

Guidelines for Faculty Appointments and Reviews
Department of Liberal Studies
Texas A & M University at Galveston (TAMUG)

Department of Liberal Studies, Office of Dr. JoAnn DiGeorgio-Lutz, digeorgj@tamug.edu

Revised: September-October 2020

Reviewed by Department Faculty: October 2020

Approved by Chief Academic Officer, TAMUG: March 2021

Approved by Dean of Faculties of TAMU: March 2021 Next

Scheduled Review: March 2024

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks	4
3. Areas of Faculty Performance	5
3.1. Teaching	5
3.2. Research, scholarly activity, or creative work	6
3.3. Service	6
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness	6
4.1. Indicators of <i>Excellence in Teaching</i>	6
4.2. Indicators of <i>Effectiveness in Teaching</i>	7
4.3. Indicators of <i>Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i>	7
4.4. Indicators of <i>Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i>	8
4.5. Indicators of <i>Excellence in Service</i>	8
4.6. Indicators of <i>Effectiveness in Service</i>	8
5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure	9
5.1. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty	9
5.2. Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)	10
6. Annual Review	11
6.1. Purpose	12
6.2. Focus	12
6.3. Time Period of Review	13
6.4. Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance	13
6.5. Required Components	14
6.6. Assessment outcomes that require action	15
6.7. Time-Line	16
6.8. Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:	16
7. Mid-Term Review	16
7.1. Purpose	16
7.2. Process	17
7.3. Feedback from midterm review	17
8. Post-Tenure Review	17
8.1. Purpose	18
8.2. Peer Review Committee	18

8.3. Process 18

8.4. Professional Development Review 21

8.5. The Professional Development Plan 22

8.6. Appeal 22

8.7. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review 23

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status23

Appendix A Liberal Studies Form G125

Appendix B Liberal Studies G231

1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Liberal Studies at Texas A&M University at Galveston seeks to provide a robust intellectual foundation for students pursuing occupational and leadership roles in a diverse range of areas, from public policy and communication to environmental law and coastal community development. Our location on the Gulf of Mexico provides an opportunity for a fully immersed marine and maritime education, and our students receive excellent preparation for graduate studies and law school.

Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Liberal Studies for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. ([UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2](#)) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence. **Please also reference the TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines which supplements this document and can be found at the following link:**
<https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/pdf/TAMUG-Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines-Nov20.pdf>

This document articulates general Unit guidelines for faculty, annual review, tenure and promotion, promotion and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure

In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University or Texas A&M University System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System statements take precedence.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). LIST faculty should refer to the TAMUG Faculty Evaluation guidelines for specific details and they are repeated below from the TAMUG guidelines. <https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/pdf/TAMUG-Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines-Nov20.pdf>

2.1 Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty

Faculty with the titles of Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor will be expected to achieve impactful performances in these three areas:

2.1.1 Teaching

2.1.2. Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities

2.1.3. Service

2.2. Academic Professional Faculty

Faculty with the titles of Instructional Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Assistant Professor will be expected to achieve impactful performances in two of these three areas:

2.2.1. Teaching

2.2.2. Service

2.2.3. Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities

Academic Professional Track Faculty support as a priority the teaching mission of the university. Most will contribute to the service activities as the second dimension of their responsibilities. In rare cases and with the approval of the department head and CAO, an exception to the service requirement may be made for those with Academic Professional Track faculty assigned to conduct research, scholarly or creative activities.

2.3. Lecturers and Adjuncts

Faculty with titles of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer will be expected to achieve impactful performances in this area:

2.3.1. Teaching

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

(Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance (*creation and dissemination of new knowledge via research and publication, instruction/teaching, and service to the department, the university, the profession, and external constituencies*).

Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

Again, LIST faculty should refer to the TAMUG college guidelines for specifics.

<https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/pdf/TAMUG-Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines-Nov20.pdf>

3.1. Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the College's instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning.

A commitment to excellence in teaching is an expectation of all faculty, no matter the track. This category includes classroom and laboratory instruction, courses that provide experiential learning, development of new courses and teaching methods, including the development or expansion of electronic delivery of course

content, academic advising (may also include as a service activity where appropriate), supervision of undergraduate and graduate research, clinical supervision, and mentoring. The specific criteria and indicators for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are found in Section 4.

