

12.01.99.C0.06 Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members



Revised: October 21, 2024

Next Scheduled Review: October 21, 2029

[Revision History](#)

Procedure Summary

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi considers the management of faculty performance to be an ongoing process that consists of performance planning, goal setting, faculty development, regular feedback, and a performance interview. Performance management is an essential function that supports several major objectives:

- To promote the establishment of performance expectations and goals that are consistent with institutional goals and objectives
- To formally communicate with faculty regarding performance
- To develop maximum performance potential of faculty
- To acknowledge faculty for job accomplishments

Procedure

1. GENERAL

- 1.1. Each year department chairs/supervisors, in consultation with faculty, will review academic unit (e.g., college, school, library) goals and ensure these goals are consistent with institutional goals. In conjunction with unit goals, department chairs/supervisors will identify individual performance goals and development and training needs for faculty. A faculty member's professional performance is to be evaluated annually by their department chair/supervisor in the electronic faculty review system, based on the responsibilities outlined in university procedure *12.01.99.C0.03, Responsibilities of Faculty Members*, the criteria that are directly related to the faculty member's job responsibilities outlined in their notice of appointment and workload, and their established goals, as developed by the department chair/supervisor in consultation with the faculty member.

- 1.2. Department chairs/supervisors will fairly evaluate a faculty member's job performance regardless of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, disability, genetic information, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or any other classification protected by federal, state, or local law.

2. FACULTY EVALUATION RATINGS

- 2.1. The areas of evaluation for faculty members that must be given a rating will be based on their responsibilities and may include teaching, librarianship, research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA), and/or service. Evaluations must be based on the data provided in an appropriate university-approved faculty information management system. Weight will be given to those areas of responsibility according to the percentage of workload distribution. Rating levels used in evaluating a faculty member are as follows:

- Exceeds Expectations:
 - Exceeds performance expectations for full-time faculty members of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or academic unit.
- Meets Expectations:
 - Meets performance expectations for full-time faculty members of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or academic unit.
- Unsatisfactory:
 - Performance is below expectations for a full-time faculty member of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or academic unit.
 - The faculty member must improve performance in any area of teaching, librarianship, RSCA, and/or service that is scored unsatisfactory in the annual review, and a professional development plan will be created as outlined in section 5 of this procedure.

- 2.2. Academic units must adhere to the specific rating levels listed in section 2.1 of this procedure and must establish general criteria for faculty to achieve these rating levels. The criteria must be approved by a majority vote of full-time faculty in their respective academic unit. The academic unit dean/director will ensure criteria are fair and consistent across departments.

- 2.3. At the discretion of the respective academic unit dean/director, the department chair/supervisor, with oversight from the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) and in consultation with faculty, may

determine more specific department and/or discipline-specific criteria to be used in conjunction with the general criteria developed by the respective academic unit.

- 2.4. Each academic unit must make the criteria therein publicly available to faculty in writing prior to the implementation of the criteria for use in the faculty evaluation process. Each academic unit dean/director must submit the academic unit's criteria to the Provost for approval prior to implementation in the faculty evaluation process.

3. PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESS

- 3.1. Faculty performance reviews are conducted annually in the spring for all full-time faculty members and cover the activities from the previous calendar year. The only exception to this is during an untenured tenure-track faculty member's pre-tenure review, which is conducted in lieu of their fourth year's annual performance review as outlined in university rule *12.01.01.C1, Tenure*. The pre-tenure review does not include the fall semester of the faculty member's fourth year, so that semester's activities will be included in the following year's annual performance review. This means that an untenured tenure-track faculty member's fifth year annual review will cover 16 months (e.g., September 1, 2024 through December 31, 2025).
- 3.2. Faculty members will be evaluated on the general expectations listed in university procedure *12.01.99.0.03, Responsibilities of Faculty Members* and those areas named in section 2.1 of this procedure that are part of their assigned professional duties and relative to their workload profile and that the evaluator is in an actual position to properly assess their performance. For example, some professional faculty members may not be evaluated on RSCA, while some research faculty may not be evaluated on teaching.
- 3.3. Faculty evaluations must include a rating for each appropriate area of responsibility, as well as an overall rating for the annual review period. The evaluation must also state whether the faculty member is making adequate progress toward promotion, tenure, and/or post-tenure review, as applicable. The faculty member's workload distribution and its relationship to their overall rating must be stated in the evaluation.
- 3.4. The academic unit dean/director will review faculty evaluations in the electronic faculty review system to ensure that fairness and consistency are achieved across departments.
- 3.5. An overall rating will be assigned for the annual review period, based on the weighted scores assigned in each evaluation area. Regardless of workload, if

a faculty member receives an Unsatisfactory rating in one (1) or more evaluation area that results in a combined Unsatisfactory weighting equal to or greater than 50% of their overall rating, the faculty member will receive an overall Unsatisfactory rating. If a faculty member receives an Unsatisfactory rating in the same evaluation area over a contiguous two-year period, regardless of workload, they will receive an overall Unsatisfactory rating.

- 3.6. In order to qualify for a merit payment connected to the annual faculty evaluation, faculty members must receive an overall rating of Meets Expectations or higher.

4. FACULTY RESPONSE PROCESS

- 4.1. Faculty members can file a written response to their annual evaluation via the electronic faculty review system, which will accompany the evaluation for any subsequent performance reviews.
- 4.2. If a faculty member disagrees with their evaluation, then the faculty member should present their concerns to their department chair/supervisor. The department chair/supervisor will reach a decision as soon as possible, but generally not later than 10 working days from the date the concern was presented.
- 4.3. In the event that a satisfactory resolution is not reached, the faculty member may bring the concern to their respective dean/director or Provost for faculty who report to the dean/director. The academic unit dean/director, or Provost as applicable, will reach a decision as soon as possible, but generally not later than 10 working days from the date the concern was presented. The decision of the academic unit dean/director, or Provost as applicable, will be final.

5. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 5.1. If the faculty member receives an Unsatisfactory rating in any category/categories (teaching, librarianship, RSCA, and/or service) or an overall rating of Unsatisfactory, the faculty member, in collaboration with the department chair/supervisor, will establish a short-term professional development plan addressing any/all Unsatisfactory areas (individual categories and/or overall rating) within 30 days of the performance review. This plan must include performance improvement benchmarks.
- 5.2. The original written evaluation and development plan must be submitted to the academic unit dean/director and Provost.

- 5.3. Normally, the development plan period will be for one (1) academic year. The department chair/supervisor will assess evidence of improvement midway through the plan and discuss progress with the faculty member.
- 5.4. The successful completion of the professional development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The department chair/supervisor will assess evidence of improvement at the completion of the development plan at or before the next performance review of the faculty member. If the faculty member is deemed to have made insufficient progress by the end of the plan period, the department chair/supervisor in conjunction with the academic unit dean/director, will take appropriate administrative action up to and including recommendation for dismissal.

Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements

System Policy [12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure](#)

System Regulation [32.01.01, Complaint and Appeal Procedures for Faculty Members](#)

University Rule [12.01.01.C1, Tenure](#)

University Rule [31.01.08.C1, Merit Pay](#)

University Procedure [12.01.99.C0.03, Responsibilities of Full-Time Faculty Members](#)

University Procedure [12.07.99.C0.01, Fixed-Term Faculty Members](#)

University Procedure [32.01.01.C0.01, Complaint and Appeal Procedure for Faculty Members](#)

This procedure supersedes:

- 33.99.99.C0.02, Performance Review of Full-Time Faculty Members

Contact Office

Contact for clarification and interpretation: Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
(361) 825-2722