

FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE

The following information can be found on the SMU website at:

<https://www.smu.edu/Meadows/About/AcademicAffairs>

<https://www.smu.edu//media/Site/Meadows/About/AcademicAffairs/PromotionTenureReviewProcess.pdf>

Promotion and Tenure Review Process: Procedures and Documentation **Meadows School of the Arts**

Updated/Revised Fall 2022

Within the framework of the “GUIDELINES FOR THE AWARD OF RANK AND TENURE” (SMU POLICY NUMBER: 2.11), 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.

*“It is the policy of the University to award tenure to faculty that have achieved **significant distinction and achievement in the areas of research/creative activity and teaching** and to recognize that it is an immensely important decision – both for the faculty member in question and for the long-term academic quality of the University.” SMU Policy Statement 2.11”*

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.

External Reviewers are predictably expected to hold tenured faculty positions, in the standard University-wide review process. However, in the Meadows School, it is also frequently 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—not 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.

Completed not 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, not 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 add his or her own list and forward both lists to the Senior Associate Dean who will contact the students to request their feedback by email. **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 (Third-Year Contract Review) 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 Senior Associate Dean will contact the students to request their feedback. **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. 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 ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR ACADEMIC PLANNING and FINANCE is responsible for preparing the following materials for the promotion/tenure file by September 15,

Student Evaluation of Teaching, including:

1. Rating summary in comparison to departmental or school averages
2. A summary of the questionnaires sent to 100 students at random.

The SENIOR ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR FACULTY 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.
3. **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.
4. **Student Letters**

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 for Faculty 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 not 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 not 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 is independent and may 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, Corporate Communication and Public Affairs/Arts Management and Arts Entrepreneurship /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 for Faculty 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. ***The letter is written on behalf of the Committee by the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty and signed by each member of the committee.*** 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.

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. Additionally, 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 recommendations of the academic units' Faculty Committees, 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 when (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 2.11). 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 the external reviewers are due.
- **June 1**, dossiers are sent to the external reviewers.
- **August 15**, the external reviews are due.
- **September 15**, the tenure and promotion file closes.
- **November 1**, the academic unit faculty committee recommendation is sent to the Chair/Director.
- **November 15**, files are due in the Dean's office with the Chair/Director's recommendation.
- **December 1-15**, the Meadows Promotion and Tenure Review Committee meets.
- **February 1**, the 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

The following is a template to be used by each academic unit in the Meadows School to identify the standards required to fulfill University expectations regarding levels of achievement as outlined and described in SMU Policy Number 2.11.

University Policy Manual

Guidelines for the Award of Rank and Tenure

Policy number: 2.11

Policy section: Academic Affairs

1. Policy Statement

It is the policy of the University to award tenure to faculty that have achieved significant distinction and achievement in the areas of research/creative activity and teaching and to recognize that it is an immensely important decision – both for the faculty member in question and for the long-term academic quality of the University.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to define and outline the promotion and tenure process for tenure-track and tenured faculty. The principal factors to be considered in the evaluations for promotion and tenure are (a) distinction in research or equivalent creative activity in the arts (hereafter research/creative activity) and (b) effective teaching. Valued service to the University and to the profession to which the faculty member belongs will be taken into consideration for both promotion in rank and award of tenure, but cannot substitute for the primary factors of research/creative activity and teaching.

3. Rank and Tenure

- a. The appointment to the rank of assistant professor requires the potential for meeting the standards for promotion and tenure.
- b. Tenure is awarded to those faculty who are outstanding in research/creative activity and whose performance in teaching is outstanding or of high quality. Each department or school should have guidelines that provide greater clarity as to what constitutes outstanding research/creative activity in a given discipline and outstanding or high quality teaching. Tenure cannot be granted on the basis of academic potential alone. Demonstrated accomplishments in research/creative activity and teaching are essential. Tenure is not attained automatically but only through the deliberative process described below and by the final approval of the Board of Trustees. With the awarding of tenure, an assistant professor is promoted to associate professor.
- c. In some circumstances due to extended service at another university (usually without tenure) or at other institutions, an initial appointment may be at the rank of associate professor without tenure. The candidate for this appointment should have outstanding achievement in research/creative activity and the potential for meeting the standards for tenure.

