Introduction

These by-laws describe the method of governance for the Department of English at Texas A&M University. They are limited by the regulations and requirements of the College of Liberal Arts and of the University.

A clearly delineated body of rules and procedures is often helpful to the governance of a large university department. However, a department is primarily an academic community for whom common goals and a spirit of cooperation are ultimately more significant than written by-laws. This document is not meant to cover every detail of governance that might arise, but it provides basic definitions and an outline of rules and procedures designed to encourage effective and responsible leadership by both faculty members and the Head.

Part I: The Faculty of the Department

A. Membership

All persons holding full-time, part-time and visiting academic appointments in the Department with the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor; Instructional Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Assistant Professor; or Lecturer of any grade are members of the faculty of the Department. (Instructional ranks, Visiting Professors, and Lecturers of any grade are considered non-tenure-track faculty).

B. Voting Faculty

1. Unless otherwise specified in this document, the voting faculty includes all members of the Department holding tenured or tenure-track positions, all non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF), and all visiting and adjunct faculty.

2. The Executive Committee will decide cases of questioned status under this provision.

C. Responsibilities

Faculty responsibilities in departmental governance include:

* Election of representatives to the Executive Committee and standing committees.
* Service on committees.
* Participation in faculty meetings.
* Submission of items to be included on committee agendas.
* Petition to return unfavorable decisions on policy and personnel to the appropriate committees or Head for reconsideration.
* Review of tenure and promotion decisions by appropriate ranks.

**Part II: Officers of the Department**

**A. Head**

1. The Head is the administrative and executive officer of the Department and its spokesperson to the University administration and communities outside the University.

2. The Head, in consultation with the Executive Committee, appoints the directors, associate directors, coordinators, and the Associate Head. The Head makes other appointments to fill unexpired terms on committees and to assist in the daily operation of the Department.

3. At least every two years, the Head seeks the written opinion of the Department regarding the performance of the departmental administrators.

4. In some matters, the Head is granted a separate opinion or recommendation (e.g., tenure). It is nonetheless assumed that the Head normally supports the decisions of the appropriate committees or the faculty as a whole or both. In cases of disagreement, the Head will explain his/her position to the faculty or appropriate committee and include relevant votes of committees or the Department as a whole when reporting to the College and the University.

**B. Associate Head**

The Associate Head is appointed by the Head in Consultation with the Executive Committee to a renewable term of three years.

**C. Directors**

The Directors of Graduate Studies and Undergraduate Studies are appointed by the Head in consultation with the Executive Committee, normally to no more than two consecutive terms of three years each. Appointments are to be ratified by majority vote of the faculty.

**D. Associate Directors**

Associate Directors are appointed by the Head, in consultation with the relevant Director(s) and with the Executive Committee, to renewable terms of three years.
E. **Coordinators**

Coordinators of programs are appointed by the Head in consultation with the Executive Committee to renewable terms of three years.

**Part III: Committees of the Department**

A. **The Executive Committee**

1. **Membership**
   a. The Executive Committee consists of seven voting members: the Directors of the Department (appointed by the Head), one professor, one associate professor, one assistant professor, one non-tenure-track faculty member elected by the department (one-year term). There is one non-voting graduate student (elected by the graduate students; one-year term); there may be one non-voting staff member (selected by the staff; one-year term). The Associate Head is a non-voting member ex officio.

   b. Voting members in the professorial ranks serve staggered two-year terms. The non-tenure-track faculty member and the graduate student each serve a one-year term. No one may serve more than two consecutive terms.

2. **Meetings**
   a. The Executive Committee meets as often as necessary to conduct its business, but in any case it must meet at least once every two months during the academic year.

   b. The Executive Committee's meetings are open, except when closed by a minimum two-thirds vote of the Committee. The Chair is responsible for posting a notice of agenda items before the meeting and for the distribution of minutes of each meeting within 72 hours to all department faculty and to the English Graduate Student Association.

3. **Duties**
   a. The Executive Committee advises the Department Head on the day-to-day administration of the business of the Department.

   b. The Executive Committee serves as the Department's budget advisory committee, advising the Head on the allocation of the Department's resources.

   c. The Executive Committee serves as the Department's advisory committee on all personnel-matters, including those which arise on an ad hoc basis.
The Executive Committee serves as the Head's advisory committee on departmental appointments to ad hoc committees which do not fall within the purview of the standing committees.

d. The Executive Committee has the primary responsibility of assessing, in consultation with the faculty, the staffing needs of the Department; it coordinates the search for candidates for new positions.

i. The Executive Committee recommends to the Head appointments to the search committee. In cases of appointment to senior ranks, a second search committee may be convened. A search committee submits advertisements, reviews dossiers, consults with appropriate faculty, and submits recommendations to the full faculty.

ii. The Head in consultation with the Executive Committee calls a faculty meeting to consider the final recommendations of the search committee for all positions other than lecturers. The recommendations of the search committee will then be forwarded to the Head with the advice and consent of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

iii. The tenured and tenure-track faculty may recommend that the Head make provisional offers to tenure-track candidates at the Modern Language Association annual conference.

e. The Executive Committee reviews the actions of the Department's standing committees.

i. The Executive Committee may not reverse a decision of a standing committee, nor may it rewrite standing committee documents. However, it may upon a simple majority of those voting, refer the actions or documents of any standing committee back to the committee for reconsideration.

ii. If a matter has been referred back to the standing committee and that committee's response is still unacceptable to a simple majority of the Executive Committee, the Head convenes a meeting of the full faculty to resolve the matter.

iii. The actions of the ad hoc committees are reviewed either by the Executive Committee or the full faculty depending upon the charge given to that particular committee.

f. The Executive Committee rules on questions of interpretation of these by-laws.

g. The Executive Committee operates with the advice and consent of the full faculty.
i. As part of its consideration of any matters which significantly affect the professional lives of the faculty, or matters clearly controversial, the Executive Committee calls for a meeting of the full faculty to discuss and if necessary vote upon the matter at hand.

ii. The Executive Committee may, upon a simple majority vote of those members present, call for a department meeting.

iii. Decisions of the committee are subject to review by the full faculty upon formal petition by 20% of the voting faculty.

B. Graduate Studies Committee

1. Membership

a. The Graduate Studies Committee consists of five voting members: three faculty members elected at-large by the graduate faculty, two members appointed by the Head in consultation with the Director of Graduate Studies and the Executive Committee. Any Associate Graduate Directors are non-voting members ex officio. There is one non-voting graduate student (elected by the graduate students; one-year term).

b. Faculty members serve staggered three-year renewable terms; graduate student members serve one-year renewable terms.

