

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.

A. PROCEDURES FOR CONTRACT RENEWAL DURING THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD.

Review for contract renewal during the probationary period normally takes place in the fall semester of the last year of the contract. The steps in this review process are as follows.

1. The department Chair confers with the candidate and obtains copies of publications, a current curriculum vitae, and other relevant materials.
2. The department Chair consults with the tenured members of the department to identify the steps the department will follow in its evaluation of the candidate. Research and teaching are the primary factors on which the candidate will be judged.
3. The Chair informs the candidate of the procedures by which his or her teaching and research will be evaluated.
4. The tenured faculty conducts a thorough review of teaching. In addition to a review of student evaluations, the tenured faculty conducts a thorough peer review. Peer review includes such pedagogical materials and activities as: course syllabi; classroom materials such as handouts, tests, and assignments; other aspects of teaching such as student conferences, web or Internet pedagogy, and use of technology; and visits to class.
5. The tenured faculty conducts a thorough review of research by reviewing all publications and all work accepted for publication, all work in progress that the candidate wishes to make available, and all funded or pending grant applications. Ordinarily, departments do not seek outside letters for contract renewal.
6. The decision about the recommendation for contact renewal is made in a meeting of the tenured members of the faculty after all items of evidence have been assembled.
7. Within a week of the department's decision, the Chair communicates the department's decision to the Dean and with the Dean's approval communicates the department's decision to the candidate along with an evaluation (in writing at the candidate's request) of the candidate's performance.
8. In the event that the department recommends non-renewal and the candidate does not agree with the decision, the decision can be appealed to the Dean within twenty-one days. The Dean's decision after appeal will be final.
9. If the department recommends renewal and the Dean denies the recommendation, the candidate may appeal the Dean's decision to the Provost within twenty-one days. The Provost's decision will be final.

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.

PROCEDURES FOR DEAN'S REVIEW OF DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROMOTION AND THE AWARD OF TENURE

The Dean will forward the departmental recommendations on promotion (to the rank of associate as well as full professor) and the award of tenure to the appropriate standing Advisory Committee for review.

Recommendation for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and the Award of Tenure:

There are three Advisory Committees, one for each division. The Advisory Committees have the responsibility of advising the Dean on the award of tenure for faculty members in respective divisions and their promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Members:

One faculty representative from each department within the Division, elected by the members of that department.

One faculty member from another division in Dedman College appointed by the Dean.

One faculty member from another school appointed by the Dean.

Term of Office:

Elected faculty representatives serve for three-year staggered terms. After the first election, elected faculty representatives will be randomly chosen to serve one, two or three year terms so as to establish staggered terms for the membership. Appointed faculty members serve three-year terms.

Eligibility:

Only tenured faculty members of the rank of associate professor and above, including department Chairs, are eligible to vote for candidates and serve on these Advisory Committees.

Elections:

Elections take place in the spring semester of the academic year. Elected representatives start their term in the following year academic year.

Vacancies:

Vacancies in the Advisory Committee will be filled by the department as and when necessary. If a representative goes on leave the department will appoint another representative to serve for the period of that member's leave.

Divisional Advisory Committee Meetings:

The Committees are advisory to the Dean and they help ensure that standards for granting of tenure and promotion in the faculty are both high and equitable. Meetings will be arranged by the Dean in which the committee members will be arranged by the Dean in which the committee members will explain their assessment of the candidates. The Chair of the department to which the candidate belongs and, in those cases where the departmental recommendation is not unanimous, a faculty member representing the opposing opinion will be invited to appear at the meetings. When appropriate, the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies may be invited to present pertinent information on the candidate. The faculty representative from the candidate's department is eligible to participate in the proceedings of the committee. No formal votes will be taken in committee meetings. Members of the Committee will be required to submit their evaluations to the Dean in writing within 48 hours of the meeting. These letters will become a permanent part of the candidate's dossier.

Decision by the Dean:

Persons being recommended as well as those not being recommended for tenure and promotion will be notified by the Dean. The Dean's decision will be communicated to the Divisional 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 tenured faculty of the department to discuss the reasons for the decision.

Recommendation for Promotion to the Rank of Professor.

The Advisory Committee for Promotion to the Rank of Professor is composed of faculty representatives elected (see procedures below) from the three divisions and a faculty member from another school appointed by the Dean and is responsible for advising the Dean on promotion of faculty members to the rank of Professor.

Members:

The Advisory Committee includes seven faculty members distributed as follows:

Two elected faculty representatives (from different departments) from each division. One faculty member from another school appointed by the Dean.

Term of Office:

Elected faculty representatives shall serve for three year staggered terms. After the first election, elected faculty representatives will be randomly chosen to serve one, two, or three year terms so as to establish staggered terms for the membership. Appointed faculty members shall serve for a three-year term.

Eligibility:

Only tenured faculty members of the rank of professor, including department Chairs, are eligible to serve on the Advisory Committee.

Nominations:

The Faculty Council will invite up to two nominations from each department in respective divisions excluding departments which will have a continuing member. The selection process within the department is left to its discretion with the restriction that all faculty members of the rank of professor should be consulted. From these nominations, the Faculty Council will nominate two candidates for each position in the division. The faculty of Dedman College will be informed of the slate of nominees prior to a general faculty meeting called to approve the nominations. Additional nominations can be made at the faculty meeting, each with the support of at least five professors from the division.

Elections:

Elections will be arranged by the Secretary of the Council and will be conducted by secret mail ballot. Elections shall be by majority of the votes cast within respective divisions. Deadline for casting votes shall be specified on the ballot. All faculty are eligible to participate except adjuncts and visitors. Also eligible to vote are administrators who hold faculty rank.

Vacancies:

Vacancies in the Advisory Committee occurring in the fall semester due to resignations from the committee or departures from the University will be filled by appointment by the Dean in consultation with the Faculty Council. The term of office of the appointed member is only for the remainder of the academic year. Such vacancies occurring during the spring semester will be filled during the regular end-of-year elections. The term of office of the new member will be the unexplored term of the member vacating the position. If a faculty member goes on leave during the term of office, in consultation with the Council, the Dean will appoint a person from the proper division to serve for the period of the member's leave.

Advisory Committee Meetings:

The Committee is advisory to the Dean, and it helps ensure that standards for promotion are both high and equitable. Meetings will be arranged by the Dean in which members will explain their assessments of the candidates. The Chair of the department to which the candidate belongs and, in those cases where the departmental vote is not unanimous, a faculty member representing the opposing opinion, will be invited to appear before the meeting. When appropriate, the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies may be invited to present pertinent information on the candidate. Any faculty representation from the candidate's department is eligible to participate in the proceedings of the committee. If the committee does not include a faculty representative from the candidate's department, the department will be asked to send a representative to participate in the proceedings as a resource person on the candidate and the department. No formal votes will be taken in Committee meetings.

Members of the Committee will be required to submit their evaluations to the Dean in writing within 48 hours of the meeting. These letters will become a permanent part of the candidate's dossier.

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.