- d. The rank of professor is the highest rank to which a faculty member may aspire. It should not be assumed that promotion to this rank will automatically follow from any certain number of years of service. Nor should it be assumed that all faculty will achieve this rank. It should be reserved for those persons whose research/creative activity is recognized by members of the professional field as outstanding and sustained and whose teaching as judged by students and peers is outstanding or of sustained high quality. It is generally expected that candidates for promotion to professor will have a more substantial service record than candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure who have primarily focused on their research/creative activity and teaching.
- e. For faculty who were at the assistant or associate rank prior to 2022, the requirements for consideration for tenure and promotion as stipulated in the policy in effect at the time of the faculty member's initial appointment will continue through the 2026-2027 academic year. The one-year extension policy will remain in effect during that period for assistant professors hired prior to 2022. This paragraph will be removed when it is no longer possible to be considered for tenure and promotion under that version of the policy.

4. Third-Year Review

As specified in the initial three-year contract at the time of employment, a review of an assistant professor's progress toward tenure is conducted during the spring semester of the candidate's third year. These reviews are conducted internally within the schools according to their own internal policies. Candidates that have successful third-year reviews are awarded a second contract. Assistant professors whose contracts are not renewed are entitled to one additional year of employment (terminal year).

5. Promotion and Tenure Process

- a. Normally, the tenure review process takes place either in the candidate's sixth year or at a time specified in the initial appointment letter. Full-time service in the ranks of Instructor and Assistant Professor is counted in the probationary period leading to mandatory action by the University either promoting the individuals to tenure rank or notifying them that they will not be promoted.
- b. There is no set period of time after promotion to the rank of associate professor to be considered for promotion to the rank of professor. Associate professors with tenure may request to be considered for promotion to the department chair. The department chair, after consulting with the full professors in the department, may choose to deny the request if it is clear that the faculty member does not meet the standards for promotion. If the request is denied, the department chair must provide feedback to the faculty member on the steps that are necessary for the case to go forward. In addition, the associate professor may appeal the decision to the Dean who will make the final decision on whether to initiate the promotion

process. In schools that do not have departments or the equivalent, the associate professor may request to be considered for promotion to the Dean and may appeal a negative decision to the Provost who will make the final decision. The faculty member may not be considered for promotion in consecutive years.

- c. Information and supporting documents pertinent to the action are assembled by the faculty member and others as appropriate as prescribed by the schools and University. These documents should include the evaluation of the candidate's research or creative activity by at least six external reviewers with at least three reviewers suggested by the department or school. The final list of reviewers must be approved by the Dean taking into account the quality of the reviewers and their institutions. The list of reviewers should not include mentors, former professors, direct collaborators, or co-authors. Evaluation of teaching should include evaluations by students and faculty colleagues.
- d. In accordance with the procedure of the schools and University, the documents are reviewed by the department (if applicable), the Dean's Advisory Committee, and the Dean. At each level of the evaluation process, there should be thorough documentation evaluating the candidate's research/creative activity, teaching, and accomplishments in serving the University and the profession. All promotion and tenure cases must be reviewed by the Dean even if the department or department chair is not in favor of promoting and/or granting tenure to the candidate. The Dean submits recommendations, either positive or negative, to the Provost no later than February 1.
- e. The Provost reviews the recommendations of the Deans and the documents with the Provost's Advisory Committee, a faculty committee appointed by the Provost. The Provost makes recommendations, either positive or negative, to the President.
- f. The President makes a decision to either recommend granting promotion and/or tenure to the Board of Trustees or to deny promotion and/or tenure.

6. Appeals

- a. A negative recommendation of the Dean must be appealed within three weeks to the Provost.
- b. A negative recommendation of the Provost must be appealed within three weeks to the President.
- c. A negative decision by the President shall be final and cannot be appealed to the Board of Trustees.

The administrators named above may use their advisory committees or *ad hoc* committees to provide advice on the matter of the appeal. Candidates that do not receive tenure are entitled to one additional year of employment (terminal year). Candidates that choose not to go through the tenure review process will not be granted

an additional year beyond their current contract as they already have a full year remaining on their contract to seek employment elsewhere.

