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I. College Structure

The College of Science and Engineering (S&E) consists of the Department of Life Sciences, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, the Department of Computing Sciences, and the Department of Engineering. Both Departments of Computing Sciences and Engineering are within the School of Engineering and Computing Sciences, which is also a unit in the college. Each department is headed by a chair and the school is headed by a director.

II. Committees

The college participates in university-level committees and also maintains standing committees focused on issues that affect the operations of the college as a whole. In addition, each department maintains standing committees that direct and guide their organization and operation of their missions and functions. Electronic records of all committee meeting minutes are archived in the appropriate college or department office. A listing of university and college committees and their current members is available on the college’s website at http://sci.tamucc.edu//documents/se-handbook.pdf

III. Faculty Meetings

University and college faculty meetings are held at the beginning of each fall and spring term. Special meetings may be called by written notice. In addition, each department schedules regular meetings. University and college faculty meetings are seldom called during summer sessions.

All regular faculty members are required to attend these meetings. For action to be taken at a regular meeting, items should be on the agenda. Faculty may request items be placed on the agenda. Information items and announcements may be made at any meeting. Faculty votes on non-routine items held during meetings will require a quorum. Attendance of more than 50% of the fulltime faculty will constitute a quorum. In the absence of a quorum, discussion and votes may occur on routine business items (committee membership, etc.) and the floor may be open to discussion and debate of non-routine matters, but no vote will occur on the latter.

IV. Role and Responsibilities of the Dean

Role

The dean of the College of S&E is responsible to the provost/vice president for academic affairs and serves as the chief academic administrator of the college. The dean is administratively responsible for planning, organizing, coordinating, directing, and evaluating the cooperative effort of the college.
Responsibilities

The specific responsibilities of the dean include the following:

1. Promotes an understanding, both internally and externally, of the college, its purposes, and objectives.

2. Serves as a voting member of the Deans’ Council, and any other bodies as designated by university.

3. Administers all personnel matters related to the college, including: recommendations for initial appointments, promotions, retention, tenure, salary and compensations for faculty; appointment, assignment, and compensation of part-time and adjunct faculty; and the appointment, assignment and compensation of non-academic personnel.

4. Approves teaching loads, teaching schedules, academic advisory responsibilities, special assignments that may impact on faculty’s instructional responsibilities, and requests to participate in outside activities.

5. Promotes faculty development activities and encourages faculty concern for teaching and scholarship.

6. Oversees a program for the orientation of new faculty.

7. Conducts an annual evaluation of those programs and personnel directly responsible to the college.

8. Presides and conducts college-level faculty meetings.

9. Supervises curricular and course planning, including the planning and promoting of improvements within the curricula of the college, development of new undergraduate and graduate programs, the compilation of the descriptions of courses and programs, the preparation and approval of catalog statements on general and specific requirements, the maintenance of the standards of instruction, and the compilation of information for accreditation.

10. Approves the college’s schedule of classes each semester.

11. Administers the annual budget approved for the college.

12. Administers the utilization of space and equipment assigned to the college.

13. Maintains an official record of syllabi for all courses in the college.
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14. Administers policies and procedures established by the university and college relative to established academic and administrative committees.

15. Participates in those professional activities and ceremonial functions consistent with the Office of the S&E Dean.

16. Provides data required for institutional research purposes and promotes those research efforts related to academic matters.

17. Approves all publications related directly and solely to college policies and programs.

18. Appoints and supervises the associate dean(s) and the chairs of the academic departments and research units of the college.

19. Provides budgetary control and administrative supervision of the Center for Coastal Studies, the Center for Water Supply Studies, the Conrad Blucher Institute for Surveying and Science, Office for Information Assurance, Statistics, and Quality Control, and other such units as may be created in the college. Approves all letters of agreement/contracts of the above units.

20. Performs other responsibilities as directed by the provost/vice president for academic affairs.

V. Roles and Responsibilities of the Associate Deans

Role

The associate deans of the College of S&E are 1/2-time administrative positions as defined in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 33.99.99.C0.04. The college has two associate deans, the associate dean for academic affairs and the associate dean for research/director of the School of Engineering and Computing Sciences.

Each associate dean reports directly to the dean of the College of S&E and exercises the administrative responsibilities delegated by the dean. In the absence of the dean, the duties and responsibilities of dean shall be exercised by the appropriate associate dean.

Responsibilities

The specific responsibilities of the associate dean for academic affairs are:

1. To manage overall operation of the college student records office including supervision of the college academic advisors and other college office staff;
2. To coordinate academic advising of students enrolled in the college and the handling of student requests for exemptions to the academic standards and rules;

3. To organize and coordinate the college registration process and semester class schedules;

4. To maintain the college-level computerized management information systems and to provide reports and analysis as requested by the dean and department chairs;

5. To undertake other duties as assigned by the dean.

The specific responsibilities of the associate dean of research and director of the School of Engineering and Computing Sciences are:

1. To provide leadership in the development of the School of Engineering and Computing Sciences

2. To serve as an advocate for the school in the community, with industry, and with other academic and government institutions

3. To oversee and manage course scheduling, budgets, outreach, program assessments and accreditations for the school,

4. To make recommendations to the dean on the hiring, tenure and promotion of faculty and the hiring and promotion of staff in the school

5. To assist the dean in the development of research in the College of S&E

6. To undertake other duties as assigned by the dean.

VI. Faculty Recruitment and Selection Process

The college adheres to University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.99.99.C0.01 on recruitment and appointment of faculty; statements published at EqualOpportunity http://tder.tamucc.edu/equal_employment_opportunity/index.html on equal opportunity and affirmative action; and Texas A&M University System Policy 33.03 on nepotism.

The following paragraphs outline the process for faculty recruitment and selection used by the College of S&E at A&M-Corpus Christi.
1. Identify need

The need for faculty should be identified early in the academic year in order to allow sufficient time for the search and recruiting process, but may occur at any time due to faculty turnover. The need for additional faculty is determined within the departments by the chairs in conjunction with the faculty. Determinants include:

A. **Course requirements**: Additional courses required to meet student demand, to maintain reasonable class sizes, to satisfy other program, department and college needs.

B. **Accreditation needs**: Courses or academic areas required to satisfy accreditation.

C. **Academic improvements**: Coverage of areas to improve or broaden academic offerings and research strengths.

2. Acquire approval

Each department chair will justify and prioritize faculty needs and anticipated openings within his or her unit. The dean prioritizes college faculty needs after consulting with the department chairs. Following approval by the dean and the provost, the department chair will establish a search committee.

**Department Search Committee for Full-Time Tenure-Track and Professional-Track Faculty**

Faculty search committees will consist of a minimum of three members. One member of the search committee may be from outside the department or the college. The department chair appoints the members and the search committee chair with the dean’s approval and will then provide the committee members with a description of their responsibilities as listed below as well as inform the search committee of any resources available, including the recruitment budget.

The search committee has the following responsibilities:

A. The search committee chair will attend a briefing and/or update with the Employee Relations/Equal Employment Opportunity (ER/EEO) Office prior to commencing the search process to discuss administrative procedures, equal opportunity guidelines and diversity initiatives.

B. Members of the search committee will review University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.99.99.C0.01 Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty.

C. The search committee will prepare the position description and announcement, including fields of expertise, required and/or preferred credentials and experience, rank, type of appointment, any special duties required in the position, required application materials, application deadline, and submission address. The position description and announcement
must be approved by the chair, the dean, ER/EEO director, and provost before the position is advertised.

D. Search committee chair completes and submits the faculty position requisition form, along with the advertisement/announcement, via the faculty online search process to the department chair, who reviews and forwards to the dean, and the provost for approval.

E. With approval from the department chair and dean, determine where and how the position shall be advertised. Normally, the position announcement should be sent to the appropriate disciplinary placement service publications, and to disciplinary online posting resources. A copy of the position advertisement should be sent to the Office of Human Resources for posting on or linking to its website and to the Office of the S&E Dean to be posted on the college website.

F. Ensure that minutes are taken of all search committee meetings documenting decisions, and reasons for selecting or not selecting candidates.

G. Develop in writing the criteria to be used in evaluating applicants for the position. These criteria must be consistent with the job description and must be approved before applications are reviewed.

H. Develop a timetable for the screening process.

I. Screen all applicants. The search committee members receive candidate’s letters of application and documents via the Islanderjobs.tamucc.edu online process.

J. Proceed with preliminary telephone interviews of a subset of applicants who appear to be best qualified. As part of the preliminary interview process, the committee shall determine if the applicant’s oral proficiency in English is appropriate to the appointment.

K. Validate credentials of the candidates still considered for the position following the remote interviews including verifying previous experience, current ability to work in the United States and securing official transcripts.

L. Recommend to the chair which applicant(s) should be invited to campus for interview. Recommendations are then submitted to the dean for approval. The files, including letters of recommendation, of the finalist(s) are forwarded to the dean along with the committee’s recommendation.

M. Organize and conduct the campus interview. The campus interview should include opportunities for the applicant to meet members of the faculty, students, the chair, the dean, the vice president for research, commercialization and outreach, the program coordinator(s), and the provost or their designees, all depending upon availability. The campus interview should also include a scholarly presentation by the applicant to a faculty and student audience, which should be advertised through the college listserv.
N. The committee will request candidate evaluations from all members of the program faculty and students. Following discussion and consideration of faculty and student evaluations, the committee will submit a recommendation to the department chair and state the reasons for the recommendation. The department chair will submit the committee’s recommendation and his or her evaluation and recommendation to the dean for approval.

O. Document the search properly in accordance with ER/EEO employment guidelines on forms provided by the Office of the S&E Dean.

P. Notify those applicants interviewed by telephone or in person who are no longer under consideration. The letter must be composed in consultation with the department chair and dean and based upon a template provided by the Office of the S&E Dean. The search committee chair will also ensure that the Office of Human Resources electronically notifies candidates not interviewed by telephone or interviewed on campus.

3. Negotiate an Offer
   The chair, in consultation with the dean, will informally discuss terms of an offer with the candidate including start-up requirements. The start-up needs will be submitted as an itemized written request from the candidate to the dean. The dean, after consideration of the candidate’s request, and in consultation with the vice-president for research, commercialization and outreach, and the provost, extends a written offer, and secures a written agreement.

4. Make an Offer
   The provost then sends a formal contract to the successful applicant, who must sign and return it.

NOTE: Information on EEO policies may be obtained from the ER/EEO Office and is available also in the Office of the S&E Dean.

Process for Recruiting and Appointing Part-Time, Adjunct and/or Temporary Full-time Faculty

Individuals within the community may contact the department and the college concerning a desire to teach at the university on a part-time basis. Applications sent to the college or university are forwarded to the appropriate chairs. When a course needs to be offered and no full-time faculty is currently available to teach the course, an adjunct or part-time or temporary fulltime individual may be sought. The starting point in that search is those individuals who have expressed a desire to teach at the university. The chair may also seek qualified individuals from other sources, which may include, but not be limited to, referrals from faculty, faculty from other nearby institutions, etc. Prior to a contract being issued, the chair will discuss the appointment with the dean. If approved by the dean, the appointment will be recommended to the provost.

All part-time, adjunct and temporary faculty must provide original transcripts of all college and university work and a current curriculum vitae (C.V.). Qualifications are verified through telephone or personal interviews and transcripts. A personnel file is maintained in both the Office of
the S&E Dean and the Office of the Provost. Faculty members must complete all required Human Resources forms.

**VII. Faculty Responsibilities**

The college is committed to excellence in teaching and learning, scholarly pursuits, a concern for students, and the integrity of the institution. As such, all faculty are expected to adhere to the guidelines listed in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C0.03 for full-time faculty and Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C0.02 for part-time faculty. These items include the following:

- Meet classes as scheduled in the syllabus and make alternative arrangements when necessary for absences;
- Facilitate learning so as to meet course objectives;
- Maintain competence in teaching fields;
- Be professional in conduct in the classroom and show respect for students;
- Be available to students for consultation during regular office hours;
- Serve as a mentor to students in accordance with the college requirements on advisement;
- Engage in service activities according to requirements for performance by rank as stated in university and College policies on tenure and promotion; and
- Engage in scholarly activity according to requirements for performance by rank as stated in university and college policies on tenure and promotion.

While these responsibilities provide the foundation of good teaching and professionalism, they do not alone qualify one for tenure or promotion.

**Faculty Personnel Files**

Faculty personnel files are maintained in both the Office of the Provost (originals) and the Office of the S&E Dean. At the time of employment at A&M-Corpus Christi, all faculty will provide original transcripts for all college and university work. If additional courses or degrees are completed after commencing work at the university, the faculty will provide an original transcript to the Office of the S&E Dean for maintenance in the faculty personnel files. In addition, faculty are to maintain a complete and current academic record available online through the Digital Measures program. The academic record will be used by the university to derive a C.V. by **August 1st** prior to each academic year to meet the requirements of House Bill 2504 which requires Texas public
institutions of higher education to post a C.V. for each faculty member and course syllabi on a publicly accessible website. New faculty will be requested to provide a C.V. prior to the start of classes. The academic record deposited in Digital Measures will also be used by department chairs to develop a current C.V. as a reference during the annual evaluation and will be used as a resource in promotion and tenure evaluations. It is the responsibility of each individual faculty to assure that the transcript records of their education are correct and on file in the Office of the S&E Dean and that the academic record housed in Digital Measures is current.

Faculty personnel files kept in the Office of the S&E Dean contain the following materials:

- Copies of official transcripts showing all graduate work and the awarding of degrees. (Original transcripts are kept in the Office of the Provost)
- Annually updated C.V. (derived from Digital Measures).
- A&M-Corpus Christi employment contracts.
- Copies of correspondence related to contracts.
- File copies of outside employment approval forms.
- Reports and recommendations from the chair and the dean related to tenure and promotion decisions.
- Reports of courses taught, class size, grade distribution, and student evaluation.
- Faculty submitted materials related to teaching effectiveness and faculty development activities; scholarly and/or creative accomplishments; and professional, university, college, and community service.
- Faculty annual evaluations.
- Faculty annual goals and objectives.
- Other relevant personnel forms.
- Miscellaneous correspondence.

New Faculty Orientation

New full-time faculty are expected to attend university and Department orientation programs. The university holds an orientation program for new faculty commencing at the beginning of each fall semester. This serves as an introduction to many programs, personnel, offices, policies and procedures of the university; to rights, expectations and responsibilities of faculty; and to pedagogy for teaching effectiveness. A similar program for part-time/adjunct faculty is also held at the beginning of each Fall and Spring Semester.

Outside Employment Policy

The college adheres to Texas A&M University System Policy 07.01 (“Ethics”) that requires all full-time budgeted employees who work for remuneration to receive the prior approval of their chief executive officer or his/her designee except as exempted by that policy.
The policy maintains that outside work be reasonable in amount, avoid unfair competition with private enterprise, be conducted at no expense to the A&M System, and not interfere with an employee’s work assignments.

Full-time faculty members considering outside employment opportunities must complete an External Employment and Consulting Application form (go to http://sci.tamucc.edu//documents/forms/external-employment-approval-form.pdf). Full-time faculty must receive explicit permission from the dean to teach simultaneously at any other institution.

**Student Access**

Faculty members are expected to be available for students during office hours and other times to reasonably accommodate students. Office hours should be established at the beginning of the term.

Full-time faculty members must schedule a minimum of five office hours weekly scheduled over multiple days for each term in which faculty are teaching. In addition, faculty members must have a statement in syllabi and attached to the posting on the office doors that additional times are available by appointment.

Part-time/adjunct faculty members teaching person-to-person and/or online courses shall make themselves available for students at some time other than class hours. It is recommended that part-time/adjunct faculty members teaching one 3 credit-hour class should hold 1 office hour a week, and weekly scheduled over the class day(s) of the week. Part-time/adjunct faculty members teaching more than 3 credit hours should hold office hours prorated based on the 1 office hour per 3 credit-hour course guideline. Part-time/adjunct faculty members must include contact information and office hours on the syllabus. Rooms for meetings between the faculty member and the students are provided by the College.

For laboratory classes, academic departments should establish guidelines of student access to laboratory instructors/assistants outside the scheduled laboratory hours.

**Student Grade Appeal Process**

The College of Science and Engineering (S&E) follows the student grade appeals procedure described in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 13.02.99.C0.03. The procedures for student grade appeals in courses in the College of Science and Engineering are described in Appendix I of this handbook.

**Attendance at University Commencement**

The college adheres to University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C0.03 Responsibilities of Full-Time Faculty Members, faculty members are encouraged to attend commencement ceremonies to demonstrate support for the graduates and their families.
At the beginning of the fall semester, the Office of the S&E Dean will request a list of the faculty who will be attending graduation ceremonies at the end of the fall and spring semesters. All faculty are required to attend either the Fall or Spring Commencement. All faculty who teach in the second summer session will attend the Summer Commencement. The Office of the S&E Dean distributes a memo several weeks before Commencement informing faculty of the time, location, parking and other relevant information regarding the upcoming ceremony. Any absences must be excused by the respective chair and the dean in advance.

**Summer Teaching Process**

Faculty members are generally not contractually promised summer teaching nor required to teach during the summer. Teaching summer courses is an additional opportunity, not a right. If a scheduled course does not meet, faculty are not automatically moved to another paid assignment. Faculty teaching or fulfilling other paid assignments in the summer sessions are expected to continue all aspects of the faculty role including regular office hours, student advising, department and other college and university obligations as well as attendance at summer commencement ceremonies.

Determination of summer teaching schedules and loads is based first on programmatic and student needs and second on budgetary constraints. In general, continuing faculty are given priority in making summer teaching assignments. A second significant factor considered in making summer teaching assignments is the specific faculty expertise in an area.

The process for determining summer teaching schedules and faculty summer loads is described below:

- Early in the spring semester, chairs determine which courses will be offered during the summer. This determination is based on both program and student needs and the size of expected enrollments for the courses. Chairs schedule courses based on their logical place in the program.

- Early in the spring semester, chairs query their faculty to find out who is interested in teaching during the summer. Faculty are asked how many courses they would like to teach and which sessions they would prefer to teach.

- Chairs notify the dean of departmental course requirements for the summer and of any adjunct instructor requirements. The dean requests summer funding from the university administration to meet programmatic needs.

- Chairs match faculty preferences with needed courses. Chairs principally assign faculty to courses on the basis of faculty expertise in an area. Where more than one faculty member is capable of teaching a given course, the chairs may make the summer assignment based on any of a number of appropriate factors, including but not necessarily limited to seniority, previous experience with the course, teaching evaluations, previous summer or other budgetary resource allocations, or simple rotation. Chairs may make such assignments based on different criteria, as they deem appropriate to each situation.
Faculty Absences
(*Section revised and approved, 9 May 2017*)

When classes must be missed for professional or personal reasons, faculty (from all ranks, e.g., tenure-line, professional track, visiting and adjunct faculty) should make appropriate arrangements to assure minimum disruption of course activities. Scheduling examinations and arranging for acceptable proctors is an example of an appropriate arrangement. Use of recorded lectures, online assignments, or guest lectures given by colleagues or outside experts may be appropriate. Students may also conduct research activities designated in the syllabus during the faculty's absence.

For planned absences, faculty must provide his/her department chair with a list of the classes to be missed, arrangements made for coverage of classes, and information on how the faculty may be reached during his/her absence. This document must be completed, approved and signed by the department chair and forwarded to the office of the dean in advance of the absence. In particular, arrangements for absences during travel should be filed at the same time as Travel Request is filed.

In the event a faculty member is unable to make arrangements because of an unforeseen absence, the department chair should attempt to find an appropriate arrangement or cancel the class and provide notice on the faculty's behalf.

Substitute instructors are required for cases of extended leave (i.e., more than three consecutive lecture hours per course), and the substitutes' reassigned workload should be approved by the department chair and the dean. Consequently, appropriate compensations for substitute instructors if needed and available will be made.

Faculty missing classes for bereavement, illness or medical appointments that cannot be rescheduled should apply for sick leave following University Procedures 31.03.02.C1.02, Faculty Sick Leave Usage.

**VIII. Emeritus Faculty Status**

In accordance with University Rule 31.08.01.C1, Faculty and Staff Emeritus, the College of Science and Engineering recognizes faculty who perform exemplary service to the university over the course of their careers. The university offers 8 emeritus titles: Professor Emeritus, Director Emeritus, Executive Director Emeritus, Dean Emeritus, Assistant Vice President Emeritus, Associate Vice President Emeritus, Vice President Emeritus, and President Emeritus. Privileges and responsibilities of faculty and staff emeriti are detailed in University Rule 31.08.01.C1.

Eligibility and the nomination process stated herein are for designations of Professor Emeritus of S&E faculty. Designation of other Emeritus titles of S&E faculty and staff are the purview of central administration.
Eligibility

Every faculty member who, at the time of separation, holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi and has served the university at least ten (10) years is eligible for consideration for emeritus status.

On rare occasions, fixed term faculty may also be considered for Emeritus status provided they have a distinguished record of service to the University. A minimum of ten years of service is required for consideration.

A faculty member may request in writing that he/she not be considered for emeritus status. Significant contributions for faculty members are defined as contributions in teaching, research, or service that go beyond the normal duties and responsibilities of an appointment. Such contributions should include, but are not limited to, actions that:

(a) bring credit to the university within the academic and/or broader community;
(b) serve the university in times of need, change, or development; or
(c) serve a particular department or constituency of the university not ordinarily associated with the duties of appointment.

Process

A faculty member eligible for Professor Emeritus status or a colleague from the same department initiates the process by making a request in writing to the chair of the member’s department by September 1. The department chair, with consent of the eligible member, shall convene and join the department’s tenured and tenure-track faculty in considering the request by reviewing a CV and a one to two-page summary of teaching, research, and service prepared by the eligible member or colleague. The department faculty will provide a letter with their recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will write his/her own recommendation and send both letters to the dean by October 1st.

The dean will convene the college emeritus committee to review the department’s and chair’s recommendations. The college committee will submit its recommendation to the dean by November 15th.

The dean will review the recommendation from the college committee and will submit his decision and all necessary documentation to the Office of the Provost by December 1st.

IX. Travel Guidelines

The College of S&E encourages all faculty to be professionally active. To further that end, the college provides funds to support professional travel. The amount of reimbursement varies depending on the availability of funds. While each Department establishes priorities supporting their goals and philosophy, there are some general guidelines that apply across the continuum.

1. All travel plans and requests must originate and carry the approval of the relevant chair or director for the department/institute/center. The approval of the dean (or designee) is
also required. Requests specify the date(s) of travel, purpose or reason for travel, how attendance at desired event will benefit the college and enhance the faculty member’s professional development, etc. Requests for international travel must be approved by the president and should be submitted to reach the Office of the Provost 30 days prior to the start date.

