

PROMOTION PROCEDURES FOR TENURED FACULTY AT BAYLOR UNIVERSITY

February 1, 2021

I. Promotion Review

A. General information

Each faculty member interested in promotion to the rank of Professor should consult with the department chair about the appropriate year to seek promotion. The tenured faculty member, all available Professors¹ in the department, the departmental chair, the dean, the Provost, and the President participate in the promotion review process, as follows. Typically, faculty will not attain the level of eminence and leadership consistent with the rank of Professor before at least six years past the granting of tenure. In any case, faculty will not receive promotion to the rank of Professor through the process described in this document sooner than four years after they were initially granted tenure (that is, the candidate would not apply for promotion before the spring of the third year as a tenured faculty member). However, upon the recommendation of the Provost, the President may promote a faculty member to the rank of Professor without following this process, if such a decision serves the interests of the University. Such a decision must be based on the criteria of excellence described in the Promotion Policy and approved by a majority vote of the Professors of the applicable department (secured by secret ballot) and by the dean of the applicable School or College.

B. Summary Calendar for the Promotion Review Processes

Note: These dates are given as guidelines. They vary slightly from year to year depending on when weekends and holidays occur; deans and department chairs distribute exact dates, as received from the Office of the Provost, each year.

By February 15: Candidate submits letter of intent to department chair

By February 15: Candidate provides department chair the names of suggested external reviewers and other information, if any, pertinent to the selection of the reviewers

By April 1: Candidate submits credentials portfolio for review

Prior to meeting with candidate: Department chair acquires external review letters

Prior to meeting with candidate: Department chair provides departmental Professors with promotion recommendation forms

Prior to meeting with candidate: Department chair provides summary teaching evaluation to candidate and departmental Professors

November 1-30: Candidate meets with departmental Professors, chair, and dean

By December 6: Promotion recommendation forms due to chair

By December 12: Chair's letter and all other materials due to dean

¹Throughout this document, "Professors" refers to those faculty who have attained the rank of Professor.

January 15: Dean's letter and all other materials due to Provost
February 1: Provost makes recommendation to President about promotion decision
February 15: President makes final promotion decision and communicates decision to Provost, who communicates to dean the promotion decision
February 15-28: Promotion candidate's dean or dean's designee informs promotion candidate of promotion decision

C. Process

1. Prior to review of information

- a. The **promotion candidate** must submit to the department chair a letter of intent to seek promotion by February 15.
- b. The **promotion candidate** must provide to the department chair the names of possible external reviewers by February 15. The department should develop guidelines for candidates' input into reviewer selection.
- c. The **promotion candidate** is to prepare a credentials portfolio that supports the request for promotion. The candidate must provide a copy of this portfolio by **April 1** for review by the available professors in the department, the department chair, and the dean or dean's designee. The credentials portfolio should begin with a table of contents. The material in the portfolio should be subdivided and indexed into the categories set forth below:
 - i. A letter setting forth reasons why promotion should be granted, discussing each of the following **that is relevant** with strong emphasis on scholarship and/or professional performance:
 - (a) An explanation of any special conditions of the candidate's appointment that would relate to a promotion determination.
 - (b) Scholarship and/or professional performance.
 - (c) Teaching effectiveness, in the context of the information provided in items I.C.1.c.iv-vii and I.E.
 - (d) Service to the department, the university, and the larger academic community.
 - (e) Leadership; in scholarship, teaching, departmental and university service, and in the larger academic/professional community
 - (f) Community and religious service.

(g) Interpersonal relationships with students, colleagues, and other members of the university community.