3.2. Research, scholarly activity, or creative work

Faculty members must document scholarly activities, including works in progress, and clearly identify the impact this scholarship has on their respective field. Refer to Appendix IV of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) for further details regarding the Evidence Supporting Performance in Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities. Experts in the same or related disciplines must make decisions about the quality or merit of scholarly and creative work. Peer review is essential. A book or article written but unpublished, an artwork completed but not juried, or the rendering of professional collaboration and consultation not subject to peer recognition is less significant in this category. Examples of the creation, influence, and dissemination of the ideas/work must be documented. The specific criteria and indicators for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating research, scholarly activity or creative work performance are found in Section 4.

3.3. Service

This includes service to the institution—to students, colleagues, department, TAMUG, TAMU, and TAMUS—as well as service to the profession/field beyond the campus. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large. Refer to Appendix V of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#)) for further details regarding Evidence Supporting Performance in Service.

A variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of our goals of pre-eminence through service to the institution, students, colleagues, professional societies, governmental agencies, and to the public at large. In each case an important consideration is service that results in the creation of ideas, the influence of ideas, and the dissemination of ideas. Quality and impact of service is expected from each member of the faculty. Service is typically the active participation in professional or community organizations or other bodies that utilize a faculty member's professional expertise in their field, as an educator and scholar. The department values both internal and external service. The specific criteria and indicators for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating service performance are found in Section 4.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Liberal Studies recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#)).

4.1. Indicators of *Excellence in Teaching* includes, but is not limited to:

- Selection for peer reviewed (faculty) university, TAMUG, or professional society outstanding teacher/instruction awards (such as the Association of Former Students award).
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence through peer review.
- Outstanding teaching performance over a significant period of time as evidenced by outstanding student ratings, interviews with students and student leaders, and outstanding peer evaluations (including peer reviews of classroom instruction).
- Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials, including high quality online (distance learning) courses.

- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases, readings, simulations, and the like).
- Major contributions to the development of new instructional programs.
- Invitation to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's student(s).
- Development and/or coordination of successful new executive development programs.
- Incorporation of diversity and inclusion in course materials and evidence of lowering barriers to entry and learning and/or increasing success for underrepresented or marginalized students.

4.2. Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Teaching*** includes, but is not limited to:

- Selection of student awards for outstanding teaching/instruction.
- Development of a new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses.
- Evidence of high-quality course preparation, and student interaction through peer review and student evaluations.
- Supervision, development, and the creation of independent student projects.
- Significant contributions to student development through student advising and mentoring, including service as a departmental undergraduate advisor in specific programs.
- Significant self-development activities, such as a faculty development leave, that led to increased teaching effectiveness.
- Engagement in the TAMUG Honors Program and/or programs for mentoring the professional development of students.
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching.
- Successful completion of departmental peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness as documented in the departmental guidelines developed and approved by the faculty in 2019.

Additional criteria and rubrics of assessment are found in Appendix III Evidence Supporting Performance in Teaching of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#).

4.3. Indicators of ***Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work*** to include but is not limited to the following:

- Single-authored article published in peer reviewed journal
- Co-authored article published in peer reviewed journal
- First authorship article on multi-authored article published in peer reviewed journal
- Authorship in multi-authored peer reviewed journal
- Published book in academic/university press
- Published book in commercial press
- Edited book in academic/university press
- Edited book in commercial press
- Editorship of a book series for an academic press
- Editorship of a special edition of a peer-reviewed journal
- Frequent citation of publications indicated by the appropriate citation index
- Receipt of major fellowship, research, or publication award(s) such as NSF, Fulbright,
- Invitation to present showcase or keynote paper or address at important international and national conferences.
- Invitation to present research at peer and/or aspirant schools.
- International (or national, where appropriate) recognition or reputation of scholarship.