2. No travel will occur without the appropriate documentation and paperwork being completed and approved. Travel requests must be submitted according to the approved university processes.

3. Faculty traveling out of town for field trips related to teaching must also complete a form detailing the planned travel; this also documents the business purpose of their travel for insurance purposes.

4. Whenever possible, grant and contract funds should be expended to support professional travel.

5. Travel expenditures must conform to university, system and state policies.

6. If expenditures exceed approved amounts, the excess money is the faculty member’s responsibility.

7. Expense reports must be submitted according to the approved university processes.

X. Recommendations for Graduate Faculty Status

Recommendation of designation of graduate faculty status shall follow University Procedure 12.99.99.C0.03.

Tenured/ Tenure-Track Faculty

Graduate faculty in programs within schools or departments or members of interdisciplinary programs will review the qualifications of faculty members seeking graduate faculty status. This review occurs when such a faculty member is newly appointed to the program or is renewing an existing appointment to the graduate faculty. Upon recommendation by the graduate faculty of the program, the appropriate department chair or school director and the College of Science and Engineering dean (in succession) will review the qualifications of the faculty member.

For faculty in a new program (i.e., without existing graduate faculty), the chair/director of the primary department/school will develop a list of potential graduate faculty members, review their qualifications, and submit the list of recommended graduate faculty members to College of Science and Engineering dean (along with documentation of their qualifications) for review.

The College of Science and Engineering dean will forward recommendations for graduate faculty status to the Graduate Council in accordance with University Procedures.
Persons Other Than Tenured/ Tenure-Track Faculty

Appropriately qualified individuals who are not tenure-track university faculty may be appointed to graduate faculty status to co-direct, train, and advise graduate students and/or teach graduate courses. Such graduate faculty appointments are made in one of three categories: associate members, adjunct members or special appointments. Eligibility and privileges of these appointments are described in University Procedure 12.99.99.C0.03.

Graduate faculty in programs within schools or departments or members of interdisciplinary programs will review the qualifications of faculty who are not tenure-track seeking graduate faculty status. This review occurs when such a faculty member is newly appointed to the program or is renewing an existing appointment to the graduate faculty. Upon recommendation by the graduate faculty of the program, the appropriate department chair or school director and the College of Science and Engineering dean (in succession) will review the qualifications of the faculty member.

Faculty who have already been designated as System Graduate Faculty in other institutions in the A&M System will be eligible to serve in a capacity similar to associate members. The department chair or school director notifies the College of Science and Engineering and the College of Graduate Studies of these appointments. Such notifications are a formality for record-keeping purposes and do not require formal approval.

XI. College Promotion and Tenure Process

Promotion of Faculty

University Handbook Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C1.01 provides faculty rank descriptors. It is stated that appointment to an academic rank is based on past and anticipated success in performance, accomplishments, and leadership in teaching, research and professional service. Faculty members progressing from one rank to the next are expected to achieve increasing success both by progressively mastering and by progressively improving in these areas. Consistently sustained development, performance of faculty responsibilities, and contribution to the university and the profession, as described in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C1.01 (Academic Rank Descriptors) 12.02.99.C0.01 (Tenure), and 33.99.04.C0.02 (Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members), are requisite for all promotions. The merit of a faculty member’s professional achievements, rather than meeting the minimal required time in rank and residence, is the basic standard for all recommendations of promotion.

Unless otherwise requested in writing, a faculty member is eligible to be considered for promotion during the academic year in which all the education and experience standards for a given rank are met as specified in Faculty Handbook sections noted above.

Tenure of Faculty

Tenure is defined in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.02.99.C0.01.

Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time assistant professor or a higher rank, the tenure probationary period will not exceed six years unless an extension is granted in writing by the dean.
of the college and by the provost. Up to three years of credit at other institutions may be considered as part of the probationary period if agreed to at the time of the faculty member’s initial tenure track appointment.

Mandatory review of probationary faculty members for promotion and/or tenure decision will usually take place at the sixth year of tenure track appointment. If tenure decision is negative, the faculty member’s contract will be terminated after one additional academic year of appointment. Faculty members who believe their teaching, scholarship and service record merits early promotion and tenure may apply. It must be noted that early promotion and tenure requires extraordinary qualifications, and that if early promotion and tenure application is denied the faculty member’s contract will be terminated after one additional academic year of appointment.

Under extraordinary circumstances, a faculty member may submit a written request for “extension of the tenure probationary period” to the faculty member’s department chair. The request shall follow University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C4. Extension may be granted upon written concurrence by the faculty member, department chair, dean, and the provost.

**Promotion to Professor**

For promotion from associate professor to professor, ten years of full-time tenure track faculty experience at A&M-Corpus Christi is generally required before a faculty member can apply. Years of credit at another institution that are stated in writing at the time of the initial faculty appointment counts toward the ten-year requirement.

**Procedures for Initiating Promotion and/or Tenure Review**

Before the end of the spring semester prior to the tenure review, the dean shall meet with promotion and tenure candidates of their status as candidates and the deadline for the submission of their dossiers. Associate professors shall be notified in the initial year of their eligibility for promotion. This notification is simply informational. The Office of the Dean verifies that each faculty member on the promotion/tenure list satisfies the university standards for education, experience, and length of employment. The dean will present a list of candidates to the college Promotion and Tenure Committee, the director of the School of Engineering & Computing Sciences, the department chair, and the department Promotion and Tenure Committee by June 10th.

Before the end of the spring semester prior to the promotion and tenure review, the dean will hold a meeting open to all promotion and tenure candidates in the college to review timelines, processes, and portfolio expectations. Supporting documentation (faculty portfolio) as specified in Documentation Guidelines, Appendix C, must be submitted to the Office of the Dean by the close of business on September 1st in the relevant fall semester.

**Department Promotion and Tenure Committee**

A department Promotion and Tenure Committee consisting of all tenured faculty, excluding the department chair, is established by each department chair to evaluate tenure and promotion applications of respective Departments. To evaluate applications for promotion only, the Committee
membership will consist of all tenured faculty at or above the rank to which promotion is requested. The Committee membership will therefore vary with the rank being sought by the candidates.

The role of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee is to make recommendations to the department chair, and to the college Promotion and Tenure Committee. The vote shall be in closed ballot, counted, and reported at the time when the vote is taken. A positive response from the Committee as reported on the first form in Appendix A is based on a positive vote of majority of the Committee; explanatory text should also be provided. Otherwise, the second form in Appendix A should be used. If a conflict of interest (such as spousal or partner relationships) arises as determined by department chair or the dean, the committee member must recuse him/herself from reviewing only that of the individual candidate’s dossier for which the conflict exists.

If the number of faculty in a rank in a department does not meet the university minimum of three committee members, the department chair will solicit nominations of other faculty within the college at the appropriate rank. Additional tenured faculty members will be nominated by members of the department Committee. The dean may make the appointment(s) or seek alternative nominations. Any faculty member on post-tenure review status is excluded from serving.

The Committee chair will be selected from and elected by members of the Committee. The Committee chair should have served before on the Committee. The dean (or designee) and the department chair shall review college and university tenure rules and procedures at the initial meeting of the Committee. The dean (or designee) and the department chair must not be present during subsequent Committee meetings. The Committee chair will establish the meeting schedule, coordinate the solicitation of external review letters and the review of candidate documents, and oversee the creation and submission of the Committee report to the department chair and the college Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**External Review**

The department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department chair are the primary evaluators of faculty teaching, scholarship and service contributions. Independent external review is a critical source of supplemental evaluation allowing an assessment of the prominence of a candidate’s scholarship as viewed by his or her professional peers. The portfolio of all faculty being considered for promotion and tenure must include external review letters. Letters of support should not be requested from members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee as they will be directly engaged in discussion and evaluation of the candidate. Although letters may be included, for example, that support a candidate’s service to the community or profession, engagement in outreach activities or serve as testimonials from students, the only letters to be included in the portfolio evaluating scholarship will be those solicited in the process described below.

A minimum of four, but no more than six, external review letters will be included in the candidate’s portfolio. External reviewers will be selected by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, department chair and dean, with half coming from a list nominated by the candidate and half from a list nominated by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the dean. The candidate may submit a list of external reviewers who should be excluded from the selection. At least two of the external review letters should come from the non-candidate’s list.
The faculty candidate will submit a C.V., three publications, and five suggested external reviewers to Committee chair of his/her department Promotion and Tenure Committee by **June 15**th. External reviewers must be established scholars in the candidate’s field of study or a closely related area. The reviewers must have appointment at the rank to which the candidate is applying or higher. The dean will approve the final list of external reviewers by **June 20**th.

External review letters will be requested by the department chair. To ensure that adequate time is allowed for external reviewers to review the candidate’s materials and respond, the department chair will send out requests for review by **July 1**st. The department chair will notify the candidate when external reviews are requested. External review letters are due on **September 15**th.

External reviewers will be asked to specifically comment on the candidate’s scholarly work and the significance of the contributions to the discipline. Chair of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee will prepare a summary of positive and negative comments and their recommendations on tenure and promotion. The summary and all external review letters received from accepted reviewers will be advanced with the portfolio. Letters are treated confidential, and shall not be shared with the candidate. The candidate will be provided with a redacted summary of the external review without identifying individuals. The summary will be drafted by the Committee chair and approved by the department chair. All external review letters and reviewer identifiers will be removed from the portfolio before it is returned to the candidate at the end of the process.

**Response of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall provide a written report to the college Promotion and Tenure Committee through the department chair expressing the Committee recommendation. The report shall contain the rationale used for reaching the recommendation. The format for this report is included in Appendix A. Committee members must vote positive or negative in promotion and tenure recommendations. Abstentions will be recorded as negative votes. The report shall be signed by each member of the Committee and shall be sent to the department chair by **September 30**th. All matters related to the deliberation of the promotion and tenure committee should remain confidential. Candidates are discouraged from approaching committee members regarding these deliberations. Candidates should only be informed of their status through the appropriate official communication procedures outlined in this document.

**Role of the Department Chair**

The role of the department chair is to review the department Promotion and Tenure Committee report, forward it to the college Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the dean. If the candidate is within the School of Engineering & Computing Sciences, the department chair will forward the report to the School director. The School director will forward the report to the college Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the dean.

The department chair shall also submit a separate evaluation report to the college Promotion and Tenure Committee and the dean. If the candidate is within the School of Engineering & Computing Sciences, the department chair will write his evaluation to the School director. The department chair should meet with the candidate to review both recommendation reports by **October 15**th. If the candidate is within the School of Engineering & Computing Sciences, the school director should...
meet with the candidate to review both recommendation reports by October 15th.

**Response of the Candidate**

The candidate may submit a response to the recommendations of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department chair (or School director). Such response should indicate concurrence with the recommendations or non-concurrence. Responses must be submitted to the department chair (School director) within two business days of the meeting with the department chair (School director) and will be included in the candidate’s portfolio. The department chair’s (School director) recommendation, the department Promotion and Tenure Committee’s recommendation, and the candidate’s response shall be added to the portfolio and forwarded to the dean and the college Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College**

The role of the college Promotion and Tenure Committee is to make recommendations to the dean concerning the promotion of faculty and granting of tenure.

Each department in the college elects one tenured (full) professor from that department to serve a two-year term on the college Promotion and Tenure Committee. This elected faculty member cannot serve consecutive terms unless there are fewer than three eligible faculty members in his or her department. College administrators at the level of department chair and above shall not serve on the Committee. After the election, the dean may appoint one person per department for purposes of equity, diversity, and representation to serve a two-year term on the college Promotion and Tenure Committee subject to the same requirements and conditions as elected members. Committee members will assume their duties **September 1st** of the year in which they are elected.

After receiving the recommendations from the department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department chair (School director), the dean (or designee) shall call a meeting of the college Promotion and Tenure Committee. At this meeting, the college Promotion and Tenure Committee shall elect a chair, and the dean shall review college and University tenure policies. The dean or associate deans shall not be present during subsequent meetings of the Committee. While being an independent body, the college Promotion and Tenure Committee should follow each individual department’s guidelines and consider each department’s recommendations for discipline-specific criteria such as evidence of research productivity including the number and type of peer reviewed publications.

If a conflict of interest arises, that member should not serve on the committee for the year in which the conflict exists and another person should be elected/appointed to fill that empty position for the year.

**Documentation Available to the Committees and Department Chair (School Director)**

Each department Promotion and Tenure Committee and department chair (School director) shall have for review the following documentation:
1. Documentation specified in Appendix C;

2. Evidence to support achievement of the criteria for promotion and/or tenure (refer to Appendices D-G);

3. Copies of all annual faculty evaluations by candidate’s department chair;

4. Letters from external reviewers;

5. Other documentation pertinent to a faculty member’s evaluation as determined by the dean.

The college Promotion and Tenure Committee shall have for review the same documentation noted above. In addition, the department chair (school director) will provide the college Promotion and Tenure Committee with:

1. The recommendation report of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee;

2. The recommendation report of the department chair or school director;

3. The response of the candidate.

**Response of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The college Promotion and Tenure Committee shall provide a written report to the dean. The report shall contain the rationale used for reaching its recommendation. The vote should be reported, and no abstentions are allowed. A positive recommendation is based on a majority positive vote of the Committee members. A tie vote is insufficient to recommend tenure or promotion. Tenure and promotion from assistant professor to associate professor are not evaluated separately. Explanatory text of the Committee report should use the form in Appendix B. The report shall be signed by each member of the Committee and shall be sent to the dean by **November 1st**.

**Role of the Office of the Dean and Withdrawal from Candidacy**

After receiving the written recommendations of the college Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair or school director and the candidate response, the dean will meet with the candidate about the dean’s recommendation and the results of the other levels of review. The candidate will be given an opportunity to read the dean’s recommendation letter. Upon request by the candidate, the dean will inform the candidate of the numerical results of the department and college Promotion and Tenure Committee votes. The dean shall submit all materials with a formal letter of recommendation to the Office of the Provost by **November 30th**.

A candidate for promotion and/or tenure may withdraw from consideration prior to the dean submitting the letter of recommendation to the Office of the Provost. The withdrawal request must be made in writing to the dean, signed and dated. Once the withdrawal request is submitted to the dean it may not be rescinded. A candidate for tenure who requests withdrawal from consideration will be offered a terminal contract for one additional academic year following the term or semester.
in which the notice is received.

Information about the process beyond the college is available in University Handbook Rules and Procedures 12.02.99.C0.01 (Tenure) and 33.99.04.C0.02 (Promotion of Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty Members).

**XII. Procedures for Annual Evaluation**

Faculty shall be evaluated annually for performance. The result of the annual evaluation provides evidence for recommendations on merit salary increases, promotion, and tenure. All college and departmental policies and procedures shall be consistent with University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 33.99.99.C0.02. The dean of the college is responsible for assuring that all eligible faculty members are evaluated. However, the evaluation process is the function of the chair of the department with which the faculty member is associated.

New full-time faculty will be asked to identify draft goals and objectives for the coming year (or portion of the academic year if assuming duties within the year). The chair and faculty member will mutually agree on goals and objectives. The final goals and objectives of new faculty members will be documented in Goals and Accomplishments section of Digital Measures. Each continuing full-time faculty member will review the past year’s goals and objectives, generate a self-evaluation of accomplishments and, in consultation with the chair, identify goals and objectives for the coming year. Faculty should complete annual updates of Digital Measures by **February 15**th. An electronic or hard copy of current C.V., as reported from Digital Measures, along with goals and accomplishments should be submitted to department chair prior to the evaluation meeting. Faculty evaluation meetings with the chair will be completed no later than **April 1**st. Results of the evaluation meeting will be recorded on annual evaluation forms (see templates in Appendix J). Ranking levels used in evaluating a faculty member as summarized in Appendix J are Excellent, High, Standard, and Unsatisfactory. Each department in the college should develop criteria for the ranking levels.

The faculty member will be given a copy of his/her annual evaluation and will have five working days to reply to the evaluation in writing. The evaluation and response, if any, will be discussed and signed by the faculty member and chair and forwarded to the Office of the S&E Dean for placement in the faculty member’s personnel files in the Office of the S&E Dean by **April 15**.

When the faculty member requests, there shall be a meeting between the faculty member, the department chair or school director, and the dean. Following such a meeting, the dean’s written review and comments will be placed in the personnel file and a copy will be given to the faculty member. Unsatisfactory annual performance reviews may lead to termination of appointment of untenured faculty. Two consecutive negative annual reviews will lead to a post-tenure review of tenured faculty.

**XIII. Pre-Tenure (Mid-Term) Review**

Each untenured tenure-line faculty member shall receive a comprehensive mid-term review by the relevant department’s promotion and tenure committee, department chair, dean and provost. The mid-term review occurs in the spring semester. In most cases, untenured faculty will be eligible
for the mid-term review in the third year of employment in the tenure-line position, in preparation for consideration for tenure in the sixth year of service. In special cases as negotiated and noted in the hiring letter from the provost, untenured tenure-line faculty may be eligible for consideration for tenure earlier than the sixth year of service and may request a mid-term review earlier than the third year of employment. For faculty given 3 years of credit, the mid-term review may occur in the spring semester prior to the earliest academic year in which they could apply.

Similar in scope and magnitude to the tenure review, the purpose of the mid-term review is designed to guide the candidate in the general tenure process and to offer suggestions to help the applicant strengthen his or her later application for tenure. Each reviewing party will identify the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations in writing to assist the candidate in achieving the academic stature required for tenure in the department. Unsatisfactory annual performance reviews and/or a negative mid-term review may lead to termination of appointment.

Before the end of the spring semester of each year, the dean will identify faculty members subject to mid-term review during the next academic year (normally beginning their third year) and notify the candidate and the relevant department’s chair, school director, and promotion and tenure committee. The S&E Dean’s Office verifies that each faculty member on the mid-term review list satisfies the college standards for education, experience, and length of service for this review.

Supporting documentation for mid-term review must include a complete C.V. and documentation of teaching effectiveness and scholarly activities. All materials as described below must fit in a two-inch thick binder, and submitted to the Office of the Dean by the close of business on the first Monday in March during the academic year of review.

The two-inch binder should include

1. Copy of original appointment letter (provided by dean’s office);
2. Current curriculum vitae (provided by candidate);
3. Copies of all annual faculty evaluations (provided by department chair);
4. Documentation of teaching effectiveness, including peer evaluation of teaching once each academic year (provided by department chair);
5. Course syllabi and student course evaluations (provided by department candidate);
6. Documentation of scholarly activities, including copies of publications. Other documentation pertinent to a faculty member’s evaluation as determined by the dean.
7. Documentation of service activities (university/college/department, professional and community).

Response of the department promotion and tenure committee, Department Chair, School Director, and Dean

Each department’s promotion and tenure committee shall provide by April 15th a written report signed by each member of the committee to the dean expressing the recommendation of the committee, with copies to the candidate and the department chair (school director). The department chair shall review the candidate’s portfolio and the committee report and submit an independent report to the candidate and the dean by May 1st. If the applicant is in the School of Science and Engineering, The school director will be the one submitting an independent report to the candidate and the dean by May 1st.
The department chair shall meet with the candidate to review the comments and recommendations of the committee and the chair. If the applicant is in the school of Science & Engineering, the school director will meet with the candidate to review the comments and recommendations. The dean shall review the candidate’s portfolio and the reports from the committee and department chair and prepare an independent evaluation. The dean will meet with the tenure-track faculty member to discuss the review. The dean’s evaluation will be submitted to the provost with copies to the department chair and the candidate. One copy of each report shall be placed in the candidate’s official file in the dean’s office.

**XI V. Post-Tenure Review: Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review**

These guidelines are written for reviews of tenured faculty with workloads of less than 50% administrative assignments. For faculty holding administrative appointments, reviews shall focus on individual performance within the context of a tenured faculty member, including scholarship, teaching, and service. The reviews must be consistent with workload assignments. The post-tenure review will not evaluate an individual’s administrative responsibilities.

Administrators with 50% or higher appointments are reviewed following A&M-Corpus Christi Rules and Procedures (33.99.03.C0.02 Performance Reviews of Academic Administrators).

These guidelines do not infringe on the tenure system, academic freedom, due process or other protected rights. These guidelines do not establish new term-tenure systems or require faculty to reestablish their credentials for tenure.

The purpose of comprehensive review 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.

**Responsibility and Scope**

The review shall be conducted by a peer committee of tenured faculty at the college level. If there is a conflict of interest at the committee level, the dean will make suggestions to replace those members. Unsatisfactory reviews are subject to further evaluation and recommendation by the dean and provost. Every tenured member of the faculty will undergo a comprehensive review every six years, or following the second unsatisfactory comprehensive annual evaluation in any 6-year review cycle. 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 professor. Except for leaves occurring in the sixth year, periods when a faculty member is on leave will still count towards the six-year requirement. The post tenure review may not be waived for any active faculty member.
but may be deferred in rare circumstances when the review period coincides with approved leave or under significant extenuating circumstances. A deferral request must be submitted by the faculty member to the provost’s office through the department chair and dean and be for a period of no more than one year from the scheduled review. Subsequent extensions as necessary will require separate application and approval. A faculty member who has submitted a letter of resignation will not be reviewed. A successful comprehensive review for promotion to professor may serve in place of this post tenure review process.

The basis of the review is the record of teaching, scholarship, and service. The following materials to be assessed for the six years under review are:

- Current curriculum vitae (provided by faculty)
- Annual performance evaluations (provided by department chair or school director)
- Annual faculty activity reports, since most recent review, and determined by the college (reports are available in Digital Measures and provided by faculty)

Faculty members will receive an evaluation for each category of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, service) as well as a comprehensive review. Reviews shall focus on individual performance relative to assigned responsibilities and contributions consistent with that of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload.

**Review Outcomes**

- *Exceeds expectations* – faculty member exceeds expectations for assigned responsibilities and provides contributions that meets or exceeds that expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload.
- *Standard* – faculty member meets responsibilities and provides contributions comparable to that expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload. Strengths are commended and weaknesses are identified for 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.

**Review Process**

**October 15th:** The tenured faculty member is notified that he or she will undergo a comprehensive periodic review during the following spring semester. The college committee will also be notified.

**January 20th:** The faculty member submits his or her current curriculum vitae and faculty activity report to the dean or the dean’s designee. Department chairs or school director submit copies of the faculty member’s annual evaluations for the past six years or since the last review to the dean or the dean’s designee. If a faculty member has written a response to any annual evaluation during the review period, the response letter(s) will be included.