(h) A statement of how the candidate supports the goals and mission of the university.

ii. Promotion CV:

Rather than being a general-purpose document, this should be specifically designed to facilitate the promotion review process. It is imperative that the candidate include complete information about each item listed on the CV, so that those involved in making the promotion decision will be fully informed as to the extent and nature of the candidate's achievements. Specifically, the candidate should include the following:

- (a) A table of contents specifying sections for education; academic employment history (including non-academic employment that pertains to the discipline in which the candidate is being considered for promotion); scholarly/creative activity; teaching activity and effectiveness; grants/awards/honors; students advised/mentored; service to the university and discipline. Other sections may also be appropriate if some information pertinent to the promotion decision would not fit in any of these categories.
- (b) Refereed publications should be separated from non-refereed publications; in disciplines in which analogous, but not identical, distinctions exist, works should also be separated, with explanations provided for the nature of the distinctions.
- (c) Complete and accurate bibliographic citation should be included for each item of scholarship/creativity included in the resume. Citations should use a consistent format that is accepted within the candidate's discipline.
- (d) An annotation should accompany each scholarly or creative work. This should include a brief (**one to two sentences**) summary of the nature of the work's contribution to the field; a clear description of the candidate's contribution (quantitative and qualitative) to joint-authored works; and any available information about the journal or publisher, including standing in the discipline, frequency of publication, acceptance rate, and nature of the editorial board and review process. Departments may choose to create standard descriptions of common journals or publishers for their disciplines; **if this is done**, the promotion candidate should include such descriptions with indications that the department created them. (Note: such information about the venue – such as journal, gallery, or concert hall – is particularly important in the case of disciplines for which traditional print publication is not the primary or only outlet, including for disciplines that

rely upon electronic publications, so as to make clear for evaluators the way that these compare with those in more traditional outlets. For these venues, data such as number of subscribers and number of daily hits may be helpful.)

- (e) For any work that has been accepted for publication but has not yet been published, the candidate should provide complete information about the status of the publication, including any editorial correspondence. (The degree to which departments will consider these forthcoming publications in the promotion decision will vary depending on the circumstances as well as on any pertinent information contained in the departmental guidelines.) The candidate should be very clear about issues such as the certainty of the publisher's commitment, the amount of work remaining to complete the project, when the work is likely to appear, etc.
- (f) Some scholarly or (especially) creative contributions may not lend themselves to the precise methods of documentation and explanation described above. In these cases, the candidate should include any available information that would address the same issues of scope, recognition in the field, nature and extent of the candidate's contribution, etc., which the above guidelines address. For example, a reference to a documentary film should include the length of the film, date released, festivals in which it has been included, what the candidate and his or her collaborators, respectively, contributed to the finished product, critical responses (these might be included separately, rather than quoted in full in the resume), awards or prizes won, etc.

iii. Supporting materials for scholarly and creative work:

- (a) A table of contents for this section, distinguishing refereed publications from non-refereed publications (and making similar distinctions for work to which these terms do not apply);
- (b) Representative samples of publications and other work;
- (c) Reviews, critical commentary, and other published reflections of the quality and significance of work; and
- (d) Other supporting material as appropriate (e.g., editorial correspondence substantiating the acceptance of forthcoming work, other correspondence that directly substantiates the quality and significance of work, etc.).

iv. A description of teaching: classes taught, enrollments, course syllabi for the previous three years, sample teaching materials, etc.

- v. Course evaluation reports including comments for the previous three years; any reports from peer evaluations of teaching; other evidence of quality teaching, such as teaching awards and recognition.
 - vi. A list of any graduate students supervised by the candidate, both current graduate students and those who have completed their degrees. The candidate should provide brief documentation for the accomplishments of each student. Specific items will vary by discipline, but might include awards, thesis titles, publications, notable artistic creations or performances, etc.
 - vii. A five-year plan for teaching, research, publication, artistic performance, or other professional development.
 - viii. Any other categories of the candidate's choosing that are pertinent to the promotion decision.
- d. The **department chair** is to provide by April 15 the department's recommendation with regard to whether the promotion candidate should be reviewed for promotion in the following academic year. This recommendation should include the vote of the Professors in the department on whether the candidate should be reviewed as well as an account of any reasons for and against review. (This recommendation is not a recommendation for or against promotion, which would follow the receipt and consideration of external reviews and more detailed information about the candidate's teaching, as described below.)
 - e. The dean is to notify the candidate and the department chair by April 30 of her or his approval of the request to be reviewed for promotion in the following academic year. If the dean's recommendation is positive, the process will proceed as described below, starting with section I.D.
 - f. If the dean's decision is negative, the dean will inform the candidate whether the department's recommendation was positive or negative. The dean will also provide the candidate with the reason(s) for the negative decision.
 - g. If the recommendation of both the dean and the department is negative, the process will end; the candidate, however, may initiate the process as described above in future years.
 - h. If the recommendation of the dean is negative, but that of the department was positive, the candidate may appeal to the Provost for the process to proceed. This appeal must be made in writing, and must include the candidate's rationale for being considered for promotion as well as the credentials portfolio described above and all communications received by the candidate from the dean and the department chair regarding the process. This appeal must be received by the Office of the Provost by May 15. If the candidate does not appeal by that time, the

process will end; the candidate, however, may initiate the process as described above in future years.

- i. In the event of such an appeal, the Provost will rule on the appeal in writing to the candidate, the dean, and the chair by May 31. If the Provost rules that the candidate will be reviewed for promotion, the process will continue as described below, starting with Section I.D. If the Provost rules that the candidate will not be reviewed for promotion, the decision is final, and the process will end; the candidate, however, may initiate the process as described above in future years.
- D. The **department chair** is to secure by October 1 a minimum of three external reviews of the promotion candidate's work, and make these available to the available professors in the department and the dean or dean's designee prior to the meeting of these individuals with the candidate. In most cases, all external reviewers will hold academic appointments; in any event, this must be the case for at least two of the external reviewers.

Academic units will ordinarily have established their own policies and procedures related to the selection of external reviewers of promotion candidates. However, these policies and procedures should reflect the following general guidelines.

1. **Responsibility for Securing External Reviews:** The department, school, or college conducting promotion external reviews is responsible for obtaining qualified evaluators who can provide fair and objective assessments of the candidate's work, and the professors of the unit will ordinarily participate in the selection process. In the case of joint appointments, the two units should consult on the selection of external reviewers.
2. **Qualifications of Reviewers:** Evaluators should possess credentials that will document their expertise in evaluating the candidate's scholarly and/or creative achievements within the context of the discipline or profession.

Outside evaluators in an academic setting must hold the rank of Professor or equivalent, or have comparable professional standing in a non-academic setting. Ideally, evaluators should come from highly reputable programs at respected universities, but in any case should be recognized as an expert authority to comment upon the candidate's scholarly/creative work. Department chairs (or deans as relevant) should provide information establishing the credentials of each evaluator. This information should include an explanation justifying the selection of any evaluator with a non-academic affiliation.

3. **Confidentiality:** Candidates for promotion should be allowed to provide input into the selection of external reviewers – e.g., nominating and commenting on possible reviewers, and providing information about reviewers who might be predisposed against the candidate's work for reasons other than the quality of the work. When doing so, each candidate must disclose any relationships with reviewers who are

discussed. Candidates should not, however, be involved in the final decision, be told the identity of the reviewers who are chosen, or be allowed to read the original reviews. Confidentiality is granted to the external reviewers by the department, college, or school through the promotion process. The external reviews, however, may be discoverable in the event of legal action.

4. **Objectivity:** One criterion in determining the degree of objectivity of external evaluators is the nature of any relationships with the candidate. External evaluators should not include individuals for whom a close academic or personal connection with the candidate might compromise their ability to evaluate the candidate's work objectively (e.g., dissertation advisors, former instructors, graduate school colleagues, co-authors, fellow faculty, personal friends, former students of the candidate, etc.). In rare cases, the candidate's specialized research is sufficiently narrow to require drawing from individuals with close professional connections. In these instances, the unit is responsible for explaining and justifying an exception to the requirement. The relationship and the justification for providing exception for it should be communicated to the Administration as part of the credential materials of the candidate. The department chair must communicate to the candidate the criteria and process for selection of external evaluators.
5. **Number of External Evaluators:** There should be a minimum of three external evaluations of the candidate's scholarship from academic and/or nonacademic sources as discussed above. The department may request more than this minimum number; if so, this fact should be noted in the department's promotion guidelines.
6. **Evaluator Credentials:** Each external evaluator should submit information regarding his/her credentials and work which qualifies the individual to be an evaluator of the candidate. An acceptable form of this evidence is a curriculum vitae from the evaluator. In any case, information should be provided regarding the evaluator's position, rank, and recent record of scholarship, creative activity, and/or professional accomplishments (typically of at least the last five years). A summary statement of the evaluator's accomplishments may not be sufficient, but it is useful for such a summary to be provided, in addition to a detailed curriculum vitae or professional resume, to the promotion committee. The evaluator should also make clear the nature of any relationship that he or she has with the candidate. If justification is needed to support the choice of an external evaluator, that justification must come from the department chair and/or the dean of the department, college, or school.
7. **Timing:** The process for developing a list of names of possible external reviewers should begin sufficiently far in advance of the promotion portfolio submission deadline to ensure that ample time is allowed to secure commitments from qualified evaluators and to avoid placing the evaluators under significant time pressure.
8. **All External Evaluations Received Must be Used:** In the absence of highly unusual circumstances (which require pre-clearance from the Provost's office), all external evaluations should become part of the materials used by all individuals evaluating the

candidate including professors in the department, department chair, dean, Provost, and President.

9. External Letters Electronic Submission: Any e-mail letter included in the promotion candidate's file instead of the required original, signed copy must be accompanied by a departmental e-mail requesting submission of an original copy with signature. This action supplies a paper trail of requests, which then can be made available to the professors of the department, dean, and Administration for their review and use. Original, signed copies of external letters are strongly preferred, and every effort should be made to obtain them.
10. Co-Author Letters: Letters from co-authors regarding the contributions of a candidate to co-authored work can in some circumstances provide useful information regarding the record of a promotion candidate, so departments may choose to submit letters of this nature as an additional part of the promotion review process. In no circumstance, however, shall a letter from a co-author be considered an "external review letter" with respect to the other recommendations in this report.
11. Evaluation Content: External evaluation letters should focus on the candidate's scholarly or creative work as is appropriate to the department. Letters should discuss the candidate's work in relation to its significance in the discipline. The department chair should provide each evaluator with copies of the candidate's curriculum vitae and additional materials (such as examples of the candidate's work that might not be readily available to the evaluator). The department chair should also give the evaluator a copy of the department promotion guidelines and direct the evaluator to evaluate the candidate's work in this context.
12. Request Letter: The candidate's department chair should write a request letter that reflects the particularities of the case including promotion expectations, workload of the candidate, the model of scholarship and/or creative activity the candidate is expected to follow, etc. A sample letter is provided in the Appendix to this document; this should be augmented with details specific to the candidate and department as appropriate. In any case, request letters should invite evaluators to respond to all of the following:
 - a. Based on the supplied materials, evaluate the quality of the candidate's scholarly or creative work in light of the provided department expectations.
 - b. Based on the evaluator's expertise in the area, assess the level of contribution that the candidate has made in the discipline.
 - c. Assess the richness of the candidate's current scholarly or creative agenda and the potential for ongoing successful contributions in the future.
 - d. If the evaluator is acquainted with the candidate, then report the length and nature of the association.
 - e. Describe any particular distinctions earned by the candidate in his or her academic discipline.

Request letters should not ask an evaluator to comment on whether the candidate is deserving of promotion, either at Baylor or at the evaluator's institution. The request letter should make clear that detailed and specific comments will be of most value.

13. The department chair is to schedule a meeting of the available Professors of the department, the promotion candidate, and the dean or the dean's designee (if a designee, this person should not be a member of the candidate's department). This meeting is to take place prior to December 1.
- E. The **department chair** is to provide to the candidate and the Professors of the department a summary teaching evaluation. The report will draw on information from the candidate's reflective summary of teaching and the course evaluation forms from the past three years, as well as other evidence of teaching quality the candidate might possess such as peer evaluations, professional presentations or written publications about pedagogy, all of which are included in the candidate's portfolio, in order to evaluate the candidate's work in the classroom and in mentoring as well as any additional contributions to teaching in the academic unit. In the summary teaching report, the department chair will also describe the candidate's teaching assignment in the department over the course of the candidate's time since tenure, and will make clear any circumstances that caused this assignment to be more or less demanding than the teaching workload (e.g., two courses per semester) would indicate.
- F. The **department chair** shall send to the available Professors of the department the **Professor Promotion Recommendation Form** for each candidate.
1. Review of information within department and school or college
 - a. After the candidate's credentials portfolio, the chair's letter to the external reviewers, and the letters from external reviewers are made available, the available Professors of the department are to review them.
 - b. Prior to December 1, the promotion candidate is to meet with the department chair, the available Professors of the department, and the dean or the dean's designee. The principal purpose of this meeting will be to allow the promotion candidate to answer any questions that might exist regarding the candidate's credentials. (Note: In discussions with the candidate, specific points should not be attributed to the letters from external reviewers, nor should any external reviewer's identity be revealed to the candidate.)
 - c. Following this meeting, the available Professors of the department are to complete and sign the **Professor Promotion Recommendation Form** for the promotion candidate and submit them to the department chair. If the chair holds the rank of Professor, the chair is to submit his or her own **Professor Promotion Recommendation Form**. If the chair does not hold the rank of Professor, he or she may not submit such a form. This shall be done by December 6. The department chair shall maintain the confidentiality of these evaluation forms,

which shall not be available for review by the promotion candidate. In addition to the chair, only the President, Provost, and the dean or dean's designee will have access to the **Professor Promotion Recommendation Forms**.

- d. After receiving the **Professor Promotion Recommendation Forms**, the chair shall write a letter presenting her or his own evaluation of the merits of the candidate's application. This letter is to be distinct from the individual **Professor Promotion Recommendation Form** the chair would have submitted as a colleague (if she or he holds the rank of Professor), in that it would be written from the perspective of the chair, taking into account the opinions registered on the **Professor Promotion Recommendation Forms** submitted by others.
- e. The letter from the chair shall be submitted to the dean by December 12, along with: the promotion candidate's credentials portfolio; the external review letters, reviewers' credentials, any justifications for reviewer choice and a copy of the letter and the materials that were given to the external evaluators; the summary teaching evaluation; the **Professor Promotion Recommendation Forms** submitted by the available Professors of the department; and departmental promotion guidelines and any special conditions of the candidate's employment. (Examples of the candidate's work that cannot be conveniently included in the portfolios can be retained in the department office, and made available to subsequent reviewers as necessary, for the duration of the evaluation process.)
- f. Following the meeting and receipt of all materials from the department chair, (or, in each school or college that performs these reviews as a department of the whole, following the meeting and receipt of the **Professor Promotion Recommendation Forms** from the available Professors of the department) the dean or dean's designee shall submit to the Office of the Provost as directed a letter addressing the merits of the candidate's application for promotion by January 15. The Office of the Provost shall maintain confidentiality of the letter, which shall not be available for review by the promotion candidate. In addition to the Provost, only the President will have access to the letter. Along with this letter, the dean or dean's designee shall deliver to the Office of the Provost by January 15:
 - i. the promotion candidate's credentials portfolio;
 - ii. the external review letters, along with the chair's explanatory material about reviewer credentials and reviewer choice and the chair's letter to the reviewers;
 - iii. the summary teaching evaluation;
 - iv. the **Professor Promotion Recommendation Forms** submitted by the available professors of the department;

- v. the chair letter; and
- vi. departmental promotion guidelines and any special conditions of the candidate's employment.

