

College Structure

The College of Science and Engineering (S&E) consists of the Department of Life Sciences, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences and the School Engineering and Computing Sciences. Each department is headed by a chair and the school is headed by a director. In this document, the term “department” includes the “School” of Engineering and Computing Sciences and the term “chair” includes the “Director” of Engineering and Computing Sciences unless specified otherwise.

Committees

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

Faculty Meetings

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

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

Role and Responsibilities of the Dean

Role

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

Responsibilities

The specific responsibilities of the dean include the following:

1. Promotes an understanding, both internally and externally, of the college, its purposes, and objectives.
2. Serves as a voting member of the Deans' Council, and any other bodies as designated by university policy.
3. Administers all personnel matters related to the college, including: recommendations for initial appointments, promotions, retention, tenure, salary and compensations for faculty; appointment, assignment, and compensation of part-time and adjunct faculty; and the appointment, assignment and compensation of non-academic personnel.
4. Approves teaching loads, teaching schedules, academic advisory responsibilities, special assignments that may impact on faculty's instructional responsibilities, and requests to participate in outside activities.
5. Promotes faculty development activities and encourages faculty concern for teaching and scholarship.
6. Oversees a program for the orientation of new faculty.
7. Conducts an annual evaluation of those programs and personnel directly responsible to the college.
8. Presides and conducts college-level faculty meetings.
9. Supervises curricular and course planning, including the planning and promoting of improvements within the curricula of the college, development of new undergraduate and graduate programs, the compilation of the descriptions of courses and programs, the preparation and approval of catalog statements on general and specific requirements, the maintenance of the standards of instruction, and the compilation of information for accreditation.
10. Approves the college's schedule of classes each semester.
11. Administers the annual budget approved for the college.
12. Administers the utilization of space and equipment assigned to the college.
13. Maintains an official record of syllabi for all courses in the college.

14. Administers policies and procedures established by the university and college relative to established academic and administrative committees.
15. Participates in those professional activities and ceremonial functions consistent with the Office of the S&E Dean.
16. Provides data required for institutional research purposes and promotes those research efforts related to academic matters.
17. Approves all publications related directly and solely to college policies and programs.
18. Appoints and supervises the associate dean(s) and the chairs of the academic departments and research units of the college.
19. Provides budgetary control and administrative supervision of the Center for Coastal Studies, the Center for Water Supply Studies, the Conrad Blucher Institute for Surveying and Science, Office for Information Assurance, Statistics, and Quality Control, and other such units as may be created in the college. Approves all letters of agreement/contracts of the above units.
20. Performs other responsibilities as directed by the provost/vice president for academic affairs.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Associate Deans

Role

The associate deans of the College of S&E are 1/2-time administrative positions as defined in University Statement 31.99.99.C2.01. The college has two associate deans, the associate dean for academic affairs and the associate dean for research/director of the School of Engineering and Computing Sciences.

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

Responsibilities

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

1. To manage overall operation of the college student records office including supervision of the college academic advisors and other college office staff;
2. To coordinate academic advising of students enrolled in the college and the handling of student requests for exemptions to the academic standards and rules;
3. To organize and coordinate the college registration process and semester class schedules;
4. To maintain the college-level computerized management information systems and to provide reports and analysis as requested by the dean and department chairs;
5. To undertake other duties as assigned by the dean.

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

1. To provide leadership in the development of the School of Engineering and Computing Sciences
2. To serve as an advocate for the school in the community, with industry, and with other academic and government institutions
3. To oversee and manage course scheduling, budgets, outreach, program assessments and accreditations for the school,
4. To make recommendations to the dean on the hiring, tenure and promotion of faculty and the hiring and promotion of staff in the school
5. To assist the dean in the development of research in the College of S&E
6. To undertake other duties as assigned by the dean.

Faculty Recruitment and Selection Process

The college adheres to A&M-Corpus Christi Faculty Handbook, Section 2.4.2 on equal employment opportunity and affirmative action programs and A&M-Corpus Christi Faculty Handbook, Section 2.4.4 on nepotism (The Texas A&M University System Policy 33.03).

