

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <i>College Structure and Administration</i> | 1 |
| I.A. College Structure | 1 |
| I.B. Administrative Positions | 2 |
| I.B.1. Role and Responsibilities of the Dean | 2 |
| Role..... | 2 |
| Responsibilities | 2 |
| I.B.2. Roles and Responsibilities of the Associate Deans..... | 4 |
| Role..... | 4 |
| Responsibilities | 4 |
| I.B.3. Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs..... | 7 |
| Role..... | 7 |
| Responsibilities | 7 |
| I.B.4. Roles and Responsibilities of Assistant to the Chair..... | 9 |
| Role..... | 9 |
| Responsibilities | 9 |
| I.B.5. Roles and Responsibilities of Program Coordinators..... | 10 |
| Role..... | 10 |
| Responsibilities | 10 |
| I.C. Governance | 11 |
| Dean..... | 11 |
| College | 11 |
| Department | 11 |
| II.A. Faculty Responsibilities | 12 |
| New Faculty Orientation | 12 |
| Outside Employment Policy | 12 |
| Student Access | 13 |
| Attendance at University Commencement | 13 |
| Faculty Absences..... | 13 |
| (Section revised and approved, 9 May 2017)..... | 13 |
| Posting Grades | 14 |
| II.B. Faculty Positions | 15 |
| II.B.1. Academic Ranks for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty | 15 |
| II.B.2. Full Time Non-Tenure Track Positions..... | 15 |
| General | 15 |
| Non-Tenure Track Positions..... | 15 |
| Instructor..... | 15 |
| Visiting Faculty | 15 |
| Professional Track Faculty | 15 |
| Research Track Faculty | 16 |
| Clinical Track Faculty | 16 |
| Appointment of Non-Tenure Track Faculty | 17 |
| Change in Academic Preparation | 17 |
| II.B.3. Graduate Faculty Status | 18 |

College of Science

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Tenured/Tenure-Track (T/TT) Faculty | 18 |
| Professional Faculty | 18 |
| Persons Other Than Tenured/Tenure-Track and Professional Faculty..... | 18 |
| II.B.4. Emeritus Faculty..... | 20 |
| Eligibility | 20 |
| Process..... | 20 |
| II.C. Faculty Recruitment | 21 |
| II.C.1. Recruitment and Selection Process for Tenure-Track and Full Time Non-Tenure Track Positions | 21 |
| II.D. Workload | 26 |
| II.E. Faculty Performance, Development and Evaluation | 27 |
| II.E.1. Performance Criteria for Faculty..... | 28 |
| II.E.1.a. Teaching Effectiveness | 29 |
| II.E.1.b. Research | 31 |
| II.E.1.c. Service..... | 32 |
| II.E.2. Promotion and Tenure (P&T) for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty..... | 33 |
| II.E.2.a. Definitions and Required Time in Rank | 33 |
| II.E.2.b. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor | 34 |
| II.E.2.c. Promotion to (Full) Professor | 36 |
| II.E.2.d. The Promotion and Tenure Process | 37 |
| II.E.3. Faculty Promotion Criteria and Process for Fixed-Term Faculty | 42 |
| Promotion of Professional Track Faculty | 42 |
| Promotion of Professional Assistant Professor to Professional Associate Professor | 42 |
| Promotion of Professional Associate Professor to Professional Professor. | 42 |
| Promotion of Research Track Faculty | 43 |
| Promotion of Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor | 43 |
| Promotion of Clinical Track Faculty..... | 43 |
| II.E.4. Faculty Annual Evaluation | 44 |
| (Updated, September 21, 2018)..... | 44 |
| II.E.4.a. College Faculty Annual Evaluation Process | 44 |
| II.E.4.b. College and Departmental Guidelines for Annual Evaluation | 45 |
| II.E.4.c. Evaluation of Part-Time, Adjunct and/or Temporary Fulltime Faculty and Teaching Assistants | 49 |
| II.E.5. Faculty Pre-Tenure (Mid-Term) Review Process..... | 50 |
| II.E.6. Faculty Post-Tenure Review Process..... | 52 |
| III.A. Department Chair Access to Courses in Learning Management Systems..... | 56 |
| III.B. Student Grade Appeal Process..... | 58 |
| III.C. Graduate Assistants Appointment Process | 61 |
| III.D. Academic Continuity Plan | 64 |
| III.E. Summer Teaching Process | 70 |
| IV.A. Abandoned Property Report Process..... | 71 |
| IV.B. Facilities & Administrative Costs Distribution Policy | 73 |
| IV.D. Faculty Personnel Files | 75 |
| IV.E. Faculty Travel Guidelines..... | 76 |
| Appendix A: College of Science Committees and Councils | 77 |
| • College of Science Chairs/Directors Council | 77 |
| • College of Science Steering Committee..... | 77 |
| • College of Science Awards and Scholarship Committee..... | 77 |

College of Science

| | |
|---|------------|
| • College of Science Curriculum Committee | 77 |
| • College of Science Distinguished Lecturers Selection Committee | 78 |
| • College of Science Library Committee | 78 |
| • College of Science Library Liaisons | 78 |
| • College of Science Emeritus Committee..... | 79 |
| • College of Science Research Enhancement Committee | 79 |
| • College of Science Teaching Assistant Assignment Committee..... | 79 |
| • College of Science Grade Appeal Committee | 79 |
| • College of Science Promotion and Tenure Committee..... | 80 |
| • College of Science Ad Hoc Committees | 80 |
| Appendix B: Faculty Annual Evaluation Templates..... | 81 |
| Appendix C: Faculty Teaching Peer-reviewed Assessment Template¹ | 82 |
| Appendix E: Department and College Committee Response Forms | 90 |
| Appendix F: Supplementary Departmental P&T Criteria and Standards | 92 |
| Department of Life Sciences..... | 92 |
| (Adopted October 2012; Revised May 2014)..... | 92 |
| Scholarship | 92 |
| Teaching | 93 |
| Service | 94 |
| Specific Guidelines for Tenure | 94 |
| Guidelines for (Full) Professorship | 95 |
| Use of External Review | 95 |
| Level of Effort Related to Workload..... | 95 |
| Department of Mathematics and Statistics..... | 95 |
| Supplementary P&T Criteria and Standards..... | 96 |
| (Adopted October 2012; Revised May 2014)..... | 96 |
| Teaching | 96 |
| Scholarship Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor | 97 |
| Scholarship Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Professor..... | 98 |
| Service..... | 99 |
| Specific Guidelines for Tenure..... | 100 |
| Guidelines for (Full) Professorship..... | 100 |
| Use of External Review..... | 100 |
| Level of Effort Related to Workload | 101 |
| Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences | 102 |
| Supplementary P&T Criteria and Standards | 102 |
| Scholarship | 102 |
| Teaching | 103 |
| Service | 104 |
| Level of Effort Related to Workload..... | 104 |
| Assistant Professor Mid-Term Review | 105 |
| Specific Guidelines for Tenure | 105 |
| Guidelines for (Full) Professorship..... | 105 |
| Student Internship Report Template (Appendix G)..... | 107 |

***Grade Appeal Forms (Appendix H)* 108**

College Structure and Administration

I.A. College Structure

The College of Science (COS) consists of the Department of Life Sciences, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, the Center for Coastal Studies, and the Center for Water Supply Studies. Each department is headed by a chair and each center is headed by a director.

I.B. Administrative Positions

I.B.1. Role and Responsibilities of the Dean

Role

The Dean of the College of Science serves as the chief academic, administrative, and fiscal officer of the college, and sole representative of the college to the upper administration, across campus and to the outside community.

The Dean of the college is a 12-month appointment, reporting to the Provost/VPAA

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, termination, salary and compensations for faculty; appointment, assignment, termination and compensation of part-time and adjunct faculty; and the appointment, assignment, compensation, termination and promotion of non-academic personnel.
4. Approves teaching loads, teaching schedules, academic advisory responsibilities, hiring and assignments of TAs/RAs, special assignments that may impact on faculty's instructional responsibilities, and College personnel requests to participate in outside activities.
5. Promotes faculty development activities in 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. Monitors and certifies that students complete all degree requirements as indicated in University Procedure 11.99.99.C0.05
11. Administers the annual budget approved for the college.
12. Administers the utilization of space and equipment assigned to the college.
13. Approves syllabi for all courses in the college and forwards them to the Provost.
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 Science 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 directors of research units of the college.
19. Provides budgetary control and administrative supervision of research centers and operations.
20. Performs other responsibilities as directed by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

I.B.2. Roles and Responsibilities of the Associate Deans

Role

The associate deans are half-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.

Each associate dean is on a 12-month appointment reporting directly to the Dean of the College of Science and exercises the administrative responsibilities delegated by the Dean. In the absence of the Dean, the duties and responsibilities of the Dean shall be exercised by the appropriate associate dean as designated by the Dean. An associate dean may also be designated as acting dean by the Dean in which case the acting dean serves as the final authority on all decisions in the Dean's absence.

Responsibilities

The specific responsibilities of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs include the following:

1. Manages overall operation of the college student records office including coordination with the college academic advisors and other college office staff.
2. Coordinates academic advising of students enrolled in the college and the handling of student requests for exemptions to the academic standards and rules.
3. Organizes and coordinates the college registration process and semester class schedules.
4. Provides reports and analyses as requested by the Dean and department chairs using Argos and other data sources.
5. Oversees assessment of academic programs and departments in the college
6. Informs the Dean of issues and operations related to academics.
7. Undertakes other duties as assigned by the Dean.

The specific responsibilities of the Associate Dean for Research include the following:

1. Assists the Dean in the development of research in the College of Science.

2. Assists the budget coordinator in reviewing and addressing grant-associated matters.
3. Informs the Dean of issues, initiative, actions, and operations related to research.
4. Undertakes other duties as assigned by the Dean.

I.B.3. Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs

Role

The department chairs are 12-month, half-time administrative positions as defined in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 33.99.99.C0.03. Chairs represent their respective departments in college and university matters and act as liaisons between departmental faculty and the college dean. Chairs report directly to the dean.

Responsibilities

The specific responsibilities of department chairs include the following:

1. Administers all personnel matters related to the department, 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, compensation, and promotion of non-academic personnel.
2. Responsible for construction of the class schedule for each semester.
3. Oversees the assignment of teaching loads, teaching schedules, academic advisory responsibilities, and recommend special assignments that may impact on faculty's instructional responsibilities in the department.
4. Promotes faculty development activities in teaching and scholarship.
5. Conducts the annual evaluation of department personnel.
6. Schedules and conducts department-level faculty meetings.
7. Supervises curricular and course planning, including the planning and promoting of improvements within the curricula of the department, 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.