2. Promotion decision

- a. The **Provost** will review the recommendation of the available Professors of the department, department chair, and dean, and will recommend to the President by February 1 that the candidate be granted or denied promotion, and will submit all relevant material to the President. The Provost may consult with any individual he or she deems appropriate in the course of this review, with recognition that the faculty has special expertise and interests in promotion decisions.
- b. The **President**, after consultation with the **Provost**, will make a final decision regarding the granting or denial of promotion by February 15. In reaching this decision, the President will consider the recommendations of the available professors of the department, department chair, and dean, with recognition that the faculty has special expertise and interests in promotion decisions. The President and/or Provost may also review any material related to the candidate and consult with any individual they deem appropriate during this process.
- c. The **President** will sign a letter to the candidate conveying this decision, and will report the decision to the Provost.
- d. The **Provost** will communicate to each dean the promotion decision made for each faculty member within the dean's academic unit, and, in the case of successful promotion candidate(s), will provide the dean a summary of the conclusions reached during the review process regarding strengths and weaknesses.
- e. The promotion candidate's dean or the dean's designee will meet with the promotion candidate by February 28 to inform him or her of the promotion decision and to deliver personally to the candidate the letter from the President officially notifying the candidate of the promotion decision.

If the candidate has completed a successful promotion review, the dean or the dean's designee will discuss with the faculty member at this meeting (or at a meeting scheduled prior to the end of this academic year) the strengths and weaknesses in her or his performance noted during the review process and communicated by the Provost. In addition, the dean or the dean's designee will discuss with the candidate the ongoing expectations of professors of the department in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, service, and personal conduct, and, in general, with respect to the distinctive mission of Baylor. The dean or dean's designee will prepare a statement documenting the content and date of this meeting and the fact that the procedures described in this paragraph

for this meeting have been followed. This statement will be included in the promotion candidate's official personnel file maintained in the Office of the Provost.

- f. The **President** will report the decisions to the Board of Regents.

3. Denial of Promotion

- a. If a tenured faculty member is not approved for promotion, he or she shall have the chance to apply again.
- b. Reasons for denial of promotion will not be given unless the candidate makes a written request to the Provost. This request must be received by the Provost within two weeks of the candidate's receipt of notice of promotion denial. The Provost will respond in writing within two weeks after receiving the written request from the candidate.
- c. An unsuccessful candidate may request that the President reconsider the denial of promotion. The request must be received by the President within two weeks of the candidate's receipt of reasons that promotion was denied, and must state the candidate's justification for receiving promotion. The reconsideration process will not include information about the candidate's achievements that was not made available in the original promotion review. In the course of this reconsideration, the President shall confer with the Provost, the candidate's dean, and the candidate's department chair. The President shall respond to the candidate in writing within three weeks of receiving the request for reconsideration.

II. Exceptions to the Above

Any granting of promotion status by other means shall occur only in accordance with the provisions stated in BU-PP 702 Policy for Promotion at Baylor University, section III.D. Any exceptions made in the granting of promotion shall be stated in writing to the faculty member receiving promotion, the professors in the department, and the chair. Only the President shall have authority to issue official promotion notices, and these must be in writing to the concerned parties.

III. Implementation

- A. Because some schools within the University are not organized by department, the functions of the departmental chair and dean or dean's designee as outlined in this policy will be performed by the dean or the dean's designee within those schools.
- B. If a tenured faculty member is in a department or division with four or fewer professors of the department, the dean shall appoint additional faculty members from within the University so that there are a total of five professors who will submit promotion

evaluation forms. All professors within the department or division will be included in this number; the dean will only add enough to this group to make a total of five faculty members.

