

TENURE PROCEDURES AT BAYLOR UNIVERSITY

Approved June 2, 2021

The tenure process for tenure-track faculty not transferring prior research or teaching credit toward tenure is as follows. When a faculty member transfers prior experience in accordance with Tenure Policy Section III.B., the review years to be omitted will be identified accordingly by the Office of the Provost.

I. Tenure-Track Reviews

A. General information

This document describes the reviews that are prescribed by the University to take place for tenure-track faculty prior to and including the Tenure Review in which a decision is made about awarding tenure. For those faculty on a six-year tenure track, these reviews are ordinarily conducted in the second, fourth, and sixth years of service. However, units within the University (for example, schools, colleges, departments, and divisions) may establish additional methods such as reviews or other forms of communication so as to maximize the ability of the tenure candidate and the tenured members of the unit to exchange information about the candidate's progress toward the tenure decision.

B. Overview of University process

The tenure-track faculty member, all available tenured departmental faculty, the departmental chairperson, and the dean (or the dean's designee) shall participate in reviews of the tenure-track faculty member's progress and performance in the second and fourth years on the tenure track. (Note: here and subsequently in this document, "available" refers to faculty who are not prevented from participating in the process under discussion by some significant circumstance approved by the dean and chair as sufficient to warrant non-participation; when such approval is granted, the department chair will make note of it in records of the portions of the process during which the faculty member did not participate.)

(Note: in each school or college that performs these reviews as a department of the whole, the dean or dean's designee will perform the tasks designated in the remainder of this document for the department chairperson. See also further clarification of the process in this situation in Sections I.C.8, I.C.9, and I.C.12.)

The tenure-track faculty member must demonstrate that she or he should be continued on toward tenure. If the tenure-track faculty member fails to do so during the first or second year of employment at Baylor, the faculty member will not be issued a letter of appointment for the following year. If the tenure-track faculty member fails to do so after the second year of employment at Baylor, a terminal letter of appointment will be issued for the succeeding year.

The annual review process takes place in the fall semester for second-year faculty and

early in the spring semester for fourth-year faculty; specific dates are provided in the following Process.

C. Process

1. **Tenure-track faculty members** are to maintain a notebook that follows the guidelines of the University Tenure Committee (see Section II.B.1.d.). They are to make this notebook available for review by the available tenured departmental faculty members by October 1 for second-year faculty and by January 15 for fourth-year faculty.
2. The **available tenured departmental faculty members** are to review the candidate's notebook during October (for second-year faculty) and during January (for fourth-year faculty).
3. The **department chairperson** is to provide colleague evaluation forms to the available tenured departmental faculty members, and to schedule the review meeting with the tenure-track faculty member, the tenured departmental faculty, and the dean or dean's designee. These tasks should be accomplished by October 1 for second-year faculty and by January 15 for fourth-year faculty.
4. Each **tenure-track faculty member** is to prepare and submit to the department chairperson and dean a report containing data and statements in support of continuation toward tenure. This should be done by October 1 for second-year faculty and by January 15 for fourth-year faculty. Each such report will be added to the tenure notebook.
5. The **department chairperson** is to provide to the candidate and the available tenured departmental faculty a summary teaching evaluation prepared with the available tenured departmental faculty (or a committee thereof, as determined by the department chairperson in consultation with the available tenured departmental faculty). The summary teaching evaluation will draw on information from the candidate's reflective summary of teaching, the peer review reports, and the student evaluation forms, all of which are included in the candidate's notebook, 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. This summary teaching evaluation should chronicle the candidate's efforts at improvement in teaching and should help the candidate in continuous improvement.
6. The **tenure-track faculty member, available tenured departmental faculty members, department chairperson, and dean or dean's designee** will meet to discuss and review the tenure-track faculty member's progress and performance. This review should address all pertinent topics of interest to the participants (and departments may make a practice of submitting such topics to the department chair in advance if thoroughness is thus facilitated). If there have been any changes in expectations or conditions of the faculty member's employment, the department chairperson is to ensure that these are clearly communicated in writing to all participants in this meeting. This meeting will take place by November 1 for second-

year faculty and by February 15 for fourth-year faculty.

7. Following this meeting, the **available tenured departmental faculty members** are to complete and sign the colleague evaluation form on the tenure-track faculty member and submit it to the department chairperson. This shall be done by November 10 for second-year faculty and by February 25 for fourth-year faculty. Each tenured departmental faculty member should include on the form, along with other comments, an indication recommending that the candidate be (a) Continued or (b) Not Continued on the tenure track, or an indication that the faculty member is abstaining for a specific compelling reason. The department chairperson shall maintain the confidentiality of the evaluation forms, which shall not be available for review by the tenure-track faculty member. In addition to the chairperson, only the President, the Provost, the dean or dean's designee, and the University Tenure Committee upon the Committee's request will have access to the evaluation forms.
8. After receiving the colleague evaluation forms, the **department chairperson** is to prepare a summary report of the observations made in the review meeting and in the colleague evaluations by the available tenured departmental faculty members, including a report of the Continue/Not Continue/Abstain vote, for submission to the dean. Before submitting this report to the dean, the department chairperson is to make this report available for the available tenured departmental faculty members' inspection, either by reading it to them or by allowing them to read it in a secure location such as the departmental office. This summary report shall not be duplicated or distributed via email, nor shall it be made available for review by the tenure-track faculty member. The summary shall be submitted to the Dean by November 20 for second-year faculty and by March 5 for fourth-year faculty. In the fourth year, the department chairperson will also report the results of the Continue/Not Continue/Abstain vote to the candidate in written form. The chair may, at his or her discretion, report the results of the vote to the candidate in the second year.

If any of the available tenured departmental faculty members believes that his or her opinions were not adequately expressed in the chairperson's report, he or she may submit an independent letter expressing his or her opinion to the chairperson. This letter should be attached to the chair's letter and sent forward with it to the dean.

(Note: In each school or college that performs these reviews as a department of the whole, the dean or dean's designee will prepare the summary report described here. This report is different from the summary letter described in Section I.C.9 below, in that this report is to summarize the observations made in the review meeting and in the evaluations of the tenured departmental faculty members, and is to be made available for their inspection as described above, and the dean's summary letter is to document the review and recommend whether or not the faculty member be continued on tenure-track. Further, if in this situation one of the available tenured departmental faculty members believes that his or her opinions were not adequately expressed in the dean's summary report, he or she may submit an independent letter expressing his or her opinion not only to the dean, but also

to the Provost.)

9. The **dean or dean's designee** is to prepare a summary letter to the Provost, which documents the review, including feedback from the colleague evaluations, and recommends whether or not the faculty member be continued on tenure-track. If during any review the dean's evaluation of the tenure-track faculty member differs significantly from the evaluation of the tenure-track faculty member by the tenured faculty of the department, the dean or dean's designee must communicate in writing to the department chair and through the chair to the tenure-track faculty member the nature of and reasons for the difference in his or her assessment; this should be done without violating the confidentiality of any opinions expressed in the departmental summary report.

(Note: In each school or college that performs these reviews as a department of the whole, if during any review the dean's evaluation of the tenure-track faculty member differs significantly from the evaluation of the tenure-track faculty member by the tenured faculty of the school or college, the dean or dean's designee must communicate in writing to the tenure-track faculty member the nature of and reasons for the difference in his or her assessment; this should be done without violating the confidentiality of any opinions expressed in the departmental summary report.)

10. The dean's summary letter is to be signed by the **department chairperson** and the **dean or dean's designee**.
11. The **tenure-track faculty member** is to acknowledge the receipt and content of the summary letter provided by the dean or dean's designee by her or his signature on the letter. Should the tenure-track faculty member question any portion of the summary letter, she or he should provide a written response to be attached to the summary letter. The tenure-track faculty member receives a copy of the summary letter.
12. The **dean or dean's designee** is to submit the summary letter to the Provost for review. This should be done by December 5 for second-year faculty and by March 20 for fourth-year faculty.

(Note: In each school or college that performs these reviews as a department of the whole, the dean or dean's designee will submit not only this summary letter, but also the summary report of colleague evaluations described in Section I.C.8 above.)

13. The **Office of the Provost** will review the summary letters submitted each year and maintain a file on the professional performance and years of service of each faculty member.

