

Promotion and Tenure Review Process:
Procedures and Documentation

Meadows School of the Arts

Updated/Revised Fall 2017
Effective January 1, 2018

Within the framework of the “GUIDELINES FOR THE AWARD OF RANK AND TENURE” (SMU POLICY NUMBER: 6.12), the following policies and procedures are followed in all academic units of the Meadows School of the Arts. This document summarizes only the procedural process for promotion and tenure within the Meadows School of the Arts; criteria and standards for the evaluation of faculty within each discipline are found in the guidelines of each academic unit.

Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure

Specific written criteria and standards appropriate to each discipline are established by each academic unit and approved by the Dean. These criteria and standards must adhere to both University and School policies and procedures. In any instance where the academic unit’s criteria deviate from those of the School, the guidelines of the School shall take precedence. These criteria should be consistent with the academic unit’s goals and its merit review policies.

In all of the academic areas of the school, the principal factors that are considered in evaluations for promotion and for the awarding of tenure are teaching and scholarship/research/creative activity. Tenure cannot be granted based on promise alone. The demonstration of accomplishments in teaching and research or professional/creative activities must be significant.

The standards and criteria of the individual academic units of the Meadows School will outline the standards for professional or creative activity that are most valued at merit review and that are required for tenure and promotion. The criteria should reflect comparable standards of performance in the nation’s leading institutions. Individual academic unit guidelines are included as a part of all promotion and tenure dossiers.

Timeline and Process for Promotion and Tenure Review

March 1-10

The initial contract specifies the year in which the review for promotion and tenure is scheduled to take place. Candidates for promotion and tenure and their academic Chairs/Directors meet to discuss procedural matters with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs during the period of March 1-10 of the academic year preceding the upcoming consideration.

Faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor who wish to be considered for promotion to Full Professor must inform their Chair/Director and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs by the first day of March preceding the fall semester in which they wish to be considered for promotion. These candidates, along with their academic Chairs/Directors, also meet to discuss procedural matters with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs during the period of March 1-10 of the academic year preceding the upcoming consideration.

March 10-May 15

The candidate, Chair/Director, and Senior Associate Dean assemble materials to be made available to External Reviewers by the Senior Associate Dean.

Identification and Solicitation of External Reviewers

For each candidate, documentation is sent to six External Reviewers for their review.

First and foremost, External Reviewers should be individuals of the highest credibility who have established outstanding reputations in the candidate's academic/artistic discipline and who are able to evaluate the candidate's work and credentials with objectivity, insight, and rigor.

While it is typically expected that External Reviewers hold tenured faculty positions, in the Meadows School, it is often both appropriate and desirable for notable professionals in the candidate's field to be asked to serve as External Reviewers. Such Reviewers should have a level of awareness and understanding of the tenure and promotion process to enable them to provide significant and meaningful feedback on the candidate's record.

For candidates seeking promotion to Full Professor, External Reviewers in tenured faculty positions **must** hold the rank of Full Professor. For candidates under consideration for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, External Reviewers in tenured faculty positions may hold the rank of either Associate Professor or Full Professor.

Reviewers are asked to disclose the nature of their relationship with the candidate. Reviews should not be solicited from those with close relationships to the candidate.

Candidates do not solicit External Reviewers directly nor engage with them about the review.

The candidate provides the Chair/Director with the names, addresses, and email addresses of six prospective External Reviewers, in ranked order, along with a brief statement of their professional qualifications. The candidate must provide this information to the academic Chair/Director within a timeframe that allows the Chair/Director to confirm to the Senior Associate Dean—by no later than May 1—the participation of the six External Reviewers who will provide review letters for the file.

It is the Chair/Director's responsibility to identify the six External Reviewers who will review the scholarly, artistic and/or professional activities of the candidates. The Chair/Director solicits review letters from three persons on the list of six names and addresses submitted by the candidate (and will return to the candidate's list for more names, if necessary). Additionally, the Chair/Director chooses three additional External Reviewers.

The Chair/Director's final selection of External Reviewers is done in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean who will forward the official requests to the External Reviewers.

By no later than May 1, the Chair/Director must confirm to the Senior Associate Dean the participation of the six External Reviewers who will provide review letters for the file and provides the Senior Associate Dean with a written DRAFT document explaining why these External Reviewers were chosen, their specific academic specializations, and their professional and academic stature.

In this document, it is imperative that the Chair/Director describes, in compelling and definitive terms, exactly why each External Reviewer is, without question, an individual of the highest credibility who has established an outstanding reputation in the candidate's academic/artistic discipline and who is able to evaluate the candidate's work and credentials with objectivity, insight, and rigor and why each qualifies to serve as an External Reviewer for the candidate.

A final draft of this document is due for inclusion in the candidate's dossier by no later than September 15.

The CANDIDATE is responsible for preparing the following materials for the promotion/tenure file by May 15:

1. An up-to-date curriculum vitae organized in sections (arranged in reverse chronological order—most recent first) on the candidate's education, teaching experience, and related professional positions. Candidates are encouraged—if they wish—to create a C.V. of a more “narrative” nature such that it would provide more detailed explanation as to the particular and specific relevance of its contents to those outside of the discipline.

Because information on the quality, national stature, and/or acceptance rates of professional venues is essential, candidates should not hesitate to provide information on the journals that contain the candidate's publications, orchestras with which the candidate has performed, galleries in which the candidate has exhibited work, publishers of books or other material, theatre companies with which the candidate has worked, etc. Such information is crucial in the evaluation process. Those outside the candidate's field cannot be expected to know the relative importance or prestige of theatre companies, music publishers, communications journals, galleries, dance companies, etc.

2. A personal statement that includes discussion of teaching and research/artistic philosophy, relationship between scholarly or artistic work and effective teaching, research plans, and other activities within the University and the profession. The statement serves as a self-evaluation and philosophical statement of the candidate's professional activity as it relates to the academic unit, School, University, and the national and international academic community. Candidates are encouraged to work with their academic Chairs/Directors and mentors. Examples are on file in the Associate Dean's office.

3. Supporting documents. These materials, which will also be summarized in the tenure dossier, may include anything that the candidate deems relevant to his/her candidacy, such as copies of major publications (articles, tapes, videotapes, photographs, or recordings, as appropriate... excerpts are acceptable in some cases...) reviews, critiques, and programs.

4. A list of materials that will be sent to the External Reviewers.

These materials include:

- 1. Curriculum Vitae**
- 2. Personal Statement**
- 3. Original Appointment Letter (“date of letter”)**
- 4. Reappointment Letter (“date of letter”)**
- 5. List of Courses Taught Including Enrollments**
- 6. Supporting Documents*****

***These “Supporting Documents” are selected by the candidate from among those examples listed above (see **3. Supporting documents.**). The candidate has the final say about what supporting documents, if any, the candidate wishes to include.

This list is signed and dated by the candidate, and it is included in the tenure file that is submitted to the External Reviewers.

Because External Reviewers are asked to evaluate research and creative productivity rather than teaching, the materials sent to them should only concern research and creative work (except for the “**List of Courses Taught Including Enrollments**”).

5. Names and email addresses of ten current and/or former students who can evaluate the candidate's teaching. The candidate will not solicit these students but will only submit the names to the academic Chair/Director. The Chair/Director will contact the students to request their feedback using an email template provided to the Chair/Director by the Senior Associate Dean. This list is not included in the materials sent to the External Reviewers.

The CHAIR/DIRECTOR is responsible for preparing the following materials for the promotion/tenure file by May 15:

- 1. File letters:** Copies of appointment and reappointment letters (with salary statements deleted). These documents are included in the materials forwarded to the External Reviewers.
- 2. List of candidate's courses taught, including course enrollments.** This information is forwarded for review by the External Reviewers.
- 3. Names and email addresses of ten current and/or former students, in addition to those submitted by the candidate,** who can evaluate the candidate's teaching. -The Chair/Director will contact the students to request their feedback using an email template provided to the Chair/Director by the Senior Associate Dean. This list is not included in the materials sent to the External Reviewers.

May 15-September 15

The file officially closes on September 15, at which point materials may only be added with the permission of the Senior Associate Dean.

The CANDIDATE is responsible for preparing the following materials for the promotion/tenure file by September 15:

- 1. A "stand alone" Listing of Candidate's Publications and/or Professional/Creative Activities** separate from the candidate's C.V.
- 2. A "stand alone" Listing of Candidate's University Service Activities** separate from the candidate's C.V.

3. A “stand alone” Listing of Candidate’s Professional Service Activities separate from the candidate’s C.V.

4. A “stand alone” Listing of Candidate’s Teaching Activities, including supporting documentation and materials separate from the candidate’s C.V.

5. Any ADDITIONAL “Supporting Documents” that the candidate may wish to include.

The CHAIR/DIRECTOR is responsible for preparing the following materials for the promotion/tenure file by September 15:

1. Promotion and Tenure Summary Sheet that includes:

- A. Name, Rank, Department/Division, School
- B. Rank/Tenure, action to be considered
- C. Date of original appointment to SMU
- D. Date of any previous appointments at SMU

2. Standards of the Academic Unit for achieving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for achieving promotion to Full Professor.

3. ADDITIONAL File letters: Copies of annual evaluations (and any challenges to these by the candidate), third year review letters from both the Chair/Director and the third year review committee, and any letters specifying changes in expectations (if applicable). If these documents do not adequately convey to an outsider the candidate’s role within the academic unit, a statement clarifying that role should be provided by the Chair/Director.

4. A detailed and comprehensive statement describing the Candidate's "Professional Venues" prepared by the Chair/Director. In this statement, it is imperative that the Chair/Director describes, in compelling and definitive terms and detail, the relative stature, relevance, and importance of each of the venues in which the candidate's scholarly and/or creative work has been published, presented, and/or exhibited.

5. A detailed and comprehensive statement explaining specifically why the External Reviewers were chosen, their specific academic specializations, and their professional and academic stature. As stated earlier, in this statement, it is imperative that the Chair/Director describes, in compelling and definitive terms, exactly why each External Reviewer is, without question, an individual of the highest credibility who has established an outstanding reputation in the candidate's academic/artistic discipline and who is able to evaluate the candidate's work and credentials with objectivity, insight, and rigor and why each qualifies to serve as an External Reviewer for the candidate.

6. Review Letters from the six External Reviewers along with a copy of each External Reviewer's C.V.

7. Statement on the Process for Soliciting Student Letters: 20 current or former students, 10 chosen by the candidate and 10 chosen by the Chair/Director.

8. Student Letters

9. Other External/Internal Letters that the Chair may request or receive that are submitted to provide information about the candidate's professional record. These may include, but are not limited to, faculty peer assessments of the faculty member's teaching and research/professional activities.

The Chair/Director may solicit letters of evaluation on teaching from the tenured faculty of the academic unit (if the unit's faculty review committee does not include all tenured members of the faculty) and from tenured faculty members in related disciplines, as appropriate. Letters should be prepared only by individuals who directly review the candidates teaching and/or teaching materials. Letters should be explicit about how the assessment was made.

The SENIOR ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS is responsible for preparing the following materials for the promotion/tenure file by September 15:

- 1. Description of the promotion and tenure process for the School.**
- 2. Peer Evaluations of Teaching**, including 2nd-Year and 5th-year Teaching Reviews.

The ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR ADMINISTRATION is responsible for preparing the following materials for the promotion/tenure file by September 15:

- 1. Student Evaluation of Teaching**, including:
 - a. a rating summary in comparison to departmental or school averages, and
 - b. a summary of the questionnaires sent to 100 students at random.

September 15-November 15

Division/Institute/Department Faculty Committees meet in September and October. Except in cases where academic unit guidelines specify otherwise, membership consists of all tenured faculty members of the unit. In cases of promotion to the rank of Professor, the Committee consists only of faculty members who hold the rank of Professor. The Committee membership will also include a faculty member of appropriate rank from a related discipline either within Meadows or from the University at large. The academic Chair/Director, in consultation with the Dean, appoints the outside member.

The first meeting of the academic unit's Faculty Committee is attended by the Senior Associate Dean who summarizes procedures, stressing the confidentiality of the process even after the committee's recommendation has been submitted.

