaison between groups desiring workshops, panels, or meetings in areas of professional competence;
- 6) Creating executive management development programs, short courses, conferences and seminars relating to the professional community;
- 7) Serving on committees providing expertise to local, state, regional, national or international communities;
- 8) Serving as a consultant to public or private organizations provided that such services are supportive of the faculty member's total university commitment and not in conflict with that commitment.
- 9) Serving on editorial review boards and as an ad hoc reviewer are an indication of service to the profession.
- 10) Student advising.

Appendix II

The Schedule for New Faculty Performance Review to be Followed by Department Chairperson

YEAR 1

February Review of Faculty Activity Report by Chairperson. Provide feedback to each faculty member and then make recommendation to the Senior Associate Dean and the Dean for compensation and development purposes.

YEAR 2

November Review with faculty their performance to date.

March Review of first and second year Faculty Activity Reports by Chairperson. Outline in writing the performance expectations for the coming year.

March Provide recommendation to the Dean for compensation and development purposes.

YEAR 3

November Review with faculty their performance to date.

January Chairperson establishes Advisory Renewal Review Committee(s) [ARRCs]. Review of all ARRC reports by Chairperson and committee members. Disseminate reports to faculty member being reviewed with Chairperson comments. Provide for two-way communication.

March Provide recommendation to Senior Associate Dean on one-year grace or three-year renewal contract.

If a three-year renewal is offered, outline in writing the performance expectations for the coming three years and make compensation and development recommendations.

If a one-year termination contract is offered, provide recommendations for terminal year.

The office of the Senior Associate Dean will send a letter indicating renewal or termination contract terms.

Provide recommendation to the Senior Associate Dean and the Dean for compensation and development purposes.

YEAR 4

November Review with faculty their performance to date.

March Review of Faculty Activity Reports by Chairperson. Outline in writing the performance expectations for the coming year.

March Provide recommendation to the Dean for compensation and development purposes.

YEAR 5

November Review with faculty their performance to date.

March Review of Faculty Activity Reports by Chairperson. Outline in writing the performance expectations for the coming year.

March Provide recommendation to the Dean for compensation and development purposes.

Appendix III

Promotion and Tenure Schedule and Candidate Responsibilities (Including Promotion Only Candidates)

A. Important Dates For Candidates

Second Friday In May	Candidate communicates in writing to the office of the Senior Associate Dean of his/her intention to be considered for promotion to full professor and/or promotion and tenure
	Failure to notify the Senior Associate Dean of the candidate's promotion and tenure intentions will be taken as a formal declination
Last Friday in May	Candidate submits list of six external reviewers and dated, tentative curriculum vita to the Senior Associate Dean's office via Interfolio
Last Friday in July	Candidate submits updated curriculum vita, research statement and at least three (3) articles to Senior Associate Dean's office via Interfolio
Last Friday in September	Last day on which additional tenure-related documents can be added to the candidate's tenure dossier via Interfolio for consideration by the department and P & T Committee
Last Friday in October	Individual faculty letters of recommendation must be submitted to the office of the senior associate dean via interfolio by this date
November	Departmental promotion and tenure committee makes recommendation to the school P & T Committee and to the Dean
January	School P & T Committee makes recommendation to Dean
February	Dean communicates his decision to the candidate as soon as possible and sends this recommendation and material to Provost
May	Provost Committee decision presented to Trustees
May	Candidate notified of decision

B. Documents To Be Submitted Via Interfolio By Candidate

1. External Reviewer List and Materials for External Reviewers
 - A. List of six potential external reviewers for research and service contributions with contact information for each.
 1. Briefly state the qualifications for each external reviewers and provide contact information
 - B. Updated Vita.
 - C. Research Statement.
 - D. Three (or more) articles or working papers to be sent to the external reviewers.
 - E. Any other pertinent material that the candidate feels is relevant to his/ her tenure decision.
2. Materials for tenure dossier
 - A. Research
 1. A personal statement of one's research strategy, focus, and how that strategy and focus has impacted the person's research outputs.
 2. Self-rating of all journals. A system of "A", "B", and "C" might be used. An "A" journal would be those which represent the highest standards of excellence in one's field; "B", the next level, but academically oriented and with an established refereeing system; and "C", practitioner oriented journals (indicate whether refereed or not). If possible, it would be beneficial for the candidate to indicate the basis for the rating (e.g., journal article, etc.)
 3. Publications should include all publications, published reviews for all books; for accepted work, letter of acceptance together with most recent state of manuscript; for books, contract and readers' reports.
 4. A listing of all citations to one's research. The Social Science Citation Index will provide these. The year, name of the citer and the journal in which the citation occurred must be indicated. The Business Library can assist in compiling citation-related documents.
 5. For co-authored pieces, indicate the relative contribution (in percentages) of each author to the final product.
 6. Record of grants proposed and grants received, if applicable.
 7. Any other pertinent information, including copies of all editor and reviewer comments on work under review.
 - B. Teaching
 1. Teaching statement. Personal statement on teaching philosophy including what you consider to be the principle learning objectives of your courses, preferred pedagogy and any innovative teaching method that you use.
 2. Candidates should prepare a summary of course evaluation metrics for all sections taught. Also include the average GPA and enrollment for each course.
 3. All Instructor/course Evaluations (since joining SMU, since last promotion at SMU, or at any other institution prior to SMU.).
 4. Grade distribution for all courses for which there are ratings (or explanation why ratings are not available).

[Type here]

5. Documentation of sources, such as other faculty members, where major preparations of new course materials are indicated.
6. Syllabi for Courses listed and any major supplementary materials (e.g., videos, engaged learning exercises, etc.).
7. Any other pertinent information related to teaching.

C. Service

1. Service statement. Evidence of any distinguished performance in the service dimension is welcome.
2. Summary listing of all service-related activities, including University, School, and Professional activities, offices held, and any distinctive contribution. Indicate if membership on committees was by appointment, election, or volunteer.
3. Any other pertinent information related to service.

Approved by the Executive Committee to take effect August 27, 1980.

Revised September 30, 1983

Revised March 6, 1989

Revised May 1, 1995

Revised November 1, 1996

Revised July 2006

Revised August 2007

Revised February 2009

Revised February 2010

Revised August 2010

Revised October 2011

Revised April 2012

Revised September 2013

Revised October 2019

Revised October 2020