- 4.4. Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work*** includes, but is not limited to the following:
- Publication in non-refereed journals
 - Publication of a professional book.
 - Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs.
 - Publication of chapter(s) in scholarly book(s).
 - Well-documented contribution (i.e., mentorship) to the research of others.
 - Significant self-development activities such as a faculty development leave.
 - Consulting reports.
 - Book reviews.
 - Reprints of articles
 - Reviewer for scholarly journals
 - Editorial staff for scholarly journal
 - Works under review
 - Ad hoc reviewer for manuscripts
 - Grant proposals written and submitted (any amount from any source).
- 4.5. Indicators of ***Excellence in Service*** includes, but is not limited to:
- Officer or committee chair in a national/international professional organization.
 - Program chair of major related conference.
 - Administrative leadership role within the department or TAMUG.
 - Officer in the Faculty Senate.
 - Chair of a university committee or task force.
 - Other demonstrated leadership in departmental, TAMUG, TAMU, or system administrative or service roles.
 - Higher ranks are expected to demonstrate significant professional service such as leadership in their professional organization, editorial board memberships, grant review panels, national taskforce, or review panels (e.g., NRC reports), international organizations, etc.
 - Service on a governmental commission, task force, or board.
 - Chair of departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee
 - Member of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee
 - Attraction of significant external financial support through development /philanthropy activities
 - Membership on editorial board of a peer reviewed journal(s)
 - Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large.
- 4.6. Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Service*** includes, but is not limited to:
- Officer in regional or state professional organization.
 - Program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organization meeting.
 - Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate.
 - Service on TAMU, TAMUG, and department committees and task forces.
 - Advisor to student organizations.
 - Administrative roles within the department.
 - Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups.
 - Service as consultant to business organization(s) and/or governmental agencies.
 - Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large.
 - Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.
 - Ad hoc reviewer for double blinded refereed journals and/or national or international organizations.
 - Reviewer of textbooks and other supplemental materials or published instructional software.
 - Member of a university or departmental search committee

- Member of a university task force
- Significant contribution in adherence to university compliance and safety protocols and/or emergency crisis management"

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service), with primary emphasis on the **quality, significance, and impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The process for Promotion and Tenure for both tenure/tenure-track faculty and Academic Professional Track faculty in the department follows the guidelines and process established in the TAMUG guidelines in Appendix I (pages 35-37) and Appendix II (pages 38-39). The LIST department adheres to the Committee of the Whole and the DH invites senior faculty to serve on the sub-committee in the spring semester. The criteria for the unit is as follows:

- 5.1.1 Assistant Professor: are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish an excellent pattern of research and publication. Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on departmental and TAMUG academic needs. Further, it is expected that assistant professors will display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

During their probationary period, the work of Assistant Professors is expected to display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. At the point of their mandatory mid-term review, they will need to show effectiveness in all three dimensions of their dossier, and a clear trajectory of acceleration towards establishing a productive pattern of scholarly and creative activities and publications.

5.1.1.1 Performance expectations for tenure (Promotion to Associate professor with tenure)

Assistant professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish an excellent pattern of research and publication. Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on departmental and TAMUG academic needs. Promotion to associate professor with tenure will be based on an assessment of all the performance dimensions, with research and publication carrying the heaviest weight. The minimum requirements for tenure in the Department of Liberal Studies include the following:

- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Department of Liberal Studies and TAMUG.
- Pattern over time of some indication of effectiveness in service (defined above).
- Pattern over time of effectiveness in instruction/teaching (defined above).
- Pattern over time of excellence (and effectiveness) in research and publication (defined above with specificity below).
- High potential for continued excellence.

To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member must possess sufficient years of service in academia as denoted in TAMU 12.01. In addition, probationary faculty members must maintain AQ status

at all times during the probationary period.

5.1.2 Associate Professor: are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate effectiveness in the service dimension. Excellence is expected in instruction/teaching or research and publication. Associate professors, relative to assistant professors, are expected to exhibit increased contributions in one or more of the areas of service effectiveness and excellence. Promotion to professor will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions. The requirements for promotion to professor are demonstration of excellence in all three dimensions. The following questions should guide the review.

5.1.2.1 Has the candidate contributed successfully to the research, teaching and service missions of the Department and the University?

5.1.2.2 Has the candidate achieved substantial national and/or international recognition in research or another form of research or creative activity in his/her chosen field(s), or has shown significant evidence to do so in the future?

5.1.3 Professor: The requirements for promotion to Professor at TAMUG recognize the University's minimum requirements of completion of all requirements expected of an Associate Professor and superior accomplishment (excellence) in research/creative activities and a high level of ability in teaching and Service. Professors are also expected to demonstrate outstanding merit in the pursuit of excellence and national/international prominence.

By itself, administrative experience is insufficient as a justification for promotion to the rank of Professor. However, extraordinary service in this dimension should be positively taken into consideration in the promotion review.

Professors are expected to demonstrate leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence. This leadership may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, such as: (1) leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in service; (2) leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in instruction/teaching, which includes student development; (3) leadership in contributing to the body of knowledge; (4) leadership in the development of junior faculty.