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

1. Identify need

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

- A. Course requirements: Additional courses required to meet student demand, to maintain reasonable class sizes, to satisfy other program, department and college needs.
- B. Accreditation needs: Courses or academic areas required to satisfy accreditation.
- C. Academic improvements: Coverage of areas to improve or broaden academic offerings and research strengths.

2. Acquire approval

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

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

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

The search committee has the following responsibilities:

- A. The search committee chair will attend a briefing and/or update with the Employee Relations/Equal Employment Opportunity (ER/EEO) Office prior to commencing the search

process to discuss administrative procedures, equal opportunity guidelines and diversity initiatives.

- B. Members of the search committee will review the A&M-Corpus Christi Faculty Search and Selection Handbook available from the ER/EEO Office.
- C. The search committee will prepare the position description and announcement, including fields of expertise, required and/or preferred credentials and experience, rank, type of appointment, any special duties required in the position, required application materials, application deadline, and submission address. The position description and announcement must be approved by the chair, the dean, ER/EEO director, and provost before the position is advertised.
- D. Search committee chair completes and submits the faculty position requisition form, along with the advertisement/announcement, via the faculty online search process to the department chair, who reviews and forwards to the dean, and the provost for approval.
- E. With approval from the department chair and dean, determine where and how the position shall be advertised. Normally, the position announcement should be sent to the appropriate disciplinary placement service publications, and to disciplinary online posting resources. A copy of the position advertisement should be sent to the Office of Human Resources for posting on or linking to its website and to the Office of the S&E Dean to be posted on the college website.
- F. Ensure that minutes are taken of all search committee meetings documenting decisions, and reasons for selecting or not selecting candidates.
- G. Develop in writing the criteria to be used in evaluating applicants for the position. These criteria must be consistent with the job description and must be approved before applications are reviewed.
- H. Develop a timetable for the screening process.
- I. Screen all applicants. The search committee members receive candidate's letters of application and documents via the Islanderjobs.tamucc.edu online process.
- J. Proceed with preliminary telephone interviews of a subset of applicants who appear to be best qualified. As part of the preliminary interview process, the committee shall determine if the applicant's oral proficiency in English is appropriate to the appointment.
- K. Validate credentials of the candidates still considered for the position following the remote interviews including verifying previous experience, current ability to work in the United States and securing official transcripts.
- L. Recommend to the chair which applicant(s) should be invited to campus for interview. Recommendations are then submitted to the dean for approval. The files, including letters

of recommendation, of the finalist(s) are forwarded to the dean along with the committee's recommendation.

- M. Organize and conduct the campus interview. The campus interview should include opportunities for the applicant to meet members of the faculty, students, the chair, the dean, the vice president for research, commercialization and outreach, the program coordinator(s), and the provost or their designees, all depending upon availability. The campus interview should also include a scholarly presentation by the applicant to a faculty and student audience, which should be advertised through the college listserv.
- N. The committee will request candidate evaluations from all members of the program faculty and students. Following discussion and consideration of faculty and student evaluations, the committee will submit a recommendation to the department chair and state the reasons for the recommendation. The department chair will submit the committee's recommendation and his or her evaluation and recommendation to the dean for approval.
- O. Document the search properly in accordance with ER/EEO employment guidelines on forms provided by the Office of the S&E Dean.
- P. Notify those applicants interviewed by telephone or in person who are no longer under consideration. The letter must be composed in consultation with the department chair and dean and based upon a template provided by the Office of the S&E Dean. The search committee chair will also ensure that the Office of Human Resources electronically notifies candidates not interviewed by telephone or interviewed on campus.