**February 1st:** The dean or dean’s designee provides the peer-review committee with a copy of the submitted documents. The peer-review committee shall be formed at the college level. Each department elects one tenured (full) professor to the committee by vote of the tenured and tenure-
track faculty. The dean appoints one additional committee member. The elected members will serve on two-year terms. The dean’s appointee will serve on one-year term. Department chairs, associate deans and the school director shall not serve on the committee.

March 1st: The peer-review committee will submit a report for each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review through the dean’s office to the Office of the Provost. The report shall state the rating for each category of responsibility, the comprehensive review rating, and the basis for that determination. A copy of the college post-tenure review process must be submitted with its post-tenure review reports. The report must be shared with the faculty under review and the faculty member’s department chair or school director.

April 1st: If the peer-review evaluation is Unsatisfactory in any category, the peer-review committee report shall contain sufficient documentation to identify the area(s) and particulars of the unsatisfactory performance and the basis for the committee’s decision. If the evaluation is Unsatisfactory in any category the dean shall review the submitted documents and prepare a separate report and recommendation. The dean’s and peer committee’s reports and recommendations shall be forwarded to the provost for review by April 1st. The provost will prepare a final decision by April 15th.

For all faculty ultimately receiving an Unsatisfactory rating, the faculty member, peer-review committee and department chair (school director) shall establish a professional development plan by May 15. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the dean. Should May 15 fall after the conclusion of the spring semester the deadline will be extended until September 15.

Disciplinary Action

Incompetence or neglect of duty discovered during the Post Tenure Review may lead to, appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including review for termination, in accordance with due process procedures of Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi Rule 12.01.99.C3 Faculty Dismissals, Administrative Leave, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments and Texas A&M University System Policy 12.01 Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

Professional Development Plan

The plan will:

- Indicate the University resources available to provide appropriate support for the faculty member in achieving the goals of the plan.

- Indicate who will monitor the implementation of the plan and support the faculty member through the process (for example, a faculty mentor, department chair, or school director).

- Include a follow-up schedule (with specific dates), benchmarks, and tangible goals for evaluating improved performance.
The original written review and development plan shall be submitted to the provost’s office with one copy for the faculty member, the department chair or school director, and the college dean. Normally, the development plan period will be for two years. The department chair, with input from the peer-review committee, will assess evidence of improvement after one year. An annual status report, and a final report will be submitted to the dean and provost by May 15th of ensuing years. 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 or school director, in conjunction with the dean, will take appropriate administrative action, up to and including recommendation for dismissal proceedings.

**XV. Criteria Used in Evaluating Performance and Development**

The annual performance and development evaluation of faculty, used for promotion, tenure and merit pay, is based upon University Handbook of Rules and Procedures (http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/rules_procedures/): 12.01.99.C0.03 (responsibilities of full-time faculty members), 12.01.99.C0.04 (descriptions of teaching, scholarship and creativity, and service), 33.99.04.C0.02 (promotion of tenured and tenure-track faculty members), 12.02.99.C0.01 (tenure), and 31.01.08.C1.01 (merit pay for faculty). University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C0.04 includes three major performance criteria: teaching, scholarship and creativity, and service. The College of S&E subdivides teaching into three sub-areas, which are (a) knowledge and experience in the teaching field, (b) quality of teaching, and (c) academic advisement and career counseling.

Academic preparation and experience are relevant to determining the rank and placement of the faculty member in a department of the College of S&E. For non-tenure line faculty hired without a terminal degree, continued growth in academic preparation and experience promises enhanced academic performance and as such are informative criteria. Tenure-line faculty are hired with terminal degrees and appropriate experience for their positions. Although continuing educational growth is encouraged, additional academic preparation and experience are addressed as components of teaching, research and service.

Within the ranks of the tenure-line faculty there are three recognizable groups – those faculty primarily supporting undergraduate programs (generally with a 4/4 teaching assignment), graduate faculty primarily supporting Master of Science programs (generally with a 3/3 teaching assignment), and graduate faculty supporting Doctor of Philosophy programs (generally with a 1/2 teaching assignment). Faculty who chairs or serves on MS thesis or PhD dissertation committees will not be given additional reassigned workload time. The nominal effort allocation for faculty of each respective group is summarized in Table 1. Members of these groups differ in proportions of time allowed for research, service and teaching, and also in the resources made available to them for research support. Teaching, research and service are all essential to the growth and sustenance of the college, but relative contributions by faculty of these three groups differ among these criteria. The college recognizes that these differences must be reflected in the evaluation criteria. Individual faculty may negotiate different effort allocations annually with their department chairs (school director). Differences from the nominal allocations associated with the initial appointment must be
appropriately documented and approved by the dean. Differences from the nominal allocations will be taken into account in all performance, promotion and tenure reviews. Non-tenure-line full-time faculty workload assignments will be negotiated with the department chair or school director with the dean’s approval.

Table 1. Nominal Effort Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Load*</th>
<th>Teaching (%)</th>
<th>Research (%)</th>
<th>Service (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1 or 1/2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 3-SCH teaching load per course

All evaluations of faculty performance will be based on documented evidence of faculty contributions and achievements in the three areas of teaching, research, and service, commensurate with the effort allocation as stated in the individual offer letter and annual evaluations. While it is recognized that effort allocations may differ contributions in teaching and research will normally be the major factors in determining the outcomes of the tenure and promotion reviews. Supporting evidence in teaching effectiveness, research achievements, and service accomplishments is essential for an affirmative recommendation.

Each department in the college shall develop specific indicators that lend itself to supporting evidence of teaching effectiveness, research achievements, and acceptable service. For example, on research the faculty holding tenure-track appointments in a discipline offering graduate degrees in our college are expected to contribute to the graduate program and to advance the state-of-knowledge of their respective fields of expertise. Candidates for tenure and promotion must provide evidence of accomplished scholarship based on the research conducted while at A&M-Corpus Christi and the potential for continuing contributions in their fields of expertise. Tenured members of the graduate faculty are expected to be active participants in and supporters of professional societies in their fields of expertise, and to participate actively in and contribute to the departmental graduate program. Examples of indicators of teaching effectiveness, research and service are given below.

Teaching Effectiveness

An effective instructor is a good communicator. The ability to convey information in a clear and concise fashion, to motivate and retain student interest, and to stimulate critical discussion are some of the indicators of an effective classroom presence. Candidates for promotion and tenure will submit all student evaluations of their performance.

The measurement of teaching effectiveness and student learning is a difficult process. The college uses as many avenues as possible to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Each department identifies
the techniques most suited to their relevant disciplines and the goals/objectives of the programs. The program goals/objectives operationalize the college objectives, which in turn reflect the purpose and mission of the university as a whole.

Each department evaluates its curricula. As part of the overall evaluation, students participate in a course evaluation process each semester. Each department designs tools utilized for their student course evaluations. The process is conducted online, near the end of the semester. Directed independent studies will not be part of the process unless so designated/requested by the faculty or chair. Quantitative student responses are tabulated and analyzed, and their written comments are recorded. The results are given to the dean, the department chair, school director, and the individual instructor for review.

The results are generally discussed with the faculty member during the annual performance review, and a copy is kept in the faculty’s personnel file in the Office of the S&E Dean. Annual evaluation of teaching is done in part through student course evaluations. When needed or if warranted, the results may be discussed by the department chair with the individual faculty member immediately. From time to time, the dean refers comments to the chairs or school director to discuss and clarify with appropriate faculty.

While student evaluations are useful in determining perceived teaching effectiveness, additional insight can be gained with other evaluation methods. In consultation with each faculty member, a faculty teaching mentor will be appointed by the department chair and peer-observation of teaching performance will be conducted by the respective teaching mentor or another designated evaluator. Prior to mid-term review, tenure-track faculty will receive peer evaluation once each academic year. Following the mid-term review, tenure-track faculty should receive at least one peer evaluation prior to the promotion and tenure review. The evaluation will include a written report that contains constructive comments concerning perceived deficiencies if any, and suggested strategies for remediation. A follow-up evaluation may be requested once remediation has occurred. A peer evaluation instrument will be used that has been deemed valid and reliable by the education evaluation literature such as the Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol (D. Sawada, M.D. Piburn, E. Judson, J. Turley, K. Falconer, R. Benford, I. Bloom, “Measuring Reform Practices in Science and Mathematics Classrooms: The Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol,” School Science and Mathematics 102(6): 245-253, 2002) or similar instrument. The evaluation instrument will include assessments of degree of currency of course content, innovation, clarity of presentation, student engagement, inquiry, opportunities for collaboration and possible other items such as student surveys conducted by the evaluator to measure teaching effectiveness. Each department in the college shall develop a specific process and instrument for peer evaluation.

Other techniques used to ensure continuous improvement of instructional delivery and communication include assessment tools that attempt to measure student learning. For example, major field tests, critical thinking tests, as well as employee and alumni surveys are used to assess for teaching and associated learning throughout the college.

Consideration in this category will also be granted for the development of new courses in the candidate’s area of expertise, the restructuring of current course offerings to meet departmental goals, the mentoring and advising of graduate and undergraduate students as evidenced by career
counseling and research supervision, the securing of outside funding to equip student laboratories, and improvements of instructional efficiencies. Likewise, participation in departmental, college and university seminars and workshops on teaching effectiveness and professional short courses will also be considered. Candidates for promotion to professor are expected to show continued excellence in teaching.

Supervision of individuals who have been hired as part-time/adjunct faculty is the responsibility of the corresponding chair or his/her designee. The primary component of the evaluation of these part-time/adjunct faculty members is teaching. The chair shall seek various inputs to identify the quality of teaching by these individuals. The inputs should include (but are not limited to) student evaluations, class visits, student and peer comments, and other factors that measure teaching performance. Due to the short-term and non-permanent nature of the employment relationship, any problems that arise should be addressed with the part-time/adjunct faculty member as quickly as possible.

**Research**

The college comprises a spectrum of tenure-line faculty ranging from those strictly engaged with undergraduate programs to faculty supporting Ph.D. programs. Scholarship is a component of the workload for all tenure-line faculty in the college, but the resources and time allocated to support faculty research varies with faculty program assignment and terms of appointment. Three broad groups are recognizable: undergraduate faculty (strictly supporting undergraduate programs with a 4/4 teaching assignment), M.S. faculty (supporting undergraduate and M.S. programs with a 3/3 teaching assignment) and Ph.D. faculty (supporting undergraduate through Ph.D. programs with a 1/2 teaching assignment).

Quantitative measures can assist in evaluating faculty scholarship for the different tenure-line faculty categories, but the quality, impact, and significance of the accomplishments are the primary indicators of whether the faculty member has been able to establish a viable and competitive research program. Some key factors for consideration are: visible products of work done by the faculty member and students, notably research publications and presentations in professional off-campus venues; external funding directly supporting the research program; and the successful mentoring and financial support of undergraduate and, where applicable, graduate student research.

**Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

**Undergraduate Faculty.** While undergraduate faculty members carry heavier teaching loads they are also expected to become productive scholars. Specific requirements will differ by discipline and department, but candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are required to provide evidence of a productive, viable undergraduate research program. Evidence can include some combination of: research articles in which the candidate is a major contributor published in peer-reviewed regional, national or international journals; professional presentations of research at the regional level or higher; mentoring of undergraduate student research; and grant awards in support of the faculty research program, undergraduate research experiences, outreach, student recruitment or academic program development.
M.S. Faculty. M.S. faculty members have reduced teaching loads compared to undergraduate faculty, which obligates them to participate in departmental graduate programs. While requirements will again differ by discipline and department, M.S. faculty candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are required to provide evidence of a productive, viable graduate research program. Evidence can include some combination of the following:

1) Research articles in which the candidate is a major contributor should be published in peer-reviewed international, national or regional journals. A peer-reviewed review article, invited chapter in a book, or an entire book may be accepted provided it contributes to the candidate’s field of study. Textbooks, lecture notes and lab manuals, while time consuming to prepare, are not normally the result of original research, and will be considered as contributing to teaching excellence instead of research.

2) Off-campus professional presentations of research results, as talks or posters, at least one of which should be at the national or international level. The candidate should be the presenter in at least one if the works are multi-authored. Invited lectures for international/national or regional meetings of professional societies are also accepted as indicators in this category. The level of institutional support available during the candidate’s period of review will be considered by the review committees and the chair.

3) Successful direction, as major professor, of an M.S. thesis to completion. Direction of non-thesis M.S. student projects serves as evidence of student mentoring and is considered an important teaching responsibility.

4) Function as a member of one M.S. thesis committee directed by another faculty member.

5) Evidence of external funding as principal investigator to support the candidate’s research and graduate program. Equipment grants primarily used to develop and support the candidate’s research and graduate program will be considered in this category. The candidate should provide evidence that equipment acquired through such a grant is critical to the candidate’s research program.

Ph.D. Faculty. Ph.D. faculty members have the lowest teaching loads and highest research expectations in the college. For a successful tenure application, Ph.D. faculty must present unequivocal evidence of a strong and independent research program at A&M-Corpus Christi competitive at the national level in their particular discipline. External funding from national and regional sources commensurate to the needs of the research program must be demonstrated. The majority of research publications will appear in strong national and international journals, a portion of which shall be based upon research conducted while the candidate was a member of the department. For tenure and promotion to associate professor, successful supervision of at least one Ph.D. student is expected.

Promotion to Professor

The successful candidate must demonstrate leadership in the department, college, university and the profession. Examples would include, but are not limited to, acquisition of external funding in support of students or programs, chairing of significant committees, a leadership role with a professional organization, design and development of new programs, strong participation in outreach and recruitment activities, and mentoring of junior faculty. As for tenure, research requirements
for promotion to professor are discipline specific, and each department shall develop specific criteria that will be used in all evaluations. However, each department must follow some general college guidelines:

**Undergraduate Faculty.** For undergraduate faculty promotion to professor the candidate must show sustained and growing productivity in the activities described above, and demonstrate success in acquiring the external support required for the candidate’s research program and/or the academic program and its students.

**M.S. Faculty.** For promotion to professor, the candidate must achieve a research record considered significant by experts in the field. For an M.S. faculty member, the candidate should demonstrate a continued and consistent publication record, including primary authorships (not including abstracts) in international, national or regional journals. Peer-reviewed book chapters, research review articles, or peer-reviewed books solicited by academic publishers (not including textbooks or lab manuals) may be included. The candidate should also show continued presentation of research results at international, national and regional meetings, success in research funding by external sources to support the candidate’s research and graduate program, and continued direction of M.S. theses.

**Ph.D. Faculty.** For promotion to professor, the candidate must achieve a research record comparable to leading scholars considered experts in the field. The candidate is also expected to have successfully supervised (a) at least one Ph.D. student to completion, and (b) two additional Ph.D. students, one of whom has attained the Ph.D. candidacy status.

**Service**

Service can generally be defined as “work performed for another or a group.” A faculty member may contribute service at more than one level including: the department, the university, the city, the nation, and the international levels. Service typically entails working on committees, serving in coordination or leadership roles, having an active role in a professional organization and generally using one’s professional expertise to serve the university and the community. University service encompasses activities done at the request of the department, college or university outside of teaching and research. Such service shall contribute to the management and growth of the department and/or college and will include but not be limited to activities such as participation to committees, program coordination, advising of students, recruiting and overall promotion of the university. Professional service refers to specialized or professional work that is directly related to the unique training and expertise found among university faculty. Community service includes STEM outreach, science communication, e.g., presentation of relevance and significance of faculty research to community at large, and professionally-related service on boards/commissions/committees, for example, City of Corpus Christi, Nueces County and south Texas. Indicators of service performance of each recognizable faculty groups shall be defined by each department in the college. As shown in the nominal effort allocation (Table 1), a faculty service contribution of approximately 10% is typically considered for promotion and tenure reviews, but this value may change to take into account the average negotiated effort allocation approved by the dean.

It is also understood that tenure confers a class of departmental citizenship upon a faculty member.
As a departmental citizen, a faculty member is expected to act in the best interests of the department and the university. Personal qualities such as commitment to the department and its mission, honesty in dealings with fellow faculty, and impartiality towards students are important to the integrity and growth of the department. Failure to exhibit such personal qualities will be considered as evidence of “non-collegiality” and may contribute to a recommendation against tenure and/or promotion. If this criterion is used by the committee, there will be clear and written documentation that the candidate has been unable to demonstrate the ability to work collegially.

### XVI. Non-Tenure Track Faculty Positions

#### General

Non-tenure track faculty positions play a critical role in the teaching, research and service mission of the university. The standard load for full-time non-tenure track faculty shall equal 15 hours or the equivalent as defined by the college.

The non-tenure track faculty provides a means of securing and retaining faculty who bring to Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi excellence in teaching, research or service. Non-Tenure Track Faculty provides a specific, professional skill to the college.

#### Non-Tenure Tracks

**Instructor.** Instructor positions are full-time teaching appointments. Instructors must hold at minimum a master’s degree in the teaching field or related discipline and be appropriately credentialed to the courses they teach prior to the first day of class. Instructors are hired on annual contracts and may be reappointed.

**Visiting Faculty.** Visiting faculty positions are annual, limited term appointments. Visiting appointments can be made at assistant, associate, or professor rank, depending on qualifications and experience. Visiting faculty may have duties that include teaching, research, and/or service as detailed in their appointment letter. Visiting faculty must hold a terminal degree in the teaching or related discipline and be appropriately credentialed to the courses they teach prior to the first day of class. Visiting faculty members can be reappointed for up to a total of three years.

**Professional Track Faculty.** Professional track faculty member appointments follow guidelines provided in University Procedure 12.07.99.C0.01.

1. Professional Assistant Professor – Professional assistant professors are entry-level rank faculty positions that require a terminal degree in the appropriate field that is closely aligned to the appointed position, i.e., has content knowledge and research experience in that field.
2. Professional Associate Professor – Professional associate professors require a terminal degree and five years of experience at the professional assistant professor rank or similar rank. It also requires significant experience related to the position responsibilities.
3. Professional Professor – Appointment to this rank requires the appropriate terminal degree and a record of sustained excellent performance in all areas of appointment. Individuals with five years of experience at the professional associate professor rank or a similar rank may be considered for appointment to the rank of professional senior professor.

4. Contracts for professional assistant professors will be on an annual basis, contracts for professional associate professors may be up to two years, and contracts for professional professors may be up to three years.

Research Track Faculty. Research track faculty appointments follow guidelines provided in University Procedure 12.07.99.C0.01.

1. Research Assistant Professor – Research assistant professors are entry-level rank faculty positions that require a terminal degree in the appropriate field that is closely aligned to the appointed position, i.e., has content knowledge and research experience in that field.

2. Research Associate Professor – Research associate professors require a terminal degree and five years of experience at the research assistant professor rank or at a similar rank. It also requires significant experience related to the position responsibilities.

3. Research Professor – Appointment to this rank requires the appropriate terminal degree and a record of sustained excellent performance in all areas of appointment. Individuals with five years of experience at the research associate professor rank or at a similar rank may be considered for appointment to the rank of research professor.

4. Contracts for research assistant professors will be on an annual basis, contracts for research associate professors may be up to two years, and contracts for research professors may be up to three years.

Clinical Track Faculty. Clinical faculty positions in College of Science & Engineering are faculty who for example hold appointments outside TAMU-CC. The positions bring excellence to the university through highly skilled and experienced practitioners who address a specific need in teaching or training in the college. Clinical faculty should hold a master’s degree or have extensive experience (5 years) in a related field, and be appropriately credentialed to the courses they teach prior to the first day of class. The clinical rank will be specified at the time of hiring. Appointments follow guidelines provided in University Procedure 12.07.99.C0.01.

1. Clinical Assistant Professor – Clinical assistant professors are entry-level rank faculty positions that require a master’s degree in the appropriate field and a minimum of five years of experience as a certified or licensed (as appropriate) practitioner.

2. Clinical Associate Professor – Clinical associate professors require a terminal degree and a minimum of five years at the clinical assistant professor rank.

3. Clinical Professor – Clinical professors require a terminal degree and a minimum of five years at the clinical associate professor rank.

4. Contracts for clinical assistant professors will be on an annual basis, contracts for clinical associate professors may be up to two years, and contracts for clinical professors may be up to three years.

Appointment, Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty
All non-tenure track faculty members will be provided with a letter of appointment that shall outline the initial terms and conditions of employment. The letter will explicitly list the necessary teaching, training, research and/or service expectations of the position.

All appointment letters must indicate that the appointment is non-tenure track, and will expire upon the completion of the appointment, unless extended or dismissal of the faculty member as stated in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures.

All non-tenure track faculty members will be evaluated annually using standard faculty review processes. The review will include an examination of all of the requirements established in the original letter of appointment and all other requirements that may be added during annual reviews. Evaluations will be filed in the dean’s office and will accompany any subsequent recommendations for re-hiring.

Upon recommendation by the dean and approval by the provost, appointments for non-tenure track faculty may be made at less than full time.

Application for promotion in rank shall follow the standard departmental processes. The candidate’s promotion dossier shall include required documentation for only those areas of teaching, research and/or service that have been part of the faculty member’s responsibility.

**Promotion of Professional Track Faculty**

**Promotion of Professional Assistant Professor to Professional Associate Professor.** In order for a candidate to be recommended for promotion to the rank of professional associate professor, the candidate should have demonstrated the following:

1. **Eligibility** – At the time of application for promotion, the candidate must have a minimum of five years of teaching experience at the professional assistant professor rank.
2. **Teaching** – The candidate should have demonstrated a high level of competence in the classroom and the ability to successfully teach an adequate variety of courses as evidenced by:
   - Favorable evaluation of teaching by peers in the department, at least once each academic year, that includes teaching skills, course syllabi, course objectives, copies of examinations and other materials as appropriate;
   - Favorable evaluation of teaching by students enrolled in courses;
   - Course improvement and development;
   - Contributions to teaching mission.
3. **Service** – The candidate should have demonstrated effective participation in department/school, college, university, and professional service activities. Examples include
   - Service on department/school, college, and/or university committees;
   - Non-committee department/school, college, and/or university service;
   - Community service including STEM outreach, science communication, and professionally-related service;
   - Service in professional organizations.
Promotion of Professional Associate Professor to Professional Professor. A candidate for the rank of professional senior professor shall be considered after a period of not less than five years following the rank of professional associate professor and is required to have demonstrated a strong commitment to excellence in teaching and service at TAMU-CC. His or her professional record should show an active role as a member of the senior faculty and provide evidence for an expectation of continuous dedication and future contributions to the teaching and service mission of the department and the university.

