

II.E.

FACULTY REVIEWS

(Revised: November 10, 2017; April 20, 2018; April 5, 2019; September 27, 2019; May 18, 2020, November 20, 2020; April 22, 2022; March 10, 2023; April 28, 2023; January 2024; April 19, 2024; January 16, 2025; May 2, 2025)

II.E.1. Annual Review of Faculty

Performance and development of all non-tenured and tenured faculty in the School will be evaluated annually. Annual evaluations will be consistent with the requirements of Faculty Handbook Sections “Responsibilities of Faculty Members” [University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.03*], “Promotion of Full-Time Faculty Members” [University Procedure *33.99.04.C0.02*]), and “Academic Rank Descriptors for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty” [University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.01*]) Evaluations of non-tenured faculty will be conducted within the requirements of SAMC Handbook section II.C: Non-Tenure Track Faculty. If the faculty member undergoes pre-tenure review in an academic year, that review will be considered as being in lieu of the annual performance review for that year.

Annual evaluations will be completed by the appropriate Department Chair. The evaluation will be provided to the faculty member in writing. Copies will be forwarded to the Director and Provost for review and placement in the faculty member’s School and University personnel file. The faculty member may review the evaluation and respond to it in writing to the Department Chair and Director. Any faculty response will be placed in the faculty member’s School personnel file. Per University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.06*, Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members, “If the faculty member receives an Unsatisfactory rating in any category/categories or overall from their department chair/supervisor, the faculty member, in collaboration with the department chair/supervisor, shall establish a short-term professional development plan addressing any/all Unsatisfactory areas.”

The forms, documents, kinds of evidence, and other materials to be used in the evaluation process are those found in the faculty member’s personnel file as described in SAMC Handbook section II.B: Faculty Personnel File and in later sections of this document. These materials will be consistent with the five major areas of: academic preparation, experience, teaching, service, and research, scholarship, and/or creative activity as described below. All full-time faculty members are required to provide an annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR) in the appropriate university-approved database (e.g., Interfolio) for use in consideration of performance reviews (University Procedure *33.99.99.C0.02*, Assistant and Associate Deans/Directors of Academic Units).

The criteria to be used for annual evaluation shall be those specified later in this document. Criteria and evidence used in evaluations shall be consistent with written measures of the discipline or department (if applicable) as well as Faculty Handbook “Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service” [University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.04*]. Instructors, Professional Assistant Professors, Assistant Professors, and Associate Professors will be evaluated regarding the criteria for their present rank and their progress toward meeting the criteria for the next higher rank. Full Professors will be evaluated regarding continued performance consistent with the criteria for that rank.

A faculty member should identify individual developmental goals for the next year with the appropriate chair. Mutually agreed-upon goals will be documented in the annual review letter and the FAR. Faculty members should engage in teaching development activities at least once every three years. Documentation of such activity may be incorporated into the FAR. The products of development activity may be incorporated into the evaluative portfolio.

The following sections describe the school's criteria for assessment of research, scholarship, and creative activity, teaching and service.

II.E.1.1. Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activity Criteria for Annual Faculty Assessment

SAMC encompasses a variety of scholarly disciplines and creative fields that each have expectations in the area of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (RSCA). Faculty in the disciplines and sub-disciplines have created detailed criteria for promotion and tenure in each area, and in a few cases, individual faculty positions have specific expectations (individual departments' criteria for assessment of RSCA are available from the SAMC administrative office or from the department chairs).

It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to assess how a faculty member is meeting those expectations on an annual basis, whether the faculty member is pre-tenured or tenured. Most non-tenure-track faculty positions do not require accomplishments in these areas; however, it is understood that many non-tenure-track faculty will achieve accomplishments in this area in spite of policy and may be recognized for it.

Candidates are responsible for providing documented evidence that the products of any RSCA have met the standards below and must ensure that those reviewing the file can clearly discern a pattern of engagement in such activity during the period under consideration.