3. Negotiate an Offer

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

4. Make an Offer

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

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

Process for Recruiting and Appointing Part-Time, Adjunct and/or Temporary 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 basis. Applications sent to the college or university

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

All part-time, adjunct and temporary faculty must provide original transcripts of all college and university work and a current curriculum vitae (C.V.). Qualifications are verified through telephone or personal interviews and transcripts. A personnel file is maintained in both the Office of the S&E Dean and the Office of the Provost. Faculty members must complete all required Human Resources forms. *There are no exceptions to this policy.*

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 the University Statement 12.01.99.C1.03. These items include the following:

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

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

Faculty Personnel Files

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

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

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

New Faculty Orientation

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

Outside Employment Policy

The college adheres to The 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 the Human Resources website: <http://falcon.tamucc.edu/~hrweb/forms/employment.html>). *Full-time faculty must receive explicit permission from the dean to teach simultaneously at any other institution.*

Student Access

Each faculty member should post office hours on his/her office door at the beginning of the term and diligently maintain those hours. Faculty must schedule a minimum of five office hours weekly scheduled over at least three days for each term in which you are teaching. In addition, you must have a statement in your syllabi and attached to the posting on your doors that additional times are available by appointment. Faculty members are expected to be available for students during office hours and other times to reasonably accommodate students.

All part-time/adjunct faculty members shall make themselves available for students at some time other than class hours. Office hours will be determined in consultation with the department chair. These 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 within the College.

Student Grade Appeal Process

The College of Science and Engineering (S&E) follows the student grade appeals procedure described in the Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Handbook of Rules and Procedures

(http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/Rules_Procedures/), Procedure 13.02.99.C2.01. The procedures for student grade appeals in courses in the College of Science and Engineering are described in Appendix I of this handbook.

Attendance at University Commencement

The college adheres to the university's policy outlined in A&M-Corpus Christi Faculty Handbook, Section 2.5.3. Faculty members are encouraged to attend commencement ceremonies to demonstrate support for the graduates and their families.

At the beginning of the fall semester, the Office of the S&E Dean will request a list of the faculty who will be attending graduation ceremonies at the end of the fall and spring semesters. All faculty are required to attend either the Fall or Spring Commencement. All faculty who teach in the second summer session will attend the Summer Commencement. The Office of the S&E Dean distributes a memo several weeks before Commencement informing faculty of the time, location, parking and other relevant information regarding the upcoming ceremony. Any absences must be excused by the respective chair and the dean in advance.

Summer Teaching Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Faculty Absences

When classes must be missed for professional or personal reasons, faculty should make appropriate arrangements to assure minimum disruption of course activities. Scheduling examinations and arranging for acceptable examination monitors is an example of an appropriate arrangement. In other circumstances recorded lectures, online assignments, or guest lectures by colleagues or external experts may be appropriate. Research activity consistent with the course provides another option.

For planned absences, the faculty member must provide the department chair with a list of the classes to be missed, arrangements made for coverage of classes, and information on how the individual may be reached during his/her absence. This document must be completed, approved and signed by the department chair in advance of the absence.

In the event of an unforeseen absence, the department chair and/or the dean may intervene on the faculty person's behalf.

Travel Guidelines

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

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

the president and should be submitted to reach the Office of the Provost 30 days prior to the start date.

2. No travel will occur without the appropriate documentation and paperwork being completed and approved. Travel requests must be submitted according to the approved university processes.
3. Faculty traveling out of town for field trips related to teaching must also complete a form detailing the planned travel; this also documents the business purpose of their travel for insurance purposes.
4. Whenever possible, grant and contract funds should be expended to support professional travel.
5. Travel expenditures must conform to university, system and state policies.
6. If expenditures exceed approved amounts, the excess money is the faculty member's responsibility.
7. Expense reports must be submitted according to the approved university processes.

Recommendations for Graduate Faculty Status *(Section Revised and Adopted 1 March 2015)*

Recommendation of designation of graduate faculty status shall follow University Procedure 12.99.99.C3.01.

Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

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

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

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

Persons Other Than Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

Appropriately qualified individuals who are not tenure-track university faculty may be appointed to graduate faculty status to co-direct, train, and advise graduate students and/or teach graduate courses. Such graduate faculty appointments are made in one of three categories: associate members, adjunct members or special appointments. Eligibility and privileges of these appointments are described in University Procedure 12.99.99.C3.01. The nomination and review process for these appointments bypasses the departmental graduate faculty and begins with the department chair, school director or program coordinator, but otherwise it follows the procedures described for tenure-track faculty in the preceding paragraphs.

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

College Promotion and Tenure Process

Promotion of Faculty

Section 2.2.6 of the A&M-Corpus Christi Faculty Handbook and University Policy 12.01.99.C1.01 provide faculty rank descriptors. These sections further indicate 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 A&M-Corpus Christi Faculty Handbook, Section 2.2.1 and University Policy 12.01.99.C1.05—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 of the education and experience standards for a given rank are met as specified in A&M-Corpus Christi Faculty Handbook, Section 2.2.1 and University Procedure 12.01.99.C1.05.

Tenure of Faculty

Tenure is defined in University Rule 12.01.99.C2 and in Section 2.2.2 of the A&M-Corpus Christi Faculty Handbook.

As defined by university policy, beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time assistant professor or a higher rank, the tenure probationary period for a tenure track faculty member will not exceed seven years of full-time service at A&M-Corpus Christi. Up to three years of service 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. Normally a faculty member is considered for tenure during the sixth year in service in a tenure track position at the university. Faculty members who believe their teaching, scholarship and service record merits early tenure may apply during the fifth year of service at the university, but early approval is an extraordinary request that requires extraordinary qualifications. If early tenure is denied the faculty member's contract will be terminated after one additional academic year of employment. A faculty member may withdraw an application for tenure prior to review by the dean in which case the portfolio will be returned to the faculty member and the process stopped. Criteria considered for promotion relating to teaching, scholarship, and service are also the standards used in tenure evaluations.

Procedures for Initiating Promotion and/or Tenure

Before the end of the spring semester prior to the tenure review, the dean shall notify promotion and tenure candidates of their status as candidates and of the deadline for the submission of their dossiers to the Office of the S&E Dean. Faculty at the associate professor rank shall be notified the initial year of their eligibility for promotion based upon time of service. This notification is simply informational, will be given to all of sufficient time in rank, and should not be regarded as support for an application. The Office of the S&E Dean verifies that each faculty member on the promotion/tenure list satisfies the university standards for education, experience, and length of service. The dean will present a list of candidates to the College of Science and Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the promotion and tenure committee in each department by **June 10th**.

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

Department Promotion and Tenure Committees

A promotion and tenure committee consisting of all tenured faculty, excluding the department chair is established by the chair in each department in the College of S&E to evaluate tenure applications. To evaluate applications for promotion only, committee membership will consist of all tenured faculty at or above the rank to which promotion is being requested. The constitution of the committee membership will therefore vary with the rank being sought by the candidates.

The role of this committee is to make recommendations to the department chair, and to the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E. The vote shall be in closed ballot, counted, and reported at the time when the vote is taken. A positive response from the committee as reported on the first form in Appendix A of this handbook is based on a positive vote of the majority of the committee. Explanatory text should also be provided. Otherwise, the second form provided in Appendix A is used. If a true conflict of interest (such as spousal or partner relationships) arises as determined by the chair or the dean, that member should not serve on the committee for the year in 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 chair will solicit nominations by the department of other faculty within the college at the appropriate rank. Additional tenured faculty members will be nominated by the department committee members; the dean may make the appointment(s) or seek alternative nominations. Any faculty member on post-tenure review status is excluded from serving.

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

External Review

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

A minimum of four, but no more than six, external review letters will be included in the candidate's portfolio. External reviewers will be selected by the department promotion and tenure committee, department chair and dean, with half coming from a list nominated by the candidate and half from a list of reviewers nominated by the department promotion and tenure committee, the department chair, and the dean. At most two of the external review letters considered in the promotion and/or tenure review will be from the candidate's list. The candidate may submit a list of unