



Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures
of the
Department of English
(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: July 1 2024

APPROVALS	SIGNATURE	DATE
Doug Downs	<small>DocuSigned by:</small> <i>Douglas P Downs</i> <small>802A82758C0844C</small>	
Department Faculty	Chair, Primary Review Committee	
Kathleen Ryan	<small>DocuSigned by:</small> <i>Kathleen Ryan</i> <small>3353D04DE14B4FA</small>	
Primary Administrative Reviewer Michelle Miley	Department Head/Director <small>DocuSigned by:</small> <i>Michelle Miley</i> <small>90FE300906484A6</small>	
Intermediate Review Committee	Chair, Intermediate Review Committee	
Yves Idzerda	<small>DocuSigned by:</small> <i>Yves Idzerda</i> <small>504BACEB8C0B454</small>	
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer	College Dean	
College Review Committee	Chair, College Review Committee	
Durward Sobek	<small>DocuSigned by:</small> <i>Durward K. Sobek II</i> <small>012C669F1D9E4AD</small>	
University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	
Robert Mokwa	<small>DocuSigned by:</small> <i>Robert Mokwa</i> <small>212A28411AC04BD</small>	
Provost		

Role and Scope Document MSU Department of English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit	2
Article III. Annual Review Process	3
Article IV. Primary RTP Review Committee and Administrator	4
Article VI. Review Materials	5
6.01.01 Materials for External Reviews	5
6.01.02 Materials for Dossiers	5
6.02 Documenting Collaborative Work	6
6.03 Procedures for Soliciting External and Internal Peer Reviews	6
Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents for each level of review	7
Article VIII. Retention Reviews	7
8.01-02 Timing and University Standard	7
8.03.01-04 Performance Indicators and Weighting	8
8.04.01-04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations	8
8.05.01-04 Evidence of Performance Indicators	8
8.06 Status of Scholarly Products	8
Article IX. Tenure Review	9
9.01-02 Timing and University Standard	9
9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting	9
9.03.01 Teaching	9
9.03.02 Scholarship	10
9.03.03 Service	12
9.03.04 Integration	13
9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations	14
9.04.01 Teaching	14
9.04.02 Scholarship	14
9.04.03 Service	15
9.04.04 Integration	15
9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators	15
9.05.01 Teaching	15
9.05.02 Scholarship	17
9.05.03 Service	20
9.05.04 Integration	22
Article XI. Promotion to the Rank of Professor	21
11.01 Timing	21
11.02 University Standard	22
11.03.01-04 Performance Indicators and Weighting	22
11.04.01-04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations	22
11.05.01-04 Evidence of Performance Indicators	23
Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Role and Scope Document	23

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

The Department of English constitutes a core academic discipline at Montana State University. We contribute to the University's land-grant mission through teaching, scholarship (including both research and creative activity), and service, activities which faculty frequently integrate.

Teaching

The English Department creates coursework that helps students read, write, and think critically. In addition to offering undergraduate and graduate programs listed below, the department plays a substantial role in the general education of Montana State University through core writing and literature classes. We provide coursework that satisfies the Writing core requirement for all students, as well as classes in technical and creative writing that serve students enrolled in programs offered by other departments.

The Bachelor of Arts in English provides students with three curricular options:

1. the literature option for students who wish to specialize in the study of literature, especially those preparing for a broad range of careers including graduate study in English or related fields
2. the writing option for students who wish to specialize in the study and production of expository and creative writing and rhetoric, in preparation for professional writing careers or graduate study
3. the English teaching option for students who wish to specialize in the study of literature, language, and composition as preparation for certification for secondary school teaching.

The department also offers minors in literature and in writing.

The department offers two MA programs:

1. an MA in English (MAE) focused on the interconnectedness of writing, teaching, and literary studies
2. an MA in English Education (MAEE) focused specifically on pedagogical content knowledge and expressions of the discipline in schooled places.

Scholarship

Scholarly and creative activity are an integral part of the Department's mission. Our scholarship advances professional and public understanding and appreciation of literature, of language, of writing and rhetoric, and of cultural, historical, professional, and pedagogical issues. An equally important function of our discipline is the production of original creative works. These activities not only add to knowledge and art, but also serve to enhance instruction on both the undergraduate and graduate levels, providing rigorous educational challenges and resources for students and fostering ongoing faculty development in their respective areas of expertise.

Service

The Department of English faculty fulfill active service and outreach functions locally, nationally and within the academic, professional, and public spheres. The department is expressly committed to engendering excellence in the teaching of English in the State of Montana through both its English Education program and its MAEE, providing continuing education and outreach services to English instructors around the region. Department members serve on national and state humanities committees, professional boards and organizations, various institutional committees, and community committees.

Education Credentials

Tenure-track faculty in the Department will have the appropriate terminal degree for their position, which will, in most cases, be a Doctoral Degree (the exception being for a creative writing position, which may be filled by a candidate with an MFA).

Governance

The Department of English operates with a Chair system. The Chair is elected by tenure-track faculty for a three-year term and is eligible for re-election for another three-year term upon completion of the first term. There is a two-term limit for the Chair.

The Chair is assisted in the Annual Review process (Art. III) by the Chair's Executive Council (CEC). CEC is comprised of three tenured faculty members elected by the department for one two-year term. For the Annual Review process, the Chair will appoint an untenured faculty member to serve in an advisory capacity with CEC.

Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Not applicable.