College of Science

8. Administers the annual budget approved for the department.
9. Reviews syllabi for all courses in the department and forwards them to the Dean for approval.
10. Administers policies and procedures established by the university and college relative to departmental activities.
11. Provides information required for institutional research purposes and promotes those research efforts related to academic matters.
12. Appoints and supervises program coordinators within the department.
13. Performs other responsibilities as directed by the Dean of the College of Science.

I.B.4. Roles and Responsibilities of Assistant to the Chair

Role

The role of assistant to the chair of the College of Science is to assist department chairs in the performance of their administrative duties. Depending on the size and complexity of the department, not all departments will require assistant chair. The assistant to the chair is considered a service role and is not an academic administrative position as referred to in University Rule 33.99.03.C0.03. Assistants to the chairs are 9-month appointments, reporting to their respective department chairs and normally receive one course reassigned time per semester, including summer, for the performance of their duties, or as negotiated with the Department Chair and Dean.

Responsibilities

The specific responsibilities of the assistant chair will vary from department to department within the college, depending upon the needs of the department chair. The following list of duties are examples rather than requirements:

- Represents the department at meetings and functions when the chair must be absent.
- Completes the Faculty Workload Report each semester.
- Assists program coordinators with new course proposals.
- Assists program coordinators with details of course scheduling.
- Coordinates catalog copy for the department.
- Assists program administrative assistants with credentialing of new faculty.
- Assists department personnel with faculty searches.
- Assists department personnel with program assessment.
- Performs other duties as assigned by the department chair.

I.B.5. Roles and Responsibilities of Program Coordinators

Role

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. The Program Coordinator is a 9-month appointment reporting to the Chair of the department in which the program is administratively housed and receive one course reassigned time per semester, including summer, for the performance of their duties, or as negotiated with the Department Chair, and Dean.

Responsibilities

The specific responsibilities of the program coordinator will vary from program to program within the College, depending upon the needs of the department chair. The following list of duties are examples rather than requirements:

- Coordinates faculty discussions on program changes and new program development.
- Assists the chair on scheduling of courses.
- Recommends to the chair on program hiring needs for faculty, including adjunct faculty and graduate teaching assistants; develop local adjunct pool.
- Assists the chair with program assessment and program specific reporting related to accreditation requirements
- Oversees program reviews and follow-up reports.
- Assists chair with catalog copy and course inventory.
- Coordinates with academic advisors on degree plans, program changes, etc.
- Recommends to the chair and oversee any renovation or improvements to facilities dedicated to the program.
- Assists the chair with duties related to strategic planning and continuity of learning planning.
- For programs with admissions standards, coordinates faculty review of candidates and makes recommendations on admission.
- Oversees the process of awarding program graduate assistantships and other awards as appropriate.
- Oversees credentialing of graduate teaching assistants as appropriate.
- Performs related duties as assigned by the chair.

I.C. Governance

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 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.

College

The college faculty and staff participate in university-level committees. Descriptions and current committee memberships may be found at http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/governance_orgs/committees_councils.html.

The college also maintains standing committees focused on issues that affect the operations of the college. Electronic records of all college committee meeting minutes are archived on the I:/drive. A listing of college committees is included in this document as Appendix A, and the current membership may be found online at <http://sci.tamucc.edu/assets/documents/committee-rosters.pdf>.

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.

Motions may be made and voted on at college-wide meetings. 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. All motions shall comply with the University and TAMUS policies.

Department

Each academic department will follow the college examples and define the memberships of its committees and the voting right on departmental matters. Electronic records of all committee meeting minutes are archived on the I:/drive.

II.A. 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, Responsibilities of Faculty Members. Generally, these items include:

- Teach classes, develop curriculum and mentor students as assigned and according to college and departmental guidelines.
- Engage in scholarly activity and communication in alignment with their appointments.
- Engage in service activities and leadership according to their appointments.
- Maintain high ethical standards in all professional activities by practicing intellectual honesty and avoiding exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students, staff, or colleagues.
- Work cooperatively and professionally with colleagues and share in the responsibility of group endeavors that further the mission of the department, college, and university.
- Complete all required trainings and be in compliance with university rules, regulations and guidelines.

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

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 <https://laserfichelfds.ad.tamucc.edu>)

College of Science

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.

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 attend commencement ceremonies to demonstrate support for the graduates and their families.

At the beginning of the fall semester, the Office of the Science 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 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.

Faculty Absences

(Section revised and approved, 9 May 2017)

Faculty are expected to attend all regularly scheduled class meetings, whether online or face-to-face, unless otherwise indicated on the course syllabus. 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 a 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.C0.01, Faculty Sick.

Posting Grades

University Procedure 13.99.99.C0.04, Midterm Grades, requires all faculty to submit midterm grades in a timely fashion. In addition, faculty members should strive to maintain current and accurate reporting of grades, including the final grade, in online learning management systems (e.g., Blackboard).

II.B. Faculty Positions

II.B.1. Academic Ranks for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Academic ranks for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty are described in University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.01, Academic Rank Descriptors for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

II.B.2. Full Time Non-Tenure Track Positions

Academic ranks for Full Time Non-Tenure Faculty are described in University Procedure 12.07.99.C0.01, Fixed-Term Faculty Members.

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 whose primary responsibilities are teaching shall equal 15 hours.

Non-Tenure Track Positions

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. With the approval of the dean and provost, on rare occasions their appointments may be extended for an explicitly defined period of time.

Professional Track Faculty.

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
2. Professional Associate Professor – Professional associate professors are required to have a terminal degree and five years of experience at the professional assistant professor rank or equivalent experience.
3. Professional Professor – Professional professors are required to have a terminal degree

4. and five years of experience at the professional associate professor rank or equivalent experience.

Research Track Faculty

Research faculty positions are typically full-time appointments whose primary responsibilities are designing, carrying out, and managing research, preparing publications, supervising student research, and actively participating in the continuing effort to improve the research in departments, academic units, and the university. Research faculty members are generally not required to teach courses (unless indicated in the letter of appointment) but could be afforded the opportunity to teach if there is a program need and funding is available.

Research faculty are expected to be an integral part of the academic unit and to actively participate in departmental and academic unit activities within the guidelines of the university rules and procedures and the system policies and regulations. The research rank will be specified at the time of hiring, and individuals are contracted annually. The ranks for research faculty members are as follows:

1. Research Assistant Professor – Assistant research professors are entry-level faculty positions that require a terminal degree in a discipline germane to the research program and evidence of strong research abilities and potential for scholarship.
2. Research Associate Professor – Associate research professors require a terminal degree in a discipline germane to the research program and five (5) years of experience at the assistant research professor or comparable rank. This rank requires: an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contribution of others in their field; professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of the university; and evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in research expected of a faculty member.
3. Research Professor – Senior research professors require a terminal degree in a discipline germane to the research program and five (5) years of experience at the associate research professor or comparable rank. A senior research professor must demonstrate continuing accomplishments with evidence of national and international recognition in research and evidence of valuable professional service.

Clinical Track Faculty

Clinical faculty positions in College of Science 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 must hold a master's degree 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.

1. Clinical Assistant Professor – Clinical assistant professors are entry-level rank

- faculty positions that require a master's degree in the appropriate field.
2. Clinical Associate Professor – Clinical associate professors require a terminal degree in the appropriate field and a minimum of five years at the clinical assistant professor or comparable rank.
 3. Clinical Professor – Clinical professors require a terminal degree in the appropriate field and a minimum of five years at the clinical associate professor or comparable rank.

Appointment 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.

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

Change in Academic Preparation

Academic preparation and experience are relevant to determining the rank and placement of faculty members as they are appointed to their positions in a department of the College. Further academic preparation and experience may help a faculty meet the expectations of their positions, but do not change the terms of those expectations. Any expected changes in positions should be negotiated and documented in writing.

II.B.3. Graduate Faculty Status

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

Tenured/Tenure-Track (T/TT) Faculty

All new TT faculty affiliated with a graduate program are appointed to the graduate faculty until their third-year review for promotion and tenure, at which time reaffirmation of graduate faculty status may be requested. The COS dean will notify CGS of incoming TT faculty.

For renewal of graduate faculty status for a TT faculty member (“the candidate”), graduate faculty in the department, or program for which the candidate has held graduate faculty status will review the qualifications of the faculty member. Upon a positive vote by the graduate faculty, the department chair will review the qualifications of the faculty member. Following this review, the recommendation, along with a current CV for the candidate, will be forwarded to the COS Dean’s Office for review. When the candidate is seeking graduate faculty status for a program outside her or his own department, the candidate’s department chair must also concur in the recommendation.

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

The College of Science dean will forward recommendations for graduate faculty status to the Graduate Council in accordance with University Procedures.

Professional Faculty

The process for approval of professional or clinical faculty for graduate faculty status is the same as that described for renewal of TT faculty above. In the case of Professional Track or Clinical faculty, chairs must supply explicit justification for requesting graduate faculty status.

Persons Other Than Tenured/Tenure-Track and Professional Faculty

Appropriately qualified individuals who are not tenure-track or professional 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.

College of Science

Graduate faculty in programs within departments or members of interdisciplinary programs will review the qualifications of faculty seeking graduate faculty status who are not tenure-track. 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 and the College of Science dean (in succession) will review the qualifications of the faculty member.

The appointment process for these faculty begins with the chair of the relevant graduate student's committee, who writes a memo describing the qualifications of the proposed member and their role on the student's committee. This memo, along with the CV of the proposed member, is forwarded through the relevant department chair or program director to the COS Dean, who in turn will forward the recommendation to CGS.

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 notifies the College of Science and the College of Graduate Studies of these appointments. Such notifications are a formality for record-keeping purposes and do not require formal approval.

II.B.4. Emeritus Faculty

In accordance with University Rule 31.08.01.C1, Faculty and Staff Emeritus, the College of Science 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. Eligibility, 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 Science faculty. Designation of other Emeritus titles of Science 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 1st**. The department chair, with consent of the eligible member, shall convene and meet with 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 her/his decision and all necessary documentation to the Office of the Provost by **December 1st**.

II.C. Faculty Recruitment

II.C.1. Recruitment and Selection Process for Tenure-Track and Full Time Non-Tenure Track Positions

The college adheres to University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.99.99.C0.01 on recruitment and appointment of faculty; statements published at [Equal Opportunity http://tder.tamucc.edu/equal_employment_opportunity/index.html](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 Science at Texas A&M-Corpus Christi.

1. Identify Need

The department chair is responsible for providing justification for a search following current University procedures. The information is filled out on the search request form and submitted to the Dean for approval and may include such elements as:

- Historical and projected demand for the relevant program, as well as current staffing levels
- A description of the role of the proposed faculty member in the program and the role of the program in any College or University Strategic Plan, as well as the impact of any denial of the request
- The budgetary implications of the proposed faculty member
- A description of how the search will seek a diverse pool of applicants.

2. Acquire approval

The dean prioritizes college faculty needs for the provost after consulting with the department chairs. Following approval of a position by the dean and the provost, the department chair makes a recommendation for members to be assigned to the search committee.

3. Appoint a search committee

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 dean appoints the members and the search committee chair after consulting with the department chair 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 chair and search committee will attend an initial training /briefing update with the Faculty Recruitment Coordinator in Academic Affairs prior to commencing the search process to discuss faculty search guidelines and process, administrative procedures, and equal employment opportunity guidelines.

The search committee has the following responsibilities:

- A. Review of University Procedure 12.99.99.C0.01, Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty, as well as this section of the Science Faculty Handbook.
- B. Preparation of the position description and announcement including fields of expertise, required and/or preferred qualifications and experience, rank, type of appointment, any special duties required in the position, required application materials, and application deadline. Position description is reviewed for compliance and routed for approvals by the Faculty Recruitment and Records Coordinator. The position description and announcement must be approved by the chair, the dean, Faculty Recruitment Coordinator in Academic Affairs, Director of Employee Development and Compliance Services, and Provost before the position is advertised.
- C. Determination of where and how the position shall be advertised, with approval of the department chair and dean. Normally, the position announcement should be sent to the appropriate disciplinary placement service publications, and to disciplinary online posting resources. The approved vacancy announcement in the online system will be posted by The Faculty Recruitment and Records Coordinator in Academic Affairs on the TAMU-CC Career website, the Texas Workforce Commission job board, the Chronicle of Higher Education, Higher Ed Jobs and other subscribed job boards. The approved announcement should also be sent to the Office of the Science Dean to be posted on the college website.
- D. Documentation of committee decisions, including minutes of all search committee meetings.
- E. Development in writing of the criteria to be used in evaluating applicants for the position. These criteria must be consistent with the job description and the hiring matrix. The hiring matrix will be reviewed by the chair and the dean, and the Faculty Recruitment Coordinator in Academic Affairs during the initial compliance check review.
- F. Development of a timetable for the screening process.

- G. Screening all applicants. The search committee members receive candidate's application documents via the online system.
- H. Development in writing of the interview questions. The questions must be reviewed and checked for compliance by the chair, and the dean, and the Faculty Recruitment Coordinator in Academic Affairs prior to scheduling the telephone and/or campus interviews.
- I. Conducting telephone interviews of applicants who appear to be the best qualified and have been approved by the department chair, and the dean. As part of the preliminary interview process, the committee shall determine if the applicant's oral proficiency in English is appropriate to the appointment.
- J. Validation of the credentials of the candidates still considered for the position following the telephone interviews including verifying previous experience and securing official transcripts.
- K. Recommendation to the chair regarding which applicant(s) should be invited to campus for interview. The committee and chair recommendations are submitted to the dean for approval. The application documents, of the dean's approved finalist(s) are routed to the Faculty Recruitment and Records Coordinator, along with the committee and chair recommendations.
- L. Organization of and conducting the campus interview. The campus interview should include opportunities for the applicant to meet members of the faculty, students, the chair, the director (as applicable), the dean, the program coordinator(s), the provost and human resources, or their designees, all depending upon availability. Tenure-track faculty should also meet with the vice-president for research and innovation or her/his designee. The campus interview for tenure-track applications should include a scholarly presentation by the applicant to a faculty and student audience, which should be advertised through the college listserv. The campus interview for professional teaching faculty should involve a demonstration of their teaching abilities.
- M. Compilation of candidate evaluations and comments from 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. At the same time, the search committee chair should submit all documentation to include the hiring matrix and justification for hire to the Faculty Recruitment and Records Coordinator for a final compliance check and further routing of approval of the finalist recommendation. To ensure transparency, the hiring matrix will include both a summary rating as well as ratings of the named individual committee members.

Upon receipt of the Search Committee recommendations, while waiting for a formal approval from the Faculty Recruitment and Records Coordinator, the department chair will submit for approval his or her evaluation and recommendation to the dean.

4. Negotiate an Offer

Upon finalist approval, the chair, and the dean, will informally discuss terms of an offer with the candidate. For tenure-track positions, this offer will include start-up requirements. These start-up needs will be submitted as an itemized written request from the candidate through the chair to the dean. The dean, after consideration of the candidate's request, extends a written offer for start-up to the candidate. Once an agreement on startup has been reached, the dean makes a recommendation to hire to the provost.

5. Make an Offer

Once a verbal offer has been made and accepted, the College Dean's Office will send the information of the offer to the Faculty Recruitment and Records Coordinator. The Faculty Recruitment and Records Coordinator will send the Notice of Appointment to the prospective faculty member on behalf of the provost upon approval. The finalist must review, sign and return within seven days to officially accept the offer.

NOTE: Information on EEO policies may be obtained from the EDCS Office.

II.C.2. Recruiting and Appointing Part-Time, Adjunct and/or Temporary Fulltime Faculty

Individuals within the community may contact the department and the college concerning a desire to teach at the university on a part-time semester-by-semester 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 full-time individual may be sought. The starting point in that search is those individuals who have expressed a desire to teach at the university. In addition to those who have served the department before, 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 Science Dean and the Office of the Provost. Faculty members must complete all required Human Resources forms. The college follows all applicable university rules and procedures and system policies and regulations with regard to recruiting and appointing part-time, adjunct, and/or temporary faculty positions.

II.D. Workload

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 2/1 teaching assignment). Faculty who chair or serve 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 allocated 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. 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 with the dean’s approval. Workload credit is not given for teaching large classes.

Table 1. Nominal Effort Allocation for T and TT faculty

| <i>Teaching Load*</i> | <i>Effort Allocation (%)</i> | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | <i>Teaching</i> | <i>Research</i> | <i>Service</i> |
| <i>4/4</i> | <i>80</i> | <i>10</i> | <i>10</i> |
| <i>3/3</i> | <i>60</i> | <i>30</i> | <i>10</i> |
| <i>2/2</i> | <i>40</i> | <i>50</i> | <i>10</i> |
| <i>2/1 or 1/2</i> | <i>30</i> | <i>60</i> | <i>10</i> |
| <i>1/1</i> | <i>20</i> | <i>70</i> | <i>10</i> |

*Based on 3-SCH teaching load per course

For fixed-term faculty, the nominal teaching load is 15 hours per semester. The effort allocation for instructor, professional faculty and visiting faculty should be 100% for teaching. If, through negotiation with their department chair and approved by the dean, their teaching load is changed from 15 hours per semester, the alternative work expected and the resulting effort allocation should be put in writing and included in the faculty member’s file in the Dean’s Office.

II.E. Faculty Performance, Development and Evaluation

This section of the Handbook covers professional expectations of COS faculty. Because different faculty positions have different expectations, not all sections below apply to all faculty. Faculty and administrators should use this section as a guide to faculty performance, development, and evaluation.

An outline of this section is:

- II.E.1, Performance Criteria: Lists general college-level guidelines used for evaluation in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service.
- II.E.2, Promotion and Tenure (P&T) for Tenured and Tenure-Track (T/TT) Faculty: Includes important definitions, specific college-level expectations for promotions to Associate and full Professor, and the college P&T process. Departments have more detailed expectations; see Appendix XXX for these.
- II.E.3, Promotion for Fixed-Term Faculty: Lists college-level expectations and process for promotion of Professional, Research, and Clinical faculty. Departments may develop more detailed explanations.
- II.E.4, Annual Evaluation: Describes the college annual evaluation process, as well as minimal college-level criteria for annual evaluation. Again, departments may have more specific criteria.
- II.E.5, Pre-Tenure (Midterm) Review: Describes the process for the midterm review of tenure-track faculty.
- II.E.6, Post-Tenure Review: Describes the process and criteria for post-tenure review.

II.E.1. Performance Criteria for Faculty

The evaluation of faculty, used for promotion, tenure and merit pay is based upon several University Rules and Procedures (http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/rules_procedures/), including:

- 12.01.99.C0.03, Responsibilities of Faculty Members
- 12.01.99.C0.04, Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service
- 12.01.01.C1, Tenure
- 31.01.08.C1.01, Merit Pay for Faculty
- 33.99.04.C0.02, Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members
- 33.99.99.C0.02, Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members

Procedure 12.01.99.C0.04 includes three major performance criteria: teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service. All evaluations of faculty performance will be based on documented evidence of faculty contributions and achievements in these three areas, 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 tenure and promotion reviews. Supporting evidence in teaching effectiveness, research achievements, and service accomplishments is essential for an affirmative recommendation for merit pay, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review.

Each department in the college shall develop specific indicators that lend itself to supporting evidence of teaching effectiveness, research achievements, and service accomplishments. Examples of indicators of teaching effectiveness, research and service are given below. In addition to these indicators, faculty should familiarize themselves with the more detailed expectations at the relevant department level.

II.E.1.a. Teaching Effectiveness

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.

The following is a description of some criteria which may be weighed in evaluating teaching effectiveness and student learning.

Peer evaluation of teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching of faculty is a required component of evaluating teaching. Each department shall have a policy to identify peer evaluators.

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. Tenured faculty should have at least one peer evaluation before application for full professor, and before any post-tenure review. Professional faculty, Instructors and Adjuncts should receive peer evaluation once per contract term. Departments may choose to have more frequent informal evaluations.

The peer 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. The written reports should be included in the personnel file of the faculty member.

An example of a peer evaluation instrument may be found in Appendix C. Any evaluation instrument will include assessments of degree of currency of course content, 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.

Student course evaluations

A second required component of teaching evaluation is student course evaluations. Students participate in a course evaluation process each semester. The process is conducted online near the end of the semester. Quantitative student responses are tabulated and analyzed, and their written comments are recorded. The results are available electronically to the dean, the department chair, and the individual instructor for review. Individual faculty members should take responsibility for preservation of their student evaluations.

While student evaluations often contain valuable information about faculty teaching, they should

not be the only or even the main element of evaluation of teaching. In addition, evaluators should remember the documentation in the literature of biases towards certain groups of faculty.

Other criteria

Consideration in evaluation of teaching will also be granted for documented efforts in the following broad areas. Departments may add additional examples as appropriate.

Preparation for effective teaching: examples include Complete DELA (former ODEL) “Best Practices in Online Instruction Course” within the last three years; teach at least one stacked undergraduate/graduate course; develop a new course or program; teach four or more preparations in the calendar year; participate in specific and significant professional development activities designed to improve teaching effectiveness; generating curricular material for multi-section classes.

Performance of effective teaching: examples include Receive at least one satisfactory peer evaluation for a course as assigned by the department chair within the last two years; meeting department-defined expectations for student learning in key courses for the major.

Significant course modifications: examples include Develop and deliver a High Impact Practice (as described in a college or university document) new to the course; course revision based on assessment of student learning outcomes; significant modification of course format (e.g., converting a face-to-face course to either a hybrid or fully online course); teach in a learning community, honors, or innovative course (as designated by the department chair and/or Dean).

Recognition of effective teaching: examples include Develop and deliver a teaching-related conference presentation or workshop (if not counted as a research activity); be nominated by a committee for a college, university, or external agency award (e.g., TAMU System, CASE, Minnie Piper); receive within the last three years a university or an external agency award.

Teaching activities outside the classroom: examples include supervise internships or DIS courses; Engage in additional activities outside of normal class periods and office hours to ensure students master the subject matter (e.g., tutorials, labs, review sessions, case consultation, problem solving session); Supervise Teaching Assistants/Supplementary Instructors without Service Reassignment; Participate in departmental activities focused on teaching—e.g., writing common final exam for a multi-section, multi-instructor course

II.E.1.b. Research

The college tenure-line faculty is comprised of a spectrum, 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 2/1 teaching assignment). In addition, Research Track faculty will have up to 100% of their responsibilities in this area.

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 peer-reviewed research publications and presentations in peer-reviewed 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.

II.E.1.c. 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. We recognize three broad categories of Service:

- Activities that contribute to the management and growth of a department and/or program. Examples include, but are not limited to, participation in departmental committees, program coordination, recruiting efforts, related student organizations, and program development.
- Activities that contribute to the management and growth of the college and university. Examples include, but are not limited to, participation in college/university committees, sponsorship of college/university student organizations, and promotion of the university.
- Activities that use the specialized training and expertise to contribute to the profession and community. Examples include but are not limited to participation in professional organizations, reviewing for and editing journals, professionally related service in community or government-based organizations, and communication of Science to the general public.

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 consider the average negotiated effort allocation approved by the dean.

Citizenship

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, constructive 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.

II.E.2. Promotion and Tenure (P&T) for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty

II.E.2a. Definitions and Required Time in Rank

Promotion of Faculty

University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.01 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 Procedures 12.01.99.C0.01 (Academic Rank Descriptors), 12.01.01.C1 (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 12.01.01.C1.

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.C0. 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.

II.E.2.a. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The following guidelines constitute the minimum expectations for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the College of Science. Based on these, each Department has created specific written standards for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. These standards are included in Appendices to this document and are linked below.

Meeting the expectations below is not a guarantee of tenure and promotion; rather, they serve as the foundation for the Departmental standards.

Teaching Expectations for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

At the time of mandatory review of the probationary period:

1. annual evaluations of teaching as determined by the department must at least “Meet Expectations”;
2. peer evaluations should be positive and negative comments should have been addressed with documented efforts to improve.
3. student quantitative evaluations should be close to or above the median of departmental student evaluations for comparable courses.
4. there should be documented effort in several areas listed under “Other criteria” in II.E.1.a above.

Research Expectations for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Undergraduate Faculty. While undergraduate faculty members carry heavier teaching loads, they are also expected to remain active 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 may include, but is not limited to, some combination of:

1. research articles in which the candidate is a major contributor published in peer-reviewed regional, national or international journals. Technical reports may also be considered).
2. professional presentations of research at the regional, national or international level.
3. mentoring of undergraduate student research; and
4. 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 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, such 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. In addition, the candidate should serve as a member of at least one M.S. thesis committee directed by another faculty member.
- 4) 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 resources acquired through such a grant are beneficial 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. Evidence includes all of the following:

1. External funding from national and regional sources commensurate to the needs of the research program must be demonstrated.
2. Off-campus professional presentations of research results, as described in the MS section above.
3. The majority of peer-reviewed research publications will appear in national and international journals that have a high impact factor of respective specialty field(s), a growing body of which shall be based upon research conducted while the candidate was a member of the department.
4. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, successful supervision of at least one Ph.D. student to candidacy is expected.

Service Expectations for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

The primary foci of an Assistant Professor should be on becoming a good educator and establishing a research program. As a result, service expectations should be relatively low. On-campus service should focus on helping with departmental tasks and participating in committee work. Off-campus service should focus on making connections with professional societies and/or relevant local community organizations.

II.E.2.b. Promotion to (Full) Professor

As with tenure, 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:

Teaching Expectations for Promotion to Professor

Documented improvement in Teaching as described for promotion and tenure of Associate Professors above. The amount of weight attached to improvement should be proportional to the weight of Teaching in the workload of the faculty member.

Research Expectations for Promotion to Professor

Undergraduate Faculty. For undergraduate faculty promotion to Professor the candidate must show sustained and growing productivity in the activities described under Promotion to Associate Professor above and demonstrate effort 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 abstract-only publications) in international or national 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 type of publications and presentations expected are as described in the paragraph on M.S. faculty. 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 Expectations for 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, mentoring of junior faculty in

teaching, research, and service; acquisition of external funding in support of students or programs, chairing of significant committees, a leadership role with a professional organization, hosting and organizing professional meetings, design and development of new academic programs, strong participation in outreach and recruitment activities.

II.E.2.c. The Promotion and Tenure Process

Procedures for Initiating Promotion and/or Tenure Review

Each spring semester, the Dean's Office will notify all faculty in their initial year of eligibility for promotion and/or tenure (henceforth "P&T"). This notification is simply informational.

Before the end of the spring semester prior to the P&T review, the dean shall hold a meeting to review timelines, processes, and portfolio expectations, and answer questions related to these topics.

Faculty must inform the Dean's Office of their intent to apply for P&T by **May 15th**.

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 department chair, and the department Promotion and Tenure Committee by **June 10th**.

Faculty must submit supporting documentation in electronic format ("faculty portfolio") as specified in Documentation Guidelines, Appendix D, to the Office of the Dean by the close of business on **September 1st** in the relevant fall semester.

Department Promotion and Tenure Committee

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, regarding tenure and promotion applications from that Department.

The department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of all tenured and fixed-term faculty in the department, excluding the department chair, faculty being considered for tenure and/or promotion, and visiting faculty, as appropriate to the candidacy in question. To evaluate applications for tenure and/or promotion of tenure track faculty, the Committee membership will consist of all tenured faculty at or above the rank to which promotion is requested. For departmental promotion committees of fixed-term faculty (i.e., professional, research, or clinical track) the committee membership consists of tenured faculty and appropriate fixed-term faculty (e.g., professional faculty to evaluate professional, research faculty to evaluate research faculty)

at the rank of promotion or higher. The Committee membership will therefore vary with the rank being sought by the candidates, and thus references to multiple Committees will appear in the

College of Science

procedure below. 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 portfolio 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 from the department committee nominations of other faculty within the college at the appropriate rank. The dean may make the appointment(s) from this list of nominees or request new nominations from the committee.

The Committee chair will be selected from and elected by members of the Committee with the largest membership for that academic year. The Committee chair should have served before on the Committee. The same person shall serve as Committee chair for all Committees in an academic year, and thus should ordinarily be a full Professor in rank. 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.

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 promotion and tenure portfolio of all faculty with research expectations 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.

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 dean has to approve the final list of reviewers. The candidate may submit a list of external reviewers who should be excluded from the selection. No more than six external review letters will be included in the portfolio and at least two 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 15th**. 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 20th**.

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 1st**. The department chair will notify the candidate when external reviews are requested. External review letters are due on **September 15th**.

External reviewers will be asked to specifically comment on the candidate's scholarly work and the significance of the contributions to the discipline. The 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 summary of the external review without identifying individuals. The summary will be drafted by the Committee chair and approved by the department chair.

Response of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee

Committee members must vote positive or negative in promotion and tenure recommendations. Abstentions will be recorded as negative votes. Committee members who are unable to attend shall submit their vote to the Committee chair. A tie vote is insufficient to recommend tenure or promotion.

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. Committee members who feel strongly that the report does not adequately reflect the facts of the case may add an addendum to the report. The format for this report is included in Appendix E. The report shall be signed by each member of the Committee and shall be sent to the department chair by **September 30th**. 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.

The department chair shall also submit a separate evaluation report to the college Promotion and Tenure Committee and the dean.

The department chair 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. Such response should indicate concurrence with the recommendations or non-concurrence. Responses to department chair's recommendation

College of Science

must be submitted to the chair within two business days of the meeting with the chair. The responses will be included in the candidate's portfolio. The department chair's 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. 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. 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, 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. When voting on candidates from their own department, members of the college Promotion and Tenure Committee shall vote consistent with the majority vote of the department committee.

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 E, and not be written by the representative of the candidate's department. The report shall be signed by each member of the Committee and shall be sent to the dean by **November 1st**.

Documentation Available to the Committees and Department Chair

Each department Promotion and Tenure Committee and department chair shall have for review the documentation specified in Appendices D and F-G.

The college Promotion and Tenure Committee shall have for review the same documentation noted above. In addition, the department chair 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.
3. The response of the candidate.

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, 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. The candidate may submit a written response to the dean's recommendation. Responses must be submitted to the dean within five (5) business days of the meeting with the dean. The dean shall submit all materials, including the candidate's response if any, with a formal letter of recommendation to the Office of the Provost by the date specified by the provost, **typically around Nov. 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 Procedures 12.01.01.C1 (Tenure) and 33.99.04.C0.02 (Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members).

II.E.3. Faculty Promotion Criteria and Process for Fixed-Term Faculty

Consideration for promotion in rank shall follow the standard departmental processes. The candidate's promotion portfolio 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.

A candidate for the rank of professional associate professor shall be considered after a period of not less than five years in the rank of professional assistant professor or comparable rank. Promotion requires demonstration of a strong commitment to excellence in teaching and service as appropriate to their work assignment as well as collegiality over the last five years. The candidate's professional record should show an active role as a member of the 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.

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:
 - High evaluations of teaching by students and peers. Student evaluations are done in each course, and peer evaluations are done at least once each academic year and include teaching skills, course syllabi, course objectives, copies of examinations and other materials as appropriate.
 - Contributions to the educational endeavors of the college through a consistent pattern of one or more of the following: great classroom teaching, mentoring for teaching assistants, or leading instructors for a specific course offering, updating of existing courses and/or the development of new curricula.
 - Teaching philosophy statement that provides evidence of improvements, innovations and changes initiated over the pre-promotion period.
 - Documented effort in several areas listed under “Other criteria” in II.E.1.a.
 - High score on the teaching portion of the annual evaluations for three (3) out of the last five (5) years.
3. Service – the candidate should have demonstrated effective participation in department, college, university, and professional service activities as appropriate to their work assignment.
 - Service to the department, college, and university – examples include but are not limited to:
 1. Demonstrating initiative in committee service and other activities.
 2. Performing administrative duties.
 3. Assuming leadership in the development of the curriculum.
 - Service to the community and your profession – examples include but are not limited to:
 1. Actively contribute to the efforts of the appropriate professional organizations, and/or similar activities.
 2. Actively contribute to Community service including STEM outreach, Science communication, and professionally related service.
 3. Giving presentations at conferences, symposia, workshops.
 - Documented effort in several areas listed under “Other criteria” in II.E.1.c.
 - High score-on the service portion of the annual evaluations for three (3) out of the last five (5) years.

Promotion of Professional Associate Professor to Senior Professional Professor.

A candidate for the rank of professional senior professor shall be considered after a period of not less than five years in the rank of professional associate professor or comparable rank.

Promotion requires demonstration of a strong commitment to excellence in teaching and service as appropriate to their work assignment as well as collegiality over the last five years. The candidate's 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.

In order for a candidate to be recommended for promotion to the rank of senior professional 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 associate professor rank.
2. Teaching – The candidate should have a record of sustained excellence and success in teaching as well as assume an instructional leadership role within the department and college, through lead teaching, improvement of key aspects of the curriculum, development of new courses, and/or a recognized expertise in one or more subject areas. The record must be supported by evidence such as:
 - Excellent evaluation of teaching by students and peers. Student evaluations are done in each course, and peer evaluations are done at least once each academic year and include teaching skills, course syllabi, course objectives, copies of examinations and other materials as appropriate.
 - Contributions to the educational endeavors of the college through a consistent pattern of one or more of the following: excellent classroom teaching, mentoring for teaching assistants, or leading instructors for a specific course offering, updating of existing courses and/or the development of new curricula.
 - Teaching philosophy statement that provides evidence of improvements, innovations and changes initiated over the pre-promotion period.
 - Documented effort in several areas listed under “Other criteria” in II.E.1.a.
 - Excellent score on the teaching portion of the annual evaluations for three (3) out of the last five (5) years.
3. Service – the candidate should reflect a sustained capacity to significantly contribute to the mission and goals of the college and university by:
 - Service to the department, college, and university – examples include but are not limited to:
 1. Demonstrating initiative in committee service and other activities (ex. Chairing committees).
 2. Performing administrative duties.
 3. Assuming leadership in the development of the curriculum.
 4. Participation in teaching-related professional development activities.
 5. Advising or involvement with student organizations.
 6. Participating in teaching focused grants.
 7. Faculty awards related to teaching/service (e.g., university, community, national recognition of teaching/service).
 - Service to the community and your profession – examples include but are not limited to:

College of Science

1. Actively contribute to the efforts of the appropriate professional organizations, and/or similar activities.
 2. Actively contribute to Community service including STEM outreach, Science communication, and professionally related service.
 3. Giving presentations at conferences, symposia, workshops, or publishing on the scholarship of teaching.
- Documented effort in several areas listed under “Other criteria” in II.E.1.c.
 - Excellent score on the service portion of the annual evaluations for three (3) out of the last five (5) years.

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 work- shops, 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 thesis and dissertation committees as appropriate to their appointment and workload.
3. Service – The candidate should have demonstrated effective participation in various department, college, university, and professional service activities as appropriate, examples of which include
 - Service on department, college, and/or university committees.
 - Non-committee department, 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 no 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 portfolio shall include required documentation for only those areas of teaching and/or training that have been part of the faculty member's responsibility.

II.E.4. Faculty Annual Evaluation (Updated, September 21, 2018)

II.E.4.a. College Faculty Annual Evaluation Process

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 responsibility of the chair of the department with which the faculty member is associated.

The three areas of evaluation include teaching, research activity, and service/department citizenship and other duties as defined in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C0.03 “Responsibilities of Faculty Members”. Faculty members will be evaluated based upon their assigned job duties and overall contributions to a productive department working environment. Should there exist any instances in which the faculty member was cautioned by the chair for non-collegial or other negative behavior, was the subject of a formal grievance, or other reprimands, those records must be included and addressed in the chair’s annual evaluation.

Evaluations are based on the data provided in Digital Measures (or other university database approved subsequent to this revision). Scores will then be weighted based on the workload profiles and/or ranking systems developed by each department. Faculty evaluation letters will include a rating for each area, as well as an overall rating for the review period. Descriptions of the allowed ratings may be found in Procedure 33.99.99.C0.02. Each department in the college should develop criteria for these ratings. Departmental Evaluation Rubrics are linked at the end of the previous section. In addition, the evaluation letters will explicitly discuss the faculty member’s progress towards their next promotion and/or likelihood of a successful post-tenure review.

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 15th**. 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 1st**.

Results of the evaluation meeting will be recorded on annual evaluation forms (see templates in Appendix B).

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 Science Dean for placement in the faculty member's personnel files in the Office of the Science Dean by **April 15th**.

When the faculty member requests, there shall be a meeting between the faculty member, the department chair, 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 Unsatisfactory annual reviews since the last post-tenure review or subsequent promotion will lead to a post-tenure review of tenured faculty.

All non-tenure track faculty members will be evaluated annually using the 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.

II.E.4.b. College and Departmental Guidelines for Annual Evaluation

General criteria for faculty evaluation in Teaching

Teaching is a professional activity that requires meeting deadlines, engaging with students in classes as assigned, and meeting other basic criteria. Departments are encouraged to elaborate on the following standards.

Minimal requirements

Set of minimal requirements in three main categories, which if applicable but not met, could lead to a rating of Unsatisfactory in an annual evaluation, or denial in promotion and/or tenure, regardless of performance in other requirements.

Preparation for effective teaching: Provide a complete syllabus for each course that includes appropriate course objectives and meets university requirements; meet college, university, and state deadlines for such items as syllabi, textbook orders; utilize learning management systems; attend and hold scheduled class sessions except for extenuating circumstances, providing adequate notification to department chairs and students if that's not possible; maintenance of appropriate office hours; administration of appropriate exams and other assignments.

Performance of effective teaching: maintain currency in course content and methods; provide timely and constructive feedback to students on exams and other assignments; provide timely estimates of midterm grades; provide feedback via Starfish or other student notification system

Outcomes of effective teaching: student evaluations and student success not substantially and consistently below departmental means for similar courses; perform effective assessment activities as required by the department, college or university.

Other requirements

The categories listed below represent different aspects of effective teaching. Examples for each category are shown; departments are encouraged to elaborate on these categories.

Faculty should be evaluated in each category listed below on a 0-2 scale per each category. For an evaluation of Meets Expectations, faculty should receive cumulative score of 2 points, plus meet the student evaluation criterion. For an evaluation of High, faculty should receive cumulative score of 3 points, plus meet the student evaluation criterion. For an evaluation of Excellent, faculty should receive cumulative score of 4 points, plus meet the student evaluation criterion.

1. **Preparation for effective teaching:** examples include Complete DELA (formerly ODELT) “Best Practices in Online Instruction” course within the last three years; teach at least one stacked undergraduate/graduate course; develop a new course or program; teach four or more preparations in the calendar year; participate in specific and significant professional development activities designed to improve teaching effectiveness; generating curricular material for multi-section classes
2. **Performance of effective teaching:** examples include Receive at least one satisfactory peer evaluation for a course as assigned by the department chair within the last two years; meeting department-defined expectations for student learning in key courses for the major
3. **Significant course modifications:** examples include Develop and deliver a High Impact Practice (as described in a college or university document) new to the course; course revision based on assessment of student learning outcomes; significant modification of course format (e.g., converting a face-to-face course to either a hybrid or fully online course); teach in a learning community, honors, or innovative course (as designated by the department chair and/or Dean).
4. **Recognition of effective teaching:** examples include developing and delivering a teaching-related conference presentation or workshop (if not counted as a research activity); be nominated by a committee for a college, university, or external agency award (e.g., A&M System, Case, Minnie Piper); receive within the last three years a university or an external agency award
5. **Teaching activities outside the classroom:** examples include supervise internships or DIS courses; Engage in additional activities outside of normal class periods and office hours to ensure students master the subject matter (e.g., tutorials, labs, review sessions, case consultation, problem solving session); Supervise Teaching Assistants/Supplementary Instructors without Service Reassignment; Participate in departmental activities focused on teaching—e.g., writing common final exam for a multi-section, multi-instructor course

Student evaluation criteria:

- For a rating of Meets Expectations, an overall mean score of 3.7 is required.
- For a rating of High, an overall mean score of 4.0 is required.
- For a rating of Excellent, an overall mean score of 4.3 is required.

General criteria for faculty evaluation in Research

COS expectations for scholarship for the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor are detailed in section II.E.1.b of this handbook. These expectations are further elaborated at the department level in the respective departments' P&T criteria.

Because expectations vary widely across the college, it is not possible to state a uniform definition for the minimal requirements for annual evaluation of Research. Therefore:

- Faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor should receive an annual rating of “Meets Expectations” in Research if they are making adequate progress towards meeting the standards for Research for tenure and promotion, as appropriate for their workload and departmental expectations. A rating of “High” should indicate that they are on track for potential promotion to Associate Professor. A rating of “Excellent” should indicate they are clearly exceeding the standards for promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor should receive an annual rating of “Meets Expectations” in Research if they continue to meet the standards for Research associated with promotion to Associate Professor, as appropriate for their workload and departmental expectations. A rating of “High” should indicate that they are on track for potential promotion to Professor. A rating of “Excellent” should indicate they are clearly exceeding the standards for promotion to Professor.
- Faculty at the rank of Professor should receive an annual rating of “Meets Expectations” in Research if they continue to meet the standards for Research associated with promotion to Professor. A rating of “High” should indicate they are exceeding the standards for promotion to Professor, while a rating of “Excellent” indicates they are greatly exceeding those standards.

General criteria for faculty evaluation in Service

Definitions of service for T/TT faculty may be found in section II.E.1.c above, while expectations of service for promotion and tenure may be found in sections II.E.2.b and II.E.2.c above.

In the standards noted below, three kinds of service are distinguished:

- Service to the department and program. Examples include but are not limited to participation in departmental committees, recruiting efforts, mentoring program-related student organizations, and program development.
- Service to the college and university. Examples include but are not limited to participation in college/university committees and college- or university-level student organizations.
- Service to the profession and community. Examples include but are not limited to

service for professional organizations, reviewing for and editing journals, professionally related service in community or government-based organizations, and communication of Science to the general public.

Assistant Professors:

- Meets Expectations: service in their department/program.
- High: service in their department/program, as well as one of the other two categories above.
- Excellent: service in all three categories above.

Associate Professors and Professors:

- Meets Expectations: service in their department/program, as well as one of the other two categories above.
- High: service in two or more categories above, and documented leadership in at least one category
- Excellent: service in all three categories above, and documented leadership in at least one category.

Fixed-Term Faculty:

As noted in section II.D, fixed-term faculty do not ordinarily have effort allocations that include service. Those who do have an allocation for service should have the resulting expectations in writing from the department chair, and their annual evaluation should be based on their fulfillment of these expectations.

Department-level Criteria

Each department is encouraged to develop more specific guidelines than the ones listed above. Departmental rubrics will be provided by the department chairs.

II.E.4.c. Evaluation of Part-Time, Adjunct and/or Temporary Fulltime Faculty and Teaching Assistants

Adjuncts or other faculty with semester-long appointments are evaluated after each semester in which they work. 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 and peer evaluations, class visits, 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. Evaluation forms for adjunct faculty and teaching assistants are currently located on the I:/ drive.

Teaching assistants, part-time and temporary faculty with annual contracts are evaluated using the Annual Evaluation procedures above. Unsatisfactory evaluations may lead to dismissal or non-renewal of contracts.

II.E.5. Faculty Pre-Tenure (Mid-Term) Review Process

University guidelines on Pre-Tenure Review may be found in Procedure 12.01.01.C1, Tenure, Section 4.

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 fall semester. In most cases, untenured faculty will be eligible for the mid-term review in the fourth 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 appointment 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 fourth year of employment. For faculty given 3 years of credit, the mid-term review may occur in the fall 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 will lead to non-renewal 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 and notify the candidate and the relevant department's chair, and promotion and tenure committee. The Science 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 documentation of teaching effectiveness, scholarly activities, and service. Expected documentation for the Pre-Tenure Review is the same as for the Tenure review, as indicated in Appendix D, except that no external review is expected. Any records of non-collegiality or other negative behavior and their resolutions should also be included. All materials must be submitted by **September 1st** of the year of the review.

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

Each department's promotion and tenure committee shall provide by **September 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. 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 **October 1st**.

The department chair shall meet with the candidate to review the comments and

College of Science

recommendations of the committee and the chair. The meeting should take place by October 1.

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 candidate to discuss the review. Subsequent to this meeting, the chair's and the dean's evaluation will be submitted to the provost with copies to the department chair, and the candidate by **November 1st**. One copy of each report shall be placed in the candidate's official file in the dean's office

II.E.6. Faculty Post-Tenure Review Process

Post-Tenure review is governed by university procedure 12.06.99.C0.01, Post-Tenure Review. The following guidelines are to be used for post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty in the College of Science. 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.

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, given their allocated workload distribution.
- 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 by the committee 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)
- 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

- *Satisfactory*– faculty member meets or exceeds responsibilities and provides contributions comparable to that expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload.
- *Unsatisfactory* – does not meet minimum expectations for assigned responsibilities and contributions are not consistent with those expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload. Evaluations may reflect disregard of previous advice or development efforts and/or professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

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. All faculty in the sixth full year of service since their last review or promotion must be notified unless a deferral has been requested and approved by the Office of the Provost.

January 20th: The faculty member submits his or her current curriculum vitae and faculty activity reports to the dean or the dean's designee. Department chairs submit copies of the faculty member's annual evaluations for the past six years or since the last review, and an evaluation summary not to exceed one page 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 meets with the peer-review committee to provide instructions for conducting the review and 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 on an annual basis one tenured (full) professor to the committee by vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Departments are encouraged to rotate this responsibility if possible. Members serve one-year terms. The committee chair will be selected by the peer-review committee members. Department chairs and associate deans shall not serve on the committee.

March 1st: The peer-review committee will submit a report for each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review to the dean's office. The report shall state the rating for each category of responsibility, the comprehensive review rating, and the basis for that determination.

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.

After reviewing the peer-review committee's evaluation report, the dean shall prepare an individual evaluation for each faculty member under review.

- The dean will meet with the faculty member to inform them of the dean's and peer-review committee's recommendations. The faculty member will be provided a copy of the peer-review committee's and dean's written evaluations.
- Upon request by the faculty, the dean shall inform them of the numerical results of the peer-review committee's vote.

The faculty member may submit a written response to the peer-review committee's and dean's recommendations. Responses must be submitted to the dean within five business days of the meeting with the dean and will be included in the reports and recommendations forwarded to the Provost.

April 1st: The dean's and peer-review committee's reports and recommendations and faculty response if applicable will be submitted along with a copy of the college post-tenure review process to the Office of the Provost.

April 15th: The Provost will review the provided documentation and prepare a final decision.

April 30th: The Provost will notify in writing the dean, department chair, and the peer-review committee of the final post-tenure review rating for each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review. The Provost of the peer-review committee will forward this rating to the appropriate faculty member.

Professional Development Plan

For all faculty ultimately receiving an *Unsatisfactory* rating in any category or an overall rating of *Unsatisfactory* from the Provost, the faculty member, in collaboration with the peer-review committee and department chair or dean if the faculty member has administrative assignments of 50% or greater, shall establish a professional development plan addressing any *Unsatisfactory* area (individual category or overall rating) within 30 days of receiving the final decision. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the dean.

Should the 30-day period end after the conclusion of the spring semester the deadline will be extended until **September 15th**.

The plan will:

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

The original written review and professional development plan shall be submitted to the provost's office with one copy each for the faculty member, the department chair, and the college dean. Normally, the development plan period will be for two years.

The department chair/dean, with input from the current peer-review committee, will assess evidence of improvement after one year. A one-year status report, and a final report will be submitted to the dean and Office of the 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, in conjunction with the dean, will take appropriate administrative action, up to and including recommendation for dismissal.

Disciplinary Action

If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present, appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including review for termination, may be initiated in accordance with due process described in university procedure 12.01.99.C0.05, Faculty Dismissals, Administrative Leave, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments and system policy 12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

III.A. Department Chair Access to Courses in Learning Management Systems

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 the LMS for 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.CO.01, Complaint and Appeal Process for Faculty Members* should be followed.

III.B. Student Grade Appeal Process

The College of Science (COS) follows the procedure described in University Procedure 13.02.99.C0.03, Student Grade Appeals. The process outlined below is intended for the student who questions a final grade for a course in the College of Science.

General Information

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.

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 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.

Composition of the College Grade Appeal Committee and Choice of Hearing Panel

For the College of Science, members of the hearing panel will be appointed by the associate dean for academic affairs from the pool of CGAC members. The appointment of CGAC membership is left to the Departments in the College. Members will serve for one year.

- **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.

- **Student members:** 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 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 two (2) students from his or her area. Graduate students will be selected from graduate students who are on campus during the semester in question. (It is incumbent upon the department 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 ten (10) students. In addition, the Student Senators representing the College of Science 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) to comprise the hearing panel, and informs the CGAC members, the student, and the instructor. Should members of the hearing panel be unable to serve or have a conflict of interest or be in any way involved in a particular case, they will be replaced by random draw from the central pool. When there are multiple grade appeal cases at the same time, separate hearing panels will be drawn for each case. When possible, the associate dean will not ask CGAC members to serve on more than one panel per academic year.
- **Recruiting additional members of the pool:** In the circumstance that an appeal needs to be heard, but a quorum of pool members is not available, the associate dean may ask the chairs for additional nominations of faculty or students, as needed, to complete the quorum.

The Appeal Process

A brief summary is provided here. All parties involved should consult the complete grade appeal process as detailed in Procedure 13.02.99.C0.03.

- Unless the faculty member is unavailable for any reason, the student should first meet with the instructor to try to resolve the issue informally.
- If the student believes the matter is not satisfactorily resolved at this stage, or if the faculty member is unavailable or no longer with the university, he or she may appeal the final grade in writing to the appropriate department chair. This should be done no later than twenty (20) business days after the start of the next long semester.
- Normally, within five (5) business days, the department chair will consult with the student and the faculty member to attempt a successful resolution of the appeal. If successful, the department chair will issue a written statement of the findings and agreed-upon actions; if unsuccessful, the department chair will refer the matter, normally within five (5) business days, to the associate dean.

- The associate dean will schedule a hearing before the CGAC, normally within twenty (20) days, at a time and place that does not conflict with the class students and faculty involved. The panel of CGAC members will be chosen as described above. A quorum will be four (4) members of the committee.
- The panel will present its findings and recommendations in writing, either upholding the original grade or recommending a specific grade change, to the associate dean, normally within five (5) business days after the conclusion of the hearing.
- The associate dean will make her or his decision on the grade within five (5) business days of receiving the recommendation. The associate dean's decision is final.

A note about scheduling the hearing

- NOTE: As a rule, hearings will not be held between the end of the Fall semester and the start of the Spring semester; between the end of the Spring semester and the start of the regular five-week Summer I semester; or between the end of the Summer II semester and the start of the Fall semester. However, if the student needs the results of the appeal to enable transfer to another institution for the semester following the grade under appeal, an attempt will be made to accommodate that timeline.

Forms associated with different stages of the appeal process may be found in **Appendix H**.

III.C. Graduate Assistants Appointment Process

The College of Science 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.
- 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/Assignments Spreadsheets] 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

- Completed a bachelor's degree.
- Be accepted into a graduate program at Texas A&M– Corpus Christi.
- New TAs must complete TA orientation offered at A&M – Corpus Christi.
- Be enrolled in at least nine (9) graduate semester credit hours at A&M – Corpus Christi.
- Be in good academic standing at the time of hiring, and remain in good academic standing, e.g., graduate GPA of 3.00 or higher for graduate students.
- Must complete online training modules that are required by the University and System.
- Enroll in SMTE-5004 "Teaching Assistant Seminar" in their 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.

TA Assignment Process

1. The College of Science 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 agreed upon. Once a TA is assigned to a department, other departments will not be allowed to request that applicant unless there is a 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. undergraduate GPA of at least 3.0, or an overall undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or better, or a graduate GPA of 3.0 or better, 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. The deadline to receive TA appeals is two weeks before the official start of the semester. After that, no appeals will be considered. Appointments for students granted a TA position after such appeal will be for one semester only.
3. 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. Exceptions to this rule must be approved by the Dean of the College.
4. 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 Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. 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.

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

In general, MS students will receive up to four regular (Fall and Spring) semesters of TA support, while PhD students will receive up to ten regular semesters of support. Summer TA positions do not count against these quotas. If a department wishes to hire a student as a TA beyond these limits, a letter requesting the extension should be addressed to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, detailing the student's progress towards graduation and/or any specialized teaching needs the student might fulfill.

III.D. Academic Continuity Plan

Critical Function: Continuity of Learning

| TABLE I. PLAN DETAILS | |
|--|---|
| DESCRIPTION | Continuing delivery of teaching/learning functions of the college. This function may be suspended temporarily but is time- dependent and should resume in some manner as soon as possible. In the event of long-term campus closure, online and off-site delivery of teaching is possible. |
| WHO PERFORMS THIS? | The three academic units within the College of Science: Department of Life Science (LSCI), Department of Mathematics & Statistics (MATH) and Department of Physical & Environmental Sciences (PENS). |
| RESPONSIBLE PERSONS? | <p>College of S: College Dean; Associate Dean for Research; Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs</p> <p>LSCI: Department Chair</p> <p>MATH: Department Chair</p> <p>PENS: Department Chair</p> <p>General: Senior Academic Advisors (for Undergraduates and Graduates); College IT Manager; Dean’s Office Manager; Business Manager); College Operations Supervisor</p> |
| 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) |
| DOWNSTREAM DEPENDENCIES | Center for Coastal Studies, Center for Water Supply Studies, Laguna Madre Field Station, Conrad Blucher Institute, Harter Research Institute; Departments of LSCI, MATH, and PENS |
| POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCIES IF THIS FUNCTION IS NOT CONTINUED OR | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disruption of teaching - Our faculty are prepared to switch to online teaching however power outages, evacuation, property loss and other unforeseen circumstances affecting students or faculty may forbid the continuation of teaching in online setting - Disruption of research – students assist with research. Students |

College of Science

- going elsewhere for classes would have an impact on research
- Departure of faculty – in majority of the cases, the courses can be taught by other faculty in the department until the position gets filled.
 - Departure of staff – usually, the departing staff's responsibilities can be reassigned to other staff members in the unit.

College of Science

| | |
|--|--|
| RECOVERED QUICKLY ENOUGH | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Departure of students – student might be forced to withdrawn from the university due to lack of resources needed to successfully complete the courses - Loss of revenue – departure of the students may lead to loss of revenue - Impact on other units – disruption of teaching may lead to impact on the successful completion of the courses and timely progression as many courses offered are the core courses impacting students from all colleges - Impact on important business partners – disruption of teaching may impact disruption of shadowing, internships opportunities at local industries |
| 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. |

College of Science

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| ADDITIONAL VULNERABILITIES | Unknown |
| 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 |

College of Science

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| | granting “incomplete” grades to enrolled students and rescheduling for the completion of the courses. |
| ACTION ITEMS | See TABLE III |

TABLE II. DOCUMENTS LIST

| | |
|---|---|
| COURSE GRADEBOOKS, DOCUMENTS AND SPREADSHEETS-BLACKBOARD | <p>Description: Each instructor's personal log of student performance and evaluation.</p> <p>Owner: Individual faculty members through BlackBoard</p> <p>Physical Location: Blackboard cloud server</p> <p>Medium: Electronic</p> <p>Principal contact Person(s): IT Department</p> <p>Backup Measures: Off-site server maintained through BlackBoard</p> |
| COURSE GRADEBOOKS, DOCUMENTS AND SPREADSHEETS-PERSONAL | <p>Description: Each instructor's personal log of student. Usually in the form of computer spreadsheets but may also be paper or a combination of both performance and evaluation.</p> <p>Owner: Individual faculty members</p> <p>Physical Location: Faculty members' file or computers</p> <p>Medium: More than one</p> <p>Principal contact Person(s): IT Department</p> <p>Backup Measures: Varies according to medium. Backup is part of the individual's personal emergency plan.</p> |
| INVENTORY: TEACHING EQUIPMENT | <p>Description: Inventory of routine and specialized equipment used in teaching laboratories.</p> <p>Owner: Academic Departments: LSCI, MATH, PENS.</p> <p>Physical Location: Computers of Teaching Laboratory Coordinators and IT personnel; University Secure i-drive</p> <p>Medium: Electronic</p> <p>Principal Contact Persons: MATH: College IT Personnel LSCI & PENS: Laboratory Coordinators</p> |
| PERSONNEL FILES: FACULTY PORTFOLIOS DURING REVIEW | <p>Description: Repository of portfolios for faculty who are being reviewed for Pre-Tenure (3rd-Year) Review, Promotion and Tenure and Post-Tenure Review.</p> <p>Owner: College of Science</p> <p>Physical Location: CI-372, University Cloud Storage, Laserfiche</p> <p>Medium: Paper and Electronic</p> <p>Principal Contact Person(s): Dean's Office Manager</p> |

College of Science

| | |
|---|--|
| PERSONNEL FILES: ACTIVITY PLANS/REPORTS DURING ANNUAL REVIEW | <p>Description: Faculty and Staff activity plans, curriculum vitae and activity reports during annual review period.</p> <p>Owner: College of Science</p> <p>Physical Location: CI-372</p> <p>Medium: Paper</p> <p>Principal Contact Person(s): Dean, Associate Dean, Office Manager, Senior Administrative Assistant</p> <p>Backup Measures: Department chairs and Dean’s summaries of annual reviews, Digital Measures (faculty activity report), I:drive and WorkDay (staff annual review)</p> |
| PROGRAM ACCREDITATION DOCUMENTS | <p>Description: Documentation of accreditation for appropriate programs:</p> <p>Owner: College of Science</p> <p>Physical Location: ABET: ABET Coordinator’s computer and files; I-drive NAACLS: NACCLS Program Coordinator’s computer and files; I-drive; Other programs: Associate Dean’s computer and files; I-drive; All Programs: Academic & Administrative Compliance Officer (Provost’s Office)</p> <p>Medium: more than one</p> <p>Principal Contact Person(s): Associate Dean for Academics, Program Coordinators, Academic & Administrative Compliance Officer (Provost’s Office)</p> <p>Backup Measures: Stored on computers, external hard drives and i-drive; Cloud storage</p> |
| STUDENT FILES – ACTIVE ADVISING | <p>Description: Files used by the Science Academic Advisors when dealing with current students.</p> <p>Owner: College of Science Physical Location: ST Advising Folder on i-Drive Medium: Electronic</p> <p>Principal Contact Person(s): Senior Academic Advisors</p> <p>Backup Measures: Degree Works, and Registrar for most items; Hard copies of some items are kept in advisors' offices (CI-350 Suite)</p> |
| STUDENT FILES – GRADUATED AND INACTIVE | <p>Description: Archival files for students not currently being advised.</p> <p>Owner: College of Science</p> <p>Physical Location: ST Advising Folder on i-Drive</p> <p>Medium: Electronic</p> <p>Principal Contact Person(s): Office Manager & Senior Administrative Assistant</p> <p>Backup Measures: Degree Works and Registrar are backups for most items; Hard copies of some items are kept in student folders in CI-373.</p> |
| TEACHING ASSISTANTSHIP SPREADSHEET | <p>Description: List of current and continuing TAs Owner: College of Science</p> <p>Physical Location: shared folder in the I:drive</p> <p>Medium: Electronic</p> <p>Principal Contact Person(s): Senior Administrative Assistant</p> |

| 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: Associate Dean for Research, College IT Manager, DELA, IT Description: "Teaching" has been identified as a Critical Function of the College of Science 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: DELA (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.) |

III.E. 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 fulltime faculty without research expectations are given priority in making summer teaching assignments for lower-level undergraduate courses appropriate to their expertise. Faculty expertise in an area will be the primary consideration for assignment of needed upper level and graduate courses.

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

1. 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.
2. At this time chairs will query the 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.
3. 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.
4. 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 faculty research expectations, 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.

IV.A. Abandoned Property Report Process

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 administration office 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*.

IV.B. Facilities & Administrative Costs Distribution Policy

This college policy expands on university Procedure 15.01.05.C0.01, Facilities and Administrative Costs of Extramural Projects. The college policy is identical to the university policy, with the following additions:

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.

PI or PIs salaried by the 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.

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:

College of Science

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. For example, PI-A (COS) = 40% effort, PI-B (HRI) = 40% effort, PI-C (Academic Affairs) = 20% effort. Following that agreement, the other 50% of IDC would then be distributed to college(s), center/institutes, and/or unit/divisions per PI effort. In the example given COS would receive 20% of the total IDC, HRI also 20% IDC and Academic Affairs would receive 10% of the total 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.

IV.D. Faculty Personnel Files

Faculty personnel files are maintained in both the Office of the Provost (originals) and the Office of the Science 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 Science 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 curriculum vitae (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.** 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 Science Dean and that the academic record housed in Digital Measures is current.

Faculty personnel files kept in the Office of the Science 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.
- 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 mid-term review, and tenure and promotion decisions
- 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

IV.E. Faculty Travel Guidelines

The College of Science 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 clear export control and be approved by the president and should be submitted to reach the Office of the Provost 30 days prior to the start date. To ensure this, all international travel requests should reach the Dean's office 60 days prior to travel. Within 60 days will need to provide justification of late request.
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 travel expenditures exceed approved amounts on travel requests and/or GSA rates, faculty member is responsible for the excess amount.
7. Expense reports must be submitted according to the approved.

Appendix A: College of Science Committees and Councils

- **College of Science 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 Life Sciences, Mathematics and Statistics, and Physical and Environmental 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 Science 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 academic affairs.

- **College of Science 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 Science 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.

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 Science 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 one faculty representing each PhD program in the college. All faculty members of the PhD programs are eligible to serve on the committee.

Selection: Nominated by the department chairs with approval 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 Science 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 Science Library Liaisons**

Purpose or Function: Although not a committee per se, these liaisons work with the Bell Library Acquisitions Department and with faculty of individual programs to coordinate acquisitions requests for books and media from annual budget allocations, also on university library de-acquisition efforts. **Membership:** The committee consists of one representative for each academic program. One person may serve as a liaison for multiple academic programs.

Selection: Appointed by the chair of the department in which a program is administered.

College of Science

Terms of Service: One year.

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

Chair: Not applicable

- **College of Science Emeritus Committee** including at least one emeritus scholar if possible
Purpose or Function: Evaluates faculty applications for emeritus status and makes recommendations to the dean.
Membership: The committee consists of senior faculty members from each department and two dean's appointees. Department chairs and associate deans shall not serve on the committee.
Selection: Appointed by the chair of the department; the dean appoints two additional committee members
Terms of Service: Three years
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 Science 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 Science rule must be filed with the associate vice president for planning and institutional effectiveness.
Membership: The committee consists of four members. Two members of this committee also serve as Science 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.
Terms of Service: Two 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 Science Teaching Assistant Assignment Committee**
Purpose or Function: The committee oversees assignment of graduate students to fill Teaching Assistant (TA) positions. A committee member works with faculty in his or her department to determine TA needs and assign students to meet these needs. The chair of the committee prepares letters of appointment for M.S. and Ph.D. students who are awarded TA positions. These letters are sent to the Dean's Office for review and signature, and then to students.
Membership: The committee consists of six members. Five members are representatives from the departments, and the chair of the committee is the sixth member. All full-time faculty who has teaching duties are eligible to serve on the committee.
Selection: The appropriate chair appoints one member to represent each department. The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs serves as chair.
Terms of Service: For representatives – two (2) years, staggered terms; for chair – the term of

service as Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.

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

Chair: Assumes this duty upon appointment by the Dean.

- **College of Science Grade Appeal Committee**

Purpose or Function: The committee advises the associate dean in determining the facts of grade appeal cases and attempt to reach a fair and appropriate resolution to the complaints.

Membership: The appointment of CGAC membership is left to the Departments 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: Appointed by the department chair

Terms of Service: One year.

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

Chair: Associate dean for academic affairs.

- **College of Science 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 five tenured (full) professors. Department chairs and associate deans 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 Science Post-Tenure Review Committee**

Purpose or Function: Evaluates faculty applications for promotion and tenure and makes recommendations to the dean.

Membership: The committee consists of five tenured full professors. Department chairs and associate deans 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—one year; for dean’s appointee—two years.

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 Science Ad Hoc Committees**

Ad hoc committees are appointed from time to time by the dean, the chairs/director’s 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.

Appendix B: Faculty Annual Evaluation Templates
(Updated, April 2014)

College of Science Annual Evaluation Templates: Form 1

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------------|
| Annual Evaluation College of Science Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi | | |
| Name: _____ | Date: _____ | |
| Academic Rank: _____ | Date of Employment: _____ | |
| Department: _____ | Evaluator: _____ | |
| Period of Review: _____ | | |
| Effort Allocation | % | Evaluation* |
| Teaching | _____ | _____ |
| Research | _____ | _____ |
| Service | _____ | _____ |
| * 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Standard, 3 - High, 4 - Excellent | | _____ |
| Overall | | |
| Comments: | | |
| | | |
| Recommendations: | | |
| | | |
| Acknowledgement of Evaluation | | |
| | | |
| _____ (FACULTY NAME) (Signature does not signify agreement, only that you have read this evaluation) | _____ Evaluator | |
| | Title _____ | |

Signature Date

Signature Date

Appendix C: Faculty Teaching Peer-reviewed Assessment Template¹
(Updated, September 21, 2018)

This form is a COS 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 with 2 columns: Time/Date, Description

College of Science

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 1) | The instructional strategies and activities respected students' prior knowledge and the preconceptions inherent therein. <i>(Teacher has attitude of curiosity while actively soliciting student ideas that connect subject matter and students everyday experiences.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 2) | The lesson was designed to engage students as members of a learning community. <i>(Students actively participate and are integrated as a group as knowledge is share and discussed by both instructor and student.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 3) | In this lesson, student exploration preceded formal presentation. <i>(Students are given a chance to discuss and explore simple, more concrete experience before building complex, more abstract knowledge.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 4) | This lesson encouraged students to seek and value alternative modes of investigation or of problem solving. <i>(Instructor solicits a variety of approaches to solving a problem and understands there may be more than one way to solve a problem.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |

I. CONTENT

Propositional Knowledge

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 5) | The lesson involved fundamental concepts of the subject. <i>(Significant scientific or mathematical ideas are at the heart of the lesson and are included as foundational or fundamental concepts.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 6) | The lesson promoted strongly coherent conceptual understanding. <i>(The lesson connected concepts in a way that that was meaningful and connected to other relevant concepts.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |

College of Science

| | | | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 7) | The teacher had a solid grasp of the subject matter content inherent in the lesson. <i>(College level content knowledge was apparent. When students had vague ideas, instructor was able to sense potential significance of those ideas when evaluating them.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| Faculty Handbook | | | | | |
| 8) | Elements of abstraction (i.e., symbolic representations, theory building) were encouraged when it was important to do so. <i>(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.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 9) | Connections with other content disciplines and/or real world phenomena were explored and valued. <i>(Connecting Science and math across the disciplines with real world applications tends to make it more coherent.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |

Procedural Knowledge

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 10) | Students used a variety of means (models, drawings, graphs, concrete materials, manipulatives, etc.) to represent phenomena. <i>(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.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 11) | Students made predictions, estimations and/or hypotheses and devised means for testing them. <i>(Students explicitly state what they think is going to happen before collecting data.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 12) | Students were actively engaged in thought-provoking activity that often involved the critical assessment of procedures. <i>(Students were actively thinking about how what they were doing could clarify the next steps in their investigation; hands-on AND minds-on.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 13) | Intellectual rigor, constructive criticism, and the challenging of ideas were valued. <i>(Engaging in rigorous debate is encouraged as long as proposals include evidence and do not exclude alternative arguments.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |

IV. CLASSROOM CULTURE

Communicative Interactions

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 14) | Students were involved in the communication of their ideas to others using a variety of means and media. <i>(Brainstorming presentations, critiquing, listening, making videos, group work, etc.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 15) | The teacher's questions triggered divergent modes of thinking. <i>(Higher order thinking questions are posited that may have more than one correct answer, more than one valid interpretation, etc.).</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 16) | There was some student talk between and among students. <i>(Instructor is not doing all the talking; student discussion was encouraged, and lesson included discourse between/among students.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
|-----|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 17) | Student questions and comments often determined the focus and direction of classroom discourse. <i>(Flow of lesson often influenced by student discourse as students sustained and enhanced the lesson with discussion.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
|-----|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 18) | There was a climate of respect for what others had to say. <i>(Classroom members are encouraged to present ideas and express opinions without fear of censure or ridicule.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
|-----|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|

Student/Teacher Relationships

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 19) | Active participation of students was encouraged and valued. <i>(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.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
|-----|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|

College of Science

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 20) | Students were encouraged to generate conjectures, alternative solution strategies, and ways of interpreting evidence. <i>(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.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 21) | In general, the instructor was patient with students. <i>(Unanticipated behavior can lead to new learning opportunities; instructor gives a chance for things to progress; wait time is sufficient.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 22) | The instructor acted as a resource person, working to support and enhance student investigations. <i>(Instructor is a facilitator as student initiative brings different ideas. Instructor support guides learning, does not dictate student thinking.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |
| 23) | The metaphor "teacher as listener" was very characteristic of this classroom. <i>(Instructor helps students use what they know to construct further understandings that are reached by actively listening to what students are saying.)</i> | Often (3) | Occasionally (2) | Never (1) | NA 0 |

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

Appendix D: Promotion and Tenure Documentation

Candidate should review the College of Science 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.

Guidelines that restrict quantity of supporting materials will be provided by the Dean's Office at the beginning of the process. Sections below may be omitted if they are not part of the job responsibility of the candidate.

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, dean, and provost along with student course evaluations 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. 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.

College of Science

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)

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 .

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 the page limit rule, 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.

The details regarding the final format of the portfolio and its submission will be provided to all candidates by the Dean's Office at the beginning of the process.

Appendix E: Department and College Committee Response Forms

P&T Department Committee Outcome

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 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 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

College of Science

P&T College Committee Outcome

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 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 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Appendix F: Supplementary Departmental P&T Criteria and Standards

Department of Life Sciences Supplementary P&T Criteria and Standards (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

College of Science

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

College of Science

probationary period; 4) a description of modification 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

College of Science

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.

College of Science

Department of Mathematics and Statistics Supplementary P&T Criteria and Standards (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 proceeding, 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.
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, 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.
 - 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 port- folio 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., pro- motion 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 un- acceptable. 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.

Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences Supplementary P&T Criteria and Standards (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 persons in PENS, those faculty primarily supporting undergraduate programs, graduate faculty primarily supporting Master of Science programs (master's 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

College of Science

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 under-graduate faculty, as the traditionally shorter periods of time devoted to undergraduate research projects are more conducive to presentations than full-length publications. Collaborative author-ship 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,

College of Science

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

College of Science

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.

Student Internship Report Template (Appendix G)

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:

Grade Appeal Forms (Appendix H)

Academic Affairs Student Grade Appeal Form

Student Name: _____ Banner ID: A# _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____

Email Address: _____

Phone Number: _____

Grade to be appealed:

Academic Year: _____ Instructor: _____

Course Dept: _____ Course#: _____ Semester: _____

Course Title: _____

Grade Received: _____ Grade Requested: _____

Required information to be completed by student:

I initially discussed this grade with my instructor on: _____

Materials to be submitted in support of this grade appeal include:

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Course syllabus |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Attendance policy (if not included in syllabus and relevant to course grade) Grading policy (if not included in syllabus) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Graded course materials (optional) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (Please explain) _____ |

Student's statement of action requested and reason(s) for requested change of grade. (Attach your statement to this form. Statement **MUST** demonstrate the reason the grade is arbitrary, prejudiced, or inappropriate in view of the standards and procedures outlined in the class syllabus.)

Student's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Note: Upon completion, make a copy for your records, then submit this form to the Department Chair to initiate the appeal process.

College of Science

**Academic Affairs
Department Chair Grade Appeal Response Form**

Student Name: _____ Banner ID: A# _____

Faculty member who assigned the grade: _____

Academic Year: _____ Semester: _____

Course Dept: _____ Course#: _____

Course Title: _____

Date chair received appeal: _____

Date chair met with student on appeal: _____

Date chair met with instructor on appeal: _____

Decision and Rationale of Department Chair:

Department Chair: _____ Date: _____

Note: Upon completion, make a copy for the college, then provide this form to the student to determine if continuation of the appeal process will occur.

College of Science

**Academic Affairs
Department Chair Grade Appeal Response Form**

Student's Response to Chair's Decision:

I *accept* the Chair's decision

Student's Signature

Date

(If accepted, file this form along with the previous forms on file in the college.)

I *do not accept* the Chair's decision and request to continue the appeal process.

Student's Signature

Date

(If a student does not accept the Chair's decision these materials will be forwarded to the Associate Dean's Office to continue the appeal process.)

~~~~~  
**Faculty Member's Response to Chair's Decision:**

I *accept* the Chair's decision

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Member's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**(If accepted, file this form along with the previous forms on file in the college.)**

I *do not accept* the Chair's decision and request to continue the appeal process.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Member's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Academic Affairs  
Student Grade Appeal Record

---

College Grade Appeal Committee's Report

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

College: \_\_\_\_\_

Names of committee members (type):

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Member (Chair)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Student Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Student Member

Recommendation of College Grade Appeal Committee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Recorded and Submitted

## College of Science

---

### Academic Affairs Associate Dean/Dean Grade Appeal Response Form

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Banner ID: A# \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty member who assigned the grade: \_\_\_\_\_

Academic Year : \_\_\_\_\_ Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Dept: \_\_\_\_\_ Course#: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Associate Dean/Dean received College Grade Appeal Committee's report: \_\_\_\_\_

Decision and Rationale of Associate Dean/Dean:

Associate Dean/Dean: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Note: This decision is final and must be provided to the student and faculty member.**