Promotion of Research Track Faculty

Promotion of Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor. In order for a candidate to be recommended for promotion to the rank of research associate professor, the candidate should have not less than five years of experience at the rank of research assistant professor and demonstrated the following:

1. Research – The candidate should have demonstrated a high level of competence in his/her field and the ability to successfully conduct independent research as evidenced by being actively engaged in research activities. The research activities include peer-reviewed or externally validated contributions, including but not limited to publications in high quality journals, presentations at appropriate local, national and international conferences or workshops, funding from external sources to sustain research agenda, external reputation of excellence in research.
2. Teaching – The candidate should have demonstrated a high level of competence serving on theses and dissertation committees.
3. Service – The candidate should have demonstrated effective participation in various department/school, college, university, and professional service activities as appropriate, examples of which include
   • Service on department/school, college, and/or university committees;
   • Non-committee department/school, college, and/or university service;
   • Professionally-related community service;
   • Service in professional organizations.

Promotion of Research Associate Professor to Research Professor. In order for a candidate to be recommended for promotion to the rank of research professor, the candidate should have not less than five years of experience at the rank of research associate professor and demonstrated a strong commitment to excellence in research and service at TAMU-CC. His or her professional record should show an active role as a member of the senior faculty and provide evidence for an expectation of continuous success and future contributions to the research (including extramural funding), teaching and service mission of the department and the university.

Promotion of Clinical Track Faculty
Application for promotion in rank shall follow the standard department, college, and university processes with the exception that the dossier shall include required documentation for only those areas of teaching and/or training that have been part of the faculty member's responsibility.
Appendix A

Format for the Written Response of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee to the College of S&E Promotion and Tenure Committee (and Dean) Via the Department Chair

For a positive response:

Following examination of all documentation provided for its evaluation, and considering the evidence stated in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 33.99.04.C0.02 and 12.02.99.C0.01 regarding promotion and/or tenure, the (department name) Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Engineering is pleased to inform you of its recommendation that (faculty member’s name) be awarded (promotion and/or tenure).

The vote of the committee was: (record vote)

The rationale for this recommendation is stated below: (paragraph(s) stating rationale)

Chair, (department name) Promotion and Tenure Committee

__________________________  __________________________
Committee Member                         Committee Member
__________________________  __________________________
Committee Member                         Committee Member

For a negative response:

Following examination of all documentation provided for its evaluation, and considering the evidence stated in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 33.99.04.C0.02 and 12.02.99.C0.01 regarding promotion and/or tenure, the (department name) Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Engineering regrets to inform you of its recommendation not to award (promotion and/or tenure) at the present time to (faculty member’s name).

The vote of the committee was: (record vote)

The rationale for this recommendation is stated below: (paragraph(s) stating rationale)

Chair, (department name) Promotion and Tenure Committee

__________________________  __________________________
Committee Member                         Committee Member
__________________________  __________________________
Committee Member                         Committee Member
Appendix B

Format for the Written Response of the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E to the Dean

For a positive response:

Following examination of all documentation provided for its evaluation, and considering the evidence stated in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 33.99.04.C0.02 and University Rule 12.02.99.C0.01 regarding promotion and/or tenure, the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Engineering is pleased to inform you of its recommendation that (faculty member’s name) be awarded (promotion and/or tenure).

The vote of the committee was: (record vote)

The rationale for this recommendation is stated below: (paragraph(s) stating rationale)

______________________________
Chair, College of Science and Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee

______________________________
Committee Member

______________________________
Committee Member

For a negative response:

Following examination of all documentation provided for its evaluation, and considering the evidence stated in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 33.99.04.C0.02 and 12.02.99.C0.01 regarding promotion and/or tenure, the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Engineering regrets to inform you of its recommendation not to award (promotion and/or tenure) at the present time to (faculty member’s name).

The vote of the committee was: (record vote)

The rationale for this recommendation is stated below: (paragraph(s) stating rationale)

______________________________
Chair, College of Science and Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee

______________________________
Committee Member

______________________________
Committee Member
Appendix C

Documentation Guidelines

Candidate should review the College of Science and Engineering Faculty Handbook, and use college and departmental criteria to decide which supporting materials to include.

Candidate should review her/his personnel file in the Office of the Dean to be sure it is accurate and current. Verify that all transcripts and copies of diplomas are included in the file. Certified copies are acceptable if original documents are not obtainable. Foreign credentials must be accompanied by certified translations from appropriate agencies. Members of the promotion and tenure committees will review this file along with the supporting materials submitted by the candidate.

Restrict quantity of supporting materials to fit in a two-inch thick (maximum) binder and may print supporting materials on both sides.

Section I. The dean and department chair will provide

1. Copy of candidate’s letter of intent requesting P&T review (provided by dean’s office);
2. Copy of original appointment letter (provided by dean’s office);
3. Summary of the nature of the appointment (percent teaching, research and scholarship, service - including semi-administrative and administrative duties) and any changes in those duties over time (provided by department chair).

Section II. An executive summary (2 pages maximum) that clearly illustrates how the candidate’s qualifications meet each of the requirements listed in College Faculty Handbook, and in section 3.4 of University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 33.99.04.C0.02 (provided by candidate).

Section III. Current curriculum vitae (provided by candidate).

Section IV. Copies of annual or other evaluations from the department, chair, school director, dean, and provost for the time period under review and any faculty responses to evaluations (provided by dean’s office).

Section V. Evidence of performance in regard to teaching (provided by candidate).

1. A statement of teaching philosophy and growth (2 pages maximum) discussing improvements, innovations, and changes initiated over the pre-promotion period.
2. An account of teaching assignments and teaching loads, by semester, during the pre-promotion period.
3. Copies of students’ course evaluations.
4. Additional evidence of teaching excellence may include a peer review of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and/or college criteria, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness as determined by the college.

Section VI. Evidence of performance in scholarly activity.

1. A statement explaining contributions and success in scholarly activity, 2 pages maximum (provided by candidate).
2. Documentation demonstrating performance in regard to scholarly activity (provided by candidate).
3. Copy of the letters sent to external reviewers (provided by department chair). Prior to sending to external reviewers, the letters should be verified by the candidate regarding the accuracy of the nature of the appointment, e.g., percent teaching, research and scholarship, and service (including semi-administrative and administrative duties); and any changes in the duties over time.
4. External review letters (provided by department chair or school director)

Section VII. Evidence of performance in regard to service (provided by candidate).

1. A statement explaining leadership and service contributions (2 pages maximum).
2. Documentation demonstrating performance in regard to three service categories: university/college/department, professional and community service (p. 31).

Section VIII. Other documentation.

1. Up to 3 letters from each of (a) peers, (b) the community, and (c) students. The letters should come from those who have worked closely with the candidate and are most familiar with the candidate’s capabilities in an academic environment (provided by candidate).
2. Other documentations in candidate’s personnel file maintained in the dean’s office (provided by dean’s office).

Candidate should consult departmental guidelines for specific examples of materials to be submitted. Candidate may wish to include lists (e.g., a list of recent professional presentations) as well as actual items (e.g., syllabus for a new course).

Material should be organized into a concise packet which provides the evidence for promotion and/or tenure as stated in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 33.99.04.C0.02 and 12.02.99.C0.01. The faculty member should carefully organize this material with the understanding that the committee is evaluating quality, not quantity.

The candidate is expected to include complete copies of their works. If complete copies cannot fit in the binder, candidate should include at least a portion of publications, project reports, or other
supporting documents. However, the complete works should be available to the committee at short notice if requested.

**Appendix D**

**Department of Life Sciences**  
**Supplementary Tenure and Promotion Criteria, Standards and Priorities**  
*(Adopted October 2012; Revised May 2014)*

These guidelines represent a living document, but are to be considered current policy for the faculty of the Department of Life Sciences. Applicants for promotion and tenure are expected to exhibit a positive trajectory in their academic growth by having made substantial contributions to their respective fields, demonstrated leadership and independence, and developed vibrant and robust extramurally-funded research programs (when appropriate). Scholarship, teaching, and service will be evaluated for work accomplished while at A&M-Corpus Christi and at the time of submission of their portfolio. The relative proportions of effort allocated to these three criteria will be discussed as part of the annual review process. It is also understood that substantial diversity exists among departmental programs in terms of disciplines and therefore, roles of departmental faculty. This principle should be the major criterion used to evaluate all faculty for promotion and tenure.

**Scholarship**

In general, success in scholarship should be determined by accomplishment in the areas of peer-reviewed publication, presentation of research and grantsmanship. Other indicators of scholarship such as awards reflecting quality, contracts, development of patents, etc. will also be considered. Success in scholarship will also be evaluated in terms of level of investment/support provided to applicants by the University. Successful applicants represent good investments made by the University. When considering scholarly accomplishments, those achieved while at A&M Corpus Christi are of greatest importance. Clearly, external review of applicants by peers in the field is required and will be considered essential to a more meaningful evaluation. Those faculty serving undergraduate programs are encouraged, but not expected, to engage in scholarship at levels similar to those supporting doctoral and masters programs.

Publication within the discipline is considered the most important indication of scholarship. All forms of peer-reviewed authorship should be included as evidence of accomplishment: peer-reviewed research articles, reviews, books, book chapters, notes, etc. The extent to which these documents support scholarship should be considered on a per-applicant basis and clearly related to specific field of research. Applicants are expected to demonstrate a degree of authorship consistent with their particular teaching load (i.e., doctoral, master’s, undergraduate level). Faculty for which the university has made a strong investment (e.g., start-up funds) should demonstrate a higher degree of success in publication. Primarily, these publications should provide evidence of the development of an independent research program within the discipline and especially in high-impact journals. Consideration will also be given with regard to the extent to which applicant’s works have been cited in peer-reviewed journals within their respective fields. Faculty should provide clarification regarding their individual contribution to co-authored papers, and about the status of
any papers in preparation or submitted for review. Applicants are also encouraged to promote authorship by students and to generate publications derived from collaborative research efforts. Because authorship could take many forms, applicants should strive to clearly describe their specific role in all publications (e.g., graduate advisor, corresponding author, etc.). According to NSF, authorship on papers is recommended only for those who have significantly contributed to the intellectual development of the manuscript. Co-authorship is encouraged and recognized as evidence of collaboration; however, this collaboration should not preclude development of an independent and expanding research program while at A&M-Corpus Christi. Consideration of non-peer reviewed publications will be at the discretion of the departmental committee. At the discretion of the departmental P/T committee, publication record could supersede that of presentations (i.e., a proportionally larger number of publications could be viewed as offsetting the need for presentations). Research transferred to A&M-Corpus Christi as part of previous funding awards will be considered to an appropriate extent. Technical reports, grant applications, inventions leading to patents and agency reports should also be given consideration.

Presentations made at local, state, regional, national and international conferences or symposia should be considered highly contributory to documentation of research effort and, by extension, important to evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure. Collaborative authorship on presentations should be viewed as supportive, especially in the case of graduate and undergraduate students. Presentation of research to peers can be an effective means of promoting the research program. The relative impact of presentations should be measured by the degree to which results have been disseminated to peer groups and the relative importance of venues where research is presented. It is the responsibility of the departmental committee to determine the extent to which presentations contribute to the review process.

All candidates should clearly and accurately substantiate their involvement and funding in large projects, especially those that are interdisciplinary in nature and involve faculty in other units. Grantsmanship will be evaluated according to level (e.g., doctoral, master’s, or undergraduate) and rank (e.g., associate professor with tenure, professor) aspired to by the applicant and within the review period. It is recognized that funding can assume various forms (e.g., federal, regional, state, local, and intramural; foundations; private-sector businesses, etc.) and level of contribution to the grant writing process (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Collaborator, etc.). Faculty candidates should clarify their specific contributions to a project and the proportion of project funding for which they are supported. Primary considerations for evaluation of grantsmanship at the doctoral and master’s level should be 1) extent to which extramural funding exceeds that of intramural (i.e., investment on the part of the University) and 2) maintenance of an adequate level of funding for support of an expanded research effort (e.g., for the research program, graduate/undergraduate students). What tangible results have come from funds awarded within the review period? Undergraduate faculty are expected to show some effort towards writing of grant proposals of an extramural or intramural nature and describe whether this work is research or service-oriented.

Creative educational contributions are to be considered another form of scholarship. Innovative teaching methods, research in instructional techniques, development of on-line instruction, education/professional development and community outreach in K-12 schools, instructional assessment and development of textbooks are important elements to be evaluated, especially for those in the SMTE track.
Teaching

The evaluation of teaching excellence will be largely guided by teaching effectiveness and quality. Teaching workloads are listed in the College section and are established by the dean and chair, but may be modified with their approval. A summary of the teaching load history should be made available to the departmental P/T Committee through the portfolio. Applicants should show evidence of teaching effectiveness in the form of 1) a clear statement of teaching philosophy and responsibilities; 2) a summary of steps taken to improve teaching (e.g., changes resulting from self-evaluation, review of teaching-related journals, and participation in programs designed to improve teaching skills); 3) results of student course evaluations and the extent to which they have changed during the probationary period; 4) a description of modifications of teaching style based upon peer review; 5) any testimonials regarding success of former students; 6) any documentation of teaching development activity from the Center for Teaching Effectiveness; 7) peer evaluation of teaching. Other criteria to be considered include instructional design and innovation (e.g., are course objectives effective, are they aligned with departmental curricular goals, etc.); instructional delivery (e.g., presentation skills, use of media, approach to discovery); instructional assessment; and quality of course management (e.g., meets University, College and Department management deadlines).

Evaluations should consider teaching effort associated with accomplishments achieved during the probationary period as defined by the Dean. Applicants must ensure that the departmental P/T committee is aware of any change in specific teaching load over the probationary period as it will impact the review process. Those applicants categorized as Ph.D. faculty should be teaching at least one graduate-level course.

The contribution of faculty to teaching also includes efforts related to advisement and/or mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students. Successful applicants at the Ph.D. and M.S. level should show evidence of having matriculated students in a timely manner and in numbers related to their involvement in teaching. Ph.D. faculty are also expected to chair and serve as members on master’s committees. It is understood that those faculty having higher teaching loads might not be able to participate in graduate committee service at levels similar to those having lower teaching loads. It is the responsibility of applicants to describe their level of advisement in sufficient detail as to apprise the Departmental Promotion and Tenure of their individual situation.

Mentoring of undergraduate students is considered essential to promotion and/or tenure: applicants should demonstrate evidence of faculty advisement of undergraduates and strong involvement of undergraduate students in their research program. Other areas of involvement include support of student participation in symposia and sponsoring of student clubs or organizations.

Service

In concept, overall effort in terms of service should be relatively similar for all applicants across rank; however, it is understood that distribution of service could vary across the department, college and university as well as community and at state, regional and national/international levels. In general, and initially, new faculty members at the assistant level should engage in only minimal
service and largely within the department. With time, these faculty members should show evidence of increased service load and expanded effort into the college and university. New faculty, especially those required to develop independent research programs (e.g., Ph.D. faculty at the assistant level) should limit service effort. The most common form of service is membership on departmental, college and university committees; however, other forms of service (e.g., Island Days, new student orientation, hosting of visitors, service to the community or field, etc.) should also be considered. For those faculty members seeking promotion to professor, clear demonstration of leadership both within the department and outside the university is expected. The extent to which specific forms of service are counted towards promotion and/or tenure will be addressed on an individual basis by the departmental committee. Faculty members will also be evaluated in terms of service by the chair of the department during annual review.

Specific Guidelines for Tenure

It is understood that tenure confers a higher responsibility of departmental citizenship upon faculty members. Tenured faculty are expected to act in the best interest of the department and the university. Personal qualities such as commitment to the department and its mission, honesty in dealings with fellow faculty, and impartiality towards students are important to the integrity and growth of the department. Failure to exhibit such personal qualities will be considered evidence of “non-collegiality” and may contribute to a recommendation against tenure and/or promotion. Instances of failure to demonstrate collegiality should be documented, in writing, to the department chair by the departmental committee. All evidence of accomplishment as related to tenure should reflect efforts undertaken during the probationary period while in the employment of A&M-Corpus Christi.

Guidelines for (Full) Professorship

The rank of Professor is an honor that is bestowed by peers upon applicants and acknowledges a high level of contribution and leadership in the field at national and/or international levels. Unlike promotion with tenure to associate professor, applicants seeking the rank of professor have no initial probationary period (i.e., promotion is encouraged, but not required). Thus, faculty members who seek promotion to professor will be held to higher standards of teaching, scholarship, and service than those aspiring to the Associate level. The need for objective external review of applicants is most critical at this level. External evaluation should be of a true “review” nature and undertaken by qualified authorities in the applicant’s field. External reviewers must all hold appointments as (full) professors within an academic department. Simple reiteration of the accomplishments of applicants is unacceptable. Accomplishment should, itself, be evaluated in terms of importance to the field of study. Professor status is also bestowed upon faculty considered “leaders” in the Department. For example, leadership can be evidenced by representation of the Department on key committees and panels, development of new programs or initiatives within the department, or establishment of new programs on campus or elsewhere, etc. In addition to departmental leadership, faculty aspiring to (full) professorship, regardless of level, should demonstrate leadership at the national and/or international level.

Use of External Review
The Department of Life Sciences will adopt criteria and procedures relevant to external review as described in the 2012 version of the College Handbook. The departmental committee should strive to maintain confidentiality in terms of external reviews.

**Level of Effort Related to Workload**

Faculty appointed to support Ph.D. programs will be evaluated according to the extent to which they demonstrate a clear ability to support such a program. In general, Ph.D. faculty have higher reassignment of workload for research and, as such, should demonstrate higher degrees of accomplishment in the area of research. In turn, those faculty supporting M.S. programs, typically have less reassignment related to research and increased teaching loads. This does not necessarily imply that M.S. faculty should serve on fewer graduate research advisory committees. Undergraduate faculty are typically assigned higher teaching loads and, by extension, should be responsible for substantially reduced research effort. As above, actual workload characteristics will be determined for individual faculty during the annual review. For this reason, it is important that members of the Department of Life Sciences Promotion and Tenure committee should have access to annual reviews that should be included in the applicant’s portfolio.
Appendix E

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Supplementary Tenure and Promotion Criteria, Standards and Priorities
(Adopted October 2012; Revised May 2014)

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics Promotion and Tenure Committee will use this document as a supplement to university and college policies for the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure. Each candidate will be evaluated as an individual with distinct abilities, interests and strengths. In the context of the three types of faculty identified in the college document, these guidelines specifically address evaluation of faculty who primarily support Master of Science programs (M.S. faculty). Candidates for promotion and tenure should prepare a portfolio based on these guidelines with a narrative for each of the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service laying out their agendas or philosophies, goals and accomplishments in the respective areas.

Teaching

The evaluation of teaching excellence will be largely guided by teaching effectiveness and quality. Teaching workloads are listed in the College section and are established by the dean and chair, but may be modified with their approval. A summary of the teaching load history should be made available to the departmental P/T Committee through the portfolio. Applicants should show evidence of teaching effectiveness in the form of 1) a clear statement of teaching philosophy and responsibilities; 2) a summary of steps taken to improve teaching (e.g., changes resulting from self-evaluation, review of teaching-related journals, and participation in programs designed to improve teaching skills); and 3) results of student course evaluations. Additional materials addressing teaching effectiveness might include: 4) a description of modification of teaching style based upon peer review; 5) any testimonials regarding success of former students; and 6) any documentation of teaching development activity. Other dimensions of teaching excellence include instructional design and innovation (e.g., development of new courses, production of lab manuals, alignment of course objectives with departmental curricular goals, etc.); instructional delivery (e.g., presentation skills, use of technology, approach to discovery); instructional assessment (e.g., evaluation of how well a course measures learning outcomes); and quality of course management (e.g., meets University, College and Department management deadlines).

Evaluations should consider teaching effort associated with accomplishments achieved during the probationary period as defined by the Dean. Applicants must ensure that the departmental P/T committee is aware of any change in specific teaching load over the probationary period as it will impact the review process. Those applicants categorized as M.S. faculty should have taught at least one graduate-level course.

The contribution of faculty to teaching also includes efforts related to advising and/or mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students. Successful applicants at the M.S. level should show evidence of having matriculated students in a timely manner and in numbers related to their involvement in teaching. It is understood that those faculty having higher teaching loads might not be able to participate in graduate committee service at levels similar to those having lower teaching loads.
It is the responsibility of applicants to describe their level of advising in sufficient detail as to apprise the Departmental Promotion and Tenure of their individual situation.

Mentoring of undergraduate students is considered essential to promotion and/or tenure: applicants should demonstrate evidence of faculty advising of undergraduates and, if possible given the candidate’s research program, involvement of undergraduate students in their research program. Other areas of involvement include support of student participation in symposia and sponsoring of student clubs or organizations.

**Scholarship Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

Master of Science faculty members seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor must demonstrate their activity as researchers and meet the stated expectations in the first and at least two of the last three. This list is not meant to serve the minimal expectations for tenure and promotion, so much as to illustrate the evidence that a candidate can present of a satisfactory research program. Simply checking off each item does not guarantee tenure. Considering and weighing all evidence presented by the candidate of their scholarly program will be the responsibility of the promotion and tenure committees, department chair and dean.

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics recognizes that its M.S. faculty often specializes in applied research supporting disciplines including the physical and life sciences, education, engineering, and others. As such, research expectations of an M.S. faculty member for tenure and promotion to associate professor in the department focus on individual faculty member’s contributions within and across the following categories:

1. Authorship of peer-reviewed scholarly publications in the candidate’s field of study. This will normally include at least three full-length peer-reviewed research articles in which the candidate is a major contributor in international, national or regional journals. In addition:
   - Full-length publications typically include analysis of a research problem, including a review of related literature, theoretical framework, findings, and discussion.
   - At least two publications should have resulted from research accomplished primarily while the candidate was a member of the department.
   - At least two publications should be in a national or international journal.
   - One publication may be in the form of a practice-oriented scholarly article, article in a conference proceedings, review article, book, or invited book chapter, provided the publication is peer-reviewed and contributes to the candidate’s field of study.
   - Additional peer-reviewed publications may serve as secondary evidence in this category.

2. Active participation in the professional research community. This will normally include at least three off-campus professional presentations of research results at conferences or meetings in the candidate’s general field of study. In addition:
   - At least one research presentation should be at a national or international meeting. This will typically take the form of a peer-reviewed oral presentation or poster session.
   - If multi-authored, the candidate should be the lead presenter in at least one presentation.
   - Invited lectures for international/national or regional meetings of professional organizations are also accepted as indicators in this category.
The level of institutional support available during the candidate’s period of review will be considered by the review committees and the department chair.

3. Successful mentoring of M.S. students in graduate research. This will normally include substantial contributions as a committee member on two or more completed M.S. thesis projects, including serving as major professor on at least one M.S. thesis. In addition:
   - A candidate’s opportunities to successfully direct M.S. thesis projects in mathematics is tied to the numbers of students enrolled in the Applied & Computational Mathematics (ACM) and Curriculum & Content (CC) tracks of the program. Faculty should be proactive in both contributing to available M.S. thesis committees and developing research opportunities for current and prospective M.S. students.
   - Typically, direction of non-thesis M.S. student projects serves as evidence of student mentoring and is considered an important teaching responsibility. However, schoolteachers in the Curriculum & Content (CC) track often benefit most from classroom-based scholarship. Thus, faculty supporting the CC track may demonstrate graduate research mentoring through non-thesis M.S. curriculum projects, provided such projects make significant contributions to the field of mathematics instruction and exhibit scholarly approaches to project development.

4. Development of external funding in support of the candidate’s research and graduate program. This will normally include substantial contribution as principal or co-principal investigator on externally-funded grants or research contracts. In addition:
   - Participation as co-principal investigator should include taking a substantial role in both the proposal writing process and the execution of grant activities.
   - Equipment grants primarily used to develop and support the candidate’s research and graduate program will be considered in this category. The candidate should provide evidence that equipment acquired through such a grant is critical to the candidate’s research program.
   - Unfunded grant proposals and less-substantial contributions as co-principal investigator on one or more externally-funded projects will be considered as secondary evidence in this category.

**Scholarship Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Professor**

M.S. and Ph.D. faculty seeking promotion to Professor must demonstrate their activity as researchers and meet the stated expectations in all four areas below within the five years preceding application for promotion. This list is not meant to serve the minimal expectations for tenure and promotion, so much as to illustrate the evidence that a candidate can present of a satisfactory research program. Simply checking off each item does not guarantee tenure. Considering and weighing all evidence presented by the candidate of their scholarly program will be the responsibility of the promotion and tenure committees, department chair and dean.

The department recognizes that M.S. and Ph.D. faculty in Mathematics & Statistics often specialize in applied research supporting disciplines including the physical and life sciences, education, engineering, and others. As such, research expectations of such faculty for tenure and promotion to Professor in the department focus on individual faculty’s contributions within and across the following categories:
1. Authorship of peer-reviewed scholarly publications in the candidate’s field of study. M.S. faculty candidates will normally present at least five full-length peer-reviewed research articles in which the candidate is a major contributor in international or national journals. Ph.D. faculty candidates will need to present a portfolio of greater quantity or quality of publications for comparison with leading scholars in their field. In addition:
   - Full-length publications typically include analysis of a research problem, including a review of related literature, theoretical framework, findings, and discussion.
   - At least three publications should have resulted from research accomplished primarily while the candidate was a member of the department.
   - Two publications may be in the form of a practice-oriented scholarly article, review article, book, or invited book chapter, provided the publication is peer-reviewed and contributes to the candidate’s field of study.
   - Additional peer-reviewed publications may serve as secondary evidence in this category.

2. Active participation in the professional research community. This will normally include at least five off-campus professional presentations of research results at conferences or meetings in the candidate’s general field of study. The substance and quantity of the presentations of Ph.D. faculty should be at a level comparable to leading scholars in their field. In addition:
   - All of the five research presentations should be at a national or international meetings. This will typically take the form of a peer-reviewed oral presentation or poster session.
   - If multi-authored, the candidate should be the lead presenter in at least three presentations.
   - Invited lectures for international or national of professional organizations are also accepted as indicators in this category.
   - The level of institutional support available during the candidate’s period of review will be considered by the review committees and the chair.

3. Successful mentoring of M.S. and/or Ph.D. students in graduate research. This will normally include substantial contributions as a committee member on three or more completed M.S. thesis projects and/or two Ph.D. dissertations, including serving as major professor on at least two M.S. thesis and/or chair one Ph.D. committee in the five years prior to candidacy. In addition:
   - A candidate's opportunities to successfully direct M.S. thesis projects in Mathematics or Ph.D. dissertations in sciences are tied to the numbers of students enrolled in the Applied & Computational Mathematics (ACM) and Curriculum & Content (CC) tracks of the math program as well as to number of students enrolled in doctoral programs in the College. Faculty should be proactive in both contributing to available M.S. thesis committees and developing research opportunities for current and prospective M.S. and/or Ph.D. students.
   - Typically, direction of non-thesis M.S. student projects serves as evidence of student mentoring and is considered an important teaching responsibility. However, school teachers in the Curriculum & Content (CC) track often benefit most from classroom-based scholarship. Thus, faculty supporting the CC track may demonstrate graduate research mentoring through non-thesis M.S. curriculum projects,
provided such projects make significant contributions to the field of mathematics instruction and exhibit scholarly approaches to project development.

4. Development of external funding in support of the candidate’s research and graduate program. This will normally include substantial contribution as principal or co-principal investigator on externally-funded grants or research contracts. In addition:
   • Participation as co-principal investigator should include taking a substantial role in both the proposal writing process and the execution of grant activities.
   • Equipment grants primarily used to develop and support the candidate’s research and graduate program will be considered in this category. The candidate should provide evidence that equipment acquired through such a grant is critical to the candidate’s research program.

Service

In concept, overall effort in terms of service should be relatively similar for all applicants across rank; however, it is understood that distribution of service could vary across the department, college and university as well as community and at state, regional and national/international levels. In general, and initially, new faculty members at the assistant level should engage in only minimal service and largely within the department. With time, these faculty members should show evidence of increased service load and expanded effort into the college and university. New faculty, especially those required to develop independent research programs should limit service effort. The most common form of service is membership on departmental, college and university committees; however, other forms of service (e.g., Island Days, new student orientation, hosting of visitors, and service to the community or field.) should also be considered. For those faculty members seeking promotion to professor, clear demonstration of leadership both within the department and outside the department is expected. The extent to which specific forms of service are counted towards promotion and/or tenure will be addressed on an individual basis by the departmental committee. Evaluation of service will be based on the importance of the service performed, as well as the amount of effort expended in service activities. Because service is typically the least weighted of the three criteria for promotion and tenure, candidates are not expected to have exhaustive documentation. However, when the impact of a service activity or the effort required is not obvious to an experienced faculty evaluator, candidates should take more care in documentation. Faculty members will also be evaluated in terms of service by the chair of the department during annual review.

Specific Guidelines for Tenure

It is understood that tenure confers a higher responsibility of departmental citizenship upon faculty members. Tenured faculty are expected to act in the best interest of the department and the university. Personal qualities such as commitment to the department and its mission, honesty in dealings with fellow faculty, and impartiality towards students are important to the integrity and growth of the department. Failure to exhibit such personal qualities will be considered evidence of “non-collegiality” and may contribute to a recommendation against tenure and/or promotion. Instances of failure to demonstrate collegiality should be documented, in writing, to the department chair by the departmental committee.
Tenure serves as recognition of past work and holds a promise of future accomplishments. All candidates should present a record of achievements that provides a clear indication of the capacity to continue making professional contributions at A&M-Corpus Christi. Bringing credit for years of previous service does not lessen this requirement. The totality of work documented in the portfolio from credited time and during actual service must meet guidelines set forth in this appendix. The portfolio must also include documentation of substantial work done at the university during the probationary period while employed at the university and provide convincing evidence of the capacity to continue making professional contributions at A&M Corpus Christi.

**Guidelines for (Full) Professorship**

The rank of professor is an honor that is bestowed by peers upon applicants and acknowledges a high level of contribution and leadership in the field. Unlike promotion with tenure to associate professor, applicants seeking the rank of professor have no initial probationary period (i.e., promotion is encouraged, but not required). Thus, faculty members who seek promotion to professor will be held to higher standards of teaching, scholarship, and service than those aspiring to the Associate level. The need for objective external review of applicants is most critical at this level. External evaluation should be of a true “review” nature and undertaken by qualified authorities in the applicant’s field. External reviewers must all hold appointments as (full) professors within an academic department, or be nationally recognized experts in their field capable of evaluating the candidate’s scholarly contributions. Simple reiteration of the accomplishments of applicants is unacceptable. Accomplishment should, itself, be evaluated in terms of importance to the field of study. Professor status is also bestowed upon faculty considered “leaders” in the Department. For example, leadership can be evidenced by representation of the Department on key committees and panels, development of new programs or initiatives within the department, or establishment of new programs on campus or elsewhere, etc.

**Use of External Review**

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics will adopt criteria and procedures relevant to external review as described in the 2012 version of the College Handbook. The departmental committee should strive to maintain confidentiality in terms of external reviews.

**Level of Effort Related to Workload**

Faculty appointed to support particular programs will be evaluated according to the extent to which they demonstrate a clear ability to support such a program. In general, Ph.D. faculty have higher reassignment of workload for research and, as such, should demonstrate higher degrees of accomplishment in the area of research. In turn, those faculty supporting M.S. programs, typically have less reassignment related to research and increased teaching loads. This does not necessarily imply that M.S. faculty should serve on fewer graduate research advisory committees. Undergraduate faculty are typically assigned higher teaching loads and, by extension, should be responsible for substantially reduced research effort. As above, actual workload characteristics will be determined for individual faculty during the annual review. For this reason, it is important that members of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics Promotion and Tenure committee should have access to annual reviews that should be included in the applicant’s portfolio.
Appendix F

Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences Supplementary
Tenure and Promotion Criteria, Standards and Priorities (Adopted January 2013; Revised July 2014)

The departmental P&T committee will use this document along with the university standards and the college policy document to evaluate faculty for promotion and tenure. Each candidate will be evaluated as an individual with distinct abilities, interests and strengths. The PENS department covers several disciplines including Atmospheric Science, Chemistry, Coastal & Marine System Science, Environmental Sciences, Geology, Oceanography, and Physics. Each discipline has its own challenges and standards of excellence when it comes to scholarship and teaching. The P&T committee will take into account these differences in their recommendation. As stated in the college policy, there are three groups of faculty in PENS, those faculty primarily supporting undergraduate programs, graduate faculty primarily supporting Master of Science programs (masters faculty) and graduate faculty primarily supporting Doctor of Philosophy programs (doctoral faculty). Although teaching, research and service are all-important for the growth of the department, the relative contributions by faculty of these three groups differ based on workload assignments.

Scholarship

In general, success in scholarship should be determined by accomplishment in the areas of peer-reviewed publication, presentation of research and grantsmanship. Other indicators of scholarship such as awards reflecting quality, contracts, development of patents, etc. will also be considered. Success in scholarship will also be evaluated in terms of workload assignment (doctoral, masters, undergraduate faculty) and level of investment/support provided to applicants by the University. Successful applicants represent good investments made by the University. When considering scholarly accomplishments, those achieved while at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi are of greatest importance. External review of applicants by peers in the field is required and will be considered essential to a meaningful evaluation for Tenure and Promotion decisions. Those faculty primarily serving undergraduate programs are encouraged, but not expected, to engage in scholarship at levels similar to those supporting either doctoral or masters programs.

Publication within the discipline is considered the most important indication of scholarship. All forms of peer-reviewed authorship should be included as evidence of accomplishment: peer reviewed research articles, reviews, books, book chapters, notes, etc. The extent to which these documents support scholarship should be considered on a per-applicant basis and clearly related to area of expertise. Applicants are expected to demonstrate a degree of authorship consistent with their particular teaching load (i.e., doctoral, masters, undergraduate level). Faculty for which the University has made a strong investment (e.g., significant start-up funds) should demonstrate a higher degree of success in publication. Primarily, these publications should provide evidence of the development of an independent research program. Research transferred to Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi as part of previous funding awards will be considered. Applicants are also encouraged to promote authorship by students and to generate publications derived from collaborative research efforts. Because authorship could take many forms, applicants should strive
to clearly describe their specific role in all publications (e.g., graduate advisor, corresponding author, etc.). Authorship on papers is recommended only for those who have significantly contributed to the intellectual development of the manuscript. As stated, co-authorship is encouraged and recognized as evidence of collaboration; however, this collaboration should not preclude development of scientific leadership as evidenced by an independent and expanding research program while at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. Consideration of non-peer reviewed publications will be at the discretion of the departmental committee.

Presentations made at local, state, regional, national and international conferences or symposia should be considered highly contributory to documentation of research effort and, by extension, important to evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure. This is especially relevant for undergraduate faculty, as the traditionally shorter periods of time devoted to undergraduate research projects are more conducive to presentations than full-length publications. Collaborative authorship on presentations should be viewed as supportive, especially in the case of graduate and undergraduate students. Presentation of research to peers can be an effective means of promoting the research program.

All candidates should clearly and accurately substantiate their involvement and funding in large projects, especially those that are interdisciplinary in nature and involved faculty in other units. Grantsmanship will be evaluated according to level (e.g., doctoral, master’s, or undergraduate) and rank (e.g., associate professor with tenure, professor) aspired to by the applicant and within the review period. It is recognized that funding can assume various forms (e.g., federal, regional, state, local, and intramural; foundations; private-sector businesses, etc.) and level of contribution to the grant writing process (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Collaborator, etc.). Faculty candidates should clarify their specific contributions to a project and the proportion of project funding for which they are supported or responsible. Primary considerations for evaluation of grantsmanship at the doctoral level should be 1) extent to which extramural funding exceeds that of intramural (i.e., investment on the part of the University) and 2) maintenance of an adequate level of funding for support of research effort (e.g., for the research program, graduate/undergraduate students). While evaluation of grantsmanship at the master’s level will also take into account the extent to which extramural funding exceeds that of intramural it will be based primarily on the maintenance of an adequate level of funding for support of the faculty member’s research. Undergraduate faculty are expected to show some effort towards writing of grant proposals of an extramural or intramural nature and describe whether the work is research, teaching, or service oriented.

Teaching

The evaluation of teaching will be largely guided by quality. Teaching workloads are listed in the College section and are established by the dean and chair, but may be modified with their approval. A summary of the teaching load history should be made available to the departmental P/T Committee through the portfolio.

At present, the most common metric for evaluation of quality of teaching is student evaluations. It is recognized that teaching evaluations, by themselves, do not provide a complete understanding of quality or level of effort. Applicants should show evidence of teaching effectiveness, which may include 1) a clear statement of teaching philosophy and responsibilities; 2) a summary of steps
taken to improve teaching (e.g., changes resulting from self-evaluation, review of teaching-related journals, and participation in programs designed to improve teaching skills); 3) results of student course evaluations and the extent to which they have changed during the probationary period; 4) a description of modification of teaching style based upon peer review; 5) any testimonials regarding success of former students; and 6) any documentation of teaching development activity from the Center for Teaching Effectiveness. Other criteria to be considered include instructional design and innovation (e.g., are course objectives effective, are they aligned with departmental curricular goals, etc.); instructional delivery (e.g., presentation skills, use of media, approach to discovery); instructional assessment; and quality of course management (e.g., meets University, College and Department management deadlines); facility at teaching a variety of courses, leadership at the campus, regional, state or national level in pedagogy, development of curricula, texts, laboratory manuals or other media for instruction, awards, attendance at teaching symposia/seminars, and other measures. Applicants must ensure that the departmental P/T committee is aware of any change in specific teaching load over the review period as it will impact the review process. Those applicants categorized as doctoral faculty should be teaching at least one graduate-level course, where possible. Additional means of evaluation of quality of teaching (e.g., peer review) will also be considered and arranged by the Department as needed.

The contribution of faculty to teaching also includes efforts related to advisement and/or mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students. Successful applicants at the doctoral and master’s level should show evidence of having matriculated students in a timely manner and in numbers related to their involvement in teaching and access to graduate students. Doctoral faculty are also expected to chair and serve as members on master’s committees. It is understood that those faculty having higher teaching loads might not be able to participate in graduate committee service at levels similar to those having lower teaching loads. It is the responsibility of applicants to describe their level of advisement in sufficient detail as to apprise the Departmental Promotion and Tenure of their individual situation.

Mentoring of undergraduate students is considered essential to promotion and/or tenure: applicants should demonstrate evidence of faculty advisement of undergraduates and significant involvement of undergraduate students in their research program. Other areas of involvement include support of student participation in symposia and sponsoring of student clubs or organizations.

Service

Service represents not only participation on committees but a vast number of administrative, recruiting, leadership and outreach tasks necessary for Programs, Departments, the College and University to function effectively and efficiently. Service to one’s profession is also important. Appointment to boards, committees or review panels on the basis of one’s expertise, serving as an officer in a professional organization, or organizing professional conferences and symposia all represent significant service activities. While in concept overall effort in terms of service should be relatively similar for all faculty regardless of rank, it is understood that distribution of service can vary both for individuals and in terms of commitments to the Program, Department, College and University as well as community, state, region, nation and profession. In general, and initially, new faculty at the Assistant level should engage in only minimal service and largely within the Program and Department. With time, these faculty should show evidence of increased service load.
and expanded effort into the college and university. New faculty, especially those required to develop independent research programs (e.g., Ph.D. faculty at the assistant level) should limit service effort. The most common form of service is membership on departmental, College and University committees; however, other forms of service (e.g., Island Days, new student orientation, hosting visitors, service to the community, service to the professional field, etc.) should also be considered. For those faculty seeking promotion to professor, clear demonstration of leadership both within and outside the University is expected. The extent to which specific forms of service are counted towards promotion and/or tenure will be addressed on an individual basis by the departmental committee. Faculty will also be evaluated in terms of service by the chair of the department during annual review.

Level of Effort Related to Workload

The level of effort assigned to scholarship, teaching and service is described for each category of Faculty in the College document. Faculty appointed to support Ph.D. programs will be evaluated according to the extent to which they demonstrate a clear ability to support such a program. In general, Ph.D. faculty have higher reassignment of workload for research and, as such, should demonstrate higher degrees of accomplishment in this area. In turn, faculty supporting M.S. programs typically have less reassignment related to research and increased teaching loads. This does not necessarily imply that M.S. faculty should serve on fewer graduate research advisory committees. Undergraduate faculty are typically assigned the highest teaching loads and, by extension, are responsible for substantially reduced research effort. Actual workload assignments will be determined for individual faculty during the annual review. For this reason, it is important that members of the departmental Promotion and Tenure committee should have access to annual reviews that should be included in the applicant’s portfolio.

Assistant Professor Mid-Term Review

The mid-term review will typically occur during the third year that a candidate is employed as a tenure-track faculty member. Prior to review, a candidate is advised to review all guidelines and regulations pertaining to the award of tenure at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. A candidate is strongly encouraged to seek mentoring from the department chair and one or more senior faculty regarding the best path to tenure given his or her circumstances. The mid-term review formalizes this mentoring process and provides the occasion for encouragement or course correction. At the time of the review, faculty members should be on a path to meet the expectations of the different faculty designations (Undergraduate, M.S. or Ph.D. faculty) for attaining tenure and promotion to associate professor.
Specific Guidelines for Tenure

Candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor shall have demonstrated a high level of competence in scholarship, teaching and service consistent with expectations for their level (doctoral, master’s undergraduate) as described above and in the College document. It is also understood that tenure confers a class of departmental citizenship upon a faculty member. Candidates are expected to act in the best interests of the department and the university. Personal qualities such as commitment to the department and its mission, honesty in dealings with fellow faculty, and impartiality towards students are important to the growth and integrity of the institution. Failure to exhibit such personal qualities will be considered evidence of “non-collegiality” and may contribute to a recommendation against tenure and/or promotion. Instances of failure to demonstrate collegiality should be documented, in writing, to the department chair by the departmental committee. All evidence of accomplishment as related to tenure should reflect efforts undertaken during the probationary period while in the employment of Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi.

Guidelines for (Full) Professorship

The rank of professor is an honor that is bestowed by peers upon applicants and acknowledges a high level of contribution and leadership. Unlike promotion with tenure to associate professor, applicants seeking the rank of professor have no initial probationary period (i.e., promotion is encouraged, but not required). A candidate for the rank of professor shall have demonstrated over a period of years a strong commitment to excellence in teaching, service and scholarship at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, consistent with their role (doctoral, master’s, undergraduate). His or her professional record should show an active role as a senior faculty member and provide evidence for an expectation of continuous dedication and future contributions to the objectives of the department and the university. As with tenure, objective external review of applicants will be required at this level. External evaluation should be of a true “review” nature and undertaken by qualified authorities in the applicant’s field. External reviewers must all hold appointments as (full) professors within an academic department.
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School of Engineering and Computing Sciences Supplementary Tenure and Promotion Criteria, Standards and Priorities (Adopted October 2012; Revised May 2014)

The School of Engineering and Computing Sciences follows the College guidelines on criteria for evaluation of promotion and tenure and the University Policy 2.5.1.4. Contributions in teaching and research will be the major factors in determining the outcomes of the tenure and promotion review. All evaluations will be based on documented evidence. The level of achievements is commensurate with the workload assignments as stated in the individual offer letter and annual evaluations.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

• In the teaching category, the candidate must demonstrate (a) teaching effectiveness by collective judgment of students and peer evaluations, (b) knowledge and currentness in teaching field, (c) success of student advisement and mentoring, (d) contributions to ABET accreditation, and (e) contributions to teaching mission.

Consideration will also be granted for the development of new courses in the candidate’s area of expertise, the restructuring of current course offerings, the securing of outside funding to equip student laboratories, and improvements of instructional efficiencies. Participation in seminars and workshops on teaching effectiveness and professional short courses will also be considered.

Candidates of M.S. degree program faculty must establish a record of supervision to completion as student advisor of one or more M.S. theses, and serving on one or more M.S. thesis committees excluding chairpersonship.

Candidates of Ph.D. degree program faculty must establish a record of supervision to completion as student advisor of one or more M.S. theses, serving on one or more M.S. thesis or Ph.D. dissertation committees excluding chairpersonship, and supervising as student advisor/dissertation committee chair of one or more Ph.D. students who have advanced to Ph.D. candidacy.

• In the research category, the nominal levels of achievements of candidates on 3/3 workload assignments (or 9-SCH per semester) are 3 full-length research articles, 2 conference papers, and evidence of external funding that supports the candidate’s research program (and graduate program as appropriate). The level of achievements of candidates on reassigned workloads will be prorated accordingly. For example, the levels of achievements of candidates on 1/2 workload assignments (or 3-SCH and 6-SCH workload assignments per academic year) are 6 full-length research articles, 4 conference papers, and success with competitive external funding.
Affirmative and supportive letters from external reviewers on the quality, significance and impact of the candidate’s research are essential for positive recommendation.

- In the service category, candidates must demonstrate support of the School’s mission, and/or the College’s or the University’s mission as appropriate. For candidates on 1/2 or 2/2 (12-SCH workload assignment per academic year) workload assignments, professional service at the national or international level is also expected.

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

- In the teaching category, candidates must demonstrate continued excellence in teaching as stated in Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

Candidates of M.S. degree program faculty are expected to supervise to completion as student advisor of two or more M.S. theses over the most recent five-year period at the rank of associate professor.

Candidates of Ph.D. degree program faculty are expected over the most recent five-year period at the rank of associate professor to have supervised as student advisor (a) two or more M.S. theses to completion, (b) one or more Ph.D. students to completion, and (c) two additional Ph.D. students one of whom has attained the Ph.D. candidacy status.

- In the research category, candidates must establish a research record that is considered significant by external experts in the field and that is consistent with the workload assignments.

For faculty on 3/3 workload assignments, the candidate must demonstrate a consistent record of publications, for example, 5 full-length research articles and 2 conference papers over the most recent five-year period. The candidate must also demonstrate success in external funding that supports the candidate’s research and graduate program as appropriate.

For faculty on reassigned workloads, the level of publications will be prorated accordingly. For faculty on 1/2 or 2/2 workload assignments, the candidate must achieve a research record comparable to leading scholars as judged by external experts in the field. The candidate must also establish a record of success in sustained external funding as Principal Investigator that supports the candidate’s research and graduate program as appropriate.

- In the service category, candidates must demonstrate effective leadership within the university and professional societies. This may include mentoring of junior faculty and service on University or professional society committees, as well as outreach to the local communities.
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Faculty Governance
(Adopted August 2014)

Dean

The dean is the chief administrative and academic officer of the college and reports to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The dean is assisted by associate deans, and chairs or directors of the academic, research and service units in the college to advance the college’s mission in teaching, research and service. In the spirit of shared governance, the dean also consults faculty and staff committees, and faculty and staff as appropriate, on matters related to the college operations that include planning, coordination and evaluation of all college units.

Appropriate groups of college-level committees are defined herein. Each academic department or school will follow the college examples and define the memberships of its committees and the voting right on departmental or school matters. For departmental level promotion and tenure (P&T) committees, the committee membership consists of only tenured faculty at the rank of promotion or higher. For departmental promotion committees of non-tenure-track faculty (i.e., professional, research or clinical track) the committee membership consists of tenured faculty and appropriate non-tenure track faculty at the rank of promotion or higher.

Voting Rights

On motions of general matter in nature that are brought up at the college meeting, faculty holding full-time employment in the college have voting rights on the motion. On motions of specific matter, an appropriate faculty group consists of faculty who are eligible to serve on the matter governed by the respective committee is defined as the voting body. All motions shall be in compliance with the University and TAMUS policies.

College of Science and Engineering Committees and Councils

- College of S&E Chairs/Directors Council
  
  **Purpose or Function:** This council is charged with assisting the dean in strategic and operational planning and in making administrative decisions.
  
  **Membership:** The dean; the associate deans; the chairs of the Departments of Computing Sciences, Engineering, Life Sciences, Mathematics and Statistics, and Physical and Environmental Sciences; director of the School of Engineering and Computing Sciences; the coordinators of Ph.D. programs; and the directors of the Center for Coastal Studies, Center for Water Supply Studies, and Conrad Blucher Institute for Surveying and Science.
  
  **Selection:** By virtue of the administrative position.
  
  **Term of Service:** Not applicable.
  
  **Duties Begin:** New members assume this duty upon assuming the administrative position.
  
  **Chair:** Dean of the college.
• **College of S&E Steering Committee**

  **Purpose or Function:** The committee advises the dean on issues at the dean’s request. The committee also serves as an advisory group to the dean and brings to the dean’s attention matters concerning college operation as brought up by the faculty of the college.

  **Membership:** The committee will consist of eight members. All full-time faculty members (e.g., tenure-line, professional track, research track, clinical track and instructors) are eligible to serve. Each department shall elect one member and three members shall be appointed by the dean.

  **Selection:** Elected by the departments and appointed by the dean.

  **Term of Service:** Three years, staggered terms.

  **Duties Begin:** New members assume their duties on September 1 of the year in which they are elected or appointed.

  **Chair:** Associate dean for academics affairs.

• **College of S&E Awards and Scholarship Committee**

  **Purpose or Function:** Works in concurrence with the Faculty Senate’s procedure for nominating faculty for various university awards. The committee also selects awardees for graduate and undergraduate scholarships and other related competitive awards in the college.

  **Membership:** The committee consists of five members. All full-time faculty and staff are eligible to serve on the committee.

  **Selection:** One member is appointed by the chair of each department.

  **Term of Service:** Two years, staggered terms.

  **Duties Begin:** New members assume their duties on September 1 of the year in which they are appointed.

  **Chair:** Elected by the committee.

• **College of S&E Curriculum Committee**

  **Purpose or Function:** The committee will establish regular meeting times and will review and recommend to the dean on new degrees, minors, certificate programs, and distance education programs; changes to existing degrees, minors, certificate programs, and distance education programs; and new courses to be introduced to the catalog. The agenda will be posted ahead of time to the college and meetings are open to all college faculty and administrators.

  **Membership:** The committee consists of eleven members. Ten voting members are representatives from the departments, and the associate dean for academic affairs is an ex officio (non-voting) member. All tenured, tenure-track, professional track, clinical track and instructors are eligible to serve on the committee. The committee also consults with research-track and adjunct faculty on specific curriculum matters as appropriate.

  **Selection:** Two members are elected by each department. All elected members must have at least three years of experience at TAMU-CC. At least one member from each department must have graduate faculty status. The associate dean for academic affairs is an ex officio non-voting member.

  **Terms of Service:** For voting members—two years, staggered terms; for associate dean—not applicable.
**College of Science and Engineering**

**Duties Begin:** New members assume their duties on September 1 of the year in which they are elected. The associate dean assumes this duty upon becoming associate dean.

**Chair:** Associate dean for academic affairs.

- **College of S&E Distinguished Lecturers Selection Committee**
  **Purpose or Function:** The committee will establish regular meeting times and will review and recommend to the dean on potential speakers to invite to campus for the College Distinguished Lecturer Series.
  **Membership:** The committee consists of four members. All tenured, tenure-track, professional track, research track, clinical track faculty and instructors are eligible to serve on the committee.
  **Selection:** Appointed by the dean.
  **Term of Service:** Two years, staggered terms.
  **Duties Begin:** New members assume their duties on September 1 of the year in which they are appointed.
  **Chair:** Appointed by the dean.

- **College of S&E Library Committee**
  **Purpose or Function:** Monitors the acquisition of library resources relevant to the needs of the college’s faculty and students. The committee also coordinates the division of library funds among the academic and research units within the college.
  **Membership:** The committee consists of five members. One member of this committee will be recommended to the Faculty Senate as the college representative to serve on the University Library Committee. All tenured, tenure-track, professional track, research track, clinical track and instructors are eligible to serve on the committee. The committee also consults with adjunct faculty as appropriate.
  **Selection:** One member is elected by each department.
  **Term of Service:** Three years, staggered terms.
  **Duties Begin:** New members assume their duties on September 1 of the year in which they are elected.
  **Chair:** Elected by the committee.

- **College of S&E Promotion and Tenure Committee**
  **Purpose or Function:** Evaluates faculty applications for promotion and tenure and makes recommendations to the dean.
  **Membership:** The committee consists of six tenured (full) professors. Department chairs, associate deans and the school director shall not serve on the committee.
  **Selection:** Each department elects one tenured (full) professor to the committee by vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty; the dean appoints one additional committee member.
  **Terms of Service:** For elected members—two years, staggered terms; for dean’s appointee—one year.
  **Duties Begin:** New members assume their duties on September 1 of the year in which they are elected or appointed.
  **Chair:** Elected by the committee.

- **College of S&E Research Enhancement Committee**
Purpose or Function: This college-level committee is responsible for receiving and evaluating grant proposals and recommending college-level grant awards from research enhancement program funds. The committee’s policies and award procedures must be consistent with the eligibility and award selection criteria in the statute. A copy of the College of S&E policy must be filed with the Vice President for Research, Commercialization and Outreach.

Membership: The committee consists of five members. Two members of this committee also serve as S&E representatives on the University Research Enhancement Committee, which also has two-year, staggered terms for the college representatives. All tenured, tenure-track and research track faculty are eligible to serve on the committee. Committee members are not eligible to apply for research enhancement grants. The committee also consults with professional track and clinical track faculty as appropriate.

Selection: One member is elected by each department.

Term of Service: Two years, staggered terms.

Duties Begin: New members assume their duties on September 1 of the year in which they are elected.

Review Process: Upon receiving instructions from the dean, the committee will receive and evaluate grant proposals and recommend to the dean the college-level grant awards.

Chair: Elected by the committee.

College of S&E Ad Hoc Committees

Ad hoc committees are appointed from time to time by the dean, the chairs/directors council or the college committees to address specific issues or to perform specific tasks as given by the dean or given to respective council/committees.
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College of Science and Engineering Grade Appeal Process
(Section Revised and Approved by Faculty, 9 May 2017)

Student Grade Appeal Process

The College of Science and Engineering (S&E) follows the student grade appeals procedure described in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 13.02.99.C0.03. A summary of the College procedures and web links to the forms used in the grade appeal process can be found on the College Grade Appeal website (http://sci.tamucc.edu/students/GradeAppeal.html).

The process outlined below is designed for the student who questions a final grade for a course in the College of Science and Engineering.

Instructor and Student Responsibility

The instructor of the class is the primary authority with respect to evaluating a student’s proficiency and assigning a final grade in a course. In interactions between the instructor and students and among students, the instructor should encourage free discussion, inquiry, and expression. Student performance, however, should be evaluated solely on an academic basis, and not on opinions or conduct in matters unrelated to academic standards established by AAUP (Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students, 1967). In the syllabus for each course, the instructor is responsible for outlining objectives and setting standards, for clearly stating how a student’s performance and proficiency will be evaluated, and for explaining the relationship between the evaluation instrument(s) and the student’s final letter grade in the course. Students are responsible for class attendance, for learning the content of any course of study and for maintaining standards of academic performance established for each course in which they are enrolled.

Informal Presentation of Questions and/or Requests to an Instructor

Most problems or complaints can be resolved through informal discussions between the student and the instructor. The student should first discuss the matter with the instructor who assigned the grade (unless the instructor is, for any reason, unavailable). If the two are unable to arrive at a mutual understanding and the student’s concerns are not addressed after this discussion, he/she may elect to initiate the formal grade appeal process.

Formal Grade Appeal Process

All requests for a formal grade appeal must be made in writing. To facilitate this process and document the grade appeal proceedings, a packet of forms (the “Student Grade Appeal Record”) is available at http://sci.tamucc.edu/students/GradeAppeal.html. The forms are also included at the end of the Student Grade Appeal Process section. The proceedings, findings, and recommendations shall not be open to the general public or available to any individuals other than those involved with the case. The procedures that follow apply to all programs in the College of Science and Engineering.
Foundations of a Grade Appeal. Personal issues such as simple dissatisfaction with a grade, potential loss of a scholarship or assistantship, etc. are not grounds for a successful appeal. The following instructions are given to all individuals and committees who will evaluate a grade appeal. The student should note these and bear them in mind when deciding whether or not to appeal a grade, and when preparing a grade appeal.

- **The basis of the grade appeal request must focus on specific departures from guidelines in the syllabus.** Reviewers will consider whether the instructor adhered to evaluation procedures identified in the course syllabus.
- Reviewers will consider whether the instructor’s treatment of the student was appropriate (i.e., not arbitrary, capricious or prejudiced) and adhered to equitable evaluation guidelines.
- The burden of proof shall rest with the student. The onus is on the student to demonstrate that the appeal has an appropriate foundation.
- The standard of proof shall be a preponderance of the evidence.

After the appeal process is initiated, the student has the right to withdraw the appeal at any time during the process. (Written confirmation of the student’s request to withdraw the appeal is required.) Unless withdrawn, each appeal must be resolved at some level, with the appropriate documents signed. Documentation of all resolved or withdrawn appeals is filed in the S&E Dean’s Office.

**General Timeline for the Formal Grade Appeal.** Every effort will be made to process an appeal in a timely manner and in such a way that all parties and reviewers are available, and the appeal is properly reviewed. The goal of this process is a full review of the appeal that results in a fair decision. The following guidelines are designed to ensure timely and thorough processing:

- **Initiation of the Formal Grade Appeal Process.** A student can only initiate the formal grade appeal process after a final grade in a course has been officially recorded on the student’s transcript. To initiate the process, the student completes the “Student’s Request” (Form 1 of the packet) and submits the packet to the instructor.

- **Instructor’s Review of the Student’s Grade Appeal.** If an instructor has received an appeal packet from a student between semesters, review of the student’s appeal should begin by the first day of the regular long (15-week) semester after the grade in question was recorded. Whenever possible (i.e., when both the instructor and student will be available during the summer semester), the instructor should begin reviewing appeal of a spring grade on the first day of the first summer session.

- **Final Deadline for Student to Initiate the Formal Grade Appeal.** A student must initiate the formal written appeal no later than 15 business days after the first class day of the next regular long semester. (That is, if the student wishes to appeal a fall semester grade, the student must submit a packet with a completed “Student’s Request” portion (Form 1) to the instructor within 15 business days after the beginning of the spring semester. Forms concerning grades assigned in the spring semester or in either summer session must be submitted within 15 business days after the beginning of the fall semester.)

- **Hearings by the College Grade Appeals Committee (CGAC).** The CGAC holds hearings during fall, spring and summer semesters. For summer semesters, the hearing is usually held late in the first summer session or early in the second summer session. This committee will not meet during the intersessions or “minimesters.” If the timing of an appeal
process would place a CGAC hearing in the intersession or “minimester,” the hearing will be deferred to the following semester.

If an appeal is not processed in a timely manner in accordance with the procedures, the student may proceed to the next level of review, for example, see flowchart in Fig. A-1. Students should note that registration deadlines for subsequent courses or admission deadlines for programs are not valid justifications for accelerating the timeline of the appeal procedure.

Substitutions. At times, administrative reviewers in the process (i.e., the department chair, associate dean and dean) may be away from campus for time periods that exceed the recommended deadlines. In such cases, the “acting” administrator who is officially recognized by the University will review the appeals. If there is a conflict of interest with a chair or the associate dean for academic affairs, then a substitute can be arranged. If the department chair is involved in the appeal as an instructor, then an associate dean or the dean will assume the role described for the chair in reviewing the appeal. If an associate dean is involved in the appeal as an instructor, then the other associate dean or the dean will receive the appeal materials and organize the appeal hearing. In cases where a change of grade is required and the instructor is no longer affiliated with Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, the dean may initiate and approve the grade change.

Interpretation of Procedures Before and During the Appeal Process. The primary role of an administrative reviewer in the appeal process (i.e., the department chair, associate dean and dean) is to objectively analyze the evidence and recommend a course of action. However, each of these can advise students and instructors on procedures, navigating the appeal process and possible ways to mediate the issue. When in doubt about the appeal process, students and instructors should consult the associate dean for academic affairs in S&E and/or the appropriate department chair.

The Student’s Written Appeal to the Instructor. To initiate the formal appeal process, the student must present a written appeal to the instructor who assigned the grade in question.

- **Form:** The student completes the “Student’s Request” (Form 1) to put the appeal into writing. On this form, the student should state briefly and clearly the action requested and the reason(s) for the requested action.
- **Submission:** The student electronically submits the packet with the completed Form 1 to…
  1. the instructor;
  2. the appropriate department chair (as notification that a formal grade appeal has been initiated); and
  3. the associate dean for academic affairs in S&E (as notification that a formal grade appeal has been initiated).

The student should retain a copy for his or her own files. The student should also submit copies of all other documents pertinent to the appeal with the packet. Note that if the instructor is no longer with the university or the student cannot contact him/her, then an appeal of the final grade in the class may be submitted, in writing, to the appropriate department chair.

- **Deadline:** For traditional on-campus courses, the formal written appeal should be initiated no later than 15 business days after the first class day of the next regular long (15-week) semester after the grade was assigned.
The Instructor’s Written Response to the Student. After reviewing the student’s written appeal, the instructor will provide a written response stating his or her decision and affirming that this stage of the appeal process is completed.

- **Form:** To document his or her decision, the instructor completes the “Instructor’s Response” portion of Form 2 in the packet received from the student.

- **Notification of Decision and Submission of Documents:** The instructor electronically submits the packet to...
  1. the student;
  2. the appropriate department chair; and
  3. the associate dean for academic affairs in S&E.

  The instructor should retain a copy for his or her own files. The instructor should also submit copies of all other documents pertinent to the appeal with the packet.

- **Deadline:** The instructor should send a response within five (5) working days of beginning to review the student’s appeal form. In other words, within five days after the first day of classes or within five days of receiving the student’s written appeal (whichever is later).

The Student’s Acknowledgment of the Instructor’s Decision. The student may choose to accept the instructor’s decision and withdraw the appeal or to continue the appeal with review by the appropriate department chair.

- **Form:** The student uses the “Student’s Acknowledgment” portion of Form 2 (a check box and date) to document his or her decision, and to affirm that this stage of the appeal process is completed.

- **Submission:** The student electronically submits the packet with completed Forms 1 and 2 to...
  1. the instructor;
  2. the appropriate department chair; and
  3. the associate dean for academic affairs in S&E.

  The student should retain a copy for his or her own files.

- **Deadline:** The student should submit his or her acknowledgment no later than five (5) business days after receiving the instructor’s response. If the student does not submit a written reply by the deadline, then the college is not required to process the appeal further, and the original grade will remain unchanged.

- **Potential Outcomes:**
  1. If the matter is resolved to the student’s satisfaction, the appeal will be considered terminated and the instructor will print the completed packet and arrange to have the student (and instructor) sign the “Signatures” portion of Form 4 on the hard copy. At this point, the instructor will deliver hard copies of all forms and documents pertinent to this appeal to the Dean’s Office to be filed. If the instructor approves the student’s appeal, a grade change is likely to be necessary and the instructor must submit a change-of-grade form.
  2. If the matter is not resolved to the student’s satisfaction, then the student may continue the appeal by having the chair review the appeal.

Actions of the Department Chair. If the student indicates that he or she wishes to continue the appeal, then the chair attempts to resolve the matter. He or she reviews the student’s written statement and the instructor’s response, and arranges to consult with the student and the instructor. The
chair also requests from all parties whatever available and appropriate expertise, information, documents or correspondence he or she deems helpful to making a decision. Documentation pertaining to the appeal may be copies, but students and instructors should be ready to produce the original documents if asked. The actual documentation requested depends somewhat on the nature of the appeal, but the following items are often requested at this point:

1. course description;
2. course syllabus;
3. attendance and/or grading policies (if not included on the course syllabus);
4. excerpts from the instructor’s grade book or attendance records (e.g., the student’s grades, the grade distribution for the entire class, etc.);
5. student work submitted for evaluation (from the student if the graded coursework has been returned to the student, and from the instructor if it has not).

- **Form:** To state his or her findings and document his or her decision, the chair completes the “Response of the Department Chair” portion of Form 3. If the chair finds a mutually satisfactory resolution, the form should state any actions agreed upon.

- **Notification of Decision and Submission of Documents:** The chair electronically submits the packet to...
  1. the student;
  2. the instructor; and
  3. the associate dean for academic affairs in S&E.

The chair should retain a copy for his or her own files. The chair should also submit copies of all other documents or evidence pertinent to the appeal with the packet.

- **Deadline:** The chair normally makes a decision so that (if no satisfactory resolution can be found) the matter can be referred to the S&E associate dean for academic affairs within 5 business days.

**Responses to the Chair’s Resolution or Decision.** The student and the instructor each chooses to accept the chair’s decision and terminate the appeal at this point, or to continue the appeal with review by the Office of the S&E Dean.

- **Form:** The student and instructor use the “Student Acknowledgment” or the “Instructor Acknowledgment” portion of Form 3 (check boxes and dates) to document their decisions, and to affirm that this stage of the appeal process is completed.

- **Submission:** The student and instructor electronically submit the packet to...
  1. the appropriate department chair; and
  2. the associate dean for academic affairs in S&E.

- **Deadline:** The student and instructor should submit their responses no later than five (5) business days after receiving the chair’s response. If the student or instructor does not submit a reply by the deadline, then the college is not required to process the appeal further, and the resolution or decision of the chair will be enacted.

- **Potential Outcomes:**
  1. If both the student and instructor agree to the resolution or decision of the chair, the appeal will be considered terminated and the chair will print the completed packet and arrange to have the student, instructor (and chair) sign the “signatures” portion of Form 4 on the hard copy. At this point, the chair will deliver hard copies of all forms and documents pertinent to this appeal to the Dean’s Office to be filed. The chair should follow up to ensure that any actions agreed upon are executed.
2. If either the student or instructor rejects the chair’s decision, the Dean’s Office reviews the appeal.

**Actions at the College Level**

**Dean / Associate Dean.** If either the student or instructor does not accept the chair’s decision, the appeal is reviewed by the S&E Dean’s Office. The associate dean’s role in arriving at a final decision is two-fold: 1) he or she convenes the College Grade Appeal Committee (CGAC) and schedules a hearing before them; and 2) after the hearing, the associate dean reviews the findings of the CGAC and composes the final decision from the Dean’s Office.

**Deadline for Convening the GCAC and Scheduling the Hearing:** The associate dean will schedule a hearing panel before the CGAC normally within 20 business days after receiving the request for a CGAC hearing from the student (but with some flexibility to accommodate student and faculty schedules). Forms 1, 2, and 3 will be provided to grade appeal hearing panel.

**The College Grade Appeal Committee (CGAC).** The associate dean convenes the CGAC to determine the facts of the case and attempt to reach a fair and appropriate resolution to the complaint. Depending on the circumstances of the case, the CGAC may recommend to the associate dean to: 1) uphold the original grade of the instructor, or 2) change the grade in question to a specific alternate grade. The decision of the committee is determined by a majority vote. The chair of the CGAC will submit the “Grade Appeal Committee’s Report” to the associate dean normally within five (5) business days after completion of the hearing and committee deliberations, **Form 4**.

**Notification of Dean’s Office Decision:** After the CGAC submits its report, the associate dean will review the recommendation, and compose and send written notification of the decision to the student and the instructor involved (**Form 5**) normally within 5 business days after receiving **Form 4**. The decision is final and cannot be appealed.

The timeline of the official grade appeal process is summarized in the table listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>When to initiate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean assemble College Grade Appeal Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 15 business days of Fall Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student meets with instructor (informal presentation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>After course grade is assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of formal grade appeal</td>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td>Form 1 submitted between 1st and 15th business day of next long semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor review student's grade appeal</td>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td>Form 2 submitted normally within 5 business days upon receiving Form 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair review student's grade appeal</td>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td>Form 3 submitted normally within 5 business days upon receiving Form 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean assemble CGAC grade appeal hearing</td>
<td>Forms 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Normally within 5 business days upon receiving Form 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Composition of the College Grade Appeal Committee (CGAC). For the College of Science and Engineering, members of the hearing panel will be appointed by associate dean from CGAC members. The appointment of CGAC membership is left to the Departments in the College. The hearing panel will consist of three (3) faculty members, one of whom will serve as chair, and two (2) students. To allow for replacement of committee members unable to serve, or substitutions for any member of the committee who may have a conflict of interest or be in any way involved in a particular case, members of this committee will be chosen from a larger “central pool.”