The Faculty Committee elects a chair who schedules subsequent meetings, records the committee vote, and submits a summary letter (addressed to the academic unit's Chair/Director) that must be signed by all members of the Committee. Committee members, including the Committee chair, also write individual letters for the file. Committee members are expected to evaluate both teaching and research; they thus should attend at least one of the candidate's classes, giving the candidate the courtesy of a day's notice.

The Faculty Committee of the academic unit must determine the relative merits of accomplishments by candidates in their discipline, appropriate to the standards and criteria that have been established. The Committee's recommendation and individual letters must be submitted to the academic Chair/Director by no later than November 1.

The complete academic unit recommendation, including the recommendation letter of the Chair/Director, along with the original file of materials, must be uploaded into Interfolio and available for the Dean's review by no later than November 15.

It is the responsibility of the Chair/Director to make a specific recommendation to the Dean for action. The recommendation of the Chair/Director need not agree with the recommendation of the Faculty Committee.

November 15-on or about December 7

The Dean will request that the Meadows School Promotion and Tenure Review Committee evaluate both the procedures and the substance of each academic unit recommendation.

The Meadows Committee is appointed by the Dean and consists of one tenured faculty member from each academic unit of the Meadows School (Advertising, Art, Art History, Arts Management and Arts Entrepreneurship, Corporate Communication and Public Affairs, Creative Computation, Dance, Film and Media Arts, Journalism, Music, and Theatre) and a faculty member from outside Meadows who holds the rank of Professor. The committee is chaired by the Senior Associate Dean who writes a summary letter of the Committee's proceedings addressed to the Dean.

Members of the Meadows Committee must be tenured and may be either Associate Professors or Full Professors. Committee members who are Associate Professors do not participate in the discussion or the vote for candidates being considered for promotion to Full Professor. The Committee member representing the home academic unit of the faculty candidate being discussed and voted on for consideration for promotion and tenure or for promotion participates in the discussion but not in the vote for that candidate.

Disputes

In the case of negative decisions by the academic unit (Division/Institute/Department/Center), the Chair/Director meets with the candidate and gives him/her a written statement outlining the reasons for the decision.

A negative decision at the academic unit level may be appealed to the Dean within 21 days of notification of the decision. If an appeal is to be made, the faculty member may submit any rebuttal or new data appropriate to the appeal.

A negative decision by the Dean may be appealed to the Provost. If a negative decision is not appealed, the process is complete. A negative decision of the Provost may be appealed to the President. Any de novo reviews that are required as a result of the review process will be done at the academic unit level.

December 10-January 10

The Meadows Promotion and Tenure Review Committee submits a confidential letter to the Dean for each candidate, summarizing the Committee's conclusions and recommendations. A formal committee vote is recorded and reported, but the vote is advisory and non-binding.

Additionally, each member of the Meadows Promotion and Tenure Review Committee submits an individual letter to the Dean for each reviewed candidate to report the member's vote/recommendation and to share the member's rationale for his/her recommendation.

While the Meadows School holds firmly to the belief that the Meadows Promotion and Tenure Review Committee's role and purpose are, first and foremost, to provide thoughtful, non-binding advice to the Dean, it is understood that documentation of both the collective recommendation of the Committee as well as the individual recommendations of each of its members are included in each candidate's file as the file moves forward.

January 10-February 1

The Dean considers the academic unit Faculty Committees' recommendations, the academic units' Chairs/Directors' and the report of the Meadows Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.

The faculty candidate is notified by the Dean of his/her action by the time the Dean's recommendations are forwarded to the Provost, on or about February 1.

If the recommendation of the Dean is negative, the candidate may meet with the Dean in person to discuss the reasons for the decision.

After February 1

Recommendations from the schools are considered by a faculty committee appointed by the Provost that evaluates each case and advises the Provost (See University Policy 6.12). The Provost makes recommendations to the President and ultimately to the Board of Trustees for action.