II. Tenure Review

A. General information

The sixth year of service at Baylor (or equivalent prior credit granted for work at another institution and service at Baylor) is designated the Tenure Review year, unless the tenure-track faculty member had a pre-approved extension of the time spent on the tenure track. If the tenure candidate fails to demonstrate conclusively why she or he should be given tenure at Baylor in the Tenure Review year, a terminal letter of appointment will be issued for the succeeding year. The academic credentials at the time of tenure review should be evaluated in their entirety without consideration of the time to tenure review. For example, faculty who come up for tenure early are to have demonstrated the same level of productivity as faculty who are reviewed in their sixth year. Likewise, faculty who extend the tenure-track period for an approved reason are to have demonstrated the same level of productivity as faculty who are reviewed in their sixth year.

The tenure-track faculty member, all available tenured departmental faculty, the departmental chairperson, the dean, the University Tenure Committee, the Provost, and the President participate in the tenure review process, as follows.

(Note: In each school or college that performs these reviews as a department of the whole, the dean or dean's designee will perform the tasks designated for the department chairperson. See also further clarification of the process in this situation in Section II.B.2.d.)

B. Process

1. Prior to review of information

- a. At the beginning of the Fall semester, the **University Tenure Committee Chairperson** is to
 - i. secure a list of candidates from the Provost;
 - ii. secure from the deans a list of tenured departmental faculty members to receive University tenure evaluation forms for each candidate; and
 - iii. send appropriate documents to the candidates and the dean
- b. The **tenure candidate** is to return the "Receipt of Tenure Review Notice" acknowledgment form to the University Tenure Committee Chairperson by the date designated on the form; the **Chairperson** is to monitor the receipt of these forms.
- c. The **dean or dean's designee** is to provide the University Tenure Committee Chairperson a list of tenured departmental faculty members to receive tenure evaluation forms.

d. The **tenure candidate** is to prepare a credentials notebook that supports the request for tenure as instructed by the University Tenure Committee Chairperson. A copy of this notebook is to be provided by November 1 for review by the available tenured departmental faculty members, the department chairperson, and the dean or dean's designee. The material in the notebook should be subdivided and indexed into the categories set forth below:

i. A letter to the University Tenure Committee. This letter should set forth reasons why tenure should be granted, discussing each of the following that is relevant:

(a) An explanation of any special conditions of the candidate's appointment that would relate to a tenure determination (e.g., extension of tenure-track period).

(b) Teaching effectiveness, in the context of the information provided in items II.B.1.d.v-vii.

(c) Scholarship and/or professional performance.

(d) Service to the department, the university, and the larger academic community.

(e) Community and religious service.

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

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

ii. Tenure resume.

Rather than being a general-purpose document, this should be specifically designed to facilitate the tenure review process. It should be easily readable by faculty members who are not within the candidate's discipline. It is imperative that the candidate include complete information about each item listed on the resume, so that those involved in making the tenure decision will be fully informed as to the extent and nature of the candidate's achievements. Specifically, the following guidelines should be followed:

(a) The resume should include sections for the candidate's education; academic employment history (including non-academic employment that pertains to the position in which the candidate is being considered for tenure); scholarly/creative activity; teaching activity and effectiveness; grants/awards/honors; service. Other sections may also be appropriate if some information pertinent to the tenure 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 within the discipline. For example, in many disciplines conference presentations are not considered to be as significant as published journal articles, but in some disciplines this is not the case and/or conference presentations are published as proceedings; also, invited conference presentations may be more significant than are those that are accepted as a result of general submissions. Another example is the distinction drawn in some disciplines between work that is essentially pedagogical and work that is not; where this distinction is recognized as significant, it should be clarified in the tenure resume.
- (c) Complete and accurate bibliographic citation should be included for each piece of research included in the resume. Citations should use a consistent format that is accepted within the candidate's discipline. For journals, they should include the author's name, or order of authorship for joint authors, year of publication, journal name, volume number, and inclusive page numbers. For books, they should include the author's name, or order of authorship for joint authors, year of publication, book title, location of publisher, and publisher's name.
- (d) Each scholarly or creative item should be accompanied by an annotation. This should include a brief (one-two sentence) summary of the nature of the item's contribution to the field; any available information about citations the item has received; 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 tenure candidate should include such descriptions with indications that they have been created by the department. (Note: such information about the venue is particularly important in the case of 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) The tenure resume should include the work the candidate has done prior to assuming the tenure-track faculty position at Baylor as well as that done while in this position. Such achievements would ordinarily shed light on the candidate's ability to complete various types of projects and thus on the candidate's potential for performance at Baylor as a tenured member

of the faculty.

For candidates who undergo tenure review in the sixth year at Baylor, work done prior to arriving at Baylor does not address ability to meet the department's expectations, as reflected in departmental guidelines, for the *pace* of research and/or creative activity. However, in the case of a candidate who is being considered for tenure prior to the sixth year at Baylor, work done at a previous institution (especially subsequent to receiving the terminal degree) may address this question; for example, if a candidate is being evaluated in the fourth year at Baylor, a consideration of work done during the two years prior to arriving at Baylor might reflect the candidate's pace of production during a normal tenure-track period.

- (f) For any work that has been accepted for publication but has not yet been published, complete information about the status of the publication should be provided and documented with editorial correspondence. (The degree to which these forthcoming publications will be considered in the tenure decision will vary depending on the circumstances as well as on any pertinent information contained in the departmental guidelines.) The candidate should make clear such information as how secure the journal or publisher's commitment to publication is, how much work remains to complete the project, when the work is likely to appear, etc.
- (g) For all grants that have been received to support research, information should be included that clarifies the significance of the award. Where relevant, this information would address the source of the award, its term, and its amount; the purpose of the award in the context of the candidate's career (e.g., whether it is an "early-career" grant); whether the award supported graduate students; etc.
- (h) If the candidate's research has resulted in the creation of intellectual property, that should be noted, as well as any information that is available about the ways in which and extent to which this intellectual property has been or is likely to be put to use.
- (i) Some scholarly or (especially) creative contributions may not lend themselves to the precise methods of documentation and explanation described above. In these cases, though, 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., that 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.

- (j) Participation on editorial boards of professional publications or other projects, as well as service to and leadership of professional societies and associations should be listed and explained in terms of the degrees to which these activities constitute research and/or service contributions.
 - (k) If significant society, professional, or other awards have been won by the candidate, he or she should explain their significance as they reflect on his or her impact within the profession. (Such awards should be distinguished from awards of funding for scholarly or creative projects, which would most helpfully be discussed in the context of the specific research or creative work, as described in Section II.B.1.d.ii(f) above.)
 - (l) Teaching duties and assignments should be listed in the tenure resume; other information about teaching should be provided as outlined below in Sections II.B.1.d.v-viii.
 - (m) Service contributions should be listed in the tenure resume in a way that makes clear the nature of the various contributions: whether they assisted in the professional realm (some of which would be addressed in Section II.B.1.d.ii(i) above), or within the department or university as a whole, or within the community outside the university (whether on a local or a broader geographical level).
- iii. The candidate's annual reports (all years) (see Section I.C.4)
 - iv. Annual review summary letters (all years) from the dean to the Provost (see Section I.C.9-12).
 - v. A description of teaching: classes taught, enrollments, all current course syllabi, teaching materials, etc. When preparing the notebook in years prior to the Tenure Review year, the candidate shall also provide here a reflective summary of the year's teaching and plans for improvement (for example, attending pedagogy workshops or observing the teaching of experienced colleagues); when preparing the notebook in the Tenure Review year, the candidate shall instead assess teaching effectiveness within the letter to the University Tenure Committee.
 - vi. All peer review reports of teaching that have been made available to the candidate over the preceding three academic years. These should address, among other things, comments on whether the instructor achieved the goals of the class, wise use of class time, the instructor's interest in the topic and in the students, and whether teaching methods employed fit the content in the class.
 - vii. Student evaluation summary reports for the previous six semesters. (The summary reports are the sheets that compare the faculty member's evaluations to those of colleagues in similar courses. The first two pages which contain the class comparison data should be included, as should any

summaries and analyses of student evaluations that were prepared for the departmental chairperson or dean.)

- viii. An account of involvement of students in research. This would include a list of any graduate students supervised by the candidate, both current graduate students and those who have completed their degrees. Brief documentation for the accomplishments of each student should be provided. Specific items will vary by discipline, but might include awards, thesis titles, publications, notable artistic creations or performances, etc. Furthermore, significant involvement of undergraduates in research should also be described and documented where and as appropriate.
 - ix. 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.).
 - x. A five-year plan for teaching, research, publication, artistic performance, or other professional development.
 - xi. Any other categories of the candidate's choosing that are pertinent to the tenure decision.
- e. The **department chairperson** is to secure at least three external reviews of the tenure candidate's work, and make these available to the available tenured departmental faculty members 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 tenure candidates. However, these policies and procedures should reflect the following general guidelines.

- i. Responsibility for Securing External Reviews: The department, school, or college conducting tenure external reviews is responsible for obtaining

qualified evaluators who can provide fair and objective assessments of the candidate's work, and the tenured faculty 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. The individual who secures the reviewers should provide the University Tenure Committee with an explanation of the process used for each candidate, including a copy of the letter(s) sent to evaluators and the information described below with respect to evaluators' credentials, the rationale for selecting each evaluator (with special attention given to atypical evaluators), reasons for not providing evaluators with departmental guidelines, and any other points that would be helpful to the Committee in evaluating the contents of the evaluators' letters.

- ii. **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 must hold a rank at least equal to the rank to which the candidate is seeking as a part of tenure or have comparable professional standing in a non-academic setting. The ideal evaluators should come from highly reputable programs at respected universities. In any event, department chairs (or deans as relevant) should provide information for the University Tenure Committee establishing the credentials of each evaluator, explaining the rationale for choosing the evaluator to review the particular candidate, and confirming that the evaluator has no conflict of interest with regard to this task (or a justification in an unusual situation, as described in section II.B.1.e.iv below). In the case of any evaluator with a non-academic affiliation, this rationale should explicitly address the reason for making such a selection.

- iii. **Confidentiality:** Candidates for tenure should be allowed to provide input into the selection of external reviewers – e.g., nominating and commenting on possible reviewers. 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. If tenure is granted, the candidate may request a written summary of the reviews from the department chair or dean. Confidentiality is granted to the external reviewers by the department, college, or school through the tenure process. The external reviews, however, may be discoverable if legal action is taken by a candidate who is unsuccessful in the tenure process.
- iv. **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 (e.g., dissertation advisors, former professors, graduate school colleagues, co-authors, fellow faculty, personal friends, former students of the candidate, etc.) might

compromise their ability to evaluate the candidate's work objectively. 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. This justification should be transmitted to the University Tenure Committee and Administration as part of the credential materials of the candidate. The criteria and process for selection of external evaluators must be communicated to the candidate.

- v. Number of External Evaluators: There should be a minimum of three external evaluations of the candidate's scholarship from academic and non-academic sources as discussed above. The department may request more than this minimum number – if so, this fact should be noted in the department's tenure guidelines. All external letters that are received must be submitted to the tenure committee.
- vi. 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 tenure 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.
- vii. Timing: The process for developing a list of names of possible external reviewers should begin sufficiently far in advance of the tenure notebook 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. Normally this process should be well underway early in the spring semester prior to the Tenure Review year.
- viii. 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 tenured colleagues of the candidate, department chair, dean, University Tenure Committee members, Provost, and President.
- ix. External Letters Electronic Submission: Any e-mail letter included in the tenure 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 tenured faculty, dean, University Tenure Committee, 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.

- x. 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 tenure candidate, so departments may choose to submit letters of this nature as an additional part of the tenure 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.
- xi. 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 chairperson 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 chairperson should also give the evaluator a copy of the department tenure guidelines and direct the evaluator to evaluate the candidate’s work in this context.
- xii. Request Letter: The candidate’s department chair should write a request letter that reflects the particularities of the case including tenure expectations, workload of the candidate, the model of scholarship and/or creative activity the candidate is expected to follow, any extraordinary circumstances (such as delays in laboratory setup) that should be taken into account, etc. In some cases, school or department tenure guidelines may prescribe the specific text wording. (A sample letter is provided as Appendix 1 of these Procedures.) 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 tenure, 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.

- f. The **department chairperson** is to schedule a meeting of the available tenured departmental faculty members, the tenure 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.
 - g. The **department chairperson** is to provide to the candidate and the tenured departmental faculty a summary teaching evaluation prepared with the tenured departmental faculty (or a committee thereof). The report will draw on information from the candidate's reflective summary of teaching, the peer review reports, and the student evaluation forms, all of which are included in the candidate's notebook, 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 this Tenure Review year, this summary report will provide an overall evaluation of the candidate's teaching. In it, the department chairperson will also describe the candidate's teaching assignment in the department over the course of the candidate's time on the tenure track, 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.
 - h. The **University Tenure Committee Chairperson** shall send to the available tenured departmental faculty University tenure evaluation forms for each candidate.
2. Review of information within department and school or college
- a. After the candidate's credentials notebook and letters from external reviewers are made available, the **available tenured departmental faculty members** are to review them.
 - b. Prior to December 1, the **tenure candidate** is to meet with the **department chairperson**, the **available tenured departmental faculty members**, and the **dean or the dean's designee**. The principal purpose of this meeting will be to allow the tenure 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 tenured departmental faculty members** are to complete and sign the University tenure evaluation forms for the tenure-track faculty member and submit them to the department chairperson. All available tenured departmental faculty members are to do this, and should provide ratings that are requested on the form as well as prose rationales for the ratings that have been selected. If a faculty member's knowledge of the candidate's work has been limited to an unusual extent, the faculty member may explain that

situation, but should complete the form to the best of his or her ability. This shall be done by December 6. The department chairperson shall maintain the confidentiality of these evaluation forms, which shall not be available for review by the tenure-track faculty member. In addition to the chairperson, only the President, Provost, the dean or dean's designee, and the University Tenure Committee will have access to the evaluation forms.

(Note: In each school or college that performs these reviews as a department of the whole, these forms will be submitted directly to the dean or dean's designee, and item d, below, will be omitted.)

- d. After receiving the University tenure evaluation forms, the **department chairperson** is to prepare a letter addressing the merits of the tenure candidate's application for tenure. This letter should also clarify, to the extent possible, any apparent and/or actual discrepancies among reviewer evaluations and/or tenure evaluation forms. It shall be submitted to the dean by December 12, along with the tenure candidate's credentials notebook; the external review letters, along with a copy of the letter and the materials that were given to the external evaluators, as well as the other explanatory materials delineated in Section II.B.1.e; the University tenure evaluation forms submitted by the available tenured departmental faculty members; and departmental tenure guidelines and any special conditions of the candidate's employment. (Examples of the candidate's work that cannot be conveniently included in the notebooks can be retained in the department office, and made available to subsequent reviewers as necessary, for the duration of the evaluation process.)
- e. Following the meeting and receipt of all materials from the department chairperson, *(or, in each school or college that performs these reviews as a department of the whole, following the meeting and receipt of the University tenure evaluation forms from the available tenured departmental faculty members)* the **dean or dean's designee** shall submit by December 18 to the University Tenure Committee Chairperson as directed a letter addressing the merits of the tenure candidate's application for tenure. The Chairperson of the Tenure Committee shall maintain confidentiality of the letter, which shall not be available for review by the tenure candidate. In addition to the members of the Tenure Committee, only the President and the Provost will have access to the letter. Along with this letter, the dean or dean's designee shall deliver to the University Tenure Committee Chairperson:
 - i. the tenure candidate's credentials notebook;
 - ii. the summary teaching evaluation;
 - iii. the external review letters, along with the chairperson's explanatory material;
 - iv. the University tenure evaluation forms submitted by the available tenured departmental faculty members; and

- v. departmental tenure guidelines and any special conditions of the candidate's employment.
 - f. The **University Tenure Committee Chairperson** is to monitor the receipt of these materials from the deans or deans' designees.
3. University Tenure Committee deliberations
- a. The **University Tenure Committee Chairperson** is to arrange for and conduct meetings of the University Tenure Committee; arrange for members of the Committee to sign the confidentiality agreement; obtain appropriate additional information requested by the committee members; and make any personal contacts with the candidates as required to obtain additional information.
 - b. The **members of the University Tenure Committee** are to sign a confidentiality agreement that states that they will maintain the confidentiality of the process, as described in the Policy for Tenure at Baylor University, Section VII.A.
 - c. The **members of the University Tenure Committee** are to review all material related to the candidate using relevant evaluation criteria, including the expectations conveyed in the departmental tenure guidelines provided by the departmental chairperson, with respect to:
 - i. teaching effectiveness as determined by student evaluation summary reports, self-report, departmental summary teaching evaluations, annual review and Tenure Review summary letters, departmental colleague evaluations, chair letters, dean letters, and other supporting evidence, such as student/alumni professional accomplishments;
 - ii. scholarship and/or professional performance as determined by self-report and supporting evidence, annual review and Tenure Review summary letters, departmental colleague evaluations, chair letters, dean letters, and evaluations by external reviewers;
 - iii. service to the department, the university, and the larger academic community as determined by self-report, annual review and Tenure Review summary letters, departmental colleague evaluations, chair letters, dean letters, and other supporting evidence;
 - iv. community and religious service as determined by self-report, annual review and Tenure Review summary letters, chair letters, dean letters, and other supporting evidence;
 - v. interpersonal relationships as determined by student summary evaluation reports, annual review and Tenure Review summary letters, departmental colleague evaluations, chair letters, dean letters, and other supporting

evidence; and

vi. contribution to the overall goals and mission of Baylor University as determined by the candidate's five-year plan and personal statement, departmental colleague evaluations, letters from external reviewers, chair letters, dean letters, and annual review and Tenure Review summary letters.

- d. The **members of the University Tenure Committee** will meet, discuss each tenure candidate's qualifications, and vote by secret ballot. All Committee members, including the Chair of the Committee, will vote on all secret ballots, except as provided in the remainder of this paragraph. Committee members may excuse themselves in cases in which they believe they cannot fairly evaluate a tenure candidate's qualifications. Committee members will abstain from voting on candidates for whom they have previously submitted a faculty evaluation form in the Tenure Review year.
- e. The **members of the University Tenure Committee** are to refrain from making personal contact with the tenure candidates regarding tenure matters. They should make any requests for additional information from candidates through the committee chairperson.
- f. The **University Tenure Committee Chairperson** will complete a summary report for each candidate and forward the Committee recommendations to the Provost with a copy to each Committee member.
- g. The **University Tenure Committee Chairperson** will forward all tenure documents to the Office of the Provost.

4. Tenure decision

- a. The **Provost** will review the recommendation from the University Tenure Committee regarding each candidate, giving due consideration to this recommendation as well as those of the available tenured departmental faculty, department chair, and dean, and, in recognition that the faculty has special interest in tenure decisions, will recommend to the President that the candidate be granted or denied tenure, and will submit all relevant material and University Tenure Committee recommendations to the President. The Provost may consult with any individual he or she deems appropriate in the course of this review.
- b. The **President**, after consultation with the Provost, will make a final decision regarding the grant or denial of tenure. In reaching this decision, the President will consider the recommendations of the available tenured departmental faculty, department chair, dean, and University Tenure Committee with recognition that the faculty has special expertise and interests in tenure 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 report the President's decision to the Chairperson of the University Tenure Committee.
- e. The **Provost** will communicate to each dean the tenure decision made for each faculty member within the dean's academic unit, and, in the case of successful tenure candidate(s), will provide the dean a summary of the conclusions reached during the review process regarding strengths and weaknesses.
- f. The tenure candidate's **dean or the dean's designee** will meet with the tenure candidate to inform him or her of the tenure decision and to deliver personally to the candidate the letter from the President officially notifying the candidate of the tenure decision.

If the candidate has completed a successful tenure 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 tenured faculty members 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 these procedures have been followed. This statement will be included in the tenure candidate's official personnel file maintained in the Office of the Provost.

- g. The **President** will report the decisions to the Board of Regents, through the Academic and Student Affairs Committee.

5. Denial of Tenure

- a. If any tenure-track faculty member is not approved for tenure, he or she shall be given a one-year terminal contract. **A decision to deny tenure is effective at the time it is first made.**
- b. Reasons for denial of tenure 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 tenure 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 tenure. The request must be received by the President within two weeks of the candidate's receipt of reasons that tenure was denied, and must state the candidate's justification for receiving tenure. The reconsideration process will

not include information about the candidate's achievements that was not made available in the original tenure review. In the course of this reconsideration, the President shall confer with the Provost, the University Tenure Committee Chair, 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.