RSCA consists of academic work (productivity which can be documented in the form of research, writing, speaking, artistic production or performance, or in some other appropriate form) that results in expanding the body of knowledge and understanding of the candidate's academic field. Candidates must demonstrate why any such RSCA that falls outside their discipline should merit consideration. RSCA may be achieved singly or in collaboration with others. Such work must result in some clear, externally peer reviewed or peer selected product, and must have involved work that is non-routine, novel, creative, imaginative, ingenious, or original (though not necessarily all of these). It should occur in addition to one's normal teaching assignment.

RSCA includes academic work (as defined above) in any of three separate, yet interconnected forms: Discovery and Creation, Integration and Teaching, and Application.

a. Discovery and Creation

The RSCA of discovery and creation involves the search for new knowledge in the discipline and for a richer understanding of the academic field. Products of the scholarship of discovery and creation must be externally peer reviewed or selected, and candidates are reminded that the quality of such activities must be demonstrated. A non-exhaustive list of activities includes the following:

1. publications;
2. manuscripts submitted for publication;
3. work in progress;
4. oral convention presentations (e.g. panelist, respondent -- a substantive presentation, not just moderator of panel);
5. art exhibitions;
6. music compositions, performances, and conducting;
7. theatrical performance, direction, design, scripts, and script adaptations;
8. public exhibition of media directed or produced or otherwise created.

b. Integration and Teaching

The RSCA of integration and teaching emphasizes fitting one's own research or creative activities, or the similar work of others, into larger intellectual patterns for an external audience. It involves making connections across the disciplines, placing the discipline in a larger context, illuminating data or concepts in a revealing way, and evaluating new pedagogical approaches. Such materials must be externally reviewed or selected, and candidates are reminded that the quality of such activities must be demonstrated. In addition to the more traditional forums for scholarship, such as academic writing, a non-exhaustive list of productivity includes the following:

1. textbooks or parts of textbooks;
2. published writing that makes one's field accessible to a wider audience, e.g. editorials or articles in popular press;
3. interdisciplinary achievements that advance pedagogy in a manner appropriate to the institutional mission
4. other instructional materials that advance pedagogy in a manner appropriate to one's discipline and/or the institutional mission.

c. Application

The RSCA of application brings learning and knowledge to bear upon the solution of practical problems. Such scholarship, which must be externally reviewed or selected, flows directly from one's professional expertise and would result in a publication, presentation, or other tangible product amenable to peer review. Typically, such work should be for groups outside the institution or beyond normal classroom responsibilities. Candidates are reminded that the quality of such activities must be demonstrated. A non-exhaustive list of activities that relate directly to the intellectual work of the faculty member includes the following:

1. consultation;
2. technical assistance;
3. policy analysis;
4. external program evaluation;
5. applied or clinical research and assessment and treatment of clinical cases;
6. grant writing;
7. clinics or workshops (presentations, master classes, etc.).

The quality of RSCA must be demonstrable in the judgment of the reviewing body. Types of documentation appropriate to substantiating quality in RSCA include, but are not limited to:

1. recorded recognition by colleagues and professional peers;
2. publishing in refereed and recognized professional journals and presses;
3. invited publications, performances, or exhibitions;
4. reviews of performances, books, exhibitions, compositions, applied research;
5. successful grant applications which clearly relate to RSCA (as described above);
6. awards based on professional expertise.

If sufficient documentation is not available to assist the reviewing body in assessing the quality of RSCA, then outside experts in the candidate's field may be consulted. These outside experts will be selected only after previous consultation with the candidate and appropriate disciplinary faculty.

Minimum expectations are that the faculty member will, on an annual basis, be involved in work that is non-routine, novel, creative, imaginative, ingenious, or original (though not necessarily all of these), and make verifiable and significant progress toward at least one clear, externally peer reviewed or peer selected product that meets the criteria defined for their position in departmental documents.

Faculty will be evaluated on the basis of the record put forward in their Faculty Activity Report, and it is a faculty responsibility that any achievements are documented if those achievements are to be considered in the review process.

Holistic Rankings

Exceeds Expectations: consistently meets the minimum expectations described above and exceeds a pace of accomplishment that will meet the accepted standard for RSCA as defined for their position in departmental promotion and tenure guidelines.

Meets Expectations: consistently meets the minimum expectations described above and maintains a pace that will meet the accepted standard for RSCA as defined for their position in departmental promotion and tenure guidelines. This may be achieved in a year when significant progress is made toward a goal, but completion is not achieved, especially if in conjunction with more modest accomplishments.

Unsatisfactory: does not consistently meet the minimum expectations described above or is below the accepted standard for RSCA.

II.E.12 Teaching Criteria for Annual Faculty Assessment

Teaching, according to the University Handbook of Rules and Procedures, is the “apex” of the university’s mission (*12.01.99.C0.04* Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service, Section 2). For the purposes of tenure, promotion, and annual review, assessment of faculty teaching is based on one’s “knowledge in the field, quality in teaching, academic advisement, and career counseling” (SAMC Faculty Handbook, II.D.7.1). Teaching takes place within the University’s larger context. Part of this context is the University’s status as a Hispanic Serving Institution serving the Coastal Bend region. Any teaching assessment needs to take this larger context into account by foregrounding pedagogical approaches and practices that serve our students and community. In turn, the measurement of quality in teaching is assessed holistically, based on the following, overlapping criteria: professional development and peer review, self-evaluation, and student surveys.

Since teaching is central to the university’s mission, all faculty, as appropriate to the nature of their appointment, are expected to meet certain minimum expectations.

Minimum Expectations

- Engage in teaching activity as required by school guidelines and in accordance with faculty appointment and discipline.
- Develop student learning outcomes and course content in accordance with university catalog course description and in alignment with program learning outcomes.
- Make known to students, in writing, the goals and requirements of each course, nature of the course content, student learning outcomes, and methods of evaluation to be employed.
- Meet classes as scheduled, in accordance with the university schedule and the official course designation for instructional method.
- Report changes in the format of courses as prescribed by the school, as related to type of delivery/distance learning.
- Be prepared to continue relevant teaching and learning activities in an online format or alternate location in the event of a natural disaster or emergency, in compliance with the Academic Continuity Plan.
- Meet standards for course management by ordering books on time, reporting grades on time, and reporting attendance as required, and maintain student confidentiality (in compliance with FERPA guidelines).
- Meet requirements for program assessment and department and position-specific expectations.
- Instruct so as to meet course objectives and the student and program learning outcomes.
- Participate in the university wide end-of-term student evaluation of courses.
- Maintain competence in teaching fields.
- Be professional and show respect in interactions with students.
- Be available to students for consultation on course work during regular or electronic office hours in accordance with school guidelines and policy.
- Adhere to school and department procedures and deadlines regarding course syllabi, scheduling, outcomes, and content, including filing electronic course syllabi as required by the University.

Over and above these minimum expectations, faculty teaching will be assessed in a holistic, qualitative fashion by a weighing of professional development and peer review, self-evaluation, and student surveys. When assessing faculty, department chairs will consider these categories in context and as interrelated, recognizing, for instance, how faculty draw on suggestions from peer reviews and student surveys to reconsider their practices, refine pedagogy, choose professional development opportunities, or reflect on the organization of other classes. Low performance or the absence of documentation in one category will be assessed through a consideration of the other categories and consideration of the faculty member's teaching history. Challenges in one category will be weighed against successes in another.

1. Professional Development and Peer Review

Professional development and peer review are means of continuous improvement in teaching. While participation in any of these is valuable, more weight is given when faculty demonstrate the application of peer review and professional development to their teaching. Faculty members are expected to document these activities in their Faculty Activity Report ("Candidates are responsible for supplying sufficient materials for that examination" (SAMC Faculty Handbook, II.D.7.1)).

Professional development can include participation in teaching workshops, the attendance at conferences and/or institutes directed toward teaching or toward maintaining one's professional accreditation, and the undertaking of reading programs or creative activities to stay current in one's field. Peer review can be understood as a means of improving teaching quality and effectiveness through the exchange of syllabi, the review of classes or course material and team-teaching. Peer review also can refer to the quality of a faculty member's leadership in course and curricular development and disciplinary teaching improvements.

2. Self-Evaluation

To meet standard expectations, faculty members must provide input in Interfolio to the department chair in the form of self-evaluation. Effective self-evaluation involves critical assessment of the teaching methods and techniques employed in the classroom or online. Self-evaluation can address both successful teaching experiences and challenging ones. It can identify ways faculty members continue to think about teaching through participation at professional development workshops or conferences, for instance, or the redesigning of a course or assignments, or through participation in the scholarship of teaching.

In their assessment, department chairs will consider how faculty reflect on their teaching, which could include the discussion of successful teaching moments/assignments, an explanation of how the faculty member incorporated the scholarship of teaching, or the rethinking of a course or course assignments. Low quantitative scores or concerning qualitative comments on student surveys must be addressed in the Faculty Activity Report.

Exceptional student successes should be documented in a Faculty Activity Report and may be considered representative of successful teaching. These can include student participation in conferences or performances, the winning of awards or the participation in exhibitions.

3. Student Surveys

In reviewing student surveys, department chairs will consider university-wide, end-of-term evaluations, and specific evaluations administered by the instructor. In assessing these, department chairs must contextualize student surveys (which are prone to racial and gender bias), and take into account circumstances that might influence student opinion (e.g., difficulty of course materials and assignments, grade distribution, level of course, whether the course is part of the Core curriculum or required by the School or Discipline, class size, faculty identity, and/or whether it is a new preparation or a newly designed course). In particular, department chairs are encouraged to consider the ways faculty members' race, gender, sexuality, neurodivergence, ethnicity, national origin, or religion have been shown to affect student classroom perceptions. Department Chairs may not isolate one student survey or one section of student surveys from the entire set of student surveys for that instructor when considering student surveys as a factor in the overall assessment of teaching effectiveness.

Department chairs will consider both quantitative scores and qualitative comments in their reviews. The accepted minimum in SAMC for quantitative teaching scores is 3.5 (SAMC Faculty Handbook, II.D.8). Area(s) where faculty members consistently score below 3.5 should be addressed in their Faculty Activity Reports, since these scores will be considered below standard. Consistent areas of concern raised in the qualitative comment section should also be addressed in the Faculty Activity Report.

Student Survey Rankings

4.5 - 5.0: overall mean score exceeds the standard for strong student surveys.

4.0 - 4.49: overall mean score exceeds the minimum expectations for student surveys.

3.5 - 3.99: overall mean score meets the minimum expectations for student surveys.

3.49 or less: overall mean score does not meet the minimum expectations for student surveys.

Holistic Faculty Rankings

Exceeds Expectations: consistently meets the minimum expectations described above and exceeds the standard for teaching as reflected in use of professional development and self-assessment as well as student feedback on instruction to enhance teaching and improve student learning. Other accomplishments may be used to determine a rating of “exceeds expectations,” such as teaching excellence awards, showing leadership in major curricular development, demonstrating student mentorship/teaching that leads to significant student achievement/learning (awards, publishing/conferences, research), or major teaching innovations (service learning projects, team teaching, new courses, etc.).

Meets Expectations: consistently meets the minimum expectations described above and meets the accepted standard for teaching as evidenced by commitment to continuous improvement through professional development, peer review, and self-assessment, and student surveys.

Unsatisfactory: does not consistently meet the minimum expectations described above or is below the accepted standard for teaching as evidenced by commitment to continuous improvement through professional development, peer review, and self-assessment, and student surveys.

II.E.1.3 Service Criteria for Annual Faculty Assessment

Service encompasses a variety of professionally related activities through which members of the faculty employ their academic expertise for the benefit of the University, the community, and the profession. According to University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.03*, Responsibilities of Faculty Members, faculty are expected to engage in service, which at a minimum means:

- Engaging in service activities as required by school guidelines. This includes but is not limited to school and department meetings, assessment activities, and school and department recognition ceremonies.
- Participating in commencement ceremonies according to university guidelines.
- Serving as academic advisor/mentor in accordance with school guidelines and policy.

To meet the functional needs of the institution, all faculty are also expected to perform department and disciplinary-level service as assigned by the chair as well as school and university service when requested by the director or provost. Over and above these minimum expectations, faculty may define their own institutional, professional, and/or community service agendas according to their interests and goals. Given that each department will have different service needs, service will be assessed in a holistic, qualitative fashion by weighing the responsibilities required by the different service work both in light of the faculty’s rank and a determination by the chair of its importance to the department.

Collegiality and professionalism facilitate service. They are critical to the well-being and effectiveness of the institution, especially at the department level. As good citizens of the department, faculty are expected to uphold the highest standards of professional conduct by demonstrating collegiality and integrity in their work with students, staff, and other

faculty, as well as by meeting deadlines, and completing required trainings.

The School of Arts, Media, & Communication Faculty Handbook (Section II. D.7.3) identifies three areas of service: 1) department, school, and university service; 2) professional service; and 3) community service. Descriptions of the three areas of service and corresponding examples are as follows:

Department, School, and University Service

There are many ways a faculty member may be of assistance to the department/discipline, school, and university. Some examples include, but are not limited to:

- Student recruitment
- Advising student organizations
- Directing and/or coordinating student-led service events
- Serving the student population in a mentorship or advisor capacity
- Service as an elected/appointed member of a school or department/discipline committee
- Internal program evaluation
- Completion of a special project for the university, school, or department/discipline
- Lead or co-author or editor of a major curriculum addition or revision
- Service as an elected senator or appointment to a university council or committee
- Service on a board, council, or committee outside the university by appointment as the university's or school's representative
- Completion of an institutional research project
- Maintenance and upkeep of studio/classroom spaces and equipment;
- Grant writing for institutional development

Professional Service

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi encourages professional service (or service to the profession or discipline) which is in support of the mission and goals of the university. This service must relate to one's academic field or else be clearly approved by the university. Examples of professional service include, but are not limited to:

- Officer or board member of a professional organization
- Conference organizer
- Editor of a journal/newsletter
- Moderator of a panel at an academic conference
- Committee membership for a professional association
- Peer review of professional papers, manuscripts, performances, exhibitions, and presentations
- Media contributions related to professional expertise
- Invited speaking engagements and panel discussions related to academic fields

Community Service

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi recognizes that community partnerships and community engagement produce a vibrant local culture. Therefore, community service in support of the mission and goals of the university is supported and encouraged. Examples of community service include, but are not limited to:

- Serving as an officer or board member of a community organization
- Giving volunteer assistance to a community organization or project through provision of advice, grant writing, or other application of one's professional expertise
- Conducting workshops, giving talks or demonstrations locally (may be creative or even expand knowledge, but usually there is no academic peer review to substantiate it)
- Serving on a committee for a local professional association or community organization
- Judging local competitions
- Visiting local schools in some professional capacity

Holistic Rankings

Exceeds Expectations: consistently meets expectations described above for faculty members of comparable rank and exceeds them. To meet the rank of "exceeds expectations," a faculty member may serve the department/discipline, university, school, community, or profession in a leadership capacity or may take on multiple service responsibilities that demonstrate initiative in their patterns of service. This might include participating in different department/discipline, school, or university service activities beyond the standard requirement, serving on a work-intensive standing committee, performing significant ad hoc committee work, or coordinating a program without compensation. Recognition for service, including nomination and/or receipt of an internal or external award or honor in the year under consideration may also qualify a faculty member for excellence in service at the annual review.

Meets Expectations: consistently meets minimum expectations described above for faculty members of comparable rank. The faculty member regularly attends department/discipline meetings and recognition and commencement ceremonies, participates in assessment and advising, and performs disciplinary-level service as assigned by the department chair and school or university service as requested by the director or provost.

Unsatisfactory: does not consistently meet the minimum expectations described above for faculty of comparable rank. The faculty member does not regularly attend department/discipline meetings and recognition and commencement ceremonies, participate in assessment and advising, or perform disciplinary-level service as assigned by the department chair or school or university service as requested by the director or provost.

II.E.2. Pre-Tenure Review

1. During the fall semester of their fourth year of tenure eligibility at TAMUCC, all tenure-eligible faculty members will be reviewed by the appropriate Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. In the event the faculty member was awarded credit at another institution towards tenure at the time of their initial appointment, the faculty member may be evaluated earlier than their fourth year of employment at their discretion as per the terms of employment stated in their initial appointment letter. The committee will provide the faculty member with a written statement of its findings, which will be based on School and University policies regarding promotion and tenure. A copy of this written statement will become a part of the faculty member's personnel file. This pre-tenure review is designed to

provide the faculty member with a preliminary assessment of his or her progress toward promotion and tenure. All evaluations shall be consistent with Faculty Handbook “Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service” [University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.04*].

2. Before the end of the spring semester of each year, the Director shall notify in writing each tenure-track faculty member who is subject to pre-tenure review during the following academic semester. The Director will remain available during the subsequent process to discuss the candidate’s professional development and progress toward tenure.
3. By September 1st, the tenure-track faculty member who is subject to pre-tenure review shall upload to the appropriate university-approved database a dossier documenting excellence in teaching, RSCA, and service in accordance with disciplinary, departmental, and School criteria. This dossier, which should be divided into three sections (teaching; RSCA; and service) may include materials used in the development and delivery of all classes taught (such as syllabi, handouts, peer reviews/assessments, examples of student work, workshops on teaching attended), the product of RSCA (such as publications, exhibitions, performances, work accepted and forthcoming, work in progress), and any materials produced in the course of university or community service (such as letters of appointment and/or thanks, service-related documents you were instrumental in producing, newspaper or media exposure of your activities, appropriate flyers, etc.). The tenure-track faculty member must also attach a written overview of no more than two pages, plus individual statements (each no more than two pages) on teaching, RSCA, and service.

The resulting dossier should consist of no more than 750 electronic standard letter-size pages. The Director shall be responsible for making this dossier available to reviewing faculty.

4. All tenured faculty members in the appropriate department will constitute the Department Pre-Tenure Review Committee. This committee will be similar to the Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, though it will also include any members who serve on School-level or University-level committees. The committee members should choose a chair from amongst themselves and set about the following process:
 - a) The committee discusses the tenure-track faculty member’s pre-tenure progress and, based on initial review or the candidate’s dossier, draft a list of questions to the candidate concerning matters on which the committee needs clarification or explanation.
 - b) The committee chair will then schedule a meeting with the candidate and provide the candidate with the committee’s written questions prior to the candidate’s scheduled meeting with the committee.
 - c) The committee will meet with the candidate, having a discussion guided by the questions shared with the candidate in advance.
 - d) Following the meeting with the candidate, the committee will use the candidate’s responses, their personnel file, and their dossier as the basis to discuss the candidate’s professional development in teaching, RSCA, and service.
 - e) The committee shall draft a developmental report identifying strengths and

opportunities for improvement in each area of evaluation. The Committee is not expected to solicit letters of evaluation unless deemed necessary to adequately advise the candidate concerning professional development and progress toward tenure.

- f) The Committee will place a copy of its report in the tenure-track faculty member's personnel file. This report will indicate the candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure and offer recommendations concerning further professional development. The committee shall also submit its report to the department chair.

The candidate may respond in writing to the committee's report.

- 5. The Department Chair shall develop an individual review and meet with the candidate to discuss this review and the report by the tenured faculty members. The candidate will receive a copy of the Chair's written review.
- 6. The Department Chair shall submit to the Director the Chair's review as well as the report from the Committee. The candidate may respond in writing; if so, this response shall also be forwarded to the Director.
- 7. The Director shall review the feedback from the tenured faculty and the Chair and shall prepare a written evaluation. The Director will meet with the candidate to discuss these reviews. The Director will send copies of this evaluation to the faculty member and the Provost.
- 8. If the review of the faculty member indicates that they are not progressing adequately towards the requirements for tenure, action will be taken to non-renew the appointment of the individual.

II.E.3. Post-Tenure Review

The School follows University Procedure *12.06.99.C1*, Post-Tenure Review.

1. Introduction

Faculty evaluation supports tenure and promotes faculty development. In that the School of Arts, Media, and Communication at Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi is recognized for the outstanding quality of its faculty, it is expected that the vast majority of faculty will be found to meet or exceed expectations as a result of comprehensive review. The underlying philosophy is to help tenured faculty members continue to be productive members of the University community.

2. Purpose

Post-tenure review is designed to supplement annual evaluations, which should provide regular feedback for the faculty member's continuous development. However, post-tenure review is more comprehensive. In fact, the two processes reinforce each other. The annual evaluation provides the continuity, follow-up, and motivation needed to carry out the long-range continuous improvement and development goals of this rule.

The purpose of comprehensive evaluation is to:

- 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;
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate;
- Provide assurance that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to the University and the State of Texas.

Comprehensive periodic review of tenured faculty is intended to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom through a positive, thorough, fair, and transparent process. Post-tenure review is not designed to pre-empt University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.05*, Faculty Dismissals, Administrative Leave, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments.

3. Who Will Conduct the Post-Tenure Review?

- 3.1 The SAMC Promotion and Tenure Committee (the Committee) shall be responsible for conducting post-tenure review for all faculty within the SAMC. The composition and formation of this committee is described in School Rule I.B. Standing Committee Structure.
 - 3.1.1 A Committee member must withdraw from the decision-making process of his or her own review, that of his or her spouse or partner, or any other situation where there may be a conflict of interest.
 - 3.1.2 If a faculty member who is undergoing review or any member of the Committee believes that there is a conflict of interest, he or she may object to the inclusion of a member. If the member declines to withdraw, the remaining Committee members shall consider the basis for the alleged conflict and decide the matter by majority vote. Should there be a tie, the objection is sustained.

4. Who Will Undergo Post-Tenure Review and the Post-Tenure Review File

- 4.1 Every tenured faculty member will undergo a comprehensive review every six years or following the second unsatisfactory rating in the annual performance review in any category within six years of the first unsatisfactory rating in that category.
 - 4.1.1 The six-year period starts with the first full academic year appointment in a tenured position. The period restarts at the time of promotion to full professor.
 - 4.1.2 Faculty members with administrative assignments, such as department chairs, assistant/associate deans/directors, and directors of programs, shall be evaluated on the basis of the faculty portion of their appointments only.
 - 4.1.3 Except for leaves occurring in the sixth year, periods when a faculty member is on leave will still count towards the six-year requirement.
 - 4.1.4 The post tenure evaluation may not be waived for any active faculty member but may be deferred in rare circumstances pursuant to University Procedure *12.06.99.C1*, Post-Tenure Review, Section 3.4.

4.2 It is the responsibility of the Director to provide notice to all SAMC faculty due for a six-year evaluation notice no later than October 15th that the review will be conducted the following spring. All qualifying faculty in the sixth full year of service since their last review or promotion must be notified unless a deferral has been requested and approved

by the Provost's office.

- 4.3 Post-Tenure Review File (the File) submitted by the Director to the SAMC Promotion and Tenure Committee (the Committee) will consist only of the faculty member's:
- Current curriculum vitae;
 - Annual Faculty Activity Reports for the past 6 calendar years;
 - Annual reviews for the past 6 calendar years
- 4.3.1 The faculty member undergoing review must submit his or her current faculty activity report to the Department Chair by January 12th.
- 4.3.2 The faculty member undergoing review must submit his or her current curriculum vitae to the Director or the Director's designee by January 20th.
- 4.3.3 The faculty member's Department Chair must submit copies of the faculty member's faculty activity reports and annual evaluations for the past six years to the Director or the Director's designee by January 20th.

4.3.3.1 If a faculty member has written a response to any annual evaluation during the review period, the response letter(s) must also be included.