Summary Timeline for Promotion and Tenure Review

- **May 15.** Documents for external reviewers are due.
- **June 1.** Dossiers are sent to external reviewers.
- **August 15.** External reviews are due.
- **September 15.** The tenure and promotion file closes.
- **November 1.** The academic unit faculty committee recommendation is sent to Chair/Director.
- **November 15.** Files are due in Dean's office with Chair/Director's recommendation.
- **December 1-15.** Meadows Promotion and Tenure Review Committee meets.
- **February 1.** Dean's recommendation is sent to the Provost.

Format for the Promotion and Tenure File

In order "To present, inasmuch as is possible, a uniform dossier for the Provost's Advisory," and "To clarify for the candidate the materials needed for the evaluation for tenure and/or promotion," all materials submitted for promotion/tenure review are arranged according to the same basic format, although differences among the various disciplines may dictate some variance in content.

Materials are collected using a basic format template in the Interfolio "ByCommittee" document management platform.

Additionally, the Provost's Office requires the submission of 2 hard copy files that are submitted in binders (provided by the Dean's Office) and divided into sections that are separated by dividers with tabs. prepared by the Division/Institute/Department/Center using hard copies of documents previously uploaded into the Interfolio "ByCommittee" document management platform.

CONTENTS AND FORMAT

I. Promotion and Tenure Summary Sheet

- A. Name, Rank, Department/Division, School
- B. Rank/Tenure, action to be considered
- C. Date of original appointment to SMU
- D. Date of any previous appointments at SMU
- E. Description of the promotion and tenure process for the school

II. Standards of the Department or School

- A. An orientation to the nature of research and/or creative activity in the candidate's department or school, including the nature of outlets that are desirable (e.g., peer-reviewed or top tiered journals), and the standard practices for the dissemination of research in this field, e.g., books, journals, online publications, and/or the standard practices for creative activity in this field, e.g., venues, new media, etc.
- B. **Where applicable:** The list of appropriate journals and the relative weight of each
- C. **Where applicable:** In the case of multi-authored journal articles, an explanation of the significance of the publication
- D. **Where applicable:** The weight given to books, chapters in books, edited books, and journals

III. Expectations

- A. Letter of Appointment
- B. Three-Year Renewal Letter (in tenure cases)
- C. Faculty Annual Reviews

IV. Recommendation of Dean

V. Recommendation of Dean's Promotion and Tenure Committee Including Letter(s) of Recommendation

VI. Recommendation of Academic Unit Chair/Director

VII. Recommendation(s) of Academic Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee (including Committee letter, signed by all members, commenting on procedure followed, committee vote, and supporting reasons, and individual letters from committee members)

VIII. Curriculum Vitae

IX. Personal Statement of Research/Creative Activity and Teaching
- each candidate must submit a written statement concerning his or her aims and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and research/creative activity, and also discuss other activities within the University and the candidate's profession.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

X. Listing of Candidate's Publications and/or Professional/Creative Activities, followed by a description of the candidate's "Professional Venues" prepared by the Chair/Director.

XI. Where applicable: Record of Funding – Proposed/Received

- A. List of Funding Requests Awarded
- B. List of Pending Funding Requests
- C. List of Funding Requests Submitted

XII. Where applicable: Citations List

XIII. External Peer Reviews

- A. The Chair's/Director's statement of why external candidates were chosen, the academic specialization involved, and the professional and academic stature of the evaluators.
- B. External Review Letters from at least six External Reviewers, each preceded by a copy of the individual solicitation letter from the Senior Associate Dean and followed by the external reviewer's c.v.

TEACHING

XIV. Evaluation of Teaching

- A. List of Courses Taught by Semester with Course Number, Title, and Enrollments for each course
- B. Student Evaluation of Teaching, including rating summary in comparison to departmental or school averages and a summary of the questionnaires sent to 100 students at random
- C. Peer Evaluations of Teaching
- D. Process for Soliciting Student Letters: 20 current or former students, 10 chosen by the candidate and 10 chosen by the Chair/Director
- E. Student Letters

SERVICE

XV. Service Activities

- A. University Service Activities
- B. Professional Service Activities

XVI. Supplemental Materials, Teaching Activities, Supporting Documents

XVII. Other External/Internal Letters