2. Meetings

The Director of Graduate Studies chairs the Committee and votes in the case of a tie. The Director is responsible for posting minutes after its meeting and for reporting in writing its decisions and recommendations to the Head as chair of the Executive Committee.

C. Undergraduate Studies Committee

1. Membership

a. The Undergraduate Studies Committee consists of five voting members: three members of the faculty elected at-large and two members of the faculty appointed by the Head in consultation with the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Executive Committee. Program Coordinators (if any) serve as voting members ex officio. Any Associate Undergraduate Directors are non-voting members ex officio. There is one non-voting graduate student (elected by the
graduate students; one-year term). There may be one non-voting undergraduate student appointed by the Director of Undergraduate Studies (one-year term).

b. Voting members serve staggered three-year renewable terms. The Associate Directors (if any) serve as a non-voting member

2. Meetings

The Director of Undergraduate Studies chairs the committee and votes in the case of a tie. The Director is responsible for posting minutes and reporting in writing its decisions and recommendations to the Head as chair of the Executive Committee.

D. Evaluation Advisory Committee

1. Membership

a. The Committee consists of five members selected from the tenured faculty on a rotating basis. The Head, Associate Head, and Directors of Graduate Studies and Undergraduate Studies are not eligible to serve.

b. The Head appoints the Chair of the Committee.

c. Members serve staggered two-year terms.

2. Duties

a. The Committee will review the Annual Checklists of all tenured and tenure-track faculty, evaluating each faculty member's performance in scholarship (or creative writing), teaching, and service.

b. The Head evaluates the members of the Evaluation Advisory Committee.

c. The Committee will provide its recommendations to the Head, who will inform individual faculty members of their evaluations. The Head also will provide individual faculty members the opportunity to discuss the evaluation prior to forwarding the final recommendations to the Dean.

d. The Head will allocate the Departmental salary increments on the basis of the Committee guidelines and whatever additional factors are pertinent to faculty raises.

e. The Committee also provides recommendations for faculty to be nominated for college and university research and teaching awards.
E. Strategic Planning Committee

1. Membership
   a. The Committee consists of six members: the Associate Head, three members of the faculty (a full professor, an associate, and an assistant professor) elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and two members appointed by the Head in consultation with the Executive Committee.

   b. The Head appoints the Chair of the committee.

   c. Members serve staggered 2-year terms.

2. Meetings

   The Committee will meet as often as necessary to conduct its work, but in any case will meet once in the fall and spring semesters.

3. Duties

   a. The Committee will assess progress on goals outlined in the department’s strategic planning document.

   b. The Committee in consultation with the Head and the Executive Committee will develop revised or new strategic planning documents as required and present them to the faculty. If necessary, the Committee in consultation with the Head and Executive Committee will subsequently refine revised or new strategic planning documents based on faculty input.

   c. The Committee will inform faculty of staffing issues and changes; gather information and consult faculty and graduate students about hiring needs with reference to goals outlined in the department’s strategic planning document; and prepare an annual report concerning progress toward strategic planning goals and hiring priorities in the Spring semester.

   d. The Head in consultation with the Executive Committee and the Strategic Planning Committee will call a faculty meeting to discuss the recommendations in the Strategic Planning Committee report.

F. Review Committee for First-Year Ph.D. Students

1. Membership

   a. The Committee consists of six members who are appointed by the Head of Department, in consultation with the Director of Graduate Studies.

   b. Faculty members serve staggered two-year terms
2. Meetings

Either the Director or Associate Director of Graduate Studies chairs the Committee and votes in the case of a tie. The Chair is responsible for reporting its decisions and recommendations to the Graduate Faculty, who will then vote on each candidate, and the Head of the Department.

3. Duties

The Chair, along with the Director of Graduate Studies, will meet with each First-Year Review candidate upon the conclusion of the review to discuss the Faculty feedback and vote.

G. Technology Committee

1. Membership

   a. The committee consists of six members: the Associate Head (ex officio), the senior Instructional Technology staff person, one graduate student elected by the graduate students, and two members appointed by the Head in consultation with the Executive Committee.

   b. The Head appoints the Chair of the Committee.

   c. Appointed members serve staggered 2-year terms.

2. Duties

   a. The Committee will meet as often as necessary to conduct its work, but in any case will meet at least once in the fall and spring semesters.

   b. The Committee will be responsible for overseeing and responding to the technology needs of the department and will make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Head, the Executive Committee and the faculty.

H. Tenure and Promotion and Review Sub-committees

1. The Department Head consults with candidates for tenure and promotion and, in consultation with the subcommittee of the Executive Committee (consisting of tenured members of the Executive Committee or, when candidates for promotion are NTTF, consisting also of Instructional full and associate professors serving on the Executive Committee), establishes a Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee for each candidate. The subcommittee of the Executive Committee reviews and approves assignments to the Tenure and Promotion Sub-committees. The Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee consists of a Chair, who produces the candidate’s
summary, and two committee members: one member handles the candidate’s research and one committee member handles the candidates teaching and service components. For promotion within the non-tenure track instructional professor ranks, the Promotion Sub-committee consists of a Chair, who produces the candidate’s summary, and two committee members: one member handles the candidate’s teaching (and research if applicable) and one committee member handles the candidate’s service component.

2. The Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee for individual candidates makes available the reports and full dossiers to eligible faculty. Eligibility is determined as follows: tenured faculty members vote on tenure decisions; full professors vote on promotion to the rank of full, associate, and assistant professor; associate professors vote on promotion to the rank of associate and assistant professor. When the candidates are in the non-tenure track instructional professor ranks, eligibility is determined as follows: full professors and instructional full professors vote on promotion to the rank of instruction full, associate and assistant professor; associate professors and instructional associate professors vote on promotion to the rank of instructional associate professors and instructional assistant professors.

3. The Department Head convenes eligible faculty as a Personnel Committee, to discuss each candidate. At this meeting, the candidate’s individual Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee puts forward its report and answers faculty questions. Only faculty eligible to vote for a candidate may attend the part of the meeting concerning that candidate. Voting is by signed confidential ballot. Voting faculty must affirm that they have reviewed the candidate’s files and must provide a written explanation of their vote. Eligible faculty members who cannot attend the meeting because of professional commitments may vote absentee by completing the evaluation form and ballot during the week before the formal meeting. The votes are counted by the Elections Sub-committee and summarized by the chair of the candidate’s Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee.

4. Within 48 hours of the Personnel Committee meeting, the Election Sub-committee tabulates votes, including absentee ballots, and informs the faculty of the results. The number of invalid ballots, if any, will be noted.

5. The chair of the candidate’s Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee summarizes the written explanations attached to the votes. The Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee must approve the chair’s summary of the votes, the teaching report, the research report, and the service report. The chair then forwards these reports to the Department Head.

I. The Diversity Committee

1. Membership

   a. The committee consists of 7 members: Five members are elected by the department: three at the tenured level; one assistant professor; one non-tenure
track faculty (one-year appointment); one graduate student elected by the graduate students (one-year appointment); one staff member selected by the staff (one-year appointment).

b. From among the elected members, the department Head appoints the Chair and also the Department’s representative on the College of Liberal Arts Diversity Committee.

c. All elected and appointed members will serve two-year terms, except where noted.

2. Meetings
The Committee will meet as often as necessary to conduct its work but not less than twice in the fall and twice in the spring semester.

3. Duties
a. The Committee is responsible for supporting the College’s goals of diversity and collegiality within programs and departments by working to address issues of climate with regard to racial, ethnic, gender, sexuality, religion, disability and other differences in the Department.

b. The Committee will draft action plans in response to problems raised in climate surveys executed by the dean’s office, as well as climate concerns not expressed in those surveys. It will monitor the implementation of approved plans.

c. The Department Head in consultation with the Executive Committee and the Diversity Committee will call a faculty meeting to discuss the recommendations of the Diversity Committee with regard to climate.

d. The committee will provide annual reports to the Head and department about measures adopted to improve climate and about continuing problems.

Part IV: Procedures of the Department

A. Department Meetings

1. The full Department meets as often as necessary to conduct its business. It must meet at least once each semester during the academic year. Graduate students have the privilege of the floor in Department meetings but do not vote.

2. Normally, the Head calls departmental meetings. Meetings may also be called by the Executive Committee or by a petition endorsed by at least 20% of the voting faculty.
3. The Head provides timely written notice of each Department meeting and, in consultation with the Executive Committee, an agenda of specific items to be considered.

4. The Head or a designated substitute chairs the Department meetings.

5. The Associate Head will provide a written summary of department meetings when appropriate.


7. No substantive matter may be voted upon at a departmental meeting unless it appears on the agenda for that meeting.

8. A quorum consists of a simple majority of resident eligible voting faculty members.

9. The Department normally votes by show of hands. However, any voting member present may call for a written ballot.

B. Elections

1. Regular Elections to Standing Committees
   a. Elections to fill committee vacancies are by secret ballot of the voting faculty, unless otherwise specified.
   b. Election to a standing committee requires that the candidate receive the greatest number of votes cast for the position and at least 40% of the total number of ballots cast for the position. Where two positions on a committee are to be filled, the two candidates receiving the greatest number of votes and at least 40% of the total number of ballots cast will be elected. Where three positions on a committee are to be filled, the three candidates receiving the greatest number of votes and receiving at least 40% of the total number of ballots cast for the position will be elected. As necessary, run-off elections will be held with a slate of the candidates receiving the greatest number of votes; the slate will be limited to the number of vacant positions plus one. In order for a ballot to be valid, all places under consideration must be marked.
   c. In the case of a tied vote, a revote will be held. If there is a second tie, candidates will draw straws.
d. A standing subcommittee of the Executive Committee consisting of the voting members from the professorial ranks serving the first year of their two-year terms will serve as the Elections Committee. This subcommittee will be responsible for posting vacancies, taking and posting nominations, publishing voting instructions, distributing and collecting the ballots, counting the ballots and announcing results.

2. Regular elections to fill committee vacancies will follow this procedure:
   a. On the last Monday in March, the Elections Committee will post a list of committee vacancies for the following academic year and call for written nominations from the faculty.
   b. The Elections Committee will post nominations as they are received.
   c. The deadline for nominations will be 5:00 p.m. on the first Monday in April.
   d. On the second Monday in April, the Elections Committee will distribute a ballot and voting instructions to the voting faculty. The deadline for voting will be at 5:00 p.m. on the second Friday in April.
   e. The Elections Committee will post a time and location for counting the ballots, count the ballots, and post the results.
   f. The Elections Committee will set the time and procedure for any necessary run-off elections. Run-off election ballots will be counted and the results announced in the same manner as those of the regular election.

3. The Head, in consultation with the Executive Committee and the Chair of the appropriate committee, appoints faculty members to fill any vacancies until the next regularly scheduled election.

C. Terms of Office

Terms of office for regularly appointed and elected positions begin with the academic year following election or appointment. Appointments to fill unexpired terms begin immediately upon appointment. Terms of office expire with the end of the academic year corresponding to the length of the term. If an emergency meeting of the Executive Committee is called in the summer, both outgoing and newly elected members of the Executive Committee will be asked to attend.

D. Petitions

All petitions provided for in this document are received by the Head, as chair of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will act on each petition in a timely manner.
Part V: Procedures for the Ratification and Amendment of the By-Laws

A. Ratification

These by-laws will take effect when they have been ratified by a vote of two-thirds of those voting. The vote, by secret ballot, will be organized by the Head.

B. Amendments

1. These by-laws may be amended by the initiative of the Executive Committee or by faculty petition, but each method requires ratification by a faculty vote.

2. Proposals for amendments initiated through faculty petition must be signed by 20% of the voting faculty.

3. The faculty shall vote upon proposed amendments through a mail ballot conducted only during the Fall or Spring semesters. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must be approved by two-thirds of the faculty voting.
Document A: Promotion and Tenure Policy Guidelines

Promotion to Associate Professor

Consideration of an assistant professor for tenure and promotion to associate professor is ordinarily determined by statements set forth in letters of appointment, statements that in turn follow AAUP guidelines mandating the timing of tenure review. The formal consideration of assistant professors for tenure and promotion to associate professor begins in the spring semester prior to the academic year during which the candidacy will be considered. The process follows the schedule and guidelines published by the Dean of Faculties and the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

Promotion to Full Professor

During each spring semester, and no later than the Monday following Spring Break, the department head will send to all associate professors and full professors an invitation for nominations or self-nominations for preliminary consideration for promotion to full professor. Self-nominations and nominations are regarded as having equal standing. Each nomination should include a statement indicating that the nominee has been consulted and is willing to have his or her materials considered. Each nominee will provide a current vita and representative publications for review by all full professors. The full professors will then meet and discuss each nominee. The purpose of the meeting is to offer a response and advice to each nominee regarding the prospects for promotion, and the substance of the discussion will be shared with the nominee at a meeting with the department head. Regardless of the perspectives of the full professor and the department head, the decision about whether or not to pursue the promotion lies with the individual faculty member.

Research

The Department expects all members to be active in pursuing a research agenda that leads to regular publication of work in professionally recognized outlets. Typically, a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor will have a book completed, but this is not the only appropriate research profile. Depending on the field, for example, a thematically linked series of articles may be more appropriate. In English, a first book is customarily an extensively revised version of the doctoral dissertation. In addition, the candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of progress beyond the original dissertation work.

Promotion to full professor signifies national recognition. Excellence in teaching and significant service are expected, but normally this level of promotion rests primarily on demonstrated accomplishment in research and publication subsequent to tenure and promotion to associate professor. The primary criteria for research productivity are the quality of the research, the prestige of the venue, and the impact of the publications. In English, promotion to full professor typically has been based on the publication of a single-authored monograph or substantive...
scholarly edition from a reputable scholarly press judged to represent high-quality research. In some cases, national recognition may rest on a different scholarly profile, e.g., a series of edited collections, substantive articles, publications in refereed electronic venues, or an equivalent body of creative work.

Research productivity is judged by quality foremost as determined by such measures as: refereed vs. non-refereed journals, presses, and electronic sources; professional standing of journals, presses, and electronic sources; reviews, awards, and other evidence of impact on the discipline.

More specifically:

• Single-authored books; substantial scholarly critical editions; substantial articles in refereed journals; chapters in refereed books; refereed edited collections of essays; co-authored/co-edited work; and collaborative work are normally the most highly valued research products as reflecting the most serious investment of scholarly research and creativity.

• Reviews are normally valued least (with the exception of substantial review articles), but again, the professional standing of the outlet may affect its weighting.

• Conference papers and internal research grants are valued, but primarily as evidence of research in progress.

• Given the scarcity of external grants available to faculty in English, the absence of such grants is not deemed significant.

• In the case of creative works (stories, poems, essays, novels, etc.) similar standards apply, in that, again, both quantity and quality are considered, as well as the stature of the publication or press.

• For interdisciplinary work the same criteria in terms of venue and refereed status apply.

• Differences in the customary handling of such publications (e.g., reliance, at some prestigious journals, on an editor rather than a referee process) are also recognized. (See the University list of indicators of excellence and effectiveness in scholarly activities attached.)

Teaching

The department expects every faculty member to teach at a consistently effective level and encourages excellence in teaching. Evaluation of teaching will not be based solely or primarily on student course evaluations, but will reflect a review of such related indicators as course syllabi, evidence of course development, peer evaluations (required for pre-tenure reviews), direction of graduate students, service on committees of graduate students, direction of individual studies, publications relating to teaching, receipt of grants for development of courses, faculty statements on the annual checklist about their aims and methods, etc. (See the University list of indicators of excellence and effectiveness in teaching, attached.)
Evaluation of teaching must also take into account the nature of the course being taught. For example, large-enrollment sections present particular challenges, as do courses normally enrolling a high percentage of non-majors who take the course to satisfy a requirement.

Service

The department expects every member to participate constructively in the life of the department. Such participation is normally demonstrated by regular attendance at meetings, constructive participation in decision-making and other aspects of the functioning of the department.

- Assistant Professors are not expected to perform service beyond the demonstration of good citizenship; there is an expectation, however, that service will increase after third-year reviews.

- For Associate and Full Professors, service includes such activities as advising students (as distinct from teaching), constructive colleagueship (i.e., mentoring or assistance of others in fulfilling their duties and maturing as scholars), service on elected and/or appointed committees, and administrative appointments. It may also be demonstrated by service on the Faculty Senate or on College or University committees and service to the profession (such as reviewing papers for journals, chairing sessions at conferences, or serving as an officer of a professional society).

This statement should be read in conjunction with the Tenure-Promotion Procedures of the College of Liberal Arts, which acknowledge the possibility of exceptional situations.

March 22, 2007
Approved by English faculty vote
April 5, 2007

Approved by Dean of Faculties and Dean of Liberal Arts
July 30, 2007

Document B: Promotion Guidelines for Instructional Professor

Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

The formal consideration of instructional assistant professor for promotion to instructional associate professor normally requires at least five years in the instructional assistant professor rank and strong evidence of quality performance in teaching and service. During each spring semester, and no later than the Monday following Spring Break, the department head will send to all instructional professors and tenure/tenure track faculty an invitation for nominations or self-nominations for preliminary consideration for promotion to instructional associate professor. The
process follows the schedule and guidelines published by the Dean of Faculties and the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

**Promotion to Instructional Full Professor**

Promotion to instructional full professor normally requires at least ten years of teaching and service, evidence of quality performance, and some indication of recognition at the University or professional level. During each spring semester, and no later than the Monday following Spring Break, the department head will send to all instructional associate and full professors and tenured faculty an invitation for nominations or self-nominations for preliminary consideration for promotion to instructional full professor. Self-nominations and nominations are regarded as having equal standing. Each nomination should include a statement indicating that the nominee has been consulted and is willing to have his or her materials considered. Each nominee will provide a current vita for review by all full professors. The full professors, including instructional full professors, will then meet and discuss each nominee. The purpose of the meeting is to offer a response and advice to each nominee regarding the prospects for promotion, and the substance of the discussion will be shared with the nominee at a meeting with the department head. Regardless of the perspectives of the full professors and the department head, the decision about whether or not to pursue the promotion lies with the individual faculty member.

**Teaching**

The department expects every faculty member to teach at a consistently effective level and encourages excellence in teaching. Evaluation of teaching will not be based solely or primarily on student course evaluations, but will reflect a review of such related indicators as course syllabi, evidence of course development, peer evaluations, direction of individual studies, publications relating to teaching, receipt of grants for development of courses, faculty statements on the annual checklist about their aims and methods, and significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness.

Evaluation of teaching must also take into account the nature of the course being taught. For example, large-enrollment sections present particular challenges, as do courses normally enrolling a high percentage of non-majors who take the course to satisfy a requirement.

**Service**

The department expects every member to participate constructively in the life of the department. Such participation is normally demonstrated by regular attendance at meetings, constructive participation in decision-making and other aspects of the functioning of the department. Faculty in the instructional ranks are expected to make long-term, significant service contributions.

Service includes such activities as advising students (as distinct from teaching), constructive colleagueship (i.e., mentoring or assistance of others in fulfilling their duties and maturing as instructors), service on elected and/or appointed committees, and administrative appointments. It may also be demonstrated by service on the Faculty Senate or on College or University
committees and service to the profession (such as reviewing papers for journals, chairing sessions at conferences, or serving as an officer of a professional society).

This statement should be read in conjunction with the “Hiring and Promoting Faculty in Non-Tenure Track Titles in the College of Liberal Arts” (approved 2009) and the CLLA “Guidelines for Faculty Titles,” (approved 2008) policy statements.

**Materials Submitted to Department by candidates for Instructional Associate or Full Professor**

1. Candidate’s Personal Statement on Teaching (Max 3 typed pages, 10-12 point, 1 inch margins)
2. Candidate’s CV (Be sure CV is in appropriate format)
3. Teaching materials (syllabi, handouts, formal teaching portfolio, etc.)
4. Service materials
5. Other material documenting professional development

**Content of Dossiers for Promotion to Instructional Associate or Full Professor, submitted by Department to College**

1. Candidate’s Personal Statement
2. Candidate’s CV; Include signed statement that CV is current and correct as of signature date
3. Candidate’s Verification of contents Letter
4. Dated statement signed by candidate verifying list of all materials submitted for review
5. Departmental Evaluation of Quality of Teaching
   Include tabular summary of student ratings, include actual rating sheets with supplemental materials
6. Departmental Evaluation of the Quality of Service
7. Letters of evaluation: at least three and no more than six letters of evaluation from outside the department or outside the university that speak to teaching and service accomplishments and contributions.
8. Departmental Committee Summary Report and Evaluation (Give vote and explain outcome. Committee members sign report or statement that the report is an accurate summary of the meeting
9. Head’s Recommendation
10. College Committee Summary Report and Recommendation
11. Recommendation of Dean

**Document C: Annual Review of Tenured Faculty**

**Preamble**

The goal of the annual evaluation is to determine whether a tenured faculty member is continuing to fulfill professional expectations in all three areas that form a dynamic and engaged scholarly or creative profile and to provide a method for the better recognition and
encouragement of meritorious performance. The overall profile, as described in the narrative statement and documented in the form, should demonstrate that the individual is actively engaged in the advancement of knowledge and thereby the enhancement of the reputation and visibility of the department within the college, the university, and the scholarly community at large. This is shown in terms of scholarship and creative work, in implementing best practices and effective teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and in serving in roles that sustain and enhance the intellectual life of the department, the university, and the profession. In order to assess teaching performance, types of service, and progress towards research and creative goals, the evaluation form spans a window of 5 years†; this larger overview serves to enable and encourage the individual’s development of significant and sustained scholarly and creative projects as described in the narrative statement, to permit the faculty member to present consistent and verifiable patterns in terms of teaching practices, and to confirm the nature and extent of committee work and professional service both inside and external to the university. It is not to be assumed that all cases that surpass expectations are equal; finer distinctions among clearly meritorious records lie within the discretion of the department head and the salary advisory committee based on discipline-appropriate judgments of relative quantity, quality, visibility, and impact.

†The five year period of time for the window of assessment is in keeping with the post tenure review processes at peer and aspirational peer universities.

Service

Faculty service falls into three general categories: citizenship, impact, and visibility. The first is expected of all tenure-stream faculty members, with the second and third being more typical for senior faculty. Citizenship embraces the standard running of the department and is characterized by activities such as regular attendance at departmental meetings, membership on departmental committees, casting departmental ballots as eligible, volunteering for appropriate ad hoc activities, and the like. Impact includes higher-profile department, college, or university service including but not limited to active mentoring of junior and new faculty, chairing a departmental committee, serving on or chairing a TAMU committee beyond department level, or filling a TAMU administrative role within or beyond the department level. Visibility refers to extra-University professional service including but not limited to organizing a conference or academic event; serving on an editorial board or program advisory board beyond TAMU; holding office in a professional organization; serving as a tenure or promotion reviewer for another institution; serving as an invited peer reviewer for a journal, book publisher, or grant giving organization.
To meet expectations over a five-year period: a tenured faculty member should present a record of consistent good citizenship within and beyond the department, including service to the profession at large, appropriate to rank and length of service and as evidenced by factors such as:

- Membership (need not be concurrent) on at least two standing or ad hoc departmental committees (e.g., EC, USC, GSC, Tenure and Promotion, Strategic Planning, Diversity, search committees), or on one departmental committee and one committee beyond the department level, such as a college or university committee (e.g., Faculty Senate, Liberal Arts Council, Writing Center Course Advisory Committee).
- A record of consistent participation in ad hoc departmental service opportunities such as presentations at brown-bags, the shepherding of visitors, coordination of guest speakers for departmental or interdisciplinary working groups, mentoring, assisting with graduate student placement efforts, and the like. Some of these endeavors (such as mentoring first-time teachers) clearly take more time and energy than others, and the evaluation committee is urged to consider the amount of effort on display as a factor when determining whether service expectations have been met or exceeded.
- Service to the profession as measured by at least five instances over the five-year period of some combination of any of the following: a book review in a quality peer-reviewed venue, a report for a professional journal/publisher/grants agency, an invited tenure or midterm faculty review, invited service as the external member on a thesis/dissertation committee for another university, assembling (and perhaps also chairing) a panel at a national or international conference, membership on the organizing committee for a local or regional conference.

To exceed expectations: a tenured faculty member should show one or more of the below:

- Unusually deep/extensive fulfillment of expectations from the above list or similar achievements.
- Evidence of good departmental citizenship as measured by factors such as those on the above list, in combination with successful administrative leadership within or beyond the department.
- Evidence of good departmental citizenship as measured by factors such as those on the above list, in combination with evidence of national reputation such as elected or appointed office in a relevant professional organization, membership on (or chairship of) the organizing committee for a national or international conference, membership on an editorial board, editorship of a book series, or invited service on a national or international grant review committee.

Teaching
Faculty should demonstrate teaching competence in three broad areas: classroom instruction, graduate and undergraduate mentoring, and course development. Instructional competence includes all activities associated with the fair and effective management of regularly scheduled, multi-student courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Mentoring involves participation on graduate committees as appropriate to rank and field and may also include directed readings at the graduate and undergraduate levels and the direction of significant undergraduate research projects. Course development entails the ongoing maintenance of syllabi in regularly scheduled courses, contributions to course offerings in the form of proposals for senior seminars, single-author studies, or graduate seminars, and availability to teach a reasonable variety of courses at all levels over the course of a five-year period.

To meet expectations over a five-year period: a tenured faculty member should present a record of consistent, high-quality teaching as evidenced by the following:

- coherent and comprehensive syllabi that reflect departmental course descriptions and university policies and require assessments and assignments appropriate to the level of the course
- adherence to university policies regarding the timely submission of syllabi, curriculum vitae and grades
- availability to teach courses at all levels and within a range of subject areas as appropriate for rank and field
- an annual average ranking of “satisfactory” on university and departmental teaching evaluations
- active service on graduate committees and honors thesis committees as required by field and appropriate to rank

A faculty member may exceed expectations in the area of teaching: by winning a teaching award recognized by the Faculty Senate or from a professionally recognized body external to the university, doing significant service on eight or more graduate or honors thesis committees*, chairing three or more Ph.D. committees*, or by demonstrating a consistent record of achievement with at least two of the following:

- an annual average score on university and/or departmental evaluations that is markedly higher than the departmental average.
- evidence of frequent engagement in pedagogical training such as CTE or technology workshops
- evidence of significant technological innovation or of significant course development related to the implementation of technology
- evidence of substantial contributions to course development or creation
- significant course development that furthers university initiatives in service learning, study abroad, or diversity
- a grant for teaching or course development
- evidence of significant and sustained mentoring of individual students at the graduate or undergraduate levels
*numbers are subject to change upon the advice of the Director of Graduate Studies in response to changing conditions such as enrollments.

---

**Research**

The goal of the evaluation is to determine whether the individual demonstrates an active research or creative agenda. The desired profile for research demonstrates the creation and the completion of significant research projects which might culminate in a monograph, scholarly edition, digital project, or a thematically coherent set of essays, published in well-regarded print or electronic peer-reviewed venues. The standards defined in this document for “meets” and “exceeds” expectations in research are intended to encourage faculty to be consistently productive, to produce high quality work and to be ambitious in placing that work (whether authored or editorial in nature) with top peer-reviewed presses, in nationally and internationally prominent peer-reviewed journals, and in other high impact print and electronic venues including edited collections from prestigious presses.

**Scholarship**

To meet or exceed expectations over a five-year period: a faculty member should present a record of consistent, substantive, and significant peer-reviewed scholarly or creative work, as evidenced by achievements such as, but not limited to the following unranked list:

- a substantial monograph published with a respected university or trade academic press
- a substantial critical edition with an introduction and scholarly apparatus
- digital databases, archives, and research tools whose creation involves serious intellectual work and is consistent with best practices in digital scholarship
- a book manuscript under contract with a respected university or trade academic press
- peer-reviewed scholarly articles in good-quality venues
- book chapters in edited volumes
- a substantial edited book from a respected university or trade academic press
- editing a scholarly journal
- external fellowships and grants
- invited work in prominent venues
- editing an issue of a scholarly journal
- a textbook from a respected publisher of textbooks
- omnibus reviews or article-length reviews
- internal grants

Following norms at peer and aspirational peer institutions, the benchmark for **meets expectations** is 3 substantial, well-placed peer-reviewed articles, or the equivalent as part of a profile of ongoing scholarly and creative activity to be evaluated in relation to normative criteria in the discipline, including number, length, venue, visibility, and impact. It should not be
assumed that a higher number of publications is automatically superior to 3 high-visibility, high-impact placements or than any three articles necessarily meet this standard.

The category of **exceeds expectations** demonstrates accomplishment significantly surpassing the basic benchmark taking into account number, length, venue, visibility, and impact.

**Creative Writing**

The benchmark for **meets expectations** is one of the following, to be evaluated in relation to length, venue, visibility, and impact: fifteen or more poems; 4-6 stories; a novella; a play performed in a respected venue; a screenplay optioned by a studio; 4-6 creative non-fiction essays in respected venues.

The category of **exceeds expectations** demonstrates accomplishment significantly surpassing the basic benchmark taking into account number, length, venue, visibility, and impact. Examples would include: a book of poetry; a novel; a substantial short story collection; a collection of novellas; a collection of non-fiction essays.

---

**Guidelines for Department Head and Evaluation Advisory Committee in Conducting the Annual Review**

As stated in the preamble to this document, the annual evaluation process is designed to enable and encourage the individual faculty member’s development of significant and sustained scholarly and creative projects as defined in the narrative statement, to permit the faculty member to present consistent and verifiable patterns in terms of teaching practices, and to confirm the nature and extent of committee work and professional service both inside and external to the university.

**In evaluating teaching and service**, the five-year window is designed to encourage flexibility and discretion in assessing the individual faculty member’s performance in the context of the broader goals of promoting consistent, high-quality teaching, active citizenship in the department, high impact service within the university, and highly visible contributions to the profession at large. The Head and the Advisory Committee will need to make judgments about the different responsibilities and impacts of varying teaching and service activities, and should also take into account the rhythms, stages and one-time factors marking individual careers that affect faculty performance in these areas. It is evident, for example, that factors such as class size and level, honors designation and the luck of the draw can all affect course evaluation numbers in a given semester. A faculty member may develop several new courses over a period of a few years, followed by a period of appropriately repeating and refining those courses, and in a given year (i.e. a faculty development leave or external fellowship) may do no teaching at all. Similarly, opportunities for faculty service will naturally vary at different stages of individual careers. A full professor may be more likely to be asked to serve on a major university committee than a newly-tenured associate professor. Someone who serves as President of a national scholarly organization will, in all probability, never be asked to serve in that capacity.
again, just as someone who is awarded a college or university teaching award is unlikely to receive the same award in the years immediately following.

**In the area of research**, a one-size-fits-all set of criteria is especially difficult to define. Given the widely varied research profiles of department faculty, the Department Head and Evaluation Committee must show flexibility and discretion in evaluating the individual faculty member’s scholarly and/or creative work over the five-year window. Evaluators need to consider not only the number and length of faculty publications, but also the visibility and impact of the work in the discipline. Visibility and impact are indicators of quality: visibility is an assumption about the prominence of the venue; impact requires more time to manifest itself in such things as book prizes and awards, invitations to give talks, reprints, frequency and prominence of citations, etc.

In practice, such flexibility in evaluating faculty research will necessitate a variety of judgment calls. For example, in determining whether a given faculty member has met expectations as defined (“3 substantial peer-reviewed articles, or the equivalent as part of a profile of ongoing scholarly and creative activity”), certain non-refereed publications/activities might be judged equivalent to a peer-reviewed article, for instance, a substantial invited contribution to a high-impact edited collection, or responsibility for publishing a “The Year’s Contributions to ______ Studies” round-up in a respected journal. Again, while we want to encourage publication in top journals (PMLA or ELH, for example), evaluators should also recognize significant placements published in high-quality but more specialized venues that are likely to have major impact in specific sub-fields.

Similarly, in determining what level/kind of productivity “exceeds expectations” (defined as “accomplishment significantly surpassing the basic benchmark”), evaluators will need to consider such factors as: the visibility and impact of journal-editing and special-issue-editing activity; the nature and origin of an edited book collection (how prominent is the press? how prominent are the contributors? does the book include a substantial introduction? is the volume a lightly-edited “conference proceedings” or a more originally-conceived and more substantial scholarly product?); the difference between a lightly-edited paperback edition and a full-scale scholarly edition; the distinctions between conference papers and invited keynote addresses, or between major national grants (ACLS, Guggenheim) and internal grants (i.e. Glasscock Center fellowships); etc. Moreover, it should be recognized that certain kinds of professional accomplishment—keynote addresses at particular conferences; publication in some venues; receipt of specific major national grants—are not likely to be frequently repeated.

Evaluators should bear in mind the fact that some faculty members may present achievements in both creative and scholarly endeavors. Finally, given the complexity and variety of judgments to be made, the Head and the Committee are urged to seek guidance as needed from appropriate faculty with regard to the prominence of particular venues (presses, journals, book collections) and activities (conferences organized; editorial work) in particular subfields within the discipline; reputable external peer-reviewing groups and committees (for example, in the field of digital humanities) may also be consulted as needed.
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Document D: Annual Checklist for Tenure Track Faculty

FORMAT FOR
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
FACULTY CHECKLIST
Calendar Year ______

The goal of the annual evaluation is to determine whether a tenured faculty member is continuing to fulfill professional expectations in all three areas that form a dynamic and engaged scholarly or creative profile and to provide a method for the better recognition and encouragement of meritorious performance that exceeds expectations. For all dimensions of the checklist you are asked to indicate accomplishments over a five-year period. The evaluation that results from this review will in turn guide merit recommendations. It is not to be assumed that all cases that surpass expectations are equal; finer distinctions among clearly meritorious records lie within the discretion of the department head and the salary advisory committee based on discipline-appropriate judgments of relative quantity, quality, visibility, and impact.

Name:
Rank:
Date appointed to this rank:
Date appointed at A&M:
Date submitted:

CV: Please submit a copy of your current CV with this checklist

REQUIRED NARRATIVE STATEMENT: Please attach at the end of document

Please provide a narrative commentary not exceeding 500 words. Explain the contributions this year that your research, teaching, and service made to the overall mission of the department, through the criteria of venue, impact, and visibility, in the context of your five year professional performance. The overall profile, as described in the narrative statement and documented in the form, should demonstrate that the individual is actively engaged in the enhancement of the reputation and visibility of the department within the college, the university, and the scholarly community at large in terms of scholarship and creative work, is implementing best practices and effective teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and is serving in roles that sustain and enhance the intellectual life of the department, the university, and the profession. Finally, indicate (as applicable) contributions that your research, teaching, and service have made to interdisciplinarity, diversity, and/or internationalization.
I. TEACHING : Include with this checklist syllabi and student evaluation summary forms for courses taught this year only.

A. List courses taught (with enrollment) during each of the past five years and provide the overall teaching score for each; mark with an asterisk those you taught for the first time. Provide the current year's scores first and include a semester by semester listing:

B. Describe any courses you developed or significantly revised during the five calendar years, or any other contributions to curriculum development (current year first):

C. List any CTE courses or similar teaching academy events you participated in (current year first):

D. List independent studies you supervised during the five calendar years (current year first):

E. List Honors students you supervised during the last five years (current year first)

F. List masters and doctoral committees you chaired (along with their status) during the five years (current year first):

G. List masters and doctoral committees you served on (but did not chair) during the five years (current year first):

II. SERVICE (Briefly describe the nature of your service over each of the past five years)

For untenured faculty who ordinarily do not have an extensive service record, greater weight will be placed on research and teaching

A. Institutional (describe your department, college, or university service and indicate the name of committee or assignment, dates of service, and role [e.g., chair, secretary]):

B. Professional (list your offices or other important roles in learned and professional organizations, both elected and appointed):

C. Manuscript/Grant Reviewing Activity (indicate the journals, presses, or agencies for which you reviewed manuscripts or grants during the past five years):

D. Organizing scholarly or creative event, conference, symposia, or conference panel (describe the nature of the event and your role as organizer)

E. Book reviews (indicate the journal and status of the review--invited, submitted, published; substantial review articles should appear under research publications)
III. RESEARCH

A. Publications

1. **Work published** (provide full citation, including pagination; indicate whether the manuscript was refereed or unrefereed; describe your contribution to any co- or multi-authored publication; provide a brief comment after each publication describing the quality of the venue and its professional standing; **LIST THE CURRENT YEAR'S PUBLICATIONS FIRST**):

2. **Work accepted** (provide title, journal or publisher, and projected publication date; indicate whether the manuscript was refereed or unrefereed;):

3. **Work invited or under contract and in progress** (provide title, journal or publisher, and deadline):

4. **Work in progress** (please provide brief description and goals for this work)

B. Presentations

1. Invited keynote or plenary addresses presented (provide title, name of conference or event and date)

2. Invited, keynote, or plenary addresses pending (provide name of conference or event and date)

3. Readings or exhibitions for creative work (provide name and date)

4. Readings or exhibitions for creative work pending (provide name and date)

5. Conference or Institute papers presented (provide title of paper, name of organization of conference, and date; **LIST THE CURRENT YEAR'S PRESENTATIONS FIRST**)

6. Conference or Institute papers accepted (provide title of paper, name of organization or conference, and date):

C. Grants

1. Proposals funded (provide title of project, funding agency or source, and dollar amount; if other authors are involved, describe your role; **LIST THE CURRENT YEAR'S GRANTS FIRST**):

2. Proposals submitted (provide title of project, funding agency or source, date of
submission, and dollar amount; if other authors are involved, describe your role):

D. Scholarly Editing Activity (describe your work here only if it specifically involves editing responsibilities that are not covered in the sections above)

IV. AWARDS AND HONORS

Describe any prizes, honorary degrees, or other awards; NEH Summer Institutes or special seminars; editorial board memberships; faculty exchanges; or similar activities.

V. OTHER

Describe other scholarly, creative, or professional activity that seems not to fit any of the above categories.

VI. COMPLIANCE WITH UNIVERSITY REQUIREMENTS FOR EMPLOYMENT

TRAINING: Compliance with University online training programs is required by University policy. Please consult your training profile on TrainTraq (available via https://sso.tamus.edu), and complete any training required. To receive a favorable annual review, your training must be up to date.

SAFETY: Check one of the following:

a. _____ After consideration of the teaching environments where I am instructor of record in the environment, I present the following safety concerns and attempts to mitigate them (list below)

b. _____ After consideration of the teaching environments where I am instructor of record in the environment, I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.

Document E: Annual Checklist for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

FORMAT FOR
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY (NTTF) CHECKLIST
Calendar Year 2011

The goal of the annual evaluation is to determine whether a non-tenure track faculty member is continuing to fulfill professional expectations in teaching and service (for instructional track faculty) or in teaching (for lecturers). Research and publication may also be included. This evaluation should provide a method for the better recognition and
encouragement of meritorious performance that exceeds expectations. For all dimensions of the checklist you are asked to indicate accomplishments over a five-year period. The evaluation that results from this review will in turn guide merit recommendations. It is not to be assumed that all cases that surpass expectations are equal; finer distinctions among clearly meritorious records lie within the discretion of the department head.

Name: 
Rank: 
Date appointed to this rank: 
Date appointed at A&M: 
Date submitted: 

CV: Please submit a copy of your current CV with this checklist

REQUIRED NARRATIVE STATEMENT: Please attach at the end of document

Please provide a narrative commentary not exceeding 500 words. Explain the contributions this year that your teaching and service (and research/publication if applicable) made to the overall mission of the department in the context of your five year professional performance. The overall profile, as described in the narrative statement and documented in the form, should demonstrate that the individual is actively engaged in implementing best practices and effective teaching at the undergraduate and, if applicable, graduate levels, and is serving in roles that sustain and enhance the intellectual life of the department, the university, and the profession. The profile may also demonstrate the enhancement of the reputation and visibility of the department within the college, the university, and the scholarly community at large in terms of scholarship and creative work. Finally, indicate (as applicable) contributions that your teaching, service and research have made to interdisciplinarity, diversity, and/or internationalization.

I. TEACHING
   • For Instructional Track Faculty, teaching normally constitutes 70% of professional expectations.
   • Administrators may choose a 30%-weight for teaching.
   • For Lecturers, teaching is 100% of professional expectations.

Include with this checklist syllabi and student evaluation summary forms for courses taught this year only.
A. List courses taught (with enrollment) during each of the past five years and provide the overall teaching score for each; mark with an asterisk those you taught for the first time. Provide the current year's scores first and include a semester by semester listing:

B. Describe any courses you developed or significantly revised during the five calendar years, or any other contributions to curriculum development (current year first):
C. List any CTE courses or similar teaching academy events you participated in (current year first):

D. List independent studies you supervised during the five calendar years (current year first):

E. List Honors students you supervised during the last five years (current year first)

F. List masters and doctoral committees you chaired (along with their status) during the five years (current year first):

G. List masters and doctoral committees you served on (but did not chair) during the five years (current year first):

II. SERVICE (Briefly describe the nature of your service over each of the past five years)

- For Instructional Track Faculty, service normally constitutes 30% of professional expectations.
- Administrators may choose a 70%-weight for service.
- For Lecturers, service is not a professional expectation but may indicate performance exceeding expectations.

A. Institutional (describe your department, college, or university service and indicate the name of committee or assignment, dates of service, and role [e.g., chair, secretary]):

B. Professional (list your offices or other important roles in learned and professional organizations, both elected and appointed):

C. Manuscript/Grant Reviewing Activity (indicate the journals, presses, or agencies for which you reviewed manuscripts or grants during the past five years):

D. Organizing scholarly or creative event, conference, symposia, or conference panel (describe the nature of the event and your role as organizer)

E. Book reviews (indicate the journal and status of the review--invited, submitted, published; substantial review articles should appear under research publications)

III. RESEARCH - For NTTF, research and publication are not professional expectations but may indicate performance exceeding expectations.

A. Publications

5. Work published (provide full citation, including pagination; indicate whether the manuscript was refereed or unrefereed; describe your contribution to any co- or multi-authored publication; provide a brief comment after each publication describing the quality of the venue and its professional standing; LIST THE CURRENT YEAR'S
PUBLICATIONS FIRST:

6. **Work accepted** (provide title, journal or publisher, and projected publication date; indicate whether the manuscript was refereed or unrefereed;)

7. **Work invited or under contract and in progress** (provide title, journal or publisher, and deadline):

8. **Work in progress** (please provide brief description and goals for this work)

B. Presentations

7. Invited keynote or plenary addresses presented (provide title, name of conference or event and date)

8. Invited, keynote, or plenary addresses pending (provide name of conference or event and date)

9. Readings or exhibitions for creative work (provide name and date)

10. Readings or exhibitions for creative work pending (provide name and date)

11. Conference or Institute papers presented (provide title of paper, name of organization of conference, and date; LIST THE CURRENT YEAR'S PRESENTATIONS FIRST)

12. Conference or Institute papers accepted (provide title of paper, name of organization or conference, and date):

C. Grants

3. Proposals funded (provide title of project, funding agency or source, and dollar amount; if other authors are involved, describe your role; LIST THE CURRENT YEAR'S GRANTS FIRST:

4. Proposals submitted (provide title of project, funding agency or source, date of submission, and dollar amount; if other authors are involved, describe your role):

D. Scholarly Editing Activity (describe your work here only if it specifically involves editing responsibilities that are not covered in the sections above)

IV. AWARDS AND HONORS

Describe any prizes, honorary degrees, or other awards; NEH Summer Institutes or special seminars; editorial board memberships; faculty exchanges; or similar activities.
V. OTHER

Describe other scholarly, creative, or professional activity that seems not to fit any of the above categories.

VI. COMPLIANCE WITH UNIVERSITY REQUIREMENTS FOR EMPLOYMENT

TRAINING: Compliance with University online training programs is required by University policy. Please consult your training profile on TrainTraq (available via https://sso.tamus.edu), and complete any training required. To receive a favorable annual review, your training must be up to date.

SAFETY: Check one of the following:
   a. ____ After consideration of the teaching environments where I am instructor of record in the environment, I present the following safety concerns and attempts to mitigate them (list below)

   b. ____ After consideration of the teaching environments where I am instructor of record in the environment, I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.