5. The Review Process

- 5.1 By February 1st, the Director or the Director's designee shall provide the Committee with a copy of the file and will meet with the Committee to provide instructions for conducting the review.
- 5.2 The Committee shall evaluate the faculty member's performance relative to assigned responsibilities and contributions consistent with that of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload in each of the following categories of responsibility
- Teaching
 - RSCA
 - Service
- as well as a comprehensive evaluation of the faculty member's overall performance.
- 5.3 The Committee evaluation is limited to evidence provided in the file. The committee should be guided in its deliberations by the faculty member's effectiveness and total contribution to the department, school, and university.
- 5.4 The Committee shall only use one of the following two review categories in their evaluation of each of the categories of responsibility as well as in its comprehensive evaluation of the faculty member:
- *Satisfactory* – faculty member meets or exceeds responsibilities and provides contributions comparable to or above that expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload. Strengths may be commended, and weaknesses may be identified for near-term improvement.
 - *Unsatisfactory* – well below minimum expectations for assigned responsibilities and contributions consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload. Reflects disregard of previous advice or efforts to provide correction, assistance, and/or professional misconduct, dereliction of duty or incompetence.

- 5.5 By March 1st, the peer-review committee will submit an evaluation report for each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review to the Office of the Director. The report shall be the form in Appendix A of this procedure and will check the rating for each category of responsibility, the comprehensive evaluation rating, and state the basis for that determination.
- 5.5.1 A copy of the school post-tenure review process must be submitted with its post-tenure review reports.
 - 5.5.2 If the peer-review evaluation is *Unsatisfactory* in any category, the peer-review committee evaluation report shall contain sufficient documentation to identify the area(s) and particulars of the unsatisfactory performance and the basis for the committee's decision. The report shall refrain from speculating on the reasons why the performance is unsatisfactory.
- 5.6 After reviewing the Committee's report, the Director shall prepare an individual evaluation for each faculty member under review.
- 5.6.1 The Director will meet with the faculty member to inform them of the Director's and Committee's recommendations. The faculty member will be provided a copy of the Committee's and Director's written evaluations.
 - 5.6.2 Upon request by the faculty member, the Director shall inform them of the numerical results of the Committee's vote.
- 5.7 The faculty member may submit a written response to the Committee's and director's recommendations. Responses must be submitted to the Director's office within five (5) business days of the meeting with the director. The response will be included in reports and recommendations forwarded to the Provost.
- 5.8 The Director's and Committee's report and recommendations shall be forwarded to the Provost for review by April 1st (See Appendix B).
- 5.9 The Provost will review the provided documentation and prepare a final decision regarding each faculty member's post-tenure review rating by April 15th.
- 5.10 By April 30th, the Provost will notify, in writing, the Director, Department Chair, and the Committee of the final post-tenure review rating for each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review. The Provost will forward the final post-tenure review rating to the appropriate faculty member.

6. The Professional Development Plan

- 6.1 For all faculty ultimately receiving an "Unsatisfactory" rating in **any** category from the Provost, the faculty member, peer-review committee and Department Chair (or director if the faculty member has administrative assignments of 50% or greater) shall establish a professional development plan within 30 days of receiving the final decision. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Director. Should the 30-day period end after the conclusion of the spring semester, the deadline will be extended until September 15th.

The plan will:

- Indicate the University resources available to provide appropriate support for the faculty member in achieving the goals of the plan, and
- Indicate who will monitor the implementation of the plan and support the faculty member through the process (for example, a faculty mentor or the department chair), and
- Include a follow-up schedule (with specific dates), benchmarks, and tangible goals for evaluating improved performance.

6.2 The original written evaluation and development plan shall be submitted to the Provost's Office with a copy maintained in the school.

6.3 Normally, the development plan period will be for two years. The Department Chair, with input from the then current peer-review committee, will assess evidence of improvement after one year. A one-year status report, and a final report will be submitted to the Director and Provost by May 15th in ensuing years.

6.4 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. However, if the faculty member is deemed to have made insufficient progress by the end of the plan period, the department chair will take appropriate administrative action, up to including recommendation for dismissal proceedings, in conjunction with the Director.

7. Disciplinary Action

If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present, appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including review for termination, may be initiated in accordance with due process procedures of Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi Procedure 12.01.99.C0.05, Faculty Dismissals, Administrative Leave, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments and Texas A&M University System Policy 12.01 Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

8. Periodic Review

Reviews of this process will be conducted beginning in the year of 2020 and every five years thereafter by an ad hoc committee established by the Director to provide feedback on school post-tenure review committees' adherence to the established standards and processes and make any recommendations as they see fit for consideration of the SAMC faculty as a whole.