Article III. Annual Review Process

Annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, role statements, annual assignments, self-assessment, and the Department Chair's evaluation of the individual's performance. The annual review process, appeals to the dean, and changes in assigned percentages of effort are described in the MSU Faculty Handbook (https://www.montana.edu/policy/faculty_handbook/annual_review.html).

Following MSU policy and procedures, faculty members will enter their teaching, research, and service activities for the calendar year in MSU's current designated faculty activity database (Watermark Faculty Success, as of this writing) and submit an annual review report per workflow instructions from the Provost's office and the department's Chair's Executive Council (CEC). These materials will be reviewed by CEC, which will provide an advisory evaluation to the Department Chair, who has final determination regarding the evaluation. The Chair will provide their evaluation via the annual review workflow for each faculty member. Faculty members will have the option to meet with the Chair to discuss their evaluations.

CEC does not evaluate administrative work performed outside the English Department. Administrative appointments will be evaluated by the appropriate supervisor(s). Per MSU Faculty Handbook Annual Review section 2C, for faculty with split appointments that include percentages of effort greater than 20% in another unit, the Department Chair will obtain evaluative feedback from the appropriate administrator in that unit. Also, per MSU Faculty Handbook Annual Review section 2A, CEC and the Department Chair will weight their evaluation of teaching, research, and service relative to the faculty member's assigned percentage of effort.

Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty contracted for at least 7.5 workload units (0.5 FTE) in any semester in the calendar year for which they are being reviewed and who are employed during the time of the

annual review, or who are employed on multiyear contracts, will be evaluated annually, per the NTT CBA and [Faculty Annual Review Policy](#). All NTT faculty who are reviewed will receive a written evaluation. NTT reviews are conducted by the department chair or their designated agent (e.g., Director of Core Writing) and are not evaluated by CEC.

A faculty member who disagrees with an annual review or individual rating assigned to areas of responsibility may appeal by submitting a rationale to the Dean of CLS, per [Annual Review Policy in the Faculty Handbook](#) (section 3). The rationale must be filed with the Dean within ten (10) calendar days of the receipt of the annual review.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator (Retention, Tenure, and Promotion)

Section 4.01 - Primary Review Committee - Composition and Appointment

The Primary Review Committee is the Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee, which will consist of three tenured faculty elected by English tenure-line faculty, at least two of whom will hold the rank of Professor, with one of those two acting as Committee Chair as appointed by the Department Chair. Committee members will serve staggered three-year terms and are eligible for reelection. If committee composition (particularly with regard to Professor-rank appointments) is restricted due to limitations in faculty availability or conflicts within the Department, the Chair will request approval from the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee chair to make an alternate tenured faculty appointment.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The Primary Review Administrator will be the Department Chair. Should the Primary Review Administrator have a conflict of interest with a candidate under review, the Dean of the College of Letters and Science will identify an individual to serve as Primary Review Administrator for the case under review.

Section 4.03 Identification of Responsible Entities

- a) The Department Chair will establish the Primary Review Committee either by facilitating the election of or appointing the members as described in section 4.01.
- b) The Primary Review Committee will select external reviewers and solicit five letters of review as described in section 6.03.01.
- c) The candidate will work with the department chair to select and solicit Internal Reviews for teaching performance as described in section 6.03.02.
- d) The Business Operations Manager will assure the following materials are included in the Dossier:
 - (i) Internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer.
 - (ii) Applicable Role and Scope Document.
 - (iii) Letter of hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all Evaluation Letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.
 - (iv) Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period.
- e) The Business Operations Manager will maintain copies of all review committee Evaluation Letters and internal and external review letters before, during, and after the review.

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

The next review level after the reviews by the Primary Review Committee and the Primary Review Administrator is the College of Letters & Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee.

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee Administrator***Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment***

The Intermediate Review Committee is the College of Letters and Science (CLS) Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, with composition and appointment as described in the CLS Role and Scope.

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator

The Intermediate Review Administrator is the Dean of the College of Letters and Science.

Section 5.03 Level of Review Following Intermediate Review Administrator

The next level of review after the Intermediate Review Administrator is the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Article VI. Review Materials***Section 6.01 Materials Submitted by the Candidate******6.01.01 Materials Provided by the Candidate for External Reviewers***

At the prompting of the Department Chair, candidates for tenure and for promotion to the rank of professor will provide the Primary Review Committee chair with the following items, which the PRC chair will distribute to external reviewers.

- A. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- B. A brief context statement that identifies the candidate's area of Scholarship and explains the significance of the materials (performance indicators) chosen for external review.
- C. Selected performance indicators (usually from Group 1, see section 9.03.02) from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represent their Scholarship.

6.01.02 Materials Added by the Candidate to their Dossier

Once the administrator of the Provost's office provides the candidate with access to their electronic dossier folder, the candidate is responsible for adding the following materials:

- A. Cover sheet obtained from the Provost's office.
- B. A comprehensive CV with the candidate's Teaching, Scholarship, and Service activities.
- C. A 2-4 page Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of Scholarship.
- D. Separate self-evaluations (generally 1-4 pages each) for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration, each of which summarizes evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include summaries of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition.
- E. Evidence of performance indicators, as detailed in section 9.05 (and related sections 7.05 or 11.05 as applicable to level of review).

The candidate should separate the following categories if included in the CV:

- Refereed books or book chapters
- Refereed journal articles
- Invited book chapters or articles
- Invited conference presentations
- Conference presentations
- Seminars and/or colloquia
- Grant proposals submitted and grants funded
- Non-refereed publications

The candidate may choose to include other categories as appropriate to the discipline and the candidate's record. For papers, grants funded, and other scholarly products, full author lists must match the publication or grant award.

This list is a general requirement for all dossiers. For further details including evidence of teaching, scholarship, service, and integration activity, see Articles VIII-XI of this document.

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

The Department of English values collaborative work as a legitimate form of inquiry and production and as co-equal with single authorship. Conventions for crediting collaborative work vary greatly among the different disciplines and journals represented in the Department. In particular, author order on published works can generally not be used to infer any information about the nature, quantity, or quality of the contribution of any particular author.

The candidate will provide a single document briefly describing the candidate's contribution to each collaborative work over the relevant review period. The candidate may choose to use a single statement to describe any long-term collaboration that has resulted in multiple publications or grants.

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Process

The process and requirements for soliciting peer review materials are described in the University Faculty Handbook, "Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," section 7.

6.03.01. External Peer Reviews

External reviewers should be specialists in the candidate's field and familiar with the Department expectations for faculty performance. Departments should elaborate how these guidelines apply to their disciplines. At least half of the external reviewers must be selected by the Department RTP Committee; the remainder may come from a list of names submitted by the candidate. Candidates shall not be informed of the identity of outside evaluators to protect the confidentiality of the review process.

The five external review letters must be requested by the chair of the Department RTP Committee and must not be solicited by the candidate. The Department report should state clearly how external referees were chosen and should include professional bio-sketches for each reviewer. Reviewers will be asked to state knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, if either applies.

External reviewers will be sent a copy of the candidate's CV and the English Department Role and Scope document, as well as a selection of performance indicators (see section 9.03.02) chosen by the

candidate, and the candidate's context statement. Reviewers should be asked to comment specifically on the quality of the candidate's written scholarship and their productivity, as well as the candidate's recognition in the field.

6.03.2 Internal Peer Reviews

The candidate's classroom teaching and related teaching materials will be observed by at least three faculty or administrators during the two years prior to the review. These letters may be written by members of the candidate's department, other faculty from across the University, or University administrators, and will evaluate the teaching practices and methods of the candidate. At least one letter should be from faculty in the candidate's department.

To determine peer reviewers, candidates should submit a list of at least 3 observers to the department chair or chair of RTP. After consultation, the Chair will solicit the reviews once they and the candidate agree on them; then after the reviewers agree, the candidate is notified and arranges observations. Reviewers will submit their letters to the Business Operations Manager when complete.

Letters will be considered as part of a holistic evaluation of teaching.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review

The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

Article VIII. Retention Reviews

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Reviews

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy (https://www.montana.edu/policy/faculty_handbook/extending_tenure.html).

Section 8.02 University Standard

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- A. effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
- B. integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and

- C. satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Effectiveness is defined in [Faculty Handbook Retention, Tenure & Promotion Review Definitions](#) as "successful performance, appropriate to years of service."

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance indicators and weighting are defined in Section 9.03. The same indicators and weighting used in tenure review are used in retention review.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

8.04.01. Effectiveness in teaching

Effectiveness in teaching is as described in Section 9.04.01.

8.04.02. Effectiveness in Scholarship

Quantitative:

In order to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship (research or creative activity), candidates for retention are expected to have one Group 1 performance indicator (see Section 9.03.02) published, accepted for publication, or under review, or their equivalent demonstrating steady scholarly production.

Qualitative:

The candidate is expected to demonstrate progress on development of a research/creative activity program appropriate to the candidate's field. The department expects a candidate's scholarly work to embody their field's standards for knowledge generation, to be useful and meaningful to its audience(s), and to be recognized as high quality by various formative and summative reviewers. (See also Section 9.05.02 Evidence of Performance Indicators - Scholarship.)

8.04.03 Effectiveness in Service

Effectiveness in service is as described in Section 9.04.03.

8.04.04 Effectiveness in integration

Effectiveness in integration is as described in Section 9.04.04.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of Performance Indicators is as listed in Section 9.05. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

Because candidates for retention will be reviewed early in their career, the dossier for retention review may include works submitted but not yet accepted, other preliminary steps toward publication, and/or other materials that demonstrate progress on a coherent research/creative program.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy (https://www.montana.edu/policy/faculty_handbook/extending_tenure.html).

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service, and
- b) integration of no less than two of teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- c) accomplishment in scholarship

as demonstrated by the candidate's performance during the review period.

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

9.03.01 Teaching performance indicators and weighting

The MSU Faculty Handbook defines teaching as “the set of activities performed by faculty that fosters student learning, critical and ethical thinking, problem solving, and creativity. It requires the faculty member to have a command of the subject matter, to maintain currency in the discipline, and to create and maintain instructional environments that successfully promote learning. In addition to the instructional responsibilities in the Academic Responsibilities policy, teaching includes incorporation of current pedagogical innovations, incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning and assessment, course and curriculum design and development; thesis and professional project assistance, mentoring, and supervision in student projects, theses, and dissertations; academic and career advising of undergraduate and graduate students; supervision of student teachers, graduate teaching and research assistants, student interns; and any valuable contributions to the university's instructional enterprise.”

The following is a representative list of performance indicators applicable to teaching. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in teaching is evaluated. This list is not exhaustive, and candidates are not expected to demonstrate every indicator on this list. Additionally, the indicators that contribute to teaching activity as defined by the MSU faculty handbook are too numerous to list in full, so the review committee should extrapolate the definitions and examples here to include candidate teaching activity that is not listed, but which fits the definition of teaching according to the MSU Faculty Handbook.

- Delivering quality instruction in support of the Department's teaching mission
- Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum
- Design and facilitation of instructional programs, and/or teacher mentorship
- Academic advising
- Mentorship of students (e.g. research projects, independent studies, serving on graduate committees)
- Mentorship of other instructors (GTAs, other faculty, teachers at other institutions)
- Evidence of pedagogical introspection and disciplinary currency as evidenced by updated syllabi and course assignments
- Peer review of other instructors' teaching

- Delivering quality instruction in support of the Department's service and outreach mission (e.g., courses for community members or community-oriented pedagogy, such as OLLI, The Yellowstone Writing Project, or Agricultural Extension)
- Teaching in non-credit instructional activities (e.g. non-credit courses, licensure programs, conferences, seminars, workshops)
- Engaging in curricular or co-curricular development beyond service on standing curriculum committees (examples include delivering guest lectures or organizing literary readings, departmental workshops, podcasts, or film series)
- Receiving or being nominated for teaching awards
- Writing grants to enhance teaching either within MSU or extramurally
- Accounting for student feedback and addressing any patterns of student complaints

Student course evaluations are vulnerable to various forms of bias (e.g., evaluations may be based on criteria other than quality of instruction). Therefore, quantitative scores should not be interpreted as fully reliable indicators of teaching effectiveness. Written student comments may be viewed as formative feedback to be used for instructor improvement but are not considered a form of evaluation.

As additional evidence of performance in teaching, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here, such as statements of teaching philosophy, samples of student writing, assignment examples, awards, or other items that demonstrate significant achievements or accomplishments of instruction. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

9.03.02 Scholarship performance indicators and weighting

Scholarship in English Studies advances professional and public understanding and appreciation of literature, language, writing and rhetoric, and related cultural, historical, professional and pedagogical issues. Of equal importance are original creative works produced by department faculty in genres such as fiction, poetry, creative nonfiction, and drama.

The university tenure standard related to scholarly and creative production is **Accomplishment**, defined in [Faculty Handbook Retention, Tenure & Promotion Review Definitions](#) as

sustained and commendable performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. These activities and products include peer reviewed publications, formal peer-reviewed presentations, or comparable peer-evaluated works appropriate to the discipline. The activities and products must have impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.

Faculty in the Department of English span several fields within English Studies, including Literature, Education, Rhetoric & Writing Studies, and Creative Writing. While the following performance indicators apply to all faculty, the weighting of each indicator may vary by the candidate's field. Primary RTP review will recognize variations both in the resources and time available to reviewed faculty, and in proportions of quantity and quality of scholarly and creative work. (That is, the department recognizes that a large number of scholarly contributions of average quality may carry weight equal to a much smaller number of very high impact contributions.) Based on the above definition of Accomplishment and the Department's mission within the College and University, tenure review will stress, regardless of the specific combination of professional activities, a sustained record of consequential publication or

contribution drawing on professional expertise as demonstrated by the following performance indicators.

The department weighs scholarship performance indicators in two tiers corresponding to typical degrees of difficulty, prestige, time-in-development, and impact in their achievement. Group 1 indicators are typically both more demanding to produce and of higher impact or consequence (reaching a wider or more demanding audience, accomplishing more substantial work, and/or undergoing a more selective or competitive vetting process) than Group 2 indicators, and correspondingly are weighted more heavily in demonstrating scholarly effectiveness or accomplishment. Ordinarily, demonstration of a sustained record of scholarly or creative production requires indicators from both groups. Department standards for the number and quality of such indicators are found in the next section (9.04).

Group 1 Indicators

- Refereed monographs, textbooks, edited books/collections, and co-authored or co-edited books for scholarly, student, or other publics, appropriate to and drawing on the candidate's professional expertise and field of scholarship
- Refereed article-scale works such as journal articles, book chapters, webtexts, or similar-scale publications (print or online, written, spoken-word, hypertext, or other multimodal text) for scholarly, student, or other publics, appropriate to and drawing on the candidate's field of scholarship
- Book-length creative works (novels, short story collections, memoirs, essay collections, books of poetry, and other creative genres)
- Poems, short stories, essays published in literary magazines (publications or productions in fiction, poetry, creative nonfiction, drama, and similar genres) appropriate to the candidate's professional expertise and field of scholarship
- Plays and screenplays (original or adapted) which are performed or published
- Translations or critical editions of creative or scholarly works or important source materials
- Editing of scholarly journals
- External grants, fellowships, or similar major awards funded
- Major invited talks and presentations (e.g., plenary or keynote at state / regional / national conferences or meetings)

Group 2 Indicators

- Presentations at professional conferences and meetings
- Serving as respondents or discussants at conference sessions
- Internal grants funded
- Grant proposals submitted (internal and external)
- Non-refereed publications
- Short publications such as book reviews and encyclopedia entries
- Development of scholarly source material for the profession (i.e. curriculum materials or software)
- Manuscripts in preparation for submission to publication
- Non-refereed writing, language, or literacy projects housed within digital platforms that showcase scholarly expertise
- Community-engaged research, based on the candidate's scholarly and professional expertise, leading to community-oriented publications, presentations, performances, or other contributions

- Public commentary (e.g., op-ed pieces, interviews, substantial blogs, expert opinion rendered in digital or popular media, testimony, or consulting) that draws on the candidate’s scholarly expertise
- Evidence of work on long-term and slow-developing projects—for example, project proposals for funding or publication, development of access to research sites or related community membership, communication to establish collaboration or research teams, research approvals such as IRB protocols (approved or under consideration), final grant reports, developmental communication from editors/publishers, drafts, and related work-product

For tenure review, unless otherwise noted, indicators must be achieved or completed rather than in-progress. Publications must be either publicly available online or in print (“published”) or verified (via a signed contract, print agreement, or similar correspondence from editor/publisher) as accepted for publication not pending additional development or changes, after peer review or the appropriate corresponding vetting process.

Because of the weight of Group 1 indicators, a candidate must have completed at least one Group 1 indicator for their tenure review. And as noted above, demonstrating sustained scholarly performance will usually require some Group 2 indicators as well. The following variance in weights of Group 1 and Group 2 indicators is possible:

- Candidates may argue that a very high number of Group 2 indicators demonstrates the same achievement as a small number of Group 1 indicators.
- Candidates may argue that a given indicator typically in Group 2 has, in a specific instance, more in common with Group 1 indicators and should be counted as such. External peer reviews and the primary review committee’s assessment will speak to the validity of such arguments. Reviewers may also determine that an indicator typically classified as Group 1 does not reach the levels of achievement or impact characteristic of that group and weigh the indicator as Group 2 instead.

9.03.03 Service performance indicators and weighting

Service includes committee activities for the Department, College, and University as well as outreach and other forms of service listed below. A record of service is expected of all candidates for promotion and tenure. Where necessary, statements of support and evaluation of service may be solicited from outside the English Department and may themselves serve as performance indicators.

Service can include, but is not limited to:

Institutional

- Departmental committees and governance
- College and University committees and governance
- Faculty governance and leadership
- Supporting faculty inside and outside the department in their teaching and research/creative endeavors
- Initiatives beyond solicited (contracted) assignments

Professional

- Participation in professional meetings and organizations, including holding office, organizing conferences and panels, chairing panels, or reporting back to MSU colleagues on meetings
- Reviewing manuscripts for publications
- Reviewing applications for grants and awards
- Reviewing conference proposals
- Internal and external faculty reviews
- Consulting activities related to faculty expertise

Community / Outreach

- Community service and outreach related to a faculty member's professional training and expertise and relevant to their faculty position
- Outreach work that includes serving as liaison between the university and external audiences/communities when related to faculty expertise and in service of the university mission

Awards or other recognitions for service are also performance indicators.

Service performance indicators are weighted by the amount of time the candidate devoted to a given activity and the value of the candidate's contribution. Candidates and reviewers may also weigh service by its opportunity cost (other uses of professional time that the candidate was required to forego by nature of the requirements of their service).

9.03.04 Integration performance indicators and weighting

The MSU Faculty Handbook [Retention, Tenure & Promotion Review Definitions](#) state that Integration is "the creation of synergistic relationships among the teaching, scholarship, and service contributions of faculty, such as bringing new discoveries into the classroom, fostering student learning in the lab, field, and studio, engaging the wider community with scholarly products or innovations in teaching, or the fostering engagement [sic] to address community needs."

Such creation of synergistic relationships is indicated by the candidate's demonstration, in their Integration self-evaluation statement and other self-evaluation statements (see Section 6.01.02), of ways their teaching, scholarship, or service are accomplishing some other aspect of their workload. Candidates in the Department of English are particularly encouraged to note when their research shapes their teaching, when their teaching involves research or leads to new directions in or new applications of research, when their teaching integrates service or outreach (such as service-learning or community-engaged assignments and projects), when their service (for instance, on curriculum committees) is directly informed by their teaching or research, or when their service and outreach shapes their research agendas and projects or their teaching (e.g. course designs). These and similar interactions among major areas of responsibility are all grounds for the candidate to assert Integration.

The department makes no distinction among or weighting variances based on kinds of integration, areas integrated, or perceived value of various integration.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

9.04.01 Teaching

Quantitative Expectations

Candidates should demonstrate the quantity of teaching (courses assigned) and advising (advisees assigned) commensurate with their letter of hire and ensuing workload assignments by the department. It should be clear that the amount of time devoted to teaching is commensurate with the candidate's assigned percentage of effort.

Qualitative Expectations

Effectiveness in teaching is achieved through the candidate's positive contributions to the design, delivery, and instruction of courses, both in and beyond the Department, as well as in the various areas articulated in the definition of teaching in the Faculty Handbook and throughout Section 9.03.01 on teaching.

Internal peer reviews based on class observations (sec. 6.03.02) will be, in the majority, positive. Additionally, the candidate should address patterns of student comments in student course evaluations.

Instructional methods and material should be appropriate to the respective course content and objectives, with materials reflecting current issues and scholarship in the field. Syllabi should include outcomes, course requirements, assignments and grading policies. The candidate is expected to present these materials with a teaching statement that contextualizes them and connects them to a developed teaching philosophy and goals.

Many candidates will have performed a range of additional teaching activities beyond the classroom and the department. These will be evaluated according to their reach and impact, and the candidate is expected to contextualize any non-classroom and/or department teaching activities in the teaching statement.

It is expected that the faculty member will fulfill teaching obligations as described in the MSU [Faculty Responsibilities Policy](#).

9.04.02 Scholarship

Quantitative Expectations

While the department places more value on quality of scholarly production than quantity, the standard of Accomplishment includes sustained productivity that must be demonstrated in part quantitatively. The department acknowledges and values the wide diversity its disciplines and subdisciplines encompass in ways of creating and applying intellectual discovery and the generation of consequential new knowledge for a range of publics. To create the greatest flexibility for candidates, the department does not specify required numbers beyond the minimum that a candidate must have completed at least one Group 1 indicator for their tenure review. Some typical combinations of performance indicators in scholarship demonstrating Accomplishment include these:

- One book-scale Group 1 indicator plus several Group 2 indicators
- Four article-scale Group 1 indicators plus several Group 2 indicators
- Two article-scale Group 1 indicators plus Group 2 indicators focused toward imminent production of additional Group 1 indicators.

