Department of History

Procedures and Criteria for
Annual Merit Performance Evaluation and Review

Adhering to the requirements of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 1, and the College of Liberal Arts “Guidelines for Workload Allocation and Evaluation for Tenured Faculty Members,” the Department of History presents its procedures and criteria for the annual merit evaluation and review process. Our purpose is to provide a mechanism to evaluate faculty members’ accomplishments in their three principal areas of responsibility—research, teaching, and service—in a manner emphasizing openness, fair assessment, and collegiality. This evaluation system reinforces the department’s four core commitments—to strengthen our faculty’s national profile, enhance the quality of the undergraduate experience, build our graduate program, and increase our commitment to diversity. As such, we, the faculty, view this process as a means to encourage one another to fulfill professional standards and expectations commensurate with the aims of a major research university.

Note: The annual merit evaluation and review process conducted by the Executive Committee, as described below, also fulfills the “peer evaluation” required by the University rule on Post-Tenure Review (University Rule 12.06.99.M1).

A. Procedures. On or about December 1, the department head will distribute blank "Faculty Member's Annual Report" forms (copy enclosed) along with copies of this document. Each member of the faculty will be required to submit the completed report by January 20 of the succeeding year. The "Faculty Member's Annual Report" will detail the academic activities of a calendar year (January 1 through December 31) and will serve as the primary basis for evaluating a faculty member's professional progress. It is incumbent upon each faculty member to make the best case for his/her accomplishments on the form.

Approximately six weeks after the beginning of the succeeding calendar year, the department's executive committee will evaluate the faculty with the objective of locating each member in the appropriate category of performance using a five-point scale: 4 = Superior; 3 = Excellent; 2 = Commendable; 1 = Satisfactory; 0 = Unsatisfactory. Typically, areas of responsibility will be weighted as follows: Research 60%, Teaching 20%, Service 20%. Thus, for example, a faculty member evaluated by the executive committee as Excellent in research, Satisfactory in teaching, and Commendable in service would receive a weighted composite score of 3 x 0.6 (Research) plus 1 x 0.2 (Teaching) plus 2 x 0.2 (Service) or 2.4. The executive committee will evaluate teaching and service accomplishments in a manner appropriate to rank. (For a full description of the executive committee—its role and purpose, the process to select members, and the length of term and rotation schedule—see the department’s bylaws, section E.1.)
Upon the completion of the evaluations, the department head will notify each member of the faculty in writing of the executive committee's assessment of his/her performance, including individual scores and rankings in research, teaching, and service and overall ranking and weighted composite score. This memorandum constitutes the faculty member’s annual review. The department head will also include an assessment of each faculty member’s progress in research, teaching, and service, which will vary from rank to rank. For assistant professors, the assessment will focus on progress toward tenure and promotion; for associate professors, on promotion to professor; and for full professors, on further advancement of the department’s four core commitments. (For assistant professors, progress toward tenure and promotion is also assessed by the department’s tenure and promotion committee.)

Faculty members, upon indicating receipt by signing a copy of the document, will be given the opportunity to question their rankings in writing to the department head, who will consult the executive committee when reconsidering the evaluation. In such a case, the department head will issue to the faculty member a final written notification explaining the decision. Additional meetings between the department head and the faculty member may be held at either’s request to discuss expectations and/or professional progress. If the annual review fails to follow these published guidelines, complaints should be directed in writing to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and copied to the Dean of Faculties.

The annual review serves as the primary documentation not only for evaluation of job performance but also for merit increases. On the basis of the completed evaluations and after consulting with the executive committee, the department head will recommend specific salaries to the dean when the university budget becomes known. When the recommendations have been approved by the Board of Regents, the department head will notify each faculty member of their respective salaries.

This process for annual review also acknowledges that research, teaching, and service loads may vary from faculty member to faculty member as their careers evolve. The default position is that all faculty members will teach a 2-2 teaching load, maintain a productive research agenda, and participate in department, college, university, and/or professional affairs. This document explains the circumstances that would bring about differential teaching or service responsibilities for tenured faculty (in order to maintain approximately comparable workloads across the department) or allow them to negotiate individualized loads. Faculty members who take on greater teaching or service responsibilities will be evaluated for merit in accordance with their altered workloads. Guidelines concerning differential workloads (and unsatisfactory rankings) are applicable only to tenured faculty, as performance expectations for tenure-track faculty members are discussed in other university, college, and departmental documents.

Tenured faculty members receiving two consecutive unsatisfactory rankings will face the prospect of altered performance responsibilities. In the case of unsatisfactory research productivity, the faculty member will be subject to an increased teaching or service load for a period of three years—a 3-3 teaching load being the most likely outcome. In most instances, a faculty member with a 3-3 teaching load will be evaluated as 20% Research, 60% Teaching, and
20% Service. In most instances, an increased service load will be evaluated at 20% Research, 20% Teaching, and 60% Service. In the case of unsatisfactory teaching or service, the faculty member will be subject to remedial actions and professional development as appropriate. In all cases, the department head, in consultation with the faculty member, will identify in advance, and in a written document signed by both parties, the conditions under which such adjustments or recommended actions will be continued, reversed, or modified (including appropriate expectations for those with lowered research weights). A faculty member who chooses to forgo the adjustment or recommended action may be subject to the procedures specified under university policy for post-tenure review should he/she receive a third consecutive unsatisfactory ranking (see University Rule 12.06.99.M1).

Differential teaching responsibilities may also be seen as an opportunity for those whose greatest contributions to the department take place in the classroom. Tenured faculty members may work with the department head to initiate altering their performance expectations and the respective weights assigned to research, teaching, and service. Those who volunteer for a 3-3 teaching load in this manner will be evaluated as 20% Research, 60% Teaching, and 20% Service. Similarly, those who volunteer for an increased service load (comparable, in terms of commitment, to a third class) will be evaluated at 20% Research, 20% Teaching, 60% Service. Both teaching and service options require the approval of the executive committee. In voluntary as with mandatory cases, the department head, in consultation with the faculty member, will identify in advance, and in a written document signed by both parties, the conditions under which adjustments in teaching or service will be continued, reversed, or modified.

The executive committee will determine unsatisfactory/satisfactory rankings (one is the inverse of the other) annually and within a three to five year window (the current year under consideration and the two to four preceding calendar years), as defined by the criteria below. An unsatisfactory ranking results from a faculty member’s failure to meet departmental standards in one or more of the three areas of responsibility (research, teaching, or service) as defined by the criteria below, pending a review by the department head, in consultation with the executive committee, of the person’s professional development and of his/her individual circumstances as defined by the College of Liberal Arts’ modified duties policy. A satisfactory ranking reflects a faculty member having met departmental standards in all three areas of responsibility.

The three other categories of performance above and beyond “satisfactory” (and therefore simply gradations of “satisfactory”) pertain to a faculty member’s accomplishments in the given calendar year: commendable for exceeding departmental standards; excellent for excelling in the given area; and superior for extraordinary performance.

B. Criteria. For descriptions of peer-reviewed book presses, classroom books, peer-reviewed journals, and major grants and fellowships, see the Appendix.

RESEARCH

Unsatisfactory: The absence of a significant and productive research agenda—one demonstrating
progress, trajectory, and sustainability (as defined, below, under “satisfactory”).

**Satisfactory:** The presence of a significant and productive research agenda—one demonstrating progress, trajectory, and sustainability. Evidence of such an agenda involves meeting two sets of criteria: (1) at a minimum over a three year period, editing a volume of scholarly essays; or publishing an article in a second tier disciplinary journal or a second-tier area-specific journal, a scholarly essay in an edited volume, or a significant article-length translation; or winning small (as opposed to “major”) external grants or fellowships totaling approximately $3,000; or receiving other research honors, such as a significant article or book award; or having a major (A- or B-category) research monograph in its third year of publication; and (2) other indicators of continued activity in at least two of the three years, such as papers presented at professional meetings, invited lectures, grant proposals, additional publications submitted, Glasscock Center working-group papers, department colloquium presentations, and other comparable research products.

In exceptional circumstances, such as the publication of a major (A- or B-category) research monograph, it may be appropriate to take into account a longer window (of up to five years), but past achievements cannot substitute for tangible evidence of an ongoing research program.

**Commendable:** Demonstrable evidence of research productivity in the given calendar year, such as editing a volume of scholarly essays; or publishing an article in a second tier disciplinary journal or a second-tier area-specific journal, a scholarly essay in an edited volume, or a significant article-length translation; or winning small (as opposed to “major”) external grants or fellowships totaling approximately $3,000; or receiving other research honors, such as a significant article or book award; or having a major (A- or B-category) research monograph in its third year of publication.

**Excellent:** Demonstrable evidence of a highly productive research agenda in the given calendar year, such as the publication of a major article in a first tier disciplinary journal or a first tier area-specific journal, two scholarly articles in second-tier disciplinary or area-specific journals (or any two “commendable” research accomplishments, e.g., a scholarly essay in an edited volume and a book award), a significant book-length translation, or a classroom book; or winning a major (national or international) external grant or fellowship, awarded for the year in which the grant or fellowship begins; or having a major (A- or B-category) research monograph in its second year of publication.

**Superior:** Publication of a major research monograph in the given calendar year.

**TEACHING**

**Unsatisfactory:** The absence of demonstrated competence in the classroom over a three year period as evidenced by a faculty member’s failure to meet basic expectations (as defined below under “satisfactory”).
Satisfactory: Demonstrated competence in the classroom over a three year period as evidenced by a faculty member meeting basic expectations, including consistently employing pedagogically sound techniques to instruct students, meeting classes during regularly scheduled times, holding regularly scheduled office hours, meeting minimum syllabus requirements, posting syllabi and C.V. on the HOWDY website, submitting midterm and final grades on time, conducting student evaluations, complying with W-course standards, and mitigating concerns raised in student evaluations.

Commendable: Demonstrated competence in the classroom in the given calendar year beyond meeting basic expectations, such as teaching independent studies (485s and 685s) or first-year critical thinking seminars, supervising honors theses, winning curriculum development grants, participating in workshops or programs designed to improve teaching, participating in study abroad, adding a new course to the inventory of classes, publishing pedagogical articles in scholarly journals, delivering pedagogical papers at professional conferences, hosting a speaker in one’s class who addresses concerns of diversity and/or internationalization/globalization with respect to the course topic(s), contributing significantly to internationalization/globalization and/or diversity by, for example, participating in a teaching workshop or institute sponsored by the Center for Teaching Excellence or the Office of the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity; or contributing markedly to graduate education, as evidenced by chairing one or two committees or serving on at least four others, or significant recruiting efforts.

Excellent: In the given calendar year, contributing substantially to the graduate program, as evidenced by chairing two or more committees and serving on more than four others, chairing a completed Ph.D., placement of a Ph.D. in a tenure-track B.A./M.A.-granting institution or a significant non-academic position, scholarly publications by one’s current graduate students, or significant recruiting efforts to enhance diversity and/or internationalization/globalization; contributing substantially to the undergraduate program, as evidenced by three or more “commendable” teaching accomplishments, receipt of a College-level teaching award (or equivalent), or publication of a pedagogical book.

Superior: Extraordinary teaching in the given calendar year as evidenced by, for example, receipt of a University-level teaching award (or equivalent); placement of a Ph.D. in a tenure-track Ph.D.-granting institution.

SERVICE

Unsatisfactory: Failure to provide service in a manner appropriate to rank over a three year period (as defined below under “satisfactory”).

Satisfactory: Participation over a three year period, as judged in a manner appropriate to rank, in departmental processes (e.g., attending faculty and tenure and promotion meetings, providing the head with a valid explanation for an absence from a tenure and promotion meeting, serving, when asked, on standing committees, T&P subcommittees and search committees); and in professional activities (e.g., reviewing books and manuscripts, chairing and/or commenting on
Commendable: In the given calendar year, exercising a leadership role in departmental processes (e.g., chairing a department standing committee, T&P subcommittee, or search committee; writing a research report for a T&P subcommittee; serving on the executive committee; or providing significant faculty mentoring); in university activities (e.g., sponsoring a student organization; giving a scholarly presentation on campus; serving as a member of the Faculty Senate; becoming an Aggie Ally; or conducting Center for Teaching Excellence workshop on diversity and/or internationalization/globalization); or in professional activities (e.g., reviewing at least four books and/or manuscripts; serving on editorial boards, program or prize committees, or as officers for associations; or significant public service to the local community).

Excellent: In the given calendar year, exceptional participation in university affairs (e.g., serving as a department officer, or on important college and university committees such as the Dean’s Advisory Committee, or a college or university-level search committee, or as an officer in the Faculty Senate) or in professional affairs (e.g., serving as an evaluator for a major/national grant or fellowship organization, an academic program external review committee, on an external tenure and promotion committee, as an organizer of a major conference, or as an editor of a second-tier disciplinary or area-specific journal).

Superior: Extraordinary participation in the given calendar year in university or professional affairs such as chairing a highly significant university committee, serving as president of a major historical association, or editing a first-tier disciplinary or area-specific journal.

Note: According to University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 1.5.5.8, noncompliance with either minimum safety standards or state/university mandated trainings automatically leads to an unsatisfactory ranking.

C. Appendix.

Peer-Reviewed Book Presses

A Such a press enjoys the reputation of being a major national/international publisher producing books of the highest quality that are well publicized, widely distributed, and reviewed in major journals. A book published by an A-category press typically is in the best position to make a significant impact in the discipline.

B The B-category press has a distinguished publishing record and a national/international reputation in the subject areas of the books that are distributed under its name. A book published by a B-category press is well positioned to make an impact in its field of study.

C The C-category press peer-reviews the manuscripts it publishes, but does not have a national/international reputation in the area of study of the books it distributes. Such a book is not best positioned to make an impact in its field.
Classroom Books

Those intended primarily for use in undergraduate courses—i.e., in series published by presses such as Bedford/St. Martin’s, Longman, Wiley, etc.)

Peer-Reviewed Journals

First tier disciplinary journals publish high-quality articles of significance across the discipline. Such journals enjoy high reputations, are likely to be widely read and cited by scholars, and their impact on the discipline is great. Examples may include but are not limited to: *American Historical Review, Past and Present, Journal of the Historical Society, Daedalus*

First tier area-specific journals publish high-quality articles of significance within a specific subfield or area and generally are the leading journals in the particular subfield or area. Such journals enjoy high reputations throughout their sub-field and often beyond and are likely to be read and cited by scholars in their relevant sub-field and beyond. Examples may include but are not limited to: *Journal of American History, William and Mary Quarterly, Journal of Southern History, Business History Review, French Historical Studies, Journal of Modern History, Pacific Historical Review, Journal of Military History, Journal of Asian Studies, Technology and Culture*

Second tier disciplinary journals are respected in their fields and publish articles of interest across the discipline. Examples include but are not limited to: *The Historian, History Today*

Second tier area-specific journals publish peer-reviewed articles of interest within a specific subfield or area. Publications in these journals frequently are selectively read and cited by scholars active in the relevant sub-field or area. Examples may include but are not limited to: *The Southern Quarterly, Journal of the West, Southern California Quarterly, The Annals of Iowa, Contemporary European History, European History Quarterly, German Studies Review, Modern & Contemporary France, Journal of Baltic Studies*

Major Grants and Fellowships

Highly competitive, national, semester or year-long research fellowships, such as those awarded by the American Council of Learned Societies, American Philosophical Society, Fulbright Scholar Program, Huntington Library, Guggenheim Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Humanities Center, Woodrow Wilson Center, and others approved by the College of Liberal Arts in its “Policy on Development Leaves, External Fellowships, and Course Buyouts,” Appendix 1.
The executive committee and department head will revisit this document at least every five years, starting no later than September 2018.
BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
Amended by the History Faculty, April 2014
(changes in bold)

A  **Purpose:** These bylaws outline the Texas A&M Department of History's methods of governance. The rules and regulations of the College of Liberal Arts and the University take precedence over these bylaws.

The bylaws reflect a belief that the responsibility for effective department governance rests with both the faculty and the department head. Moreover, the department believes that effective department governance depends on the exercise of responsible leadership by the faculty and the department head alike.

These bylaws shall be implemented with strict adherence to academic freedom, due process, and equal opportunity. Appointments, hiring, promotion, and tenure shall be decided solely on the basis of professional qualifications, without regard to such considerations as sex, race, national origin, religion, political affiliation, or sexual orientation.

B  **Faculty:** The history department faculty is defined to include the following ranks: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructional professor, instructional associate professor, and instructional assistant professor. In all matters where faculty act by rank, excluding promotion and tenure, instructional faculty will be considered part of the equivalent tenured or tenure track rank.

C  **Departmental Meetings:** The faculty, meeting as a whole, will review all actions of the head and the standing committees and propose changes of policy.

1. A regular meeting of the faculty will be held in each full month the University is in session during the fall and spring semesters. A quorum of 33% of the full-time faculty in residence is required for any vote to be taken.

2. Special meetings may be called by the department head and will require a quorum of 50% of the full-time faculty in residence for any vote to be taken.

3. The department head, or a faculty member designated by the head, will chair all meetings.

4. The head and the executive committee will prepare the agenda and distribute it to
the faculty at least one week prior to meetings. Any faculty member, by written request (including submissions via e-mail) to the head or executive committee, may place an item on the agenda.

5. A secretary will be chosen each semester at the first regular meeting. Minutes of all meetings will be distributed to the faculty within a week.

6. In all cases not specifically covered by these bylaws, Roberts Rules of Order will be used to conduct meetings. A copy should be available in the library.

D **Department Head:** The head is the department's executive and is responsible to the faculty, the dean of the college, and the university administration. The department head shall serve no more than two consecutive four-year terms. At the end of the first three years, the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department will vote to continue or not to continue the Head for a second term. That vote, taken by secret ballot, will be tallied by the executive committee and be sent as a departmental recommendation to the Dean.

1. The head's major responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

   1.1 proposing long-range plans to the faculty and executive committee;
   1.2 assigning courses to individual faculty, following the established principle of course rotation;
   1.3 supervising and directing the staff;
   1.4 preparing the budget and other financial planning;
   1.5 recommending pay increases in consultation with the executive committee; and will inform each faculty member of: a) the basis on which their raise, if any, was decided; b) whether it be solely on an annual review, or on their performance over multiple years of service; and c) the quartile ranking evaluation received from the Executive Committee.
   1.6 appointing committees and departmental representatives and officers with the advice of the executive committee, except as otherwise provided by these bylaws;
   1.7 presiding over department meetings; and,
   1.8 serving as a conduit for communications between the faculty and the administration.
2. In addition, the head will initiate reviews of faculty performance and make recommendations to the dean on tenure and promotion. In fulfilling this function, the head will:

2.1 justify salary and promotion decisions to the individual members of the department in writing;

2.2 meet with each tenure-track faculty member at least once during the academic year to discuss that individual's research, teaching, and other professional activities, and whether that person is making satisfactory progress.

E Standing Committees: The following standing committees will assist the faculty and head in administering the department. As needed, search and ad hoc committees will be appointed by the head with the advice of the executive committee.

1. Executive Committee: The executive committee will represent the faculty in advising the head, who will serve as its chair. It will consist of six members besides the head and include at least one member from each faculty rank. Members will serve two-year terms and no one shall serve more than two consecutive terms.

1.1 Conduct of elections: The executive committee will be elected in a secret ballot by the faculty. Election of three members by rank and three members at-large will take place in alternate years. An ad hoc election committee appointed by the head will call for nominations. Voting faculty must secure the permission of those eligible faculty whom they wish to nominate and forward those names to the election committee. At least one week before the election, the election committee will distribute ballots containing the names of all nominees. In elections by rank, faculty will vote for one candidate from each rank; if a candidate fails to receive a majority of votes cast in the first poll, a run-off will be held between the leading candidates. In elections at-large, faculty will vote for their three preferred candidates; the leading vote-getters without majorities will face a runoff until a majority is obtained. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote. Ballots will be distributed by e-mail and may be cast either by e-mail or the dual-envelope system.

1.2 Filling Vacancies: In the event that a vacancy occurs on the Executive Committee a special election will be held at the earliest feasible moment. The election will be conducted according to Section D Paragraph 1.1. The faculty member elected will finish out the time remaining on the vacant seat.

1.3 Functions: The Executive Committee will serve as a committee on committees and advise the head on all committee appointments, including search committees, and on the appointment of departmental officers. It will
serve as a planning and priority committee and suggest to the faculty the direction the department should take in hiring new faculty, encouraging research, and improving instruction. It will conduct annual reviews of faculty and advise the head on the allocation of resources, including proposed salaries. Ultimate authority in these matters will remain with the head, but the head must inform the Executive Committee of actions taken concerning these matters. In addition, the committee will undertake any special tasks which are not within the purview of other standing committees and which may be assigned to it by either the faculty or head. Agenda and minutes of all executive committee meetings will be distributed to the full faculty within a week.

1.4 Consultation Between the Executive Committee and the Department Head:
In general, discussion of appointments and other types of consultation with the Department Head shall be done in a called meeting of the committee, but when this is not possible or preferable, discussion of appointments and other matters shall be done by emails addressed to the entire committee.

1.5 The Executive Committee will meet at least once every full month of the Fall and Spring semesters in advance of the faculty meetings.

2. Graduate Committee: The Graduate Committee will be appointed by the head with the advice of the Executive Committee and will supervise graduate students and graduate instruction. The director of graduate studies will serve as a chair of the committee, which will consist of seven members. The committee will work with the director of graduate studies on the admission of students, the awarding of financial assistance (including assistantships and fellowships), and the distribution of graduate student research and travel funds. The committee will include a representative selected by the graduate students who will be a full participant except in personnel discussions. The committee shall meet at least twice a semester.

3. Undergraduate Committee: The Undergraduate Committee will be appointed by the head with the advice of the Executive Committee and will supervise undergraduate history majors and undergraduate instruction in the department. The associate department head will chair the committee, which will consist of at least five members including one of the undergraduate advisors and a graduate student. The student will be a full participant except in personnel discussions.

4. Social Committee: This committee will be appointed by the head with the advice of the Executive Committee and will supervise all departmental social affairs and the flower fund. It will consist of at least three members, including a graduate student. Members will serve two year terms, with approximately half appointed each year.
5. Promotion and Tenure Committee: This committee will conduct annual reviews and formal mid-term reviews of untenured, tenure-track faculty and will conduct formal reviews for tenure and promotion. It will consist of all faculty above the rank of the individual seeking promotion and/or tenure. In cases of instructional assistant and associate faculty seeking promotion, the committee will also include instructional faculty above the candidate’s rank. In cases of those seeking tenure without change in rank, the committee will consist of all tenured members of the candidate's rank and above.

5.1 The committee will act in accordance with the College of Liberal Arts procedures for review, tenure and promotion. The full committee, after discussion, by a secret ballot and simple majority vote, will make recommendations regarding annual reviews of untenured faculty, midterm reviews, and promotion/tenure. Faculty who will be away from the university on the day of committee meetings for pressing professional reasons (e.g., development leave, fellowship leave, or presenting research at a professional conference) may vote in absentia. Their requests for ballots must be submitted to the department head one week before the scheduled meeting. In emergencies, the department head may provide a ballot within that week at her or his discretion. Absentee ballots must be received by the staff person normally responsible for receiving electronic ballots by the beginning of the meeting for which they are being cast. The department head shall not vote on matters before the committee. The department head's participation in the deliberations will be limited to providing information requested by other members of the committee.

5.2 The Promotion and Tenure Committee's deliberations and decisions will remain strictly confidential.

5.3 Evaluation subcommittees for each faculty member under consideration at the mid-term review and for promotion and/or tenure will be appointed by the head with the advice of the executive committee. In appointing the heads of subcommittees, the department head will also consider suggestions from individual candidates for promotion.

5.4 The chair of each meeting will be selected by the head of the department in consultation with the faculty under consideration and with the approval of the executive committee (committee members under review at the meeting in question will recuse themselves). The chair of the meeting will moderate the discussion and, for the midterm review and promotion and tenure, assure that the final version of each evaluation committee report represents the faculty voice.
5.5 There will be a secretary for each candidate for the mid-term review and for promotion and tenure who will record the discussion during the meeting and modify the evaluation committee report as needed. The same procedure for selecting the chair will apply to selecting the secretary.

5.6 Modifications of the evaluation committee report will be submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for approval.

5.7 The department head will forward the full dossier and an explanation of the committee's recommendation to the dean. The head will also forward an independent evaluation based on the candidates' dossier.

5.8 In a tenure and promotion decision, the minority may submit a signed report in writing to the department head, who will submit it to the full Promotion and Tenure Committee. The majority may, if it wishes, respond in writing. The majority and minority reports and the majority's response, if any, must be submitted to the department head and included in the candidate's dossier.

5.9 Individuals in the titles of Instructional Assistant or Instructional Associate Professor may be considered for promotion to the rank above. Instructional Assistant or Associate Professor who are candidates for promotion must submit a dossier for consideration by the departmental promotion and tenure committee, following the same procedures used for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

6. **Faculty Awards Committee:** This committee will be appointed by the head with the advice of the executive committee and will supervise the nomination process for faculty awards. It will consist of at least four members who will serve two year terms, with half appointed each year.

7. **History Prize Committee:** This committee will consist of an undergraduate advisor and faculty member appointed by the head with the advice of the executive committee and will supervise the awarding of departmental prizes to undergraduate majors.

F. **Department Officers:** On both a continuing and an ad hoc basis specific functions of the department will be assigned to appointive officers. Such officers will be responsible to the faculty and the head.

1. Advised by the Executive Committee, the department head will appoint the following officers for three year terms:
1.1 Director of Graduate Studies
1.2 Associate Department Head and Director of Undergraduate Programs

2. Advised by the Executive Committee, the department head will appoint the following officers annually:

2.1 Phi Alpha Theta Adviser
2.2 History Club Adviser(s)
2.3 United Way Coordinator
2.4 Library Representative(s)

As necessary, the Department Head, with the advice of the Executive Committee, will appoint faculty members to other offices.

G **Voting Procedures:** All elections, except those involving promotion and tenure shall be conducted by e-mail with all faculty members being eligible to vote. The period for balloting shall be five calendar days with the option to cast a ballot by e-mail or the double-envelope system. Only faculty in residence may vote on hiring decisions and, by unanimous consent of those present at the meeting to discuss hiring, an offer can be made immediately after the meeting.

H **Amendment Process:** These bylaws may be amended by the full faculty on the recommendation of one-third of the faculty or the executive committee. All proposed amendments will be presented and discussed in a faculty meeting prior to a vote by secret ballot. The process of balloting will take no longer than a week and amendments will take effect if they receive the approval of a simple majority of those voting.