While there may be significant diversity in the nature of the contributions by professors, there is continued expectation of examples of excellence in one or more performance areas. Merit compensation will be the primary extrinsic means of recognizing such excellence. Another potential means of recognition is through consideration for appointment to an endowed position. The following questions should guide the review.

5.1.3.1. Has the candidate successfully developed a leadership role in the research, teaching, and service missions of the Department and the University, recognized at national to international levels?

5.1.3.2. Is the candidate recognized by their peers as leading scholar in their chosen field(s), or has shown significant evidence to do so in the future?

5.2. Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track) in LIST follow the TAMUG criteria for promotion and therefore APT faculty need to reference the TAMUG college level Faculty Evaluation guidelines for promotion criteria at the following link: <https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/pdf/TAMUGFaculty-Evaluation-Guidelines-Nov20.pdf>

5.2.1 Senior Lecturer:

The quality and impact of teaching activities will be given primary emphasis for the granting of promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers are expected, at a minimum, to maintain effectiveness in instruction/teaching at TAMUG. The granting of promotion to Senior Lecturer will demonstrate, over time, excellence, and effectiveness in instruction/teaching. Indicators are listed in section 4.

5.2.2. Instructional Assistant Professors:

Instructional Assistant Professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a productive pattern of service contributions to the department and/or TAMUG and TAMU. The granting of promotion to Instructional Assistant Professor (from a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer position) will be based on an assessment of the quality and impact of prior teaching activities and contributions to service (or research in some cases when the faculty's second responsibility is in this dimension). This would include a pattern over time of excellence and effectiveness in instruction/teaching as well as a pattern over time of effectiveness in service (or research in some cases when the faculty's second responsibility is in this dimension). The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible. Indicators are listed in section 4.

5.2.3. Instructional Associate Professors:

The granting of promotion to Instructional Associate Professor will be based on an assessment of two of the three dimensions of performance, with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching activities. This would include a pattern over time of excellence and impact in instruction/teaching as well as a pattern over time of effectiveness in service (or research in some cases when the faculty's second responsibility is in this dimension). Instructional Associate Professors are expected to be highly effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a significant pattern of service contributions to the University and/or national professional organizations. The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible. Indicators are listed in section 4.

5.2.4. Instructional Professor:

The granting of promotion to Instructional Professor will be based on an assessment of two of the three major categories of performance, with a primary emphasis on the high quality and impact of their teaching activities. This would include a pattern over time of excellence and impact in instruction/teaching as well as a pattern over time of significant service (or research in some cases when the faculty's second responsibility is in this dimension). The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible. Indicators are listed in section 4.

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors, and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual reviews will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head, director, or supervisor regarding the faculty member's performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

6.1. Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
 - See [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2. Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3. Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window. The annual review covers the calendar year of performance.

6.4. Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on at least three categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Meets expectations/Satisfactory,” “Exceeds Expectations.” A unit might decide to use more than three categories and for merit, it is advised that more than three are used. These might include: “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Satisfactory”, “Exemplary”, and “Most Meritorious” based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance.

6.4.1. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Teaching** are:

- *Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.*
- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.*
- *Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.*
- *Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.*
- *Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.*

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **satisfactory performance**. The unit should have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the members of the unit.

6.4.2. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are:

- *Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.*
- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, **for example**, funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.*
- *Satisfactory – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.*
- *Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances,*

and invited presentations. **Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.**

- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

6.4.3. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Service** are:

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

6.5. Required Components

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.1. Faculty member's report of previous activities

The exact form of the faculty member's report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the College, but must include the following:

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit's practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.
- The LIST department uses the annual G1 form submitted by the faculty and the G2 evaluation form completed by the DH. These forms were approved by the faculty and the CAO. The G1 and the G2 are attached as Appendixes A and B respectively.

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

6.5.2. A written document stating the department head's, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations.

The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs ([System Regulation 33.05.02](#) Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" portion of the department head's, director's, or supervisor's written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

6.5.3. Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

6.5.4. Performance Assessment.

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual's appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the Department, College, and University.

6.6. Assessment outcomes that require action

As per [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

6.6.1. Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care...), or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Section 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for a

tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 9.2.) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2. Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when predetermined milestones are met.

6.7. Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year.”

6.8. Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#)

7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

7.1. Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.

- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure)review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2. Process

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2019.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2019	7 years	Mar – Dec 2022 (due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)

7.3. Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.

8. Post-Tenure Review¹

In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2.).

¹ Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.

