

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 2004 (with honors) Or Famine		Post-doctoral studies at Rice University

III. The following publications(s) and student evaluations have been provided under separate cover or electronically in Interfolio:**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

I. Index of Notebook Contents

Promotion Summary Sheet

Standards of Department or School

Department Promotion and Tenure Procedures. Includes an orientation to the nature of research in the candidate's department or school and the standard practices for the dissemination of research in this field, e.g., books, journals, online publications, and professional and creative venues, etc.

The list of appropriate journals and the relative weight of each.

In the case of multi-authored journal articles, an explanation of the significance of the publication.

The weight given to books, chapters in books, edited books, and journals. Information particular to the candidate's placement of scholarship and/or venues for presentations and performances.

Expectations

Letter of Appointment (redact salary information in tenure cases only)

Three-Year Renewal Letter (in tenure cases only)

Faculty Annual Reviews

Recommendation of Dean

Recommendation of Dean's Advisory Committee

Recommendation of Chair

Recommendation of Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee

Summary Sheet

Page 4 of _____

Citations List – Department (if applicable)

External Peer Reviews

Selection Procedures for External Reviewers and Sample Letter

Outside Peer Reviewer Letters and CV's

Evaluation of Teaching

List of Courses Taught by Semester with Enrollments

Student Evaluation of Teaching, including rating summary in comparison to departmental or school averages

Peer Evaluations of Teaching and Process

Process for Soliciting Student Letters Student Letters

Curriculum Vitae

Personal Statement

Record of Funding Proposed/Received

Listing of Candidate's Publications and Creative Activities

Citations List – Candidate

Service Activities

Supplemental Materials, Other External/Internal Letters, Teaching Activities, etc.

Publications

In a separate binder or box:

- Publications (only if you are not including them electronically in Interfolio)

Document Approved by the Faculty of Dedman College, April 29, 1992
Revised October 19, 2000

**PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS OF DEDMAN
COLLEGE FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND THE EXTENSION OF CONTRACT**

A supplement to the "Guidelines for the Award of Rank and Tenure" of Southern Methodist University dated September 1979.

Dedman College is committed to recruiting the ablest faculty and to improving the quality of its tenured faculty. Excellence in scholarship, research, and creative work as measured by national standards and in teaching is essential if SMU is to continue to progress into the first rank of American universities. Therefore, in accordance with the "Guidelines for the Award of Rank and Tenure" (University document dated September 1979), tenure cannot be granted on the basis of academic potential alone. Tenure should be awarded only to those whose performance is outstanding in either research or teaching and of high quality in the other. Valued service to the University and to the profession to which the faculty member belongs will count in a person's favor but cannot substitute for the principle criteria.

The range of academic disciplines and educational programs of Dedman College is diverse. Nevertheless, substantial similarity is desirable in both the procedures and the standards for judgement of faculty members in order to ensure both equitable treatment of persons and the quality of the faculty as a whole. All procedures should provide for open, informal, and professional discussions while always respecting the necessity for maintaining confidentiality in the evaluation of the candidates.

GENERAL PROCEDURES OF THE DEPARTMENTS

New faculty members will be informed by department Chairs of the University's expectations in teaching, in scholarship and research, and in service to the University and to their profession. They will be given copies of this document, of the University's "Guidelines for the Award of Rank and Tenure," dated April 29, 1992, and of any relevant departmental documents. Dedman College expects its departments to evaluate all their members regularly and to conduct careful reviews of performance in teaching and research before recommending extensions of contracts for untenured faculty. Both the University and the faculty member suffer if a department extends the contract of a person whose performance in teaching has been mediocre or whose accomplishments in research have been slight. Probationary contracts will not be extended unless satisfactory progress toward consideration for tenure is being made. In unusual circumstances renewals of contract for assistant professors for less than three years may be used to make clear that a department has reservations about a faculty member's progress. Written notification will be provided to an untenured faculty member and to the Dean summarizing the results of the review for extension of contract. A fuller oral explanation will also be provided.

The department Chair is responsible for organizing the evaluations of faculty members and for chairing the meetings of the tenured faculty at which recommendations are decided. The Chair is responsible for presenting the case; but in all other regards he or she participates in the proceedings as a voting member of the faculty.

B. PROCEDURES FOR THE REVIEW FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND TENURE FOR A PROFESSOR

In accordance with the University policy, the review for tenure normally takes place in the sixth year of the appointment of an assistant professor. In exceptional cases, nationally distinguished achievements in scholarship, research, and creative work may lead to earlier recommendation for promotion and tenure.

The following listing of steps outlines the minimal expectations of Dedman College in regard to the process of the review for tenure and/or promotion. Fuller investigation into certain matters will be desirable, the investigation varying with the particular candidate or department in order to provide justice to the person being evaluated and to provide sufficient bases for thorough evaluation.

In initiating the review of a faculty member in the spring before formal evaluation takes place, the department Chair will:

1. Confer with the Dean regarding the timing and nature of the departmental review of faculty members who are to be evaluated for tenure and promotion. This consultation is particularly important in regard to those who might be considered before the sixth year, in regard to those about whom there may be a question regarding the length of the probationary period, and in regard to those who must be evaluated before the end of the fall semester. The Chair will also confer with each candidate and explain the procedures the department will follow in its evaluation and obtain copies of publications and other needed materials.
2. Secure from the person being evaluated a current curriculum vitae, including a complete list of publications and other activities in research, scholarship, creative work, and other professional endeavors.

At this time the Chair will offer the candidate an opportunity personally to solicit letters of evaluation from persons competent to judge the candidate's professional abilities in addition to those solicited by the Chair. The letters solicited by the candidate will be distinguished in the dossier from those solicited by the Chair.

The Chair will invite but not require untenured faculty members to submit letters of evaluation regarding the candidate.

3. Secure from the faculty member a report of aims and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and research, and other activities within the University and the profession. Models of such reports, which should be factual yet should also provide a fuller explanation of the candidate's endeavors than can be found in a curriculum vitae, will be provided. Such models are available in the Dean's office.
4. Establish procedures for thorough evaluation of teaching. These must include systematic solicitation and evaluation of student judgements and may include classroom visits by tenured members of the department.

If the department uses classroom visitation, the Chair will arrange for classroom visits by tenured members of the Department, taking into consideration both the needs of the candidate and the tenured faculty who will be visiting. The Chair has the responsibility to be among the visitors for every candidate. If written reports of the visits are part of the procedure, they must be made available to all tenured faculty members before the meeting at which evaluation will take place.

These reports will become part of the final record.

Gathering evidence of students' judgements is the responsibility of the department and not of the candidate being evaluated. Students should be contacted in a systematic way, and students from classes of various types should be questioned. Written student opinions should be presented, and the students should be assured that their opinions will be held in confidence.

5. Secure a detailed assessment of the person's published and, if desirable, unpublished work by tenured members of the department and normally by at least six persons beyond the University who are nationally recognized for their work in the person's field and who are capable of impartial judgement. Candidates may suggest names of expert evaluators, but the selection will be made by the Chair in consultation with other tenured members of the department and the Dean. The department will then provide brief accounts of the professional credentials of these evaluators and a full account of how they were selected. In all cases letters soliciting their judgements should come from the Chair. In general, such letters should ask for an appraisal of the record of accomplishment based on national comparisons rather than soliciting direct comments on eligibility for tenure or promotion. Examples of such letters are available in the Dean's office.

External reviewers should be assured that their letters will be held in full confidence and revealed only to persons directly involved in the review process. Copies of letters and reports from external reviewers will be made available to all tenured faculty before the meeting at which the evaluation takes place.

6. The Chair will request from the Associate Dean for General Education course evaluations as well as an overall performance evaluation of the individual with reference to his or her participation in the general education program if the candidate has participated in teaching CORE or capstone courses.

7. Schedule no later than early October the departmental meeting at which the recommendation will be made. This should be done with enough time in advance of the meeting for faculty to familiarize themselves with the assembled material. In deliberations for an Assistant or Associate Professor's tenure decision, all tenured faculty of the ranks of Associate and full Professor will participate. In deliberations for a full Professor's tenure decision, only tenured full Professors are to participate. The candidate's updated curriculum vitae and the accounts of teaching, research, and other professional activities will be made available to all members participating in the evaluation. Previous to this time, the faculty members will be informed where they can obtain copies of the candidate's publications and, if appropriate, unpublished manuscripts, as well as the letters written regarding the candidate. The faculty will also be notified where they can inspect teaching evaluation forms, student and faculty letters, and the other evaluations of performance in teaching that the department has determined to use.

8. Chair meetings at which the tenured members openly and fully discuss the candidate's qualifications and the various letters and evaluations, both internal and external. Voting will be by secret ballot only. The Chair should discourage abstentions. The decision to recommend a candidate for promotion and tenure requires a simple majority of those present and eligible to vote. An announcement of the outcome of the balloting should be made before the meeting concluded, normally including the number of positive and negative votes.

9. Notify candidate in writing of the result and the Dean of the result and the vote count. In case of a negative recommendation, the candidate must be given a general oral explanation of the reasons for the decision, but the confidentiality of the role of individual students, faculty members, and external evaluators in the process must be strictly preserved. A letter to the candidate, with a copy to the Dean, will follow immediately, confirming the decision. If the

candidate requests, a written summary of the reasons for a negative decision will be provided to the candidate.

In departments with fewer than five faculty eligible to participate in deliberations, the Dean, in consultation with the Chair and the tenured faculty members in the department, may appoint faculty members from other cognate departments in Dedman College and other parts of the University to expand the departmental tenure and promotion committee.

10. Deliver to the Dean's office for all candidates, both those who are recommended for promotion and/or tenure and those who are not, by the last Friday of October nine copies of the materials required for evaluation by the Dean and the Provost. These materials include the documentation used in the departmental review (only one set of publications and lengthy manuscripts need be supplied) and in addition:

a. In-depth written assessments of the candidate by tenured members of the department. The letters should clearly express the reasons for the faculty member's judgement of the candidate. These assessments are not mandated until after the voting and are of fundamental importance to the tenure decision. By their nature they communicate the full range of evaluation of the candidates whereas the vote conveys only the dichotomous conclusion of that process.

b. Overall evaluation by the Chair of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in teaching, research, and service to the University and the profession. The evaluations should be placed in the context of the desire of the University to improve its faculty and its need for maintaining excellence in research recognized by national standards and in teaching.

c. A detailed account of the departmental methods and results in assessing the candidate's performance in teaching. Only one set of all available semester student evaluations need be supplied. Copies of any letters addressed to students soliciting their judgements should be included as well as an explanation of how students were selected, how many were solicited, and how many responded. All student responses are to be made available.

A check list of items for inclusion in the dossier is given below. (All items may not be appropriate for all disciplines.)

(i) Summary sheet (ii) Recommendation of the Dean (iii) Recommendation of the Chair (iv) Curriculum vitae (v) Personal statement (vi) Record of grants proposed and received (vii) Reviews of publications/citations (viii) Journals and their professional standing (ix) Outside peer evaluations (x) Departmental faculty letters (xi) Student letters (xii) Additional material

C. PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE REVIEW FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

The rank of professor is the highest to which a faculty member may aspire. It should not be assumed that all faculty members will achieve this rank, which is reserved for persons whose scholarly achievements are sustained and recognized as important by leaders in the person's field of study and whose teaching is of high quality. A professor should also be a person who has served the University effectively and who has contributed to the scholarly community as a whole.

In general the review for promotion to the rank of professor follows the procedures of the reviews for tenure/and or promotion which are outlined in the previous section, including:

1. A conference with the Dean before the end of the spring semester regarding persons who may be proposed for promotion in the following year.

2. External evaluations of the candidates achievements in scholarship, research, and creative work.
3. An evaluation of the candidate's teaching.
4. An account of the candidate's contributions to the University and the academic profession.

Only tenured full professors participate in the deliberations. In departments with fewer than three full professors, the Dean, in consultation with the Chair and the full professors in the department, if any, should periodically identify those persons who might reasonably be recommended for promotion to professor. The Dean will then appoint a special committee, composed of three professors: all those from the department; and a number from cognate departments sufficient to form the committee of three. The Chair of that committee will consult with the tenured faculty of the department and take responsibility for those duties assigned to the Chair in regular proceedings. All members of the committee take responsibility for those duties assigned to the departmental members in regular proceedings. In departments having fewer than three full professors and which have a Chair who might be recommended for promotion to professor, the Dean will confer with the professors of the department, if any, and in their absence confer with the tenured members of the department and with members of the Dean's Advisory Committee.

In a department in which an associate or assistant professor is the Chair, the Dean, after consultation with the full professors in the department, will appoint one of the full professors to take responsibility for those duties assigned to the Chair in regular proceedings.

Decision by the Dean:

Persons being recommended as well as those not being recommended for promotion will be notified by the Dean. The Dean's decision will be communicated to the Advisory Committee and the candidate's department. If, in any particular case the decision is contrary to the recommendation of the department, if requested, the Dean will meet with the full professors of the department to discuss the reasons for the decision.

Recommendation to the Provost:

The Dean's recommendation to the Provost will be normally made by February 1.

APPEAL PROCEDURES

When a department makes a negative tenure recommendation, the candidate has twenty-one days in which to appeal the decision to the Dean. If the Dean finds sufficient grounds to review the department's decision, the Dean will refer the case to the appropriate Advisory Committee. The Dean will take into account the recommendation of the Advisory Committee in deciding the appeal.

When the Dean denies a positive recommendation made by a department, the candidate has twenty-one days in which to appeal the Dean's decision to the Provost.

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.

For each multi-authored journal article, please list the candidate's specific contribution

Authorship of a scientific or scholarly paper should be limited to those individuals who have contributed in a meaningful and substantive way to its intellectual content. All authors are responsible for fairly evaluating their roles in the project as well as the roles of their co-authors to ensure that authorship is attributed according to these standards in all publications for which they will be listed as an author.

John Z. Doe

Department of XXX

**In the case of multi-authored journal articles, an
explanation of the significance of the publication.**

(if applicable)

Please see Candidate's Publication List

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

Oxford University Press is the world's largest university press with the widest global presence. Oxford University Press claims a total of fifteen Pulitzer Prize-winning titles and publishes such acclaimed authors as historian Alan Brinkley, ethnologist Richard Dawkins, journalist and speechwriter William Safire, literary critic and educator Henry Louis Gates, Jr., and environmentalist Rachel Carson.

John Z. Doe

Department of XXX

The weight given to books, chapters in books,
edited books, and journals

Please see Standards of Departments and School
(Departmental Guidelines)

Information particular to the candidate's placement of scholarship and/or venues for presentations and performances. (If applicable)

If the candidate has presented a paper, poster presentation, tabled discussion at an important conference in the discipline, please list it here.

For example:

Dr. Doe presented his paper, "Measuring Changes in Multiproduct Market Structure: An Application to U.S. Airlines," at the 2016 Conference in Behavioral Economics and Financial Literacy in Barcelona, Spain.

John Z. Doe

Department of XXX

Information particular to the
candidate's placement of
scholarship and/or venues for
presentations and performances.

(If applicable)

Please see Standards of
Department and School
(Departmental Guidelines)

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Original Appointment Letter

Confidential

February 21, 2018

Dr. John Z. Doe
16701 Dundrenman Lane
Dallas, TX 75248
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35404

Dear Dr. Doe,

Upon recommendation of Professor _____, Chair of the Department of _____, I am pleased to offer you a three-year tenure-track appointment as **Assistant Professor** of _____, beginning **August 1, 2018** and ending **May 31, 2021**.

For academic year **2018-2019**, your salary will be \$_____. The University will provide computer and software support that is standard for all faculty members. You will be provided a start-up package of _____ for equipment, travel, and other expenses as approved by your department chair and by the dean as appropriate expenditures for your research. Start-up funds should be expended by **May 31, 2021** unless you receive prior written approval from the dean. Additionally, you will be given up to \$_____ for relocation reimbursement upon presentation of the appropriate receipts. Your appointment is that of a full-time faculty member with the customary fringe benefits, and your responsibilities will be determined in consultation with the chair of your department and the Dean of Dedman College. Like all Southern Methodist University employees, you will be expected to comply with the applicable policies in the University Policy Manual appropriate to your appointment. You will be evaluated annually.

As indicated above, this is a tenure-track appointment. You will be considered for a three-year contract renewal no later than academic year 2020-2021. If your contract is not renewed at that time, your terminal year will be 2021-2022. Should your initial contract be renewed, you will be considered for a tenured appointment no later than your sixth year, academic year 2023-2024. If tenure is not granted, you will then receive a terminal contract for the 2024-2025 academic year. According to Dedman College faculty policy, to achieve tenure in Dedman College you must achieve high quality as both a teacher and a scholar, and in at least one of these two areas you must go beyond high quality to outstanding achievement.

This offer is contingent on your providing Dedman College with an official transcript showing the date on which your Ph.D. was awarded. Please send this official transcript to Cindy Havens, Office of the Dean, Dedman College, P.O. Box 750235, Dallas, Texas 75275-0235. This offer is conditioned on your ability to demonstrate work authorization pursuant to immigration laws. Hiring is also contingent upon the satisfactory completion of a background check (Disclosure and Authorization Form to Obtain Consumer Reports for Employment Purposes included).

I sincerely hope you accept this invitation and the terms outlined in this letter. To indicate your acceptance of this appointment, please sign in the space designated below and *return two copies of the original letter as well as the enclosed Payroll Schedule Election Form and background check authorization form* to Cindy Havens at the address listed above by March 2, 2018. The signed copy is for your records.

Sincerely,

Thomas DiPiero
Dean, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences
Professor of World Languages and Literatures and of English

ACCEPTED:

John Z. Doe

Date

cc: Douglas Reimelt, Associate Provost
Charlene Pinkerton, Dedman College Business Manager
_____, Chair, Department of

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Original Appointment Letter is not
applicable in this case

May 4, 2016

Professor John Z. Doe
Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences
Department of _____
Address
CAMPUS

Dear Professor Doe,

Based on the recommendation of the faculty in the Department of _____, I am pleased to renew your appointment as assistant professor of _____. You will receive a second three-year contract shortly.

I strongly encourage you to schedule a meeting with the chair of your department to discuss this letter and your progress toward tenure and promotion to associate professor. As you know, to be promoted to the rank of associate professor with tenure, you must demonstrate high quality accomplishment in both research and teaching, and you must furthermore demonstrate outstanding accomplishment in at least one of those areas. Your department chair can help you understand precisely what that means for faculty in your department and specific discipline. My remarks and recommendations below are based on the materials you submitted for your third-year review and on the recommendations of the tenured faculty in your department.

To achieve outstanding in research, your department requires a _____. Given the state of your research, your book project as represented in your third-year review dossier (the book manuscript is complete and you have finished a prospectus and begun to contact editors), as well as the number of articles you have already published, you are well on the way to achieving outstanding in research. (As you know, to achieve high quality in research, you must have a _____ at the time of your tenure decision.) I would strongly encourage you to pursue the track you have been taking of contacting editors so that you may place the book as quickly as possible and in the best possible venue, and then begin making any changes the press requires so that the book can be in production by the time you come up for tenure. (Indeed, you are potentially positioned to have the book to be published before that time.) I furthermore strongly encourage you to continue publishing well-placed journal articles in your field as you and your colleagues understand and define it. You have already published in some very good journals; I would encourage you to aim as high as possible when you consider venues for publishing your future work. Your

principal focus for the time being is to place the book in a highly regarded university or trade press. Given the quality of your work, I would recommend that you aim for a very highly regarded, high-visibility press, keeping in mind the time necessary to obtain a fully executed contract.

You have developed a number of new courses since your arrival at SMU and you have made contributions to at least one existing course. Your teaching evaluations, as well as the appraisals of your teaching by your colleagues, suggest that you are performing at an outstanding level. Your numerical evaluations are consistently above the departmental averages, which in and of itself is something of an achievement, given the high quality teaching in your department. Comments that your students make on your evaluations suggest something quite unusual: that your students are coming away from your courses not only possessed of specific information, concepts, and ways of thinking; they are also aware of *what* they have learned, as well as the delineations of the material and the concepts they are taking away from your course. I strongly encourage you to continue teaching in such a way, and to continue the strategies and methods you deploy in the classroom that students see to value so highly: individual presentations, discussions, critical writing, and reading that makes demands on students. I also note that you have offered at least one course that contributes substantially to the University Curriculum in the “Ways of Knowing” rubric. Should you continue in such a fashion, you appear poised to achieve outstanding in teaching by the time you come up for tenure.

You are doing an appropriate level of service in the department. As you know, service plays a very minor role in cases of promotion to the rank of associate professor, and while I encourage you, of course, to continue being a collegial and collaborative member of your department, please remember that your primary focus for the time being should be on research and teaching.

Thank you for your contributions to your department and to Dedman College. I look forward to working with you more in the future.

Yours sincerely,

Thomas DiPiero
Dean, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences
Professor of World Languages and of English

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Third Year Review Letter is not
applicable in this case

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Third Year Reappointment Letter

CONFIDENTIAL

May 10, 2016

Dr. John Z. Doe
Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences
Department of _____
Address
CAMPUS

Dear Dr. Doe,

Upon the recommendation of _____, Chair of the Department of _____, I am pleased to renew your appointment as Assistant Professor of _____ for an additional three years. This appointment is without tenure. The appointment begins August 1, 2016 and ends May 31, 2019. Your salary for the 2016–2017 academic year was determined during the annual review of faculty salaries, and you will soon be notified of that decision in written form by the Office of the Provost. You will be considered for an appointment with tenure no later than your sixth academic year, 2018–2019. If tenure is not granted, you will then receive a terminal contract for the academic year, 2019–2020. As you know, to achieve tenure in Dedman College you must achieve high quality as both a teacher and a scholar, and in at least one of these two areas you must perform beyond high quality to outstanding achievement.

Your appointment is that of a full-time faculty member with the customary SMU fringe benefits, and your responsibilities will be determined periodically in consultation with the chair of your department and the Dean of Dedman College. You may expect an annual evaluation of your work.

We shall hold this appointment open until May 31, 2016, although a response from you as soon as possible will be appreciated. To indicate your acceptance of the terms outlined in this letter, please sign on the space provided below and return two signed original letters to my office. The signed copy is provided for your records.

Yours sincerely,

Thomas DiPiero
Dean, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences
Professor of World Languages and of English

ACCEPTED:

John Z. Doe

Date

SMU ID

c: Dr. Douglas Reinelt, Associate Provost
_____, Chair, _____
Charlene Pinkerton, Dedman College Business Officer

John Z. Doe

Department of XXX

Annual Reviews

Concerning the annual reviews, the Department of _____'s policy is that the chair and the faculty member have a discussion about the past year and the year to come. No written reviews are done in the department.

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Annual Reviews

To: John Z. Doe.
Date: 3/18/16
Re: Annual Review for 2015
From: _____, Chair

John, you had a strong research year with four publications, with three appearing in top journals.

You also had a good year in terms of teaching undergraduate students (2 classes in the spring on _____) and graduate students (_____ in the fall). It was interesting to note, as we have talked about, that you received well above average rating in one of your undergraduate classes but below average in the other section. This outcome occurred despite the fact you were teaching the same content on the same days. It is important to demonstrate you can continue to be an effective instructor in the classroom. In addition, I know you are actively collaborating with colleagues in the department and you mentor a number of students. From my perspective, you do both of those activities very well.

Let me now turn to areas of potential weaknesses as you move toward consideration for promotion. In reviewing your the publications in the past year, despite the high quality of journals, three of your articles were co-authored with your former internship mentor. It is important, before coming up for promotion, that you have demonstrated some independent scholarship. Toward that end, I recommend you concentrate your scholarly work on completing research that you (or your students) are the lead author and that in the next year or so, you do not work on projects that are co-authored with your former mentors or colleagues. The department also values evidence that you have completed work that you started at SMU.

The other area of weakness I notice is the absence of grant support. I know you are actively working on this and applying for federal support. That is important to keep submitting, revising, and resubmitting.

Although the department has protected you from most service obligations, I also wanted to say I appreciate you serving on the Executive Committee and the Faculty Search Committee. You are a good department citizen and your input and suggestions are valued.

Please do not hesitate to ask me (or other tenured faculty) for advice as you approach your final two years in the rank of assistant professor. I encourage you to make use of our new Assistant Professor Mentoring policy.

To: John Z. Doe, Ph.D.
Date: 3/07/17
Re: Annual Review for 2016
From: _____, Chair

I would say that 2016 was a very good year for you! With regard to scholarly activities, you published four articles in 2016 in top tier journals and you were the first author on three of them. In addition, you have a chapter in press. All of those publications help in establishing your national reputation. In addition, you are also continuing your efforts to obtain grants by collaborating on a grant and working with at least two of your colleagues on grant proposals.

With regard to instruction, I was very pleased to see how positive the student evaluations were, including several comments referring to you as one of the best instructors they have had at SMU! The student comments indicate you are doing a very good job in the classroom.

Although service to the department and university is not required of assistant professors, you do generously share your expertise and thereby make a number of contributions to the department and university.

As you know, very soon the department will begin initiating the procedures to begin considering you for promotion and tenure. Keep in mind that any manuscripts that are accepted for publication prior to September can "count." Within the next week, I will give you a letter outlining the schedule and your responsibilities. Please don't hesitate to ask me if you have any procedural questions.

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. **NO ABSTENTIONS ARE ALLOWED IN TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION CASES.**)

September 15, 2017

Dean Thomas DiPiero
Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences
200 Dallas Hall
CAMPUS

Dear Dean DiPiero,

This letter is my analysis, as Chair of _____, of the case for John Z. Doe's promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

The tenured faculty met on Sept. 20, 2017 to consider Dr. Doe's case for promotion. The tenured members of our faculty voted 11 in favor of his promotion, and 0 opposed.

As you requested, below I review the strengths and weakness of Dr. Doe's teaching, research, and service. This assessment is primarily mine, though it does benefit from the faculty discussion about the promotion case. In a separate section of this letter I will comment on the evaluations provided by the external reviewers. I end this letter with my overall assessment and recommendation.

The chair will go on to explain the case.

Sincerely,

_____, Chair
Department of _____

Include all faculty letters in alpha order - naming convention Last Name, First Name Letter 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.

Date

Department Chair
Dedman College
SMU

Dear Chair:

I write to recommend Dr. John Z. Doe for Tenure/Promotion to Associate/Full Professor. I have worked with Dr. Doe on numerous projects and is entitled to tenure/promotion.

Sincerely,

Dora Andrews
Professor
Department of _____
Dedman College

Date

Department Chair
Dedman College
SMU

Dear Chair:

I write to recommend Dr. John Z. Doe for Tenure/Promotion to Associate/Full Professor. I have worked with Dr. Doe on numerous projects and is entitled to tenure/promotion.

Sincerely,

John Smith
Associate Professor
Department of English
Dedman College

Citations List

(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.....

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX

Citations are not used in the Department of _____

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Citations - Department

Please see Candidate's Section for Citations

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 names together with CV's obtained from the web – no reviewer should be directly contacted at this point. The chair of the department should discuss the list of 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 about 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. **No more than 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.

In the dossier, the selection procedure for external evaluations (see example) 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 (see example letter);
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).

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

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate the scholarly work of Professor X, who is a candidate for promotion to associate professor in the Department of Z at Southern Methodist University. In our review process we include candid and detailed appraisals from distinguished scholars of the candidate's research achievements and productivity. Within the limits of the law, SMU will do all in its power to keep your letter confidential.

I am enclosing a copy of the candidate's research statement, XXX scholarly articles, YY [other things, etc.], and a copy of her curriculum vitae as of DATE. If you would like additional materials that are listed on her CV, I would be happy to make those available to you. I am also attaching a copy of the department's guidelines for tenure and promotion. Please note that these are guidelines; not a checklist. They are meant to help new faculty understand the tenure process as they join the faculty and to assist colleagues as they evaluate tenure and promotion cases.

We are especially interested in your thoughts on the following questions:

- What is your relationship to the candidate?
- What is your opinion of the quality and significance of the research?
- What is the quality of the venues in which the candidate's work appears?
- Is the candidate establishing a logically coherent line of research independent from previous mentors?
- What is the significance of the problems/questions/issues the research addresses?
- In today's research, collaboration may be important. It is also important that faculty members be promoted on the merits of their own work. Please address as you are able the candidate's role in any collaborative work in this case.
- If you are able, please compare the candidate with others at a similar stage in their careers.

In order for this case to be deliberated fully, I will need your evaluation letter by DATE. I will also need your CV or a biosketch to submit with the candidate's promotion dossier.

Thank you for your willingness to undertake this most important task. It is a service to SMU and to our discipline. We greatly appreciate your evaluation.

Outside Peer Reviewers
Letter

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

Attach the letter behind the green sheet

Outside Peer Reviewers
Curriculum Vitae

Wendy B. Faris (Ph.D Harvard University, 1975) Professor, Department of English, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Teaching and/or Research 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**)

Outside Peer Reviewers
Letter

Stargazer, John (Ph.D. UT Austin), Associate Professor, Department of English, Stanford University. Teaching/Research fields: British, American, World, and Comparative Literature

Attach the letter behind the green sheet

Outside Peer Reviewers
Curriculum Vitae

Stargazer, John (Ph.D. UT Austin), Associate Professor, Department of English, Stanford University.
Teaching/Research 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**)

Note - how you list your courses
are how you load the
evaluations in Section 14b

John Z. Doe
Department of XX
Course Evaluations

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

Course Evaluation Instructions

For Tenure Cases: Six Years of Course Evaluations from their original appointment.

For Promotion Cases: Six Years from the Date of Tenure or Six years back from the academic year that the candidate comes up for promotion.

For the 2020-2021 cycle, an example

If the candidate came up for tenure in 2013, course evaluations should be gathered for the following academic years:

AY 2019-2020

AY 2019-2018

AY 2018-2017

AY 2017-2016

AY 2016-2015

AY 2014-2015

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Student Evaluations

There are no course evaluations for Span 3199-P81/Research Training, SPAN 3299-P81/Research Training, SPAN 3399-P81/Research Training, and SPAN 7171-P81/Research for Fall 2013. These are research/practicum courses which are normally centered around the professor's specific research projects and are not structured classes as regular university courses are.

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Student Evaluations
Biology 1401-001/Introductory Biology
Spring 2016

Southern Methodist University
Dedman College - Spring 2016

Course:

Instructor:

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following

The syllabus clearly explained the goals for learning, grading policy, and the schedule.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)											
Agree	(3)											
Disagree	(2)											
Strongly Disagree	(1)											
Not Applicable	(0)											
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following

Class time was well-organized.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)											
Agree	(3)											
Disagree	(2)											
Strongly Disagree	(1)											
Not Applicable	(0)											
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following

Course materials supported my learning of the course content.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)											
Agree	(3)											
Disagree	(2)											
Strongly Disagree	(1)											
Not Applicable	(0)											
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following

Examples and/or particular readings used during class time helped me understand the course content.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)											
Agree	(3)											
Disagree	(2)											
Strongly Disagree	(1)											
Not Applicable	(0)											
				25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	

Southern Methodist University
Dedman College - Spring 2016

Course: PERSONALITY0011162: PSYC3370-001-1162-PSYC3370 Sect 001 1162

Instructor: Michael Chmielewski *

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following												
Assignments including readings, videos, and problem sets, helped clarify my understanding of the course content.												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	14	63.64%						3.67	3.54	3.46	
Agree	(3)	7	31.82%									
Disagree	(2)	0	0%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%									
Not Applicable	(0)	1	4.55%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	
22/30 (73.33%)	3.67	0.48	4.00	639	3.54	0.62	4.00	12,045	3.46	0.73	4.00	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following												
Feedback on assignments improved my understanding of the course content.												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	11	50%						3.44	3.28	3.34	
Agree	(3)	5	22.73%									
Disagree	(2)	1	4.55%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	1	4.55%									
Not Applicable	(0)	4	18.18%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	
22/30 (73.33%)	3.44	0.86	4.00	639	3.28	0.83	3.00	12,051	3.34	0.85	4.00	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following												
My performance in the class was clearly communicated to me throughout the semester.												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	13	59.09%						3.50	3.44	3.36	
Agree	(3)	7	31.82%									
Disagree	(2)	2	9.09%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%									
Not Applicable	(0)	0	0%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	
22/30 (73.33%)	3.50	0.67	4.00	638	3.44	0.71	4.00	12,039	3.36	0.82	4.00	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following												
My interest in the subject increased as a result of taking this course.												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	15	68.18%						3.67	3.33	3.26	
Agree	(3)	5	22.73%									
Disagree	(2)	1	4.55%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%									
Not Applicable	(0)	1	4.55%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	
22/30 (73.33%)	3.67	0.58	4.00	636	3.33	0.87	4.00	12,018	3.26	0.91	4.00	

Southern Methodist University
Dedman College - Spring 2016

Course: PERSONALITY0011162: PSYC3370-001-1162-PSYC3370 Sect 001 1162

Instructor: Michael Chmielewski *

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following

If the class had a discussion component, the instructor encouraged widespread involvement, kept focus, and limited extraneous comments.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means						
Strongly Agree	(4)	13	61.9%				<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Instructor</td> <td>Department</td> <td>Dedman</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.65</td> <td>3.48</td> <td>3.47</td> </tr> </table>	Instructor	Department	Dedman	3.65	3.48	3.47
Instructor	Department	Dedman											
3.65	3.48	3.47											
Agree	(3)	7	33.33%										
Disagree	(2)	0	0%										
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%										
Not Applicable	(0)	1	4.76%										
				0	25	50	75	100					
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median		
21/30 (70%)	3.65	0.49	4.00	631	3.48	0.68	4.00	11,930	3.47	0.75	4.00		

2 - The instructor was available to answer questions outside of class.

Michael Chmielewski

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means						
Strongly Agree	(4)	14	63.64%				<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Instructor</td> <td>Department</td> <td>Dedman</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.59</td> <td>3.42</td> <td>3.47</td> </tr> </table>	Instructor	Department	Dedman	3.59	3.42	3.47
Instructor	Department	Dedman											
3.59	3.42	3.47											
Agree	(3)	7	31.82%										
Disagree	(2)	1	4.55%										
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%										
				0	25	50	75	100					
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median		
22/30 (73.33%)	3.59	0.59	4.00	632	3.42	0.64	3.00	12,248	3.47	0.66	4.00		

3 - How many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class time?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means						
0-3 Hours	(1)	3	13.64%				<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Instructor</td> <td>Department</td> <td>Dedman</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.55</td> <td>2.09</td> <td>2.10</td> </tr> </table>	Instructor	Department	Dedman	2.55	2.09	2.10
Instructor	Department	Dedman											
2.55	2.09	2.10											
3-6 Hours	(2)	8	36.36%										
6-9 Hours	(3)	7	31.82%										
9-12 Hours	(4)	4	18.18%										
12 or More Hours	(5)	0	0%										
				0	25	50	75	100					
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median		
22/30 (73.33%)	2.55	0.96	2.50	637	2.09	0.91	2.00	11,989	2.10	0.99	2.00		

4 - Did any particular aspects of this course enhance your learning?

.

5 - Did any particular aspects of this course detract from your learning?

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Student Evaluations
Spanish 1401-001/Introductory Spanish
Spring 2016

**Southern Methodist University
Dedman College - Spring 2016**

Course:

Instructor:

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following

The syllabus clearly explained the goals for learning, grading policy, and the schedule.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)											
Agree	(3)											
Disagree	(2)											
Strongly Disagree	(1)											
Not Applicable	(0)											
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following

Class time was well-organized.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)											
Agree	(3)											
Disagree	(2)											
Strongly Disagree	(1)											
Not Applicable	(0)											
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following

Course materials supported my learning of the course content.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)											
Agree	(3)											
Disagree	(2)											
Strongly Disagree	(1)											
Not Applicable	(0)											
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following

Examples and/or particular readings used during class time helped me understand the course content.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)											
Agree	(3)											
Disagree	(2)											
Strongly Disagree	(1)											
Not Applicable	(0)											
				25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	

Southern Methodist University
Dedman College - Spring 2016

Course: PERSONALITY0011162: PSYC3370-001-1162-PSYC3370 Sect 001 1162

Instructor: Michael Chmielewski *

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following												
Assignments including readings, videos, and problem sets, helped clarify my understanding of the course content.												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means				
Strongly Agree	(4)	14	63.64%									
Agree	(3)	7	31.82%									
Disagree	(2)	0	0%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%									
Not Applicable	(0)	1	4.55%									
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	
22/30 (73.33%)	3.67	0.48	4.00	639	3.54	0.62	4.00	12,045	3.46	0.73	4.00	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following												
Feedback on assignments improved my understanding of the course content.												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means				
Strongly Agree	(4)	11	50%									
Agree	(3)	5	22.73%									
Disagree	(2)	1	4.55%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	1	4.55%									
Not Applicable	(0)	4	18.18%									
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	
22/30 (73.33%)	3.44	0.86	4.00	639	3.28	0.83	3.00	12,051	3.34	0.85	4.00	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following												
My performance in the class was clearly communicated to me throughout the semester.												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means				
Strongly Agree	(4)	13	59.09%									
Agree	(3)	7	31.82%									
Disagree	(2)	2	9.09%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%									
Not Applicable	(0)	0	0%									
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	
22/30 (73.33%)	3.50	0.67	4.00	638	3.44	0.71	4.00	12,039	3.36	0.82	4.00	

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following												
My interest in the subject increased as a result of taking this course.												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means				
Strongly Agree	(4)	15	68.18%									
Agree	(3)	5	22.73%									
Disagree	(2)	1	4.55%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%									
Not Applicable	(0)	1	4.55%									
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median	
22/30 (73.33%)	3.67	0.58	4.00	636	3.33	0.87	4.00	12,018	3.26	0.91	4.00	

Southern Methodist University
Dedman College - Spring 2016

Course: PERSONALITY0011162: PSYC3370-001-1162-PSYC3370 Sect 001 1162

Instructor: Michael Chmielewski *

1 - Please Answer Each of the Following

If the class had a discussion component, the instructor encouraged widespread involvement, kept focus, and limited extraneous comments.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means				
Strongly Agree	(4)	13	61.9%					3.65	3.48	3.47	
Agree	(3)	7	33.33%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%								
Not Applicable	(0)	1	4.76%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median
21/30 (70%)	3.65	0.49	4.00	631	3.48	0.68	4.00	11,930	3.47	0.75	4.00

2 - The instructor was available to answer questions outside of class.

Michael Chmielewski

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means				
Strongly Agree	(4)	14	63.64%					3.59	3.42	3.47	
Agree	(3)	7	31.82%								
Disagree	(2)	1	4.55%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median
22/30 (73.33%)	3.59	0.59	4.00	632	3.42	0.64	3.00	12,248	3.47	0.66	4.00

3 - How many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class time?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means				
0-3 Hours	(1)	3	13.64%					2.55	2.09	2.10	
3-6 Hours	(2)	8	36.36%								
6-9 Hours	(3)	7	31.82%								
9-12 Hours	(4)	4	18.18%								
12 or More Hours	(5)	0	0%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	Dedman
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	Dedman	Mean	STD	Median
22/30 (73.33%)	2.55	0.96	2.50	637	2.09	0.91	2.00	11,989	2.10	0.99	2.00

4 - Did any particular aspects of this course enhance your learning?

.

5 - Did any particular aspects of this course detract from your learning?

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Student Evaluations

There are no course evaluations for Span 3199-P81/Research Training, SPAN 3299-P81/Research Training, SPAN 3399-P81/Research Training, and SPAN 7171-P81/Research for **Fall 2013**. These are research/practicum courses which are normally centered around the professor's specific research projects and are not structured classes as regular university courses are.

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Student Evaluations
BIO 1410-001
Introductory Biology
Fall 2013



Numeric responses use a scale 0-4 where 4 is the highest rating.

IND RESP

- 1 The syllabus clearly explained the goals for learning, grading policy, and the schedule.
 - 2 Class time was well-organized.
 - 3 Course materials supported my learning of the course content.
 - 4 Examples and/or particular readings used during class time helped me understand the course
 - 5 Assignments including readings, videos, and problem sets, helped clarify my understanding of the course
 - 6 Feedback on assignments improved my understanding of the course content.
 - 7 My performance in the class was clearly communicated to me throughout the semester.
 - 8 My interest in the subject increased as a result of taking this course.
 - 9 If the class had a discussion component, the instructor encouraged widespread involvement, kept focus, and
 - 10 The instructor was available to answer questions outside of class.
 - 11 Overall evaluation of the instructor's performance:
 - 12 Overall evaluation of the course:
 - 13 How many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class time?
- 14 *Did any particular aspects of this course enhance your learning?*

15 *Did any particular aspects of this course detract from your learning?*

Numeric responses use a scale 0-4 where 4 is the highest rating.

IND RESP

- 1 The syllabus clearly explained the goals for learning, grading policy, and the schedule.
- 2 Class time was well-organized.
- 3 Course materials supported my learning of the course content.
- 4 Examples and/or particular readings used during class time helped me understand the course
- 5 Assignments including readings, videos, and problem sets, helped clarify my understanding of the course
- 6 Feedback on assignments improved my understanding of the course content.
- 7 My performance in the class was clearly communicated to me throughout the semester.
- 8 My interest in the subject increased as a result of taking this course.
- 9 If the class had a discussion component, the instructor encouraged widespread involvement, kept focus, and
- 10 The instructor was available to answer questions outside of class.
- 11 Overall evaluation of the instructor's performance:
- 12 Overall evaluation of the course:
- 13 How many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class time?

14 *Did any particular aspects of this course enhance your learning?*

15 *Did any particular aspects of this course detract from your learning?*

Numeric responses use a scale 0-4 where 4 is the highest rating.

IND RESP

- 1 The syllabus clearly explained the goals for learning, grading policy, and the schedule.
- 2 Class time was well-organized.
- 3 Course materials supported my learning of the course content.
- 4 Examples and/or particular readings used during class time helped me understand the course
- 5 Assignments including readings, videos, and problem sets, helped clarify my understanding of the course
- 6 Feedback on assignments improved my understanding of the course content.
- 7 My performance in the class was clearly communicated to me throughout the semester.
- 8 My interest in the subject increased as a result of taking this course.
- 9 If the class had a discussion component, the instructor encouraged widespread involvement, kept focus, and
- 10 The instructor was available to answer questions outside of class.
- 11 Overall evaluation of the instructor's performance:
- 12 Overall evaluation of the course:
- 13 How many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class time?

14 *Did any particular aspects of this course enhance your learning?*

15 *Did any particular aspects of this course detract from your learning?*

Numeric responses use a scale 0-4 where 4 is the highest rating.

IND RESP

- 1 The syllabus clearly explained the goals for learning, grading policy, and the schedule.
 - 2 Class time was well-organized.
 - 3 Course materials supported my learning of the course content.
 - 4 Examples and/or particular readings used during class time helped me understand the course
 - 5 Assignments including readings, videos, and problem sets, helped clarify my understanding of the course
 - 6 Feedback on assignments improved my understanding of the course content.
 - 7 My performance in the class was clearly communicated to me throughout the semester.
 - 8 My interest in the subject increased as a result of taking this course.
 - 9 If the class had a discussion component, the instructor encouraged widespread involvement, kept focus, and
 - 10 The instructor was available to answer questions outside of class.
 - 11 Overall evaluation of the instructor's performance:
 - 12 Overall evaluation of the course:
 - 13 How many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class time?
- 14 *Did any particular aspects of this course enhance your learning?*

15 *Did any particular aspects of this course detract from your learning?*

Courses = 1

Instructor
Term
Avg DEPT
AVG

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

1	The syllabus clearly explained the goals for learning, grading policy, and the schedule.			
2	Class time was well-organized.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Course materials supported my learning of the course content.			
4	Examples and/or particular readings used during class time helped me understand the course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Assignments including readings, videos, and problem sets, helped clarify my understanding of the course content.			
6	Feedback on assignments improved my understanding of the course content.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	My performance in the class was clearly communicated to me throughout the semester.			
8	My interest in the subject increased as a result of taking this course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	If the class had a discussion component, the instructor encouraged widespread involvement, kept focus, and limited extraneous			
10	The instructor was available to answer questions outside of class.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Overall evaluation of the instructor's performance:			
12	Overall evaluation of the course:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	How many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class time?			
14	Did any particular aspects of this course enhance your learning?			
15	Did any particular aspects of this course detract from your learning?			

Enrollment

% Responses

Course GPA

Notes

DC Average (Q1-5)

Course Evaluation Essay Response Report

14 Did any particular aspects of this course enhance your learning?

15 Did any particular aspects of this course detract from your learning?

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

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Student Evaluations
Dr. Doe was on leave for Spring
2012

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Student Evaluations

The Candidate has opted to exclude spring 2020 teaching evaluation data from their dossier, due to the COVID-19 situation.

Include all faculty letters in alpha order - naming convention Last Name, First Name Letter

Date

Chair

Department of _____

Dedman College

Address

Dear Chair,

Per your request, I have attended Professor _____'s Class Name, Course Number, Fall/Spring semester class, to evaluate his teaching performance as he/she is being considered for tenure and promotion.

Description of class evaluation.

My impression is that Professor _____'s teaching performance is good/bad.

Sincerely,

Ed Rogers

Associate Professor

Include all faculty letters in alpha order - naming convention Last Name, First Name Letter

Date

Chair

Department of _____

Dedman College

Address

Dear

Chair,

Per your request, I have attended Professor Does' Class Name, Course Number, Fall/Spring semester class, to evaluate his teaching performance as he is being considered for tenure and promotion.

Description of class evaluation.

My impression is that Professor _____'s teaching performance is very good.

Sincerely,

Dora Smith

Professor

Jon Z/ Doe
Department of XXX
Section 14c - Peer Evaluations of Teaching

Please see Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee Letters and Department Chair Letter addressing this section

**Evaluation of Teaching
And
Student Letters**

Include

1. For Tenure and Promotion Cases: The department should solicit letters from all classes taught or co-taught by the Candidate during the last six years at SMU. This should be done twice, in early June and early August. 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). Contact desroor@smu.edu to get a list of students' names and emails.
2. A sample letter of solicitation.
3. Student Letter Summary Sheet (please load your student letters in the order of the summary sheet)
4. Student Letter Summary Chart: Student names should be listed alphabetically. Where student took more than one course with professor, both courses with semesters should be listed, the course in **BOLD** indicates placement of student evaluation letter.



SMU

DEDMAN COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES & SCIENCES

June 1, 2020

Dear

Dedman College at SMU is considering the candidacy of Assistant Professor _____ for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Since you were a student in Professor _____'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 Voth 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. I would appreciate receiving your comments by September 1, 2020. Thank you for your cooperation in this important matter.

Sincerely,

John Z. Doe
Department of XXX
Student Evaluation of
Teaching

The Department of XXX solicited letters of evaluation from the students Professor Doe taught from fall _____ through spring _____. We sent an email on _____ and _____, to all the students. Approximately _____ letters were emailed; _____ student responses were received. A sample letter is enclosed, with student responses.

<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

John Z. Doe

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 MATH 3308 Introduction to Discrete Mathematics	Spring 1997 Fall 1996

John Z. Doe

Department of xxxx

Student Letters

Chemistry 1303-002/General Chemistry Fall 2002

Date

Chair
Department of
Dedman College

Dear Chair,

I took Professor Doe's Chemistry 1301 in Fall 2002. He was terrible, never prepared, never answered questions.

Sincerely,

Sally Jacobs '20

Date

Chair
Department of
Dedman College

Dear Chair,

I took Professor Doe's Chemistry 1301 in Fall 2002. He was an awesome teacher, always prepared and made time after class to talk to students. Without question, he should be tenured.

Sincerely,

Valerie Smith '22

John Z. Doe

Department of xxxx

Student Letters

Chemistry 1303-001/General Chemistry Fall 2001

Date

Chair
Department of
Dedman College

Dear Chair,

I took Professor Doe's Chemistry 1301 in Fall 2001. He was terrible, never prepared, never answered questions.

Sincerely,

Gilbert Reed '19

Date

Chair
Department of
Dedman College

Dear Chair,

I took Professor Doe's Chemistry 1301 in Fall 2001. He was an awesome teacher, always prepared and made time after class to talk to students. Without question, he should be tenured.

Sincerely,

Dora Smith '82

JOHN Z. DOE
DEPARTMENT OF XXX
SECTION 10 – GRANT FUNDING

Dr. Doe had no outside grant funding.