- Community-engaged scholarship relevant to the candidate's field of professional expertise leading to a large collection of community-facing Group 2 indicators plus sufficient Group 1 indicators to demonstrate continuing development of and engagement with discipline-based, professional expertise.

Qualitative Expectations

The department expects a candidate's scholarly work to embody the field's standards for knowledge generation, to be useful and meaningful to its audience(s), and to be recognized as high quality by various formative and summative reviewers. The continuity of the candidate's scholarly production should be steady through the tenure review period, and attempts at internal or external funding of research are expected. These qualities may be demonstrated in a variety of ways; see section 9.05.02 (Evidence of Performance Indicators - Scholarship).

9.04.03 Service

Quantitative Expectations

Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have consistently served on one or more Department, College and/or University committee(s) during the evaluation period, or to have consistently performed other service for the department, college, university and/or a local or national community or organization. Candidates will perform service commensurate with the assigned percentage of effort.

Qualitative Expectations

Candidates will have performed service efficiently and accurately. This will include committee work at various levels, as well as other service as assigned. As faculty move up in rank they are expected to mentor and otherwise support their colleagues, especially those colleagues at a lower rank. It is expected that more senior faculty members will serve in leadership positions. When assessing service, the amount of time devoted to activities and the value of the service to the department, college, university and professional will be taken into consideration.

9.04.04 Integration

Quantitative Expectations

Candidates will demonstrate integration between at least two of scholarship, teaching, and/or service.

Qualitative Expectations

The candidate's demonstration of integration will speak to the university's definition (see Section 9.03.04) and will clearly demonstrate the nature of the integration among areas they are asserting.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

9.05.01 Teaching

The following table links performance indicators and methods of providing evidence of them. The list is not exhaustive nor is every item on the list necessary to demonstrate effective teaching performance; other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for teaching will be considered for review.

Performance Indicators in Teaching and Typical Evidence

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Delivering quality instruction in support of the Department's teaching mission as documented by faculty peer review of teaching.	Copy of internal peer reviews of teaching. Reviews must be submitted by the observer directly to the Department Chair and maintained in Department files. The Department Chair may serve as a peer observer.
Teaching Awards or nomination for teaching awards	Name, date, and type of award (Dept, college, University, etc.).
Grants received for teaching	Name, date, and brief description of grant, amount funded.
Delivering quality instruction in support of the department's service and outreach mission (e.g. courses for community members or community-oriented pedagogy)	Brief description of course or event, along with faculty member's role. Syllabi or course materials may be supplied if appropriate.
Teaching in non-credit instructional activities (non-credit courses, licensure programs, conferences, seminars, workshops)	Name and date of activities, along with faculty member's role. Teaching materials may be supplied if appropriate.
Pedagogical Introspection	Faculty teaching narrative that documents changes in syllabi and assignments in response to pedagogical introspection.
Effective advising	Number of students advised. Record of being available to students (evidenced by emails, appointment schedules, student feedback).
Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials	Syllabi or other documentation of new methods or materials with evidence supporting innovation. Brief description of the implementation process and outcomes.
Design and facilitation of instructional programs	Agenda or other documentation of program's goals and major components. Brief description of goals and outcomes.
Mentorship of Graduate Students	Documentation of service on graduate student MA or PhD committees, and/or brief description including graduate student's name, research focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Mentorship of Undergraduate Students	Brief description including undergraduate student's name, research focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Formative use of student feedback via University-approved instruments, particularly narrative comments, or other formative student feedback	Copies of student evaluations along with faculty teaching narratives and materials which respond to student feedback.
Faculty demonstration of addressing any patterns of student complaints	Narrative explanations of evidence that complaints are considered and addressed, supplemented by assignments, syllabi, emails, or other documentation.
Attendance of training programs designed to improve teaching	Title, place, and date of program.

9.05.02 Scholarship

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier. "Evidence of quality" in the table below is a sample of ways of demonstrating quality; no single type of evidence is required in order to demonstrate quality. These lists are intended to clarify for candidates and reviewers the kinds of evidence that do count, and to help candidates imagine ways of providing evidence for the quality and impact of their scholarship. The lists are by no means exhaustive and no single element on the list is required. For more detail on types of indicators, see Section 9.03.02.

External reviews provide essential evidence of the quality of scholarly performance. Group 1 Performance Indicators that a candidate wishes to argue should weigh heavily in tenure review must therefore be provided to external reviewers for evaluation.

Copies of performance indicators and of evidence of quality are to be included in the candidate's electronic portfolio in accord with current university guidance on assembling tenure dossiers.

Group 1 Performance Indicators

Indicator Type	Evidence of Quality	Include in Portfolio
<i>Book-scale Projects:</i> - Refereed Monographs - Refereed edited collections - Textbooks - Refereed Translations and Scholarly Editions - Trade-press books	- External reviews - Reputation of publisher / competitiveness of venue - Awards or other professional notice of the product - Positive reviews (scholarly or professional book reviews, peer reviews of work-in-progress, structured reader feedback, textbook adoption surveys, publisher feedback) - Citations / impact on ensuing scholarship, or published responses - Demand and circulation (reprint requests, sales records and other evidence of circulation) - Use of best practices in the field - Resulting professional demand (reviewing requests based on expertise established by this indicator, ensuing positions, honors, roles, projects, funding, or collaboration that result from / serve as recognition of the project)	- Copy of work or link to an online version - Copies of or links to published reviews - Copy of accepted works still in press, with copy of verification of final acceptance (see 9.03) - External reviews (Department is responsible to add to portfolio) - Copy of awards or other meritorious notice - Copies / documentation of any related evidence - Digital copy or URL link to an online version of individual journal issues edited - URL to the edited journal website showing the full run of issues edited
<i>Article-scale Projects:</i> - Journal articles - Book chapters - Webtexts / hypertexts - Other similar-scale digital products		
<i>Creative Works:</i> - Book-length projects - Short stories and flash fiction - Article- or essay-scale projects - Plays or screenplays		

<p>Journal editing (Editor of scholarly journal with external audience)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - External reviews - Job description with evidence of successful completion of listed duties (e.g. managing peer review, timely production of journal issues, quality of scholarship produced, innovations introduced and their success, performance reviews by journal staff or contributors, samples of editorial communication) - Reputation of journal during candidate's editorship (including awards or professional recognitions) - Journal issues are consistent with stated mission 	
<p>External Funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grants - Fellowships - Other competitive funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Granting agency (scope, prestige, competitiveness, appropriateness to project) - Amount funded - Prestige - Competitiveness - What did you have to promise to get it, and did you (or are you) following through - Outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copy of grant proposal and funding award letter / notice - Copy of reviewer feedback - Copies of in-progress and/or final grant reports
<p>Invited Talks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keynotes - Plenaries - Other similar presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How big (a deal) was it (occasion, venue, attendance) - Published or otherwise circulated beyond initial venue - Reviews, uptake, feedback on the talk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copy of the talk / slides / speaking outline - Copy of evidence / documentation of circulation and uptake

Group 2 Performance Indicators

Indicator Type	Evidence of Quality	Include in Portfolio
<p>Conference / meeting contributions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentations - Keynotes at local / low-impact confs - Respondent or discussant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Type of conference - Evident preparation for presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copy of the paper / slides / speaking outline - Conference program - Invitation (for invited talks)
<p>Internal grants funded</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Source of grant (including scope, prestige, competitiveness, appropriateness to project) - Amount funded - Outcomes (predicted or accomplished) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copy of grant proposal and funding award letter / notice - Copy of reviewer feedback - Copies of in-progress and/or final grant reports

<p>Grant proposals submitted (internal and external)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Granting agency (scope, prestige, competitiveness, appropriateness to project) - Amount sought - Reviewer ratings and comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copy of grant proposal - Copies of reviewer feedback
<p>Non-refereed publications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Book-scale - Article- or essay-scale - Webtexts / hypertexts - Other similar-scale digital products - Other writing, language, or literacy projects housed within digital platforms - Public commentary (e.g., op-ed pieces, interviews, substantial blogs, expert opinion rendered in digital or popular media, testimony, or consulting) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - External reviews (if indicator was submitted to external reviewers) - Reputation of publisher / competitiveness of venue - Showcases or draws on scholarly expertise - Any vetting or quality-assurance procedures - Awards or other professional notice of the product - Positive reviews (scholarly or professional book reviews, peer reviews of work-in-progress, structured reader feedback, textbook adoption surveys, publisher feedback) - Citations / impact on ensuing scholarship, or published responses - Demand and circulation (reprint requests, sales records and other evidence of circulation) - Use of best practices in the field - Resulting professional demand (reviewing requests based on expertise established by this indicator, ensuing positions, honors, roles, projects, funding, or collaboration that result from / serve as recognition of the project) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copy of work or link to an online version - Copies of or links to published reviews - Copy of accepted works still in press, with copy of verification of final acceptance (see 9.03) - External reviews (Department is responsible to add to portfolio) - Copy of awards or other meritorious notice - Copies / documentation of any related evidence
<p>Manuscripts in preparation for submission</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Description of what is being prepared, plans for publication, and existing progress - Any invitation or commission for producing the project (e.g. accepted proposal for a book, chapter for an edited collection, or contribution to a special issue of a journal) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copy of manuscript at current state of progress - Copy of any invitation or commission to produce - Description as noted on left

<p>Short refereed publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Book reviews - Encyclopedia entries - Editorials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nature and scope of indicator - Nature and quality of publication venue - Circulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copy of work or link to an online version - Copy of accepted works still in press, with copy of verification of final acceptance (see 9.03) - Copies of any related evidence/documentation
<p>Community-engaged research</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uses scholarly and professional expertise to address problems identified by community members - Collaborates with community members as co-researchers - Products resulting from research are community-facing / speak to the addressed problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copies of developed products - Description of / reflection on research process that explains collaboration with community members - Reports from community members on research experience and impacts
<p>Work-product on long-term / slow-developing projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thorough description of project focus, goals / expected outcomes, and potential impacts - Evidence of a clear plan and project timeline - Demonstration of steady progress / production on project commensurate with project timeline - Explanation / justification of time the project is taking or requires 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copies of project proposals for funding or publication - Documentation of development of access to research sites or related community membership - Documentation of communication to establish collaboration or research teams - Copies of research approvals such as IRB protocols (approved or under consideration) - Copies of final grant reports - Copies of developmental communication from editors/publishers - Copies of project drafts - Other related work-product

9.05.03 Service

Evidence of performance indicators is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to the performance indicator will be reviewed.

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Departmental, College, University Committee	Name and level of each committee and dates of service and description of commitments or role
Faculty Governance and Leadership	Name and level of each committee and dates of service and description of commitments or role

Participation in professional meetings and organizations including holding office, organizing conferences and panels	Name of organization, digitized copy of conference proceedings, emails, or other official organizational documents with faculty attribution
Reviewing manuscripts, applications for grants and awards, and conference proposals	Name of publication/grant, emails from editors or committee chairs and/or screen shots of review submissions
Internal/External Faculty Review	Emails from committee chairs or other evidence of review participation
Consulting activities related to faculty expertise	Brief description of service and outreach activities, audience, and outcomes
Community service and outreach	Brief description of service and outreach activities, audience, and outcomes
Supporting faculty in teaching, research, and creative endeavors	Emails, thank you letters, evidence of mentorship including observation letters, etc.
Initiatives beyond solicited assignments	Emails, digitized copy of products, copy of newsletters, etc. including faculty attribution
Awards for service	Name and date of the award

Section 9.05.04 Integration

Evidence of integration is the candidate's self-evaluation of integration (see Section 6.01.02D). This self-evaluation should identify integration of evidence of performance indicators in teaching, scholarship, and/or service (see Section 9.03.04).

Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01 University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI. Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Section 11.01 Timing of Review

Typically, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five years of service in the rank of Associate Professor. However, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they "meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five years in rank."

Faculty seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Professor will provide written notification of their intent to apply for promotion to the primary review administrator by the deadline established by the Provost. A tenured faculty member seeking promotion may withdraw from promotion review at any time and may reapply in any subsequent year (MSU Faculty Handbook [RTP Standards & Timelines Policy](#)).

Section 11.02 University Standard

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

- a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service,
- b) sustained integration of no less than two of teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- c) excellence in scholarship,

as demonstrated by the candidate's performance during the review period (MSU Faculty Handbook [RTP Standards & Timelines Policy](#)).

Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

The performance indicators and weighting used for this review are the same as those defined in Section 9.03, with the addition that faculty at the Associate level are expected to contribute significantly in service roles. As with tenure review, indicators must be achieved or completed rather than in-progress. Publications must be either publicly available online or in print ("published") or verified (via a signed contract, print agreement, or similar correspondence from editor/publisher) as accepted for publication not pending additional development or changes, after peer review or the appropriate corresponding vetting process.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

11.04.01 Teaching

The standard for this review is sustained effectiveness in teaching, and quantitative and qualitative expectations match those defined in Section 9.04.01. "Sustained effectiveness" is defined by the Faculty Handbook as "consistent successful performance over time and across course offerings and different student populations as appropriate to the faculty member's appointment."

11.04.02 Scholarship

"Excellence" is defined as "sustained, commendable, and distinguished performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. These activities and products include peer reviewed publications, formal peer-reviewed presentations, or comparable peer-evaluated works appropriate to the discipline. The activities and products must have a notable impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university" (MSU Faculty Handbook [RTP Review Definitions](#)).

Quantitative Expectations

The department expects an amount of Group 1 / Group 2 contributions beyond tenure similar to those required to earned tenure to begin with—see Section 9.04.02. In unusual circumstances, such as work of considerable impact or prestige, exceptions to this standard are possible.

Qualitative Expectations

The department uses the same categories of qualitative evaluation for promotion to Professor as for tenure and promotion to Associate—see Section 9.04.02. However, to demonstrate

“commendable and distinguished performance ... in impact,” the candidate’s dossier must demonstrate national or international recognition from peers for their contributions to their field’s body of knowledge. (See evidence of performance indicators, Section 9.05.02.)

11.04.03 Service

The standard for this review is sustained effectiveness in service, and quantitative and qualitative expectations match those defined in Section 9.04.03, with the addition that faculty at the Associate level are expected to contribute significantly to service roles—at a higher quantity than pre-tenured faculty, and in some positions of greater responsibility (e.g., chairing committees rather than just serving on them, or serving on committees that require greater experience or seniority). The Faculty handbook defines “sustained effectiveness” in service as “consistent successful performance over time and across a range of duties appropriate to the faculty member’s appointment.”

11.04.04 Integration

The standard for integration for promotion to Professor matches that defined in Section 9.04.04.

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

The evidence of performance indicators used to assess teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to Professor is identical to that used to assess performance for tenure / promotion to Associate Professor and is found in Section 9.05.01-04 of this document.

Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

Faculty members are entitled to propose changes to Role and Scope Documents of their academic unit. At the request of department faculty or Chair, the department RTP committee will guide drafting of proposed changes and submit them for approval by tenure-track faculty in the department and the department Chair. Changes approved by the department will follow the approval process detailed in Article XIII.

The Chair of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC) may also receive requests or recommendations for changes to the Role & Scope document, which they will forward to the unit. Units will act on any proposed changes received from the UPTC Chair on an annual basis and will undertake a full review of their Document no less than every three years. Submission of requested changes to the UPTC Chair should occur after the review committee or administrator completes all reviews for the year.

Article XIII. Approval Process

Role and Scope Documents of the academic units must be approved, as detailed below, before taking effect. Effective dates for approving Documents will be established by the provost. Article XIII is prescribed by policy and will be the same across all units.

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- a) Tenurable faculty and administrator of the Department of English;
- b) Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee and dean of the College of Letters and Science;
- c) University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC); and
- d) Provost.

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- a) Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee and dean of the College of Letters and Science ;
- b) University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC); and
- c) Provost.

The Provost, working with the URTPC, will resolve any conflicts that arise during the approval of Role and Scope Documents of the academic units. Once approved by all required parties, the provost will establish the effective date for the revised documents. Current documents will remain in force until revised documents are effective.