8.1. Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

8.2. Peer Review Committee:

The Post-Tenure Review committee in the Department of Liberal Studies is comprised of the Promotion and Tenure Committee members appointed by the Department Head.

In accordance with University policy (12.06.99.M0.01, section 3.2), which requires each department to have its own post-tenure guidelines, the Department of Liberal Studies has adopted the following guidelines that were approved by the tenured faculty and approved by the Dean of Faculties in 2017.

Peer evaluation of performance: The Department will use its promotion and tenure committee to conduct post-tenure reviews not more than once every six years.

Criteria for rating faculty performances: Post-tenure reviews are based upon criteria referenced in “Texas A&M University: Guidelines and Procedures for Annual Review, Promotion and Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review,” section 2.0 entitled “Promotion and Tenure: Process and Procedures.” These TAMUG guidelines refer to the Indicators of Excellence and Indicators of Effectiveness (listed in Appendix 1 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2) as criteria used to evaluate faculty performance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

The Department of Liberal Studies expects that tenured faculty members will demonstrate satisfactory impact (as described in the following list) in, teaching, and service throughout their career:

Scholarship

- Pursuing a scholarship program in his or her discipline
- Informing the discipline on scholarship activities through publications, convention and conference presentations, or other professional activities

Teaching

- Offering academically sound courses incorporating current scholarship about the course’s subject matter
- Employing pedagogically sound techniques to instruct students
- Being available to meet with students to discuss academic matters
- Assigning equitable final grades based on student performance and on reasonable expectations

Service

- Willingly providing service for the department, campus (i.e., Texas A&M University at Galveston), university, or discipline

8.3. Process:

8.3.1. Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

Tenured faculty members demonstrate they meet expectations in teaching with documented completion of **no fewer** than three of the following over a period of six years (materials since last PTR):

- Recognition by a University Teaching Award or other teaching award
- Developing and delivering new courses and curricula in support of the department or campus mission
- New contributions to interdisciplinary/interdepartmental curriculum integration judged as significant by departmental peers and/or department head
- Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level with recognized excellence by student evaluations
- Major revision of existing courses
- Participation in the TAMUG Honors Program and/or programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- Participation/attendance at faculty workshops for teaching
- Grants received for teaching
- Attendance at professional development opportunities (e.g., online teaching certification)
- Attendance/participation in local, state, national or international conferences or seminars on teaching related activities, pedagogy, or scholarship in teaching
- Contribution to an on-campus continuing education program.
- Delivering an invited guest lecture in another faculty member's course
- Participation in faculty development initiatives focused on teaching improvement judged as significant by department and campus peers (e.g., CTE Steps Program)
- Participating in peer review of teaching by colleagues or outside experts judged as significant by peers
- Attendance at Center for Teaching Excellence seminars or colloquia

Tenured faculty members demonstrate they meet expectations in service with documented completion of no fewer than three of the following over a period of six years (materials since last PTR):

- Serve as the editor or assistant editor of a peer-reviewed journal
- Effectively serving as an officer in or chairing a significant state, regional or national committee as judged by departmental peers
- Effectively serving as a session or panel chair at a national or regional conference
- Organizing and successfully presenting a conference workshop, session, or panel Effectively serving as advisor to a significant active club or student organization where a significant time commitment is required: i.e., working with a student group on a major project as determined by the members of the student group or club
- Effectively serving as a program director
- Effectively chairing an active university, campus or departmental committee or task force
- Engaging in a significant number of unreported service activities (e.g., receptions, speaking engagements, extra classes without compensation, etc.)
- Serving as a mentor for a campus faculty member.
- Officer or committee chair in a national/international/regional professional organization
- Program chair/discussant at a national/international/regional professional conference/meeting
- Member of an editorial board
- Effectively serving as faculty advisor to student organizations
- Member of Tenure and Promotion Committee—Departmental
- Member of Tenure and Promotion Committee--University
- Chair of Tenure and Promotion Committee
- Member of department, TAMUG, TAMU committee
- Chair of search committee
- Member of search committee
- Officer/Member in Faculty Senate
- Chair/Member of a departmental or university task force

- Service on a governmental commission, task force, or board
- Administrative role in the department
- Chair of a department/TAMUG committee.
- Recognition/Service Awards, such as CEO Meritorious Service Award, Ricker Award, etc.
- Collaborative/Cooperative projects with other departments, university agencies/divisions/community
- External reviewer for journals, publishers, and faculty tenure and promotion packets
- Service as an evaluator of candidates in field of expertise for a federal agency such as the Fulbright Scholars Program, or service in field of expertise for a state agency
- Active and documented support of student organizations and/or events