- **Selection of panel members:** Members will serve for one semester or summer term with the possibility of reappointment for up to one year. When there are multiple grade appeal cases in the same semester, multiple hearing panels may be established to achieve a timely resolution to individual appeal case. CGAC membership includes faculty and student members. **Faculty members:** The chair of each department will develop a list of three (3) full-time, resident faculty members (i.e., instructors, professional-track faculty and tenured/tenure-track faculty) who are teaching on-campus and available for service. (It is incumbent upon the chair to determine the availability of the faculty member for this service prior to submitting the list.) This will provide a pool of 15 faculty members for the College of Science and Engineering.

- **Students:** Students will be selected to serve on the CGAC based on the level of the student filing the appeal (i.e., undergraduate students will hear the appeal from an undergraduate student and graduate students will hear the appeal from a graduate student). To serve, a student must be currently enrolled, be majoring in an area within the College of Science and Engineering and have no less than a 3.0 cumulative GPA. To hear an undergraduate appeal, a student member must be a junior or senior (by number of hours); to hear a graduate appeal, a student must be a graduate student who has completed at least one long (i.e., spring or fall) semester at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. The chair of each Department will provide one (1) student from his or her area. Undergraduate students will be drawn from the membership of a student organization that is recognized by the University Council of Student Organizations. Graduate students will be selected from graduate students who are on campus during the semester in question. (It is incumbent upon the chair to determine the qualifications and availability of the suggested student member for this service prior to submitting the name.) This will provide a pool of at least four (4) five (5) students. In addition, the Student Senators representing the College of Science and Engineering will also be included in the pool of students whenever possible (the associate dean will check their qualifications and availability).

- **Selection of members for the CGAC hearing panel:** The associate dean chooses three (3) faculty and two (2) students from the central pool (by drawing of names), and informs the CGAC members the student and the instructor. While neither the student nor the instructor has a right to peremptory challenge or challenge for cause of any CGAC hearing panel member, either party may raise an objection to members of the panel. This must be done in writing within five (5) business days of receiving the names of CGAC hearing panel membership, and the reason for the objection to a panel member must be clearly...
stated. In that event, the CGAC (including the member to which an objection has been raised) will meet to consider the objection in closed session. During the closed session, the member in question states whether or not he or she chooses to recuse himself or herself. Before the committee votes, the member in question leaves the room and the remaining members then vote to remove the member or to continue with the member impaneled. The decision is based upon majority vote. In a tied vote, the choice originally stated by the member in question is accepted. When a member is removed because of an objection from either party, the associate dean selects a new member for the CGAC hearing panel (by drawing a name from CGAC membership), with the newly chosen member being subject to the “objection rules” stated above. The associate dean again notifies all parties. If no objections are received to the substitution (as outlined above and within the timeframe stated above), the CGAC hearing panel will be considered “approved” and the associate dean can schedule a time for the hearing.

The Hearing Protocol. The request for review of a grade appeal by the Dean’s Office routes through the associate dean for academic affairs. The associate dean establishes the central pool and final CGAC, and arranges the time and place for the committee to hear the appeal. Prior to the actual hearing, the associate dean charges the GCAC, reminding them of appropriate foundations for an appeal and the protocols covered in this document. The associate dean is not a member of the CGAC, however, and does not attend the hearing. After the CGAC has filed its report, the associate dean reviews all documents and writes the final decision on the appeal. The decision of the Dean’s Office is final and is not subject to further appeal.

Attendance: Ideally all members of the CGAC hearing panel and both the instructor and student should take personal roles in the proceedings and should be present at the same time during the formal hearing. Therefore, arrangements will be made to hear the case at a time and place that does not conflict with class schedules of the students and faculty members involved.

- **Absence of the Instructor and/or Student:** Once a hearing date and time is set with the concurrence of all parties, the hearing may proceed as scheduled even if the student or instructor decides that he or she cannot attend.

- **Absence of a CGAC Hearing Panel Member:** Once a hearing date and time is set with the concurrence of all parties, if a member of the CGAC hearing panel is unable to serve, four (4) members will constitute a quorum. In the event of a tied vote, the CGAC will file its report and the dean/associate dean will determine the final outcome in his or her summation.

- **“Electronic” Attendance:** Students not residing at or near Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi may request to attend the hearing via video conference call, or another electronic medium as appropriate. Likewise, an instructor who is unavailable for a long period and unable to be physically present may also request to attend the hearing through an appropriate electronic medium.

- **Counsel:** Each party to the hearing may be accompanied by another person in an advisory capacity only; such a person may not testify or ask questions.

Role of the CGAC Hearing Panel Chair: The chair of the CGAC hearing panel is a voting member of the respective panel who is chosen from among the faculty members of the panel. The chair of a CGAC hearing panel presides at the hearing, maintains orderly proceedings and assures that
all parties receive a fair hearing. The chair also keeps appropriate records of the meeting(s), summarizes the actions of the respective CGAC hearing panel and is responsible for all communications by the respective CGAC hearing panel with other officials and parties to a hearing. The chair has the right to adjust procedures, given the circumstances at issue, to ensure fairness.

Figure A-1. Flowchart of Grade Appeal Process
Student's Request (Form 1)

Student Information (Required—to be completed by student):

Date:  
Student Name:  
Local Address:  
Local Phone #:  
E-mail Address:  

Grade to be Appealed (Required—to be completed by student):

Course Name:  
Course Prefix, Course #, and Section #:  
Semester in which course was taken:  
Instructor who assigned the grade:  
(Note that grades for zero-credit laboratory and recitation sections are assigned by the lecture instructor.)

Date on which I initially met with my instructor to discuss this grade:  

Please explain why you are appealing your final grade in this course:
Instructor’s Response (Form 2)

Date on which the instructor received the student’s grade appeal: _______________________

Department offering course (CSCI, ENGR, LSCI, MATH or PENS):

Instructor Response—check appropriate statement: _______________________

I accept the student’s appeal and agree to the resolution requested by the student.

I do not accept the student’s grade appeal. The basis for my decision is (describe below):

Student Acknowledgment—check appropriate statement: _______________________

I accept the Instructor’s decision, and terminate the appeal at this point.

I do not accept the Instructor’s decision and wish to continue the appeal process. I request that the materials for this appeal be reviewed by the Department Chair.
Response of Department Chair (Form 3)

Date on which the chair received the student’s grade appeal: 

I met with the student to discuss this appeal on (date):

I met with the instructor to discuss this appeal on (date):

Decision / Rationale of Department Chair

Date Recorded and Submitted

Student Acknowledgment—check appropriate statement:

Date Recorded and Submitted

I accept the Chair’s resolution or decision, and terminate the appeal.

I do not accept the Chair’s decision and wish to continue the appeal process.

Instructor Acknowledgment—check appropriate statement:

Date Recorded and Submitted

I accept the Chair’s resolution or decision, and terminate the appeal.

I do not accept the Chair’s decision and wish to continue the appeal process.
Student Grade Appeal Record
College Grade Appeal Committee’s Report (Form 4)

Date on which the college committee met to hear the grade appeal: __________________________

Names of committee members (type):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member (Chair)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision / Rationale of College Grade Appeal Committee

Date Recorded and Submitted
Student Grade Appeal Record
College Response by the Dean’s Office (Form 5)

Date on which the associate dean received the committee’s report: __________________________

Decision / Rationale of Associate Dean

Date Recorded and Submitted

This decision of the Dean’s Office is final and not subject to further appeal.

Signatures

By signing this page, I certify that this report is an accurate record of the student grade appeal proceedings, and includes the final resolution of the appeal:

______________________________ Date
Signature of Student

______________________________ Date
Signature of Instructor

Signatures required if a Department Chair reviewed the appeal:

______________________________ Date
Signature of Department Chair

Signatures required if the College of S&E Dean’s Office reviewed the appeal:

______________________________ Date
Signature of Chair of the S&E Grade Appeal Committee

______________________________ Date
Signature of Associate Dean

(Forms Adopted by the Faculty of the College of Science & Engineering, 13 January 2014)
### Appendix J

**College of Science and Engineering Annual Evaluation Templates**
*(Updated, April 2014)*

College of S&E Annual Evaluation Templates: Form 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: __________________________</th>
<th>Date: __________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rank: __________________</td>
<td>Date of Employment: ______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: ____________________</td>
<td>Evaluator: _____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Review: ______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Effort Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Standard, 3 - High, 4 - Excellent

#### Overall

| __________________________ |
|___________________________|

#### Comments:

| __________________________ |
|___________________________|

#### Recommendations:

| __________________________ |
|___________________________|

#### Acknowledgement of Evaluation

(FACULTY NAME) __________________
Evaluator __________________
(Signature does not signify agreement, only that you have read this evaluation)
Title __________________

Signature Date ______________
Signature Date ______________
### Effort Allocation for Next Year

Name: ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort Allocation (%)</th>
<th>Faculty Proposed</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on effort allocation as appropriate:

**Nominal effort allocation:** (See also Table 1 on p. 23 of the S&E College Handbook)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Load*</th>
<th>Teaching (%)</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1 or 1/1/2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 3-SCH teaching load per course

(FACULTY NAME) 
Chair/Director  
Dean

(Signature does not signify agreement, only that you have read this evaluation)

Signature Date  Signature Date  Signature Date
College of S&E Annual Evaluation Templates: Form 3

Data from Digital Measures
Appendix K

Faculty Performance Evaluations: Clarification and Descriptions of Rating Terminology.
(Updated, September 21, 2018)

The three areas of evaluation include teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service/department citizenship and other duties as defined in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C1.03 “Responsibilities of Full-Time Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members.” Faculty members will be evaluated only in terms of areas that are part of their job duties. Evaluations must be based on the data provided in Digital Measures. Scores will then be weighted based on the workload profiles and/or ranking systems developed by each college. Faculty evaluation letters will include a rating for each area, as well as an overall rating for the review period.

Descriptions of rating terminology (University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 33.99.99.C0.02 To access visit: Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty

http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/rules_procedures/assets/33.99.99.C0.02_performance_reviews_of_full-time_faculty_members.pdf
Appendix L

Guidelines for Appointments of Graduate Assistants
(Updated, September 21, 2018)

The College of Science and Engineering is committed to providing teaching assistantships to as many qualified graduate students as funding and need permits. Appointment of Teaching Assistants (TAs) is a multi-step process designed to maximize benefits to

• University and College—by providing instructional assistance for our numerous laboratory sections, and by providing funding that will attract students to our graduate programs;

• Undergraduate students—by providing qualified laboratory instructors who will enable them to receive individual attention in small classes;

• Graduate students—by providing them with a chance to develop teaching skills (under supervision), and by providing funding that will allow them to support themselves; and

• Instructors who supervise the TAs—by ensuring that the TAs selected for their courses have relevant backgrounds and skills in the discipline.

Review of TA Pool

Faculty and/or potential supervisors of TAs will have access to the TA summary of applicants in the I:drive [I:\CLSE TA\TA Assignments] to identify and request students for assistance with specific courses. Supervisors must keep in mind the following factors when considering TAs for their programs: academic strengths, teaching experience and past performance.

Teaching Assistantship Requirements

1. Completed a bachelor's degree.
2. Be accepted into a graduate program at Texas A&M– Corpus Christi.
3. New TAs must complete TA orientation offered at A&M – Corpus Christi.
4. Be enrolled in at least nine (9) graduate semester credit hours at A&M – Corpus Christi.
5. Be in good academic standing at the time you are hired, and remain in good academic standing, e.g., graduate GPA of 3.00 or higher for graduate students.
6. Must complete online training modules that are required by the University.
7. Enroll in SMTE-5004 "Teaching Assistant Seminar" if this is your first semester as a TA.

If a TA fails to meet any of the above requirements, his/her assistantship will be terminated. If a TA does not attend all SMTE 5004 sessions, he/she will not be eligible for future TA appointments.
By submitting a TA application, you understand and agree to the following:

- To abide by all the requirements listed above.
- You must reapply for a TA appointment each academic year.
- You must adhere to all qualifications and criteria for the A&M– Corpus Christi program in which you are enrolled. In other words, your assistantship is contingent upon you showing and maintaining "satisfactory progress" toward your graduate degree.
- Continuation of TAship is contingent upon satisfactory work performance from the previous semester; otherwise TAship may be terminated going into the new semester. TA performance evaluations are done every semester by your direct supervisor.
- As part of compliance with I-9 regulations, a representative of the university is required to view original employee eligibility documentation. For a pdf of acceptable employment eligibility documentation, select the "List of Supporting Documents" bullet on http://hr.tamucc.edu/Faculty_Staff_Resources/I-9_Services.html You should bring your chosen documentation with you on your first day.
- Offers to foreign nationals are contingent upon the employee obtaining and maintaining valid work authorization set by the United States Citizenship & Immigration Services.
- The graduate assistant (GA), research assistant (RA), and teaching assistant (TA) positions are security sensitive appointments, and employment is contingent upon an acceptable background investigation.
- All offers of employment are subject to the Regulations of The Texas A&M University System.

In addition, by submitting a TA application:

- You authorize TAMU-CC to perform a background investigation.
- You authorize TAMU-CC to release information on your assistantship to newspapers, employment newsletters, and the high school(s) and previous universities you attended.

TA’s assignment process.

1. The College of Science and Engineering TA Committee meets during reading day in spring and fall semesters and on the second Friday of July. In the meeting each department presents its needs and TA assignments are made. Once a TA is assigned to a department other departments will not be allowed to request that applicant unless there is strong justification and the first department agrees to the reassignment.

2. If a TA applicant does not meet the requirement of a last 60 hrs or overall GPA of at least 3.0, the department chair of the department to which the TA is desired for assignment can request an appeal provided that the applicant has an overall GPA of at least 2.8 or the applicant has at least three years of experience (either through university coursework or professional experience) in the required expertise area. The appeal package must include a letter from the student applicant requesting the appeal, and a letter from the requesting department chair, program coordinator, or potential faculty member who would serve as that TA’s supervisor describing the special skills and/or experience that qualify the applicant for the TA position. In addition, the requesting department chair or program coordinator must explain how the department will help the applicant to succeed in the
expected activities.

3. The deadline to receive TA appeals is two weeks before the official start of the semester. After that, no appeals will be considered.

4. Appointments for students granted a TA position after such appeal will be for one semester only.

5. A student accepting a TA position may not switch to a different Graduate Assistantship position (such as RA) any later than two weeks before the start of classes unless there is an agreement among all the parties involved.

6. All students accepting a TA position must undergo mandatory training. Failure to attend the training will disqualify the applicants for the TA position. In case of an emergency, written proof must be presented to the College of Science and Engineering Associate Dean for Academics. If a TA appointment letter has not been issued but the department has intent to hire an applicant, it is the department’s responsibility to make sure the applicant is aware of the training dates and attends.

7. All international graduate students whose primary language is not English may be required to demonstrate spoken English proficiency requirement before being appointed as graduate or teaching assistants.
Appendix M

Student Internship Report Template

Internship Title: ____________________________

Student
Name: ____________________________
Major: ____________________________ Academic Year: ____________________________ Email: __________
Cell phone number: ____________________________

Employer
Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
Telephone number: ____________________________

Internship Student Supervisor
Name: ____________________________
Telephone number: ____________________________
Email: ____________________________

Pay Rate (If applicable): ____________________________
If the student will receive a stipend or other means of pay, please include here and include an explanation.

Additional Comments:
Appendix N

College of Science and Engineering

College Abandoned Property
(Updated, September 21, 2018)

Summary:

This college policy expands on university rule 21.99.04.C1, Disposition of Abandoned and Unclaimed Personal Property to outline the process of handling personal belongings left behind by a faculty member upon a separation from employment at the university.

Process:

1. Collection of the abandoned personal property

   1.1. The department chair will notify the Office of the Dean and the University Center that the former faculty member left personal property behind.

   1.2. The department chair will appoint at least two (2) individuals (faculty or staff) from the department to box up the abandoned property, create a log of the property, and transfer the property to the University Center for storage until the property can be disposed of according to section 2 of this document.

      1.2.1. The department chair may appoint individuals from another department if necessary to ensure that at least two (2) people perform this task.

      1.2.2. If college or department staff are available for this task, the department chair may request their assistance.

   1.3. The department chair will attempt to contact the former faculty member or authorized designee within ten (10) business days to pick up the property.

   1.4. The former faculty member or authorized designee will be given ten (10) business days from initial contact with the department chair to make arrangements to pick up the personal property from the University Center.

2. Disposition of the abandoned property

   2.1. If the attempt to contact the former faculty member is successful and arrangements have been made for retrieval of the property within the allotted timeframe:

      (a) The former faculty member or authorized designee may pick up the property during the University Center’s normal business hours; and

      (b) The University Center must notify the Office of the Dean that the property has been picked up by the former employee or authorized designee.
2.1.1. At the department’s discretion, it may ship the property to the former faculty member or authorized designee at either the department’s or faculty member’s/authorized designee’s expense.

2.2. If the attempt to contact the former faculty member or authorized designee is unsuccessful after the allotted timeframe, the University Center will dispose of the property in accordance with university rule 21.99.04.C1, Disposition of Abandoned and Unclaimed Personal Property.
## Appendix O

### College of Science and Engineering Academic Continuity Plan

*(Updated, September 21, 2018)*

### Critical Function: Continuity of Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I. PLAN DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO PERFORMS THIS?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RESPONSIBLE PERSONS? | **College of S&E:** Frank Pezold (Dean); Lea Der Chen (Associate Dean for Research and Director of ENCS); Mario Garcia (Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs)  
**CSCI:** Scott King (Chair)  
**ENGR:** David Bridges (Chair)  
**LSCI:** Cherrie McCollough (Interim Chair)  
**MATH:** Blair Sterba-Boatwright (Interim Chair)  
**PENS:** Rick Coffin (Chair)  
**General:** Ronnie Emanuel (Academic Advising); Thomas Merrick (IT); Michele Roth (Dean’s Office Manager); Lisa Garza (Business Manager); Philip Spreen (Operations Supervisor) |
| PEAK PERIODS | February, March, April, September, October, November |
| COMMENT | Although the teaching mission continues throughout the year, the middle period of the “long” semesters are the time when there is the most activity and when closure would be most detrimental |
| DOCUMENTS | See TABLE II |
| UPSTREAM DEPENDENCIES | Academic Affairs (Recruitment and Enrollment Management, Academic Advising, Undergraduate Studies, Honors Program, University Libraries, International Education), Registrar’s Office, Students with Disabilities, Student Engagement and Success, Physical Plant, Environmental Health & Safety, Information Technology, University Police, Telecommunications, Central Receiving, Distance Education, National Spill Control School (RCO) Center for Coastal Studies, Center for Water Supply Studies, Laguna Madre Field Station, Conrad Blucher Institute, Harter Research Institute; Departments of CSCI, ENGR LSCI, MATH, and PENS. |
| DOWNSTREAM DEPENDENCIES | |
| POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES IF THIS FUNCTION IS NOT | Disruption of teaching |
| CONTINUED OR RECOVERED QUICKLY ENOUGH | - Disruption of research – students assist with research. Students going elsewhere for classes would have an impact on research  
- Departure of faculty  
- Departure of staff  
- Departure of students  
- Loss of revenue  
- Impact on other units  
- Impact on important business partners |
| HOW TO COPE IF USUAL SPACE IS NOT AVAILABLE | Some teaching/learning activities may take place online. Functions requiring physical interactions (e.g. laboratories) would require arrangement with off-site facilities or revised scheduling. |
| HOW TO COPE IF 50% ABSENTEEISM OF STAFF AND FACULTY | There is some redundancy of function built into faculty and staff positions. Temporary staff and faculty can be hired. Online teaching is planned if faculty members are home-bound but not incapacitated. Classes with multiple sections may be combined. |
| WHAT TO DO IF CERTAIN SKILLS/KNOWLEDGE ARE HELD BY ONLY ONE STAFF MEMBER (UNIQUE SKILL) | For most “general” courses, there is adequate redundancy among existing faculty and the adjunct pool to accommodate absences. Some (a very few) specialized courses lack this redundancy of expertise in existing faculty and staff and would need to grant enrolled students “incompletes” until suitable replacements are appointed. |
| CAN THIS FUNCTION BE PERFORMED FULLY OR PARTLY FROM HOME? | The technology is available for most lecture-only courses that will be taught online if reliable IT, data networks and communication lines are available. Courses requiring physical interaction (e.g. labs, internships, practicums) would need to substitute equivalent activities or postpone completion until the emergency situation is resolved. |
| HOW TO COPE IF DATA NETWORK IS NOT AVAILABLE | Either physical instructional delivery or online instructional delivery is necessary for almost all courses. If both are unavailable, conference calls via telephone and supplemented by “paper” mail may be used in some cases. However, these alternatives are less effective modes of instructional delivery, and have limited scope and usefulness. |
| ANY SHOW STOPPERS | Network communication is an “irreplaceable” resource (or very close to it), as well as reliable access by instructors and students. |
| DO ANY OF THESE COPING STRATEGIES EXPOSE THE UNIVERSITY TO RISK | No |
| POLICY EXCEPTIONS THAT MAY BE NEEDED | Closed captioning may not be available for emergency online offerings. Deviation from the original syllabus will be necessary for some coping strategies, requiring the development of an adaptive syllabus. |
| ADDITIONAL VULNERABILITIES IF TEMPORARY CLOSURE IS DECLARED, IS IT POSSIBLE TO STOP DOING THIS FUNCTION | Unknown  
Yes |
| COMMENTS | This is time-dependent. During “long” semesters, a missing month could be made up – perhaps by extending into the subsequent intersession. However, longer absences or absences during the “short” semesters and minimesters would be... |
“irrecoverable” and would require granting “incomplete” grades to enrolled students and rescheduling for the completion of the courses.