7. Early Consideration for Tenure

Early reviews are encouraged only in cases where candidates are making unusually rapid progress toward satisfying the criteria for tenure as outlined above. The case should be clear and compelling. The request to be considered early must be approved by the Dean and Provost. The candidate will go through the normal tenure process as discussed in Section 5. Denial of early tenure will preclude the candidate from being considered again as the decision will be final.

In a previous version of this policy, candidates who joined SMU prior to 2022 could be considered more than once for consideration for tenure. For all faculty hired prior to 2022, the former policy applies. This paragraph will be removed when it is no longer possible to be considered more than once for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

8. Extension of the Probationary Period

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

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

Requests to extend the probationary period for reasons other than childbirth and/or parental leave will be granted if they are deemed to be both fair to the faculty member making the request and the University and consistent with personnel practices generally applicable to other candidates for tenure in the University. These requests must be made by the faculty member in writing and must be submitted before the tenure review process has begun. The request must state clearly the circumstances in the faculty member's situation that might justify an extended probationary period. The request is to be forwarded, in most cases via the Department Chair, to the Dean. If the Dean supports the request, the request, along with the Dean's formal endorsement, is then sent to the

Provost for further review. If the Dean does not support the request, the faculty member will be notified and will be free to seek further review of the request by the Provost. In all cases, a decision to extend the probationary period will be made by the Provost. The faculty member will receive written notification when the request is approved.

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

9. Abbreviated and Accelerated Tenure Review

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

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

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

10. Questions

Questions regarding this policy should be directed to the Office of the Provost.

Revised: February 28, 2022

Adopted: December 7, 2001

FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

[name of Department/Division/Institute/Center]

Outstanding/Substantial Achievement – Creative/Scholarly

In the **[name of Department/Division/Institute/Center]** of the **Meadows School of the Arts**, for **creative/scholarly achievements** to be considered **outstanding** (for Tenure) and representative of **substantial achievement** (for Promotion to Associate Professor), faculty are expected to _____

High Quality – Creative/Scholarly

In the **[name of Department/Division/Institute/Center]** of the **Meadows School of the Arts**, for **creative/scholarly achievements** to be considered **outstanding** (for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor), faculty are expected to _____

Outstanding/Substantial Achievement – Teaching

In the **[name of Department/Division/Institute/Center]** of the **Meadows School of the Arts**, for **teaching** to be considered **outstanding** (for Tenure) and representative of **substantial achievement** (for Promotion to Associate Professor), faculty are expected to _____

High Quality – Teaching

In the **[name of Department/Division/Institute/Center]** of the **Meadows School of the Arts**, for **teaching** to be considered to be **of high quality** (for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor), faculty are expected to _____

FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

[name of Department/Division/Institute/Center]

Substantial and Continuing – Creative/Scholarly

In the **[name of Department/Division/Institute/Center]** of the **Meadows School of the Arts**, for **scholarly achievements (and/or performance and creativity)** to be **recognized by members of the professional field as substantial and continuing** (for Promotion to Professor), faculty are expected to

Sustained High Quality – Teaching

In the **[name of Department/Division/Institute/Center]** of the **Meadows School of the Arts**, for **teaching** to be **judged by students and peers as being of sustained high quality** (for Promotion to Professor), faculty are expected to

From the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty

- Consistent and meaningful communication between Meadows Academic Chairs/Directors and their respective faculties regarding promotion and tenure must be continual and persistent.
- This section of the *Handbook* provides accurate and comprehensive information about the promotion and tenure process and the role of the Chair/Director in the process. It should be studied carefully and followed closely. Chairs/Directors should not hesitate to consult with the Senior Associate Dean regarding questions that they might have and clarifications that they might need.
- The recommendation letter that the Chair/Director provides for the promotion and tenure dossier must clearly and unequivocally support the Chair's/Director's recommendation as to whether promotion and/or tenure should or should not be granted.
- The identification and confirmation of highly-qualified External Reviewers is one of the most important contributions that the Chair/Director makes in the promotion and tenure review process. It usually takes more time—and effort—to complete than expected. Chairs/Directors should approach the task early in the calendar and aggressively. Chairs/Directors should consult with the Senior Associate Dean, as needed, for strategies and advice in fulfilling this particular responsibility.