Tenured faculty members demonstrate they meet expectations in scholarship with documented completion of no fewer than three of the following over a period of six years (materials since last PTR):

- Publication in a peer reviewed journal (single author, co-author, or multi-authored)
- Published book in academic/university press/commercial press
- Fellowships/scholarly award such as Fulbright
- Edited book in academic/university press
- Invited book reviews
- Book reviews
- Encyclopedia entries
- Chapter in edited book
- Funded grants
- Monographs
- Reprints
- Grant proposals written and submitted
- Papers presented at national, international, regional professional conference
- Submitted work under review

8.3.2. The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.

8.3.3. If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.

8.3.4. A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.5. A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.6. A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

8.3.7. For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.² If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

8.3.8. By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee's written evaluation and the faculty member's post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

8.4. Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

8.4.1. The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

8.4.2. The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

8.4.2a The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the ad hoc review committee, specifically, what "consultation" means.

8.4.3. The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

² It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.

8.4.4. The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

8.4.5. The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

8.4.5.1. No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,

8.4.5.2. Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

8.5. The Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the unit guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, director, or supervisor and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the Professional Development Plan see Section 9 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review)

8.6. Appeal

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-tenure review are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of [University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01](#) (Faculty Grievances Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

8.7. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by making a request to the department head, director, or supervisor (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

[University Rule 31.08.01.M2](#) states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see [Institutional Rule 31.08.01](#), which indicates the process for this situation.

See the Dean of Faculties website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

The LIST department adheres to the guidelines established by the DOF for granting Emeritus status.

Appendix

Units may choose to annotate the revisions to previous versions of their evaluation guidelines

Contact Office

Department of Liberal Studies, Office of Dr. JoAnn DiGeorgio-Lutz, digeorgj@tamug.edu

Revised: September-October 2020

Reviewed by Department Faculty: October 2020

Approved by Chief Academic Officer, TAMUG: March 2021

Approved by Dean of Faculties of TAMU: March 2021 Next

Scheduled Review: March 2024

Appendix A Liberal Studies Form G1

Department of Liberal Studies

Annual G1 Evaluation Form

FORM G1: ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

[Save this document as a **PDF** with your last name, e.g., ‘G1-2019-Smith,’ and submit an electronic copy to the Department Head.]

NAME:

RANK:

OTHER APPOINTMENTS:

[List *title* and *name* of the department/program at which you have other appointment (e.g., joint/adjunct/graduate appointments).]

REVIEW PERIOD : January 1 to December 31, 2019—ONLY LIST ITEMS RELATED TO THIS REVIEW PERIOD

A. TEACHING

A.1. COURSES TAUGHT

A.1.1. Spring Semester

Office hours scheduled per week:

Course No.	Course Title	Level (F,S,J, Sr)	Requir- ed ^a	CCR ^b	Credit Hrs.	Enroll ment	SCH ^c	Student Evaluation (# responded)
Spring Totals		/	/	/				

^a Specify the program or major for which this course is required.

^b Core curriculum requirements: indicate Creative Arts, W (writing intensive), ICD (international and cultural diversity), SBS (social and behavioral sciences), and LPC (language, philosophy, and culture), courses in USGA (MELP, TCD, MPC), Honors

^c SCH (Student Credit Hours) = Credit Hours × Enrollment (**do not include** Research, Directed Studies, or Internship for SCH or Total Credit Hours).

A.1.2. Summer Semester

Office hours scheduled per week:

Course No.	Course Title	Level (F,S,J, Sr.)	Requir- ed ^a	CCR ^b	Credit Hrs.	Enroll ment	SCH ^c	Student Evaluation (# responded)
Summer Totals		/	/	/				

A.1.3. Fall Semester

Office hours scheduled per week:

Course No.	Course Title	Level (F,S,J, Sr.)	Requir- ed ^a	CCR ^b	Credit Hrs.	Enroll ment	SCH ^c	Student Evaluation (# responded)
Fall Totals		/	/	/				

A.2. STUDENTS SUPERVISING

A.2.1. Undergraduate Students and/or Interns Mentored and Honors Contracts

No.	Name	Department	Level (F/S/J/S)	Semester ^a			Comments
				Sp	Su	F	
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							

A.3. OTHER COURSES TAUGHT

[Include *recognized programs for continuing education, short courses, or special workshops*. Do not list guest lectures—guest lectures are a service activity]

A.4. TRANSFORMATIONAL LEARNING INITIATIVES

[Include *education program proposals, new courses developed, first time preparations, or course improvements, hands-on learning, high impact activities*] Only include this evaluation cycle.

B. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

B.1. PUBLICATIONS

Category	Number of		
	Published	In Press/ Accepted	Submitted
1. Peer Reviewed Journal Articles			
2. Peer Reviewed Book Chapters			
3. Peer Reviewed Books			
4. Non-Peer Reviewed Journal Articles			
5. Non-Peer Reviewed Book Chapters			
6. Non-Peer Reviewed Books			
7. Other Non-Peer Reviewed Academic Publications			
8. Book Reviews			
9. Editorship of Books, Journals, or Technical Reports			
10. Reprints			
11. Other academic publications			

[Give below *complete bibliographic notation* including names of all authors, year, title, journal name, volume number, and pages.]

[Underline the names in author list to indicate *students* or *post-docs* at the time of research.]

B.1.1. Editorship of Books, Journals or Technical Reports

[Cut & paste citations here]

B.1.2. Abstracts

[Cut & paste citations here]

B.2. RESEARCH GRANTS AND CONTRACTS ACTIVITY

B.2.1. Funded Research—only list this evaluation period.

[List all funded grants and contracts *separately*.]

[Copy the table as necessary.]

Individual faculty total funding budgeted for the review year: \$

No. (funded research)	
Investigators (indicate PI & co-PIs)	
Title	
Duration (mo./yr. - mo./yr.)	
Funding agency	
Total budget (individual budget)	
Status (completed or on-going)	

B.2.2. INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Did you apply for a TCRF or other internal (to TAMU/G) development program (PESCA, Conacyt, etc.) to conduct your research?

- If you were successful, what are the outcomes?
- If you were not successful, what is your plan to elevate your scholarship through funded research?

B.3. OTHER RESEARCH and SCHOLARLY RELATED ACTIVITIES

B.3.1. Invited Lectures and Seminars (other institutions and not guest lecturing on campus)

[List title of presentation, date, place, and additional co-authors.]

B.3.2. Presentation at Professional Conferences and/or Workshops

[List title of presentation, date, place, and additional co-authors.]

[List only the presentations *you gave*.]

B.3.3. Reviewing Manuscripts and/or Research Proposals

[List title of manuscript/proposal, authors, journal name/research program, and date.]

B.3.4. Participation in Professional Institutes, Workshops, Courses, or Conferences (enhancing skills and/or knowledge)

[List title of event, date, and place.]

B.3.5. Other Professional Development

[e.g., honors and awards, advisory panels, office holding in professional organizations, organizing sessions in professional conferences, hosting visiting scientists/students, media coverage, etc.]

C. SERVICE

C.1. SERVICE ACTIVITIES

C.1.1 Committee or Administration Service (list offices held if applicable)

- a. Departmental (both LIST and other departments) Committees**
- b. TAMUG or TAMU Committees**
- c. TAMU System Committees**
- d. University Administration**
- e. Committees Outside of TAMU System**

C.1.2. Extracurricular Participation

[e.g., student organization advisor, etc.]

C.1.3. Community Service

[e.g., volunteer, board member, advisor, officer, etc.]

D. COMPLIANCE

D.1. Please acknowledge that you are compliant with all required training.

D.2. Please acknowledge that you adhere to University rules regarding students (certifying attendance rosters, adhering to final exam schedule, syllabi compliance, etc.)

D.3. Please acknowledge that you adhere to University rules regarding faculty conduct (12.01.99 M2, section 3, and other rules and policies)

Appendix B Liberal Studies G2

Texas A&M University at Galveston
Department of Liberal Studies

FORM G2: ANNUAL REVIEW EVALUATION

NAME :
RANK :
REVIEW PERIOD : January 1 to December 31, 2019
SALARY-BUDGET : 100% budget, 9-month, full-time faculty

Teaching Effectiveness Comments:

Scholarly and Creative Activity Comments:

Service Accomplishments Comments:

Compliance:

Rating

	Most meritorious	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Teaching					
Research					
Service					
Overall					

JoAnn DiGeorgio-Lutz
JoAnn DiGeorgio-Lutz
Department Head

Date

Faculty Member

Date