**ACTION ITEMS**

See TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE II. DOCUMENTS LIST</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURSE GRADEBOOKS, DOCUMENTS AND SPREADSHEETS- BLACKBOARD</strong></td>
<td>Description: Each instructor’s personal log of student performance and evaluation. Owner: Individual faculty members through BlackBoard Physical Location: Blackboard cloud server Medium: Electronic Principal contact Person(s): IT Department Backup Measures: Off-site server maintained through BlackBoard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURSE GRADEBOOKS, DOCUMENTS AND SPREADSHEETS- PERSONAL</strong></td>
<td>Description: Each instructor’s personal log of student performance and evaluation. Usually in the form of computer spreadsheets, but may also be paper or a combination of both. Owner: Individual faculty members Physical Location: Faculty members’ file or computers Medium: More than one Principal contact Person(s): IT Department Backup Measures: Varies according to medium. Backup is part of the individual's personal emergency plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVENTORY: TEACHING EQUIPMENT</strong></td>
<td>Description: Inventory of routine and specialized equipment used in teaching laboratories. Owner: Academic Departments/School: CSCI, ENGR, LSCI, MATH, PENS. Physical Location: Computers of Teaching Laboratory Coordinators and IT personnel; University Secure i-drive Medium: Electronic Principal Contact Persons: ENCS &amp; MATH: Tom Merrick; David Burk ENCS: Jack Esparza; John Gonzales LSCI: Jessica Han, Githzette Planas-Costas; Phil Jose PENS: Carol Haley, Nikolai Kraiouchkine, Michael Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL FILES: FACULTY PORTFOLIOS DURING REVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Description: Repository of portfolios for faculty who are being reviewed for Pre-Tenure (3rd-Year) Review, Promotion and Tenure and Post-Tenure Review. Owner: College of Science and Engineering Physical Location: CI-372 Medium: Paper Principal Contact Person(s): Michele Roth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL FILES: ACTIVITY PLANS/REPORTS DURING ANNUAL REVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Description: Faculty and Staff activity plans, curriculum vitae and activity reports during annual review period. Owner: College of Science and Engineering Physical Location: CI-372 Medium: Paper Principal Contact Person(s): Frank Pezold, Michele Roth, Cynthia Williams, LD Chen Backup Measures: Department chairs and dean’s summaries of annual reviews, Digital Measures (faculty activity report), and WorkDay (staff annual review)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PROGRAM ACCREDITATION DOCUMENTS | Description: Documentation of accreditation for appropriate programs:  
Owner: College of Science and Engineering  
Physical Location: ABET- ABET Coordinator’s (Christine Allman) computer and files; i-drive NAACLS-Jean Sparks's computer and files; i-drive; Other programs; Mario Garcia’s computer and files; i-drive  
Medium: more than one  
Principal Contact Person(s): Mario Garcia, Christine Allman, Jean Sparks  
Backup Measures: Stored on computers, external hard drives and i-drive; Cloud storage |
| STUDENT FILES – ACTIVE ADVISING | Description: Files used by the S&E Academic Advisors when dealing with current students.  
Owner: College of Science and Engineering  
Physical Location: ST Advising Folder on i-Drive  
Medium: Electronic  
Principal Contact Person(s): Ronnie Emanuel, Martha Simcik, Francie Jordan, Kyle Fuehrer, Cari Reed, Hailey Boeck, Mara Stonebrook  
Backup Measures: DegreeWorks, and Registrar for most items; Hard copies of some items are kept in advisors' offices (CI-350 Suite) |
| STUDENT FILES – GRADUATED AND INACTIVE | Description: Archival files for students not currently being advised.  
Owner: College of Science and Engineering  
Physical Location: ST Advising Folder on i-Drive  
Medium: Electronic  
Principal Contact Person(s): Cynthia Williams, Michele Roth  
Backup Measures: DegreeWorks and Registrar are backups for most items; Hard copies of some items are kept in student folders in CI-373. |
| TEACHING ASSISTANTSHIP SPREADSHEET | Description: List of current and continuing TAs  
Owner: College of Science and Engineering  
Physical Location: Cynthia Williams computer; i-drive  
Medium: Electronic  
Principal Contact Person(s): Cynthia Williams, Michele Roth  
Attachment File Name: Teaching_Assistantship_Application_for_Academic_Year_2018-2019_College_of_Science___Engineering_April_30__2018__10.39.csv |

**TABLE III. ACTION ITEMS**
ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY OF ITEMS REQUIRING PHYSICAL CONTACT

Assigned to: Program Coordinators
Description: Courses with components that include physical contact (labs., internships, practicums, etc.) will either need to be modified for online delivery (if possible) or make alternative arrangements for physical delivery. If physical contact is necessary, it will need to be performed off-site. Determine off-site locations for research and physical teaching re-locations in advance—and inform the faculty about these. In some cases "kits" are available for students to use at home. In other cases where supervision is necessary, alternative arrangements (MOUs) must be made with off-campus institutions (and, perhaps, personnel). Costs vary, ranging from gratis to reimbursement for facilities, equipment time, supplies, personnel time, etc. This will be necessary to effectively keep non-online functions running. It cannot be done by individual researchers/teachers alone. It must be coordinated at the campus level (so students will have coordinated access), and is likely to also involve non-TAMUS institutions.

LECTURE CAPTURE/ONLINE PREPARATION

Assigned to: LD Chen, Thomas Merrick, ODELT, IT
Description: "Teaching" has been identified as a Critical Function of the College of Science & Engineering and is the primary focus of this business continuity plan update. A Lecture Capture program has been implemented during fall semester (peak hurricane season), and (optionally) in the spring semester using different platforms for recording lectures in classroom (using webcam microphone or voice recording capability in computers), WebEx meetings and posting to BlackBoard, or integrating Office365 into teaching. These platforms will provide an archive of captured lectures that can be accessed for online use.

ONLINE/CAPTURED LECTURE ACCESS AND DELIVERY

Assigned to: ODELT (other unit outside of college)
Description: Once lecture/course content is available for online delivery, faculty must be able to access it and deliver it to students. Likewise, students must be able to access and download the online materials. Distance Education and IT maintain the delivery systems and are available to train faculty in their use.

HANDLING OF LIVING TEACHING MATERIALS

Assigned to: Laboratory Coordinators
Description: Living materials (cell cultures, tissue cultures, microbial cultures, plants, animals, etc.) used in teaching are not usually "special" or "unique" and can often be replaced. (If any are "irreplaceable," they will be treated like living research materials.) Two main concerns for living teaching materials are: 1) sustenance and humane treatment of any specimens that need to be maintained; and 2) environmental, safety and health considerations. In some cases, it is preferable to destroy specimens (and start with new ones after the emergency) rather than attempt to maintain them and risk their release into the environment. The situation varies with specific specimens, and each appropriate unit’s emergency plan addresses dealing with its own living specimens.
| HANDLING OF NON-LIVING TEACHING MATERIALS | Assigned to: Program and Laboratory Coordinators  
Description: Most chemical and physical specimens can be stored for long periods. Some, however, require that special environmental conditions (e.g., temperature, vacuum/pressure) be maintained. Some equipment requires periodic maintenance—even when it is not actively in use. (If any non-living specimens or other items are "irreplaceable," they will be treated like non-living research materials.) |
Appendix P

Department Chair Access to Courses in the Learning Management System
(Updated, September 21, 2018)

Summary

This policy outlines the responsibilities and process associated with a department chair gaining access to department faculty courses in the Learning Management System (LMS).

Policy

1. RESPONSIBILITIES

1.1. Department Chair

1.1.1. Each department chair has the ability to add themselves to any course offered in their department to review course activity, ensure academic continuity, or evaluate faculty teaching.

1.1.2. If there is an academic need to have higher-level access to a course (e.g., to enter grades), the department chair must secure approval from their dean and request the additional access from Information Technology.

1.1.3. A department chair shall only add themselves to a course as appropriate and may not add other faculty/college staff members to a course on their behalf.

1.2. Office of the Dean

1.2.1. The Office of the Dean will provide the Office of the Provost with a list of the college’s department chairs at the start of each long semester and any time there is a change of a department chair.

1.3. Office of the Provost

1.3.1. The Office of the Provost will provide the LMS Coordinator with a list of all colleges’ department chairs at the start of each long semester and any time there is a change of a department chair. The LMS Coordinator will update the role of chairs in the LMS to allow for access to their department’s courses in the LMS.

2. PROCESS

2.1. The process of accessing a course in the LMS will normally be initiated by the department chair for a specific reason (e.g., assess alignment with the college’s academic continuity plan). Under normal circumstances, the department chair shall:
2.1.1. notify the faculty member in writing at least one (1) business day prior to accessing the course;

2.1.2. discuss feedback with the faculty member as appropriate; and
2.1.3. share any academic continuity concerns with the dean.

2.2. In emergency situations, the department chair may access a course to assist with the continuity of the course without advanced notice to the faculty member. The department chair shall attempt to contact the faculty member regarding accessing the course as soon as feasible.

3. FACULTY RESPONSE

If a faculty member has a concern with the access request or any resulting comments or concerns, established college processes and university procedure 32.01.01.C0.01, Complaint and Appeal Process for Faculty Members should be followed.
Appendix Q

Program Coordinator Duties
(Updated, September 21, 2018)

Administrative and professional

Function:

The Program Coordinator is a faculty member who has responsibility for educational leadership of a program in terms of curriculum, hiring needs, assessment, facilities, and general administration.

Scope:

The Program Coordinator shall:

- Coordinate faculty discussions on program changes and new program development.
- Assist the Chair on scheduling of courses.
- Recommend to the Chair on program hiring needs for faculty, including adjunct faculty and graduate teaching assistants; develop local adjunct pool. Assist the Chair with program specific reporting related to accreditation requirements, such as substantive change, documentation of faculty qualifications for instructors of record, documentation of student achievement.
- Generally oversee 5-year program reviews and follow-up reports (unless the Chair assigns another faculty member to this).
- Assist chair with completing course inventory change forms for assigned program(s) and catalog copy changes.
- Oversee program assessment and reporting activities in consultation with the Chair.
- Recommend to the Chair and oversee any renovation or improvements to facilities dedicated to the program.
- Assist the Chair with duties related to strategic planning and continuity of learning planning.
- Perform related duties as assigned by the Chair and in coordination with program faculty / staff, such as program recruitment, admissions, maintenance of an alumni database, assistance with graduate faculty appointments, overseeing program implementation with adjunct faculty (including appropriate syllabi and textbooks), etc.
- Coordinate with academic advisors on degree plans, program changes, etc.
- Coordinate program reviews in terms of national and international standards established by/for the discipline.

Supervision:

The Program Coordinator reports to the Chair of the department in which the program is administratively housed. The Program Coordinator serves as a liaison to the tenure-line and non-tenure line faculty of that program.
Education:
The terminal degree from a regionally accredited university or its equivalent is required. In rare and exceptional cases, a non-terminally degreed program coordinator may be named based on additional qualifications or experience.

Experience: The Program Coordinator shall have demonstrated ability in leadership in or out of higher education so as to enable the incumbent to lead the faculty of that program toward continuous improvement and the pursuit of excellence in undergraduate and/or graduate education.
Appendix R

Template of Classroom Teaching - Peer Review Form
(Updated, September 21, 2018)

This form is a COSE general format that may be changed to meet specific Program peer-reviewed needs

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of instructor ____________________  Announced Observation? ____________________

(yes, no, or explain)

Location of class ____________________  Number of students enrolled ____________________

Years of Teaching ____________________  Title of course ____________________

Subject observed ____________________  Undergrad or Grad ____________________

Observers ____________________  Date of observation ____________________

Start time ____________________  End time ____________________

II. CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND AND ACTIVITIES

In the space provided below please give a brief description of the lesson observed, the classroom setting in which the lesson took place (space, seating arrangements, etc.), and any relevant details about the students (number, gender, ethnicity) and teacher that you think are important. Use diagrams if they seem appropriate.

Record here events which may help in documenting the ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time/Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Handbook
Fall, 2018
Faculty: Page 97
1) The instructional strategies and activities respected students’ prior knowledge and the preconceptions inherent therein. 
(teacher has an attitude of curiosity while actively soliciting student ideas that connect subject matter and students everyday experiences.)

2) The lesson was designed to engage students as members of a learning community. (Students actively participate and are integrated as a group as knowledge is share and discussed by both instructor and student.)

3) In this lesson, student exploration preceded formal presentation. (Students are given a chance to discuss and explore simple, more concrete experience before building complex, more abstract knowledge.)

4) This lesson encouraged students to seek and value alternative modes of investigation or of problem solving. (Instructor solicits a variety of approaches to solving a problem and understands there may be more than one way to solve a problem.)

III. CONTENT

Propositional Knowledge

5) The lesson involved fundamental concepts of the subject. (Significant scientific or mathematical ideas are at the heart of the lesson and are included as foundational or fundamental concepts.)

6) The lesson promoted strongly coherent conceptual understanding. (The lesson connected concepts in a way that that was meaningful and connected to other relevant concepts.)

7) The teacher had a solid grasp of the subject matter content inherent in the lesson. (College level content knowledge was apparent.)
8) Elements of abstraction (i.e., symbolic representations, theory building) were encouraged when it was important to do so. (Students are provided with abstract representations or theories in ways that make conceptual sense to them. Abstractions should be presented in larger contexts that are relevant.)

9) Connections with other content disciplines and/or real world phenomena were explored and valued. (Connecting science and math across the disciplines with real world applications tends to make it more coherent.)

Procedural Knowledge

10) Students used a variety of means (models, drawings, graphs, concrete materials, manipulatives, etc.) to represent phenomena. (At least two different kinds of graphs, symbols etc were used giving students a variety of ways to use critical thinking in analyzing information and critiquing ideas.)

11) Students made predictions, estimations and/or hypotheses and devised means for testing them. (Students explicitly state what they think is going to happen before collecting data.)

12) Students were actively engaged in thought-provoking activity that often involved the critical assessment of procedures. (Students were actively thinking about how what they were doing could clarify the next steps in their investigation; hands-on AND minds-on.)

13) Intellectual rigor, constructive criticism, and the challenging of ideas were valued. (Engaging in rigorous debate is encouraged as long as proposals include evidence and do not exclude alternative arguments.)

IV. CLASSROOM CULTURE

Communicative Interactions

14) Students were involved in the communication of their ideas to others using a variety of means and media. (brainstorming presentations, critiquing, listening, making videos, group work, etc.)

15) The teacher's questions triggered divergent modes of thinking. (Higher order thinking questions are posited that may have more
### 16) There was some student talk between and among students.  
*(Instructor is not doing all the talking; student discussion was encouraged and lesson included discourse between/among students.)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17) Student questions and comments often determined the focus and direction of classroom discourse.  
*(Flow of lesson often influenced by student discourse as students sustained and enhanced the lesson with discussion.)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 18) There was a climate of respect for what others had to say.  
*(Classroom members are encouraged to present ideas and express opinions without fear of censure or ridicule.)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student/Teacher Relationships

#### 19) Active participation of students was encouraged and valued.  
*(Students have a voice in how activity occurs - they have ownership of procedure and do not simply follow directions. Hands-on, minds-on the subject matter.)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 20) Students were encouraged to generate conjectures, alternative solution strategies, and ways of interpreting evidence.  
*(Instructor encourages shift of responsibility from teacher to students in finding more than one way to solve a problem, discussing and critiquing alternate solution strategies.)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 21) In general, the instructor was patient with students.  
*(Unanticipated behavior can lead to new learning opportunities; instructor gives a chance for things to progress; wait time is sufficient.)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 22) The instructor acted as a resource person, working to support and enhance student investigations.  
*(Instructor is a facilitator as student initiative brings different ideas. Instructor support guides learning, does not dictate student thinking.)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 23) The metaphor "teacher as listener" was very characteristic of this classroom.  
*(Instructor helps students use what they know to construct further understandings that are reached by actively listening to what students are saying.)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. STUDENT INTERVIEW

The Last 10 Minutes of Each Observation – This section of the review is designed for a thorough student overview of the instructor and is conducted the last 10 minutes of the review with the instructor out of the room. Changes in these questions may be made to meet variations in classes. For this part of the review students are assured that all responses will be kept anonymous. With this assurance students are asked to be thoughtful and reflective as this input will be reported to instructor as a means to improve teaching and instruction and their feedback is essential.

1. Is the typical way your instructor usually teaches? Was anything new or different in today’s lesson that you usually do not see?

2. Is the instructor approachable? Available for help?

3. How are the assignments? Do they help you with the course?

4. Does the instructor use Blackboard or some other online organizational tool? Is it well organized and easy for you to follow?

5. Is the lab aligned with the course and does it help you with the course content?

6. Are the tests fair? Is the instructor fair in grading tests and assignments?

7. Does the instructor provide constructive feedback on assignments that provides you with a better understanding of content/what you are expected to know and remember?

8. What are some things about the course that you like?

9. What are some things you might suggest that the instructor change in order to improve the course?

10. Do you feel like you are part of a learning community in this classroom – safe, collaborative, free to express your thoughts and ask questions, etc.? Why or why not?

¹Technical Report No. IN00-1; Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol (RTOP) Arizona Collaborative for Excellence in the Preparation of Teachers, Arizona State University
Teaching Evaluation Criteria – Supplement to RTOP (COSE) Evaluation

Standard: To achieve a standard rating, faculty are expected to:

• have Student Evaluation of Teaching scores that are not substantially and consistently below the Departmental mean for similar courses
• be active in faculty mentoring of students
• perform effective assessment activities by deadlines
• be active in course improvement (it is expected that courses are being improved to kept up-to-date, a course will typically have a full update every 5 years, or several minor updates)

Above Standard: An above standard rating requires a series of beyond the requirements for Standard noted above. Examples include (but are not limited to):

• attending teaching/education workshops
• new course preparation
• teaching evaluation mean is 25% higher than college average
  • teaching large lecture courses (>75 students)
• teaching more classes outside of peak times
  • attending course improvement efforts such as those provided by CFE
• participate actively in a teaching community of practice
• receiving teaching awards within the college and A&M System
• organize a teaching workshop for the college of science and engineering
• participate in COSE teaching evaluation committees and evaluate peers with COSE instrument
• receive teaching awards at the State or National level
• participate in research and publication related to teaching
Appendix S

Department Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for Annual Activity

(Updated, September 21, 2018)

Department of Life Sciences LSCI Faculty Performance Rubric
Department of Mathematics and Statistics MATH Faculty Performance Rubric
Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences PENS Faculty Performance Rubric
Department of Computing Sciences COSC Faculty Performance Rubric
Department of Engineering Department of Engineering ENGR Faculty Performance Rubric
Limited submission programs typically allow only one or a small number of proposals to be submitted to a sponsoring agency. The guidelines require the college to internally screen applications and determine which research project(s) will go forward to the agency, targeting multiple needs across the college.

When limited submission programs come to the attention of the Dean, the relevant program data is distributed via our listserv scitech-list-bounces@listserv.tamucc.edu

Review Process

The internal review process will take approximately one week by the Research Enhancement Committee. If a department had an active project in the area of the RFP, they would not be considered unless the program end date coincided with the start date of the new award.

The committee’s charge is to identify the nationally competitive candidate(s) with the best chance of success in the external competition. Each PI will submit a one to two page preproposal describing the proposed activity, its scientific merit, the participants from the College, the budget and his/her background as related to the project. The internal committee will rank the internal preproposals according to the following criteria:

1. Intellectual merit
2. Diversity of groups within the college (Geology, Engineering, Math, Biology, etc..)
3. Budget
4. PI’s ability to run the project within the specified time span
5. Qualifications of PIs in terms of publications, experience, success of previous awards and/or area of expertise

Notification will be given to the highest ranked proposal team(s) and those not selected to submit a full proposal as soon as feasible. Proposal reviews will be shared with applicants to assist with proposal development or future applications. In the event that the selected application withdraws, the second ranked proposal team will be notified.

In rare instances, such as when a sponsor’s deadline is too short to allow the above process to take place, the college may allow an interested participant to move forward without the full internal review process based on a “first to notify” basis.
Appendix V
Facilities & Administrative (Indirect)
Costs (IDC) Distribution Policy

PI or PIs salaried by an academic college:
50% University and 50% College. Funds directed to the college will be shared with the PI or PIs. The amount, currently at 5%, remains at the discretion of the dean, but the College does not anticipate a change in this policy in the near future. PIs may carry forward less than $5,000 between fiscal years. PI IDC accounts in excess of $5,000 will require justification to carry forward. These requests will be reviewed by the dean on a case by case basis.

PI or PIs salaried by a center/institute reporting to a college dean:
50% University and 50% College. Funds directed to the college should be shared with the center/institute. Funds shared with the center are at the discretion of the dean. This amount is 40% in Science & Engineering.

PI or PIs salaried by a college but affiliated with a center:
50% University and 50% College. At the discretion of the dean funds may be shared with the center. Currently 25% of the funds will be shared with the center in Science & Engineering.

PI or PIs salaried by a center/institute reporting to President/VPR&I:
50% University, 40% Center/Institute, and 10% President/VPR&I. Funds directed to the center/institute can be shared with the PI or PIs at the discretion of the center/institute director.

PI or PIs salaried by a unit/division (e.g., CASA):
50% University and 50% Unit/Division.

PIs salaried by more than one college, OR a college and a center/institute and/or unit/division not within that college OR by a center/institute reporting to the President/VPR&I and/or unit/division not within a college:
50% University with the other 50% distributed as follows:

If needed, with the assistance of VPR&I, PIs agree on percent effort on the project (e.g., PI-A (COSE) = 40% effort, PI-B (HRI) = 40% effort, PI-C (Academic Affairs) = 20% effort)

The other 50% of IDC is distributed to college(s), center/institutes, and/or unit/divisions per PI effort (e.g., COSE = 20% IDC with split to PI, HRI = 20% IDC with split to President/VPR&I, Academic Affairs = 10% IDC).

If the project is funded, the PIs’ deans, directors, or unit/division heads must approve the agreed upon delegation of percent effort and IDC will be distributed accordingly.

Should the PIs’ deans, directors, and/or unit/division heads not approve the agreed upon delegation of percent effort, the VPR&I will adjudicate the dispute and IDC will be distributed accordingly.

Outlier cases (e.g., PI with dual appointment) will be handled by the VPR&I with the input of the relevant dean(s) and/or directors and/or unit/division heads.
Proposals originating with PIs salaried by differing Organizations (e.g. two colleges, a college & unrelated center/institute, a center/institute & unrelated unit/division, etc.) are subject to distributing 50% of IDC to the University, with the distribution of the remaining 50% as follows:

- At budgeting and, if needed, with assistance of VPR&I, PIs agree on a percent effort on the project.
- IDC is distributed to the organizations from which the PI receives salary per PI effort

PIs, please indicate the distribution of effort that is projected to be allocated to this project. The total amount of effort indicated below must equal 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>% of Effort</th>
<th>PI Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Percent Distributed 0%

If the project is funded, the Lead PI’s dean/director will review and approve before routing to all other PIs’ deans/directors for approval. Should the PIs’ deans and/or directors and/or unit/division heads not approve the agreed upon delegation of percent effort, the VPR&I will adjudicate the dispute and IDC will be distributed accordingly. Distribution of IDC to PIs is subject to the discretion of each PI's dean/director and/or organization's policy.