III. Exceptions to the Above

Any granting of tenure status by other means shall occur only in accordance with the provisions stated in BU-PP 704, Policy for Tenure at Baylor University, section III.D. Any exceptions made in the granting of tenure shall be stated in writing to the faculty member receiving tenure, the tenured faculty members in the department, and the chairperson. Such exceptions shall not extend the maximum probationary period granted in this document. Only the President shall have authority to issue official tenure notices, and these must be in writing to the concerned parties.

IV. Implementation

- A. Because of the relatively large size of some departments, those departments may properly have subsets of all available tenured faculty members within the department fulfill the responsibilities of tenured faculty members as outlined in this policy. Such a practice, and the procedure for selecting subsets in each department, must be approved by the Provost.
- B. Because some schools within the University are not organized by department, the functions of the departmental chairperson 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.
- C. If a tenure-track faculty member is in a department or division with four or fewer tenured faculty members, the dean shall appoint additional faculty members from within the University so that there are five tenured faculty members who will participate in all the candidate's annual reviews and submit tenure evaluation forms in the Tenure Review year. All tenured faculty members 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. This task will be completed during the fall semester of a new faculty member's first year, or as soon as is practically possible in the case of tenured faculty members leaving the department during the course of the candidate's time on the tenure track. The same five tenured faculty members should serve in this capacity for a given candidate throughout the probationary process unless one or more members are to be added as a result of additional department members receiving tenure and/or the dean determining that one or more existing members should be replaced; in the latter case the changes must be approved by the Provost.
 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 tenured faculty members whose areas of expertise are significantly related to that (or those) of the candidate, the dean should seek to appoint tenured faculty members 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 tenured faculty (within and outside of the department) who will be fulfilling these responsibilities, the department or division chair, and the Provost. The dean will also provide the Chairperson of the University Tenure Committee with the names at the beginning of the Tenure Review year, in order that they may receive a tenure ballot for the candidate.
- D. These procedures describe the system for evaluating tenure-track faculty members 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 tenure 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 tenure 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 tenure and shall not provide the basis for any legal claim against the University or against participants in the process of evaluation.

APPENDIX 1:

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 tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate 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 tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate 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 tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate 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, any extraordinary circumstances (such as delays in laboratory setup) that should be taken into account, 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 tenure and 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,

APPENDIX 2: Schedules for Annual Review and Tenure 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 each year.

Schedule for Second-Year Review:

By October 1:	Candidate submits report and notebook to chairperson or dean; department chair provides colleague evaluation forms to tenured departmental faculty
October 1-31:	Tenured departmental faculty members review candidates' materials, chairperson distributes summary teaching evaluation, department meets
November 10:	Colleague evaluation forms due to chairperson
November 20:	Chair summary letters due to dean
December 5:	Dean's letter due to Provost
December 15:	Non-reappointment notification deadline

Schedule for Fourth-Year Review:

By January 15:	Candidate submits report and notebook to chairperson or dean; department chair provides colleague evaluation forms to tenured departmental faculty
January 15-February 15:	Tenured departmental faculty members review candidates' materials, chairperson distributes summary teaching evaluation, department meets
February 25:	Colleague evaluation forms due to chairperson
March 5:	Chair summary letters due to dean
March 20:	Dean's letter due to Provost
Twelve months before expiration of probationary appointment:	Non-reappointment notification deadline

Schedule for Tenure Review:

Beginning of fall semester:	UTC Chairperson secures lists of candidates and tenured departmental faculty, and sends appropriate documents to candidate, tenured departmental faculty, and deans.
By November 1:	Candidate submits notebook for review
Prior to meeting with candidate:	Department chairperson supplies external review letters
Prior to meeting with candidate:	Department chairperson provides departmental colleague evaluation forms
Prior to meeting with candidate:	Department chairperson provides summary teaching evaluation
November 1-30:	Candidate meets with department and dean
By December 6:	Colleague evaluation forms due to chairperson
By December 12:	Chair letter and all other materials due to dean
By December 18:	Deans' letters and all other materials sent to UTC Chair

Early January:

UTC deliberates and sends recommendations and all other materials to Provost

Early spring semester:

President makes final tenure decisions, which are communicated to the Provost, deans, candidates (through deans), University Tenure Committee, Board of Regents, and Faculty Senate