1. The dean will consult with the candidate and the department or division chair in order to determine what faculty members might have areas of expertise that are most closely related to that (or those) of the candidate; such faculty members would ordinarily be preferred for appointment to these duties.
 2. In the absence of a sufficient number of professors whose areas of expertise are significantly related to that (or those) of the candidate, the dean should appoint professors whose record of service at the University indicates that they would be able to fulfill these duties in a conscientious and competent way.
 3. Faculty members being considered for these duties should be given the option of declining the appointment, and, if they would like to accept the appointment, should be specifically asked if there are any ways in which their ability to serve in this capacity might be compromised.
 4. When these individuals are appointed, the dean shall provide their names to the candidate, all professors (within and outside of the department) who will be fulfilling these responsibilities, the department or division chair, and the Provost.
- C. These procedures describe the system for evaluating tenured faculty members seeking promotion as that system ideally should work. Each participant in the process should strive to meet his or her important responsibilities as outlined in this policy and should encourage other participants in the process to fulfill their responsibilities. Nonetheless, there will inevitably be circumstances when participants in the process fail to comply fully and completely with their responsibilities under this policy. If such an error is promptly brought to the attention of the University prior to any final promotion decision through the Provost, the University will make reasonable efforts to correct the error if practicable. However, recognizing that such errors will inevitably occur and that promotions should be granted based on the merits of the candidate, rather than the performance of participants in the process of evaluation, an error in complying with the requirements of this policy shall in no event justify the granting of promotion and shall not provide the basis for any legal claim against the University or against participants in the process of evaluation.

APPENDIX

Sample letter to external reviewer

Note: This document serves as a model for a letter to be written to an external reviewer for an application for promotion to the rank of Professor following the reviewer's agreement to serve in this role. It may require revision in various ways (for example, the writer may want to put it in his or her "voice," and the nature of materials that will be provided to the reviewer and the way(s) that those are transmitted to the reviewer will vary widely by discipline), but it is likely that all the components of this sample should be addressed in any such letter.

Dear _____,

Many thanks for agreeing to review Dr. []'s materials and provide your assessment of them as they bear on [her] application for promotion to the rank of Professor at Baylor University. As you do so, please be aware of the following points:

Please include with your review letter a current curriculum vitae, and, in the review letter, provide any additional information that will help Baylor evaluators (including those within the discipline and those in other disciplines) to understand your specific qualifications (for example, your subdisciplinary expertise) for assessing Dr. []'s work. Please also provide the committee with information about your previous contacts with Dr. [], including any instances in which you have collaborated with [her] in any way.

I am enclosing with this letter a copy of Dr. []'s curriculum vitae and a copy of the guidelines that set forth expectations for candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor within [her] department. [Sentence(s) that describe(s) how the reviewer can access the candidate's work—which works, how many, whether also enclosed and/or available online, etc.]

In your review of Dr. []'s work, please focus on the significance of the work within the discipline, in the context of the expectations set forth in the departmental guidelines and Baylor's expectations that faculty will produce work appropriate for an R1 institution. We would like for you to assess the quality of the work, the degree to which the work contributes to the discipline, and the richness of [her] current [scholarly and/or creative] agenda as well as its potential for ongoing contributions to the field. The more specifically you can explain how [her] work leads you to arrive at your assessment, the more helpful the review will be to Baylor evaluators.

[optional paragraph that describes any specific factors that apply to the candidate but might not be clear to the reviewer, such as workload, model of scholarship and/or creative work the candidate has been expected to follow, etc.]

As you perform this review, please note that the fact that you are providing this review and the fact that you have made particular observations about Dr. []'s work will only be made known to those individuals at Baylor who are involved in the promotion decision process following submission of your review, and specifically will not be made known to Dr. []. (The only

exception to this practice is that (as is commonly the case for promotion-review processes) the review may be discoverable in the unlikely eventuality of legal action.)

It will be most helpful to us if you can send your review letter and curriculum vitae to me by [date]. We are very grateful for your willingness to help us with this process in this way. Please let me know if you have any questions about this process, and please accept my best wishes for your own work.

Sincerely,