

Approved by the department,
11.5.12; 10.24.14; 11.3.16
Approved by the dean's office,
12.10.12; 10.31.14; 12.12.16
Approved by DoF's office,
1.15.13; 5.27.14; 2.9.15; 2.23.18

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 2; University Standard Administrative Procedure (SAP) 12.06.99.M0.01; 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 "periodic peer evaluation" required by the University rule on Post-Tenure Review (University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01). Each year, annual peer evaluations for one-sixth of the tenured faculty, rotating in groups of roughly equal size, will also serve as Periodic Peer Reviews. An overall rating of unsatisfactory for a faculty member in a year designated as the Periodic Peer Review results in a "Professional Development Review," as described in the SAP. In the annual review for the appropriate year, the department head will indicate the results of an individual's Periodic Peer Review.

A. Procedures. On or about December 1, the department head will distribute blank "Faculty Member's Annual Report" forms (Appendix E) 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 and overall performance rating. It is incumbent upon each faculty member to make the best case for his/her accomplishments on the form and to state, with clarity and purpose, his/her short and long term goals for professional development (teaching, research, and service) in the section at the end of the form.

Approximately six weeks after the beginning of the succeeding calendar year, the department's executive committee will meet to determine each faculty member's overall performance rating

(or weighted composite score) by evaluating their research, teaching, and service using a five-point scale: 4 = Superior; 3 = Excellent; 2 = Commendable; 1 = Satisfactory; 0 = Needs Improvement. (The scale does not include Unsatisfactory because, as stated in SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, an Unsatisfactory rating in any single category of performance results in an overall Unsatisfactory rating with no weighted composite score.) 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 an overall performance rating (or weighted composite score) of 3×0.6 (Research) plus 1×0.2 (Teaching) plus 2×0.2 (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: <http://history.tamu.edu/wpcontent/uploads/sites/3/2016/08/bylaws.pdf>.)

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 ratings in research, teaching, and service and overall weighted composite scores. 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 discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year with the department head.. In some cases, there may be the need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member. If the annual review fails to follow the process and procedures of 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. There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review.

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 ratings) are applicable only to tenured faculty, as performance expectations for tenure-track faculty members are discussed in other university, college, and departmental documents. To balance their workloads, department officers (Associate Department Head, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Graduate Studies, and Graduate Placement Director) typically receive appropriate course reductions for their service. (See Appendix D for a sample anonymous agreement.)

Tenured faculty members receiving two consecutive Unsatisfactory ratings in any category will face the prospect of altered performance responsibilities. In the case of unsatisfactory research productivity, the faculty member will be subject to an increasing 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. Satisfactory research, when evaluated at 20%, will amount to steady progress, such as meeting criteria for Needs Improvement, as defined below. 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.. (See Appendix C for a sample anonymous written agreement.) A faculty member who chooses to forgo the adjustment or recommended action and then receives a third consecutive Unsatisfactory rating will be subject to a “Professional Development Review,” as described in University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01.

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 (Appendix C).

The executive committee will determine unsatisfactory/satisfactory ratings 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 rating 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 (e.g., a serious health condition or acute family care situation—see Appendix B). A Satisfactory rating reflects a faculty member having met departmental standards in all three areas of responsibility.

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, the executive committee will determine "Needs Improvement" ratings as defined by the criteria below. A faculty member receiving a Needs Improvement rating in a single category of performance in an annual review for a given three year period will have an additional year to meet the criteria for a Satisfactory rating or, should the criteria not be met, receive an Unsatisfactory rating. For a finding of Needs Improvement in a single category, the department head should specifically elaborate, in the annual review, the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria stated in these guidelines and then work with the faculty member to develop a plan to remedy the deficiencies. A finding of Needs Improvement in any *two* categories of performance in the same year results, by rule, in an immediate overall Unsatisfactory rating.

To illustrate, assume that for the three year period 2013-2015, a faculty member does not meet the stated criteria for a Satisfactory rating in research, but provides evidence of other "indicators of activity" as describe below by the criteria for Needs Improvement. For the 2015 review (conducted by the executive committee in spring 2016), the faculty member would receive a rating of Needs Improvement in research. Should the faculty member not meet the criteria for a Satisfactory rating in research the following year (for the next three-year period, 2014-2016), he/she would then earn an Unsatisfactory rating in research (and thus, by rule, an overall Unsatisfactory rating). Subsequent reviews would be conducted on a Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory basis, with Needs Improvement no longer an option until after the faculty member earns a Satisfactory rating.

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 Appendix A.

RESEARCH

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

Needs Improvement: Indicators of activity not considered for Satisfactory but pertinent to one's ongoing research—such as papers presented at professional meetings, invited lectures, major

external grant proposals, additional publications submitted, Glasscock Center working-group papers, department colloquium presentations, and other comparable research products—at least two activities total over the course of the three year window under consideration.

Satisfactory: The presence of a significant and productive research agenda—one demonstrating progress, trajectory, and sustainability. Evidence of such an agenda involves meeting the following criteria: 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.

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”).

Needs Improvement: Demonstrated competence in the classroom over a three year period called into question by documented complaints from students to the department head and/or a faculty

member's failure to mitigate concerns raised in student evaluations.

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, and complying with W-course standards.

Commendable: Extra engagement in the classroom in the given calendar year beyond meeting basic expectations, such as teaching independent studies (485s, 497s, and 685s) or first-year critical thinking seminars, supervising honors theses, honors contracts, and/or embedded sections, 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 position at a 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); recent placement of a Ph.D. in a tenure-track position at a 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").

Needs Improvement: Limited 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); *or* in professional activities (e.g., reviewing books and manuscripts, chairing and/or commenting on conference panels).

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 conference panels).

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; taking the training as 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 2.4.3.4.5, no faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if she or he is out of compliance with System Regulation 33.05.02, which addresses state/university mandated trainings.

The executive committee and department head will revisit this document at least every five years, starting no later than September 2020.

Appendix A

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., as well as authored or co-authored textbooks published by appropriate presses.

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 sub-field 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 sub-field 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.

Appendix B

Individual Circumstances

In their efforts to maintain a significant and productive research agenda, faculty members should not be penalized in annual reviews for individual circumstances such as a serious health condition or acute family care situation that cause them to miss significant time (three months or so). A faculty member cannot earn a satisfactory rating in research solely on the basis of illness or acute family care situations, but may request, in writing and with proper documentation, an extension of the three to five year window owing to the issues raised by such circumstances. In order to ensure fairness, equal access to assistance, and consistency in how such situations are handled across the department, the department head, in consultation with the executive committee, will normally consider such requests *after* the faculty member has been granted leave under the Family Medical Leave Act (<http://employees.tamu.edu/benefits/leave/fmla>) or a temporary workload adjustment under College of Liberal Arts policy (<http://liberalartscommunity.tamu.edu/docs/Bjobling/FacultyWorkloadAdjustmentPolicy.pdf>).

Upon approving the request, the department head will extend the three to five year window *forward*, so as to allow the faculty member to recoup the research time lost in the given calendar year, and *backward* so as to, in essence, remove the given calendar year from the evaluation period. To illustrate, assume, for example, that the significant period of lost research time occurred in calendar year 2013. The faculty member's evaluation for calendar year 2014 will extend to what amounts to a four-year window (2011-2014) and the evaluation for 2015 will cover the period 2012-2015. The 2016 evaluation, at which time calendar year 2013 will fall out of the three year window, will return to normal. Both these four year windows extend to six years where appropriate (i.e., with the publication of a major research monograph, as stated on p. 4 of these guidelines). Similarly, the 2013 evaluation period will extend back four years to include 2010 for publications, grants, and awards and to 2008 for a major research monograph.

As with all annual reviews, the executive committee will determine the faculty member's rating in research on the basis of the criteria listed on pp. 4-5 of these guidelines, as opposed to publications submitted or projects in progress.

Appendix C

Sample Written Agreement for Altered Performance Expectations

May X, 20XX

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Member

FROM: Head of Department

SUBJECT: Altered performance expectations

This memorandum stems from the conversation we had on May X, 20XX, concerning your request for altered performance expectations (i.e., a 3-3 teaching load). In accordance with the department's revised "Procedures and Criteria for Annual Merit Performance Evaluation and Review," we can formalize our agreement, as follows:

Your 3-3 teaching load will begin in the fall 20XX semester. The executive committee will evaluate you for the entire 20XX calendar year as 20% research, 60% teaching, and 20% service (as opposed to 60-20-20). Satisfactory research, under these terms, will amount to steady progress, such as meeting criteria for Needs Improvement, as described in the department's "Procedures," pp. 4-5.

We will proceed in this manner for three years (20XX, 20XY, 20XZ) and re-evaluate toward the end of the term. Should you desire, at any point during the three-year term, to revert back to 60-20-20—because a publication comes out, for example—you may do so upon informing me.

By volunteering for a 3-3 teaching load, you have removed yourself from the possibility of a second consecutive unsatisfactory rating in research under the normal criteria.

As you have already done for fall 20XX, for subsequent semesters, please provide the department scheduler four choices for your three courses.

Our signatures at the top of this memorandum will make this agreement official. Please make a copy for yourself and return the original to me.

Appendix D

Sample Agreement with Department Officer

June X, 20XX

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department Officer
FROM: Head of Department
SUBJECT: Director of Graduate Studies

Thank you for agreeing to take on the job of Director of Graduate Studies in the Department of History. Your four-year term of appointment begins September 1, 20XX, and concludes on August 31, 20YY. This memorandum outlines in broad detail your responsibilities and also lists how you will be compensated for your service.

Responsibilities

- chief advisor of graduate students
- chair, graduate committee
- supervision of associate director of graduate studies and graduate secretary
- serve as department representative on all college-level graduate committees
- serve as department representative regarding all matters involving the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies
- conduct graduate student evaluations
- supervision of TAs, including appointments
- work in conjunction with the associate department head regarding scheduling graduate seminars
- oversee all matters pertaining to the graduate curriculum
- serve as the department's graduate assessment liaison
- advise the department head on all matters concerning graduate students, including budgetary matters
- assist the department head in identifying and training your successor
- work in cooperation with the department head to ensure the best interests of the department and the graduate program.

Compensation

- Reduced teaching load (one class per semester or two per year; 1-1, 0-2, or 2-0)
- One month summer salary starting summer 20XX
- Funding to attend the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, pending budget constraints
- If you stay on the job for the full four-year term, you will receive one semester without teaching obligations
- You will be given appropriate consideration for a merit raise both on normal considerations of scholarship and teaching and your extra service as graduate director

Appendix E

Department of History Faculty-Member's Annual Report Form Calendar Year 2015

Name:

Rank:

It is incumbent upon each faculty member to make the best case for his/her accomplishments on this form. Elaborations/annotations are welcomed and encouraged.

Please list accomplishments for the calendar year only. For publications, the copyright date determines the year eligible for merit. Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary contributions in research, teaching, and service are valued no more and no less than disciplinary contributions.

*Indicates activities unlikely to be considered for merit but pertinent to one's professional development.

RESEARCH

1. **Research monographs** (complete citations)
2. **Edited volumes** (complete citations)
3. **Classroom books** (complete citations)
4. **Articles in refereed journals** (complete citations)
5. **Scholarly essays in edited volumes** (complete citations)
6. **Books or articles translated by you** (complete citations)
7. **Research fellowships/grants** (list project title, funding source, amount of fellowship/grant, date fellowship/grant begins)

8. **Research-related honors** (significant book awards, article awards, etc.)

9. ***Revised editions of previously published books** (complete citations)

10. ***Other refereed publications such as reference works, biographical dictionaries, etc.**
(complete citations)

11. ***Publications accepted but not yet in print** (indicate where it was submitted and its status – accepted but still under revision, final form of manuscript submitted or accepted, etc.)

12. ***Publications submitted** (where, date submitted, status of review)

13. ***Papers presented at professional meetings** (title of paper, name of organization, date of meeting)

14. ***Invited lectures** (title of lecture, place, date)

15. ***Submitted research fellowship/grant proposals** (list project title, funding source, amount of fellowship/grant)

16. ***Status of long-term research project(s)**

TEACHING

1. Courses Taught

<u>Semester</u>	<u>Course No.</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>#of Students</u>	<u>#of Sections</u>
-----------------	-------------------	--------------	---------------------	---------------------

2. Independent Studies (485s, 497s, and/or 685s)

<u>Semester</u>	<u>Course No.</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u># of Students</u>
-----------------	-------------------	--------------	----------------------

3. Contributions to Undergraduate Education

A. Pedagogical books, articles, lectures, and/or papers at professional conferences

(provide full citations/details)

B. Curriculum and pedagogical development (adding new courses to the Catalog, grants used to support curriculum improvement, participating in workshops or programs designed to improve teaching, etc.)

C. Extra-Engagement undergraduate experiences (honors theses, teaching first-year critical thinking seminars, study abroad)

D. Significant contributions to diversity and/or internationalization/globalization

(e.g., participation in a Center for Teaching Excellence workshop addressing these issues, study abroad)

E. Teaching awards (describe)

4. Contributions to Graduate Education

A. Chair of Graduate Student Committees

PhD candidates (list names)

MA candidates (list names)

B. Chair of Completed Ph.D.s (list names, dates)

C. Scholarly publications by current graduate students under your supervision

(complete citation)

D. Committee Member of Graduate Committees

PHD candidates (names & department)

MA candidates (names & department)

E. Graduate Student recruiting efforts (describe)

SERVICE

1. University Service

A. Department Committees (list) **Chair** **Member**

B. College Committees (list) **Chair** **Member**

C. University Committees (list) **Chair** **Member**

D. Administrative Duties (describe)

E. Sponsorship of student organizations (describe)

F. Scholarly presentations on campus (title, date, occasion; not a classroom presentation)

G. Civic and Public Relations Activities (lectures to community organizations, media – interviews and/or television appearances, etc.)

H. Significant contributions to diversity and/or internationalization/globalization
(e.g., conducting a Center for Teaching Excellence workshop addressing these issues)

I. Significant faculty mentoring by you (describe efforts, identify mentees)

J. Faculty who have mentored you significantly (describe efforts, identify mentors)

2. Extra-mural Service

A. Book Reviews (complete citations)

B. Manuscript reviews (title of press or journal)

C. Reviewing grant applications (granting agency)

D. Sessions chaired at professional meetings (full session title, name of professional meeting, date)

E. Commentator, discussion panelist, or panel organizer at professional meetings
(full title of session, name of professional meeting, date)

F. Outside research evaluator: tenure and promotion, academic program external review committee, etc. (list institution, nature of evaluation, and date)

G. Conference organizer (title of conference, location, date)

H. Offices held or committee membership in professional organizations
(name of organization or board and position held)

I. *Membership in professional organizations

MISCELLANEOUS

Special Accomplishments Please describe any accomplishments in research, teaching, or service not specified in the above criteria.

Goals (*required*)

A. Short term goals for professional development (teaching, research, service)

B. Long term goals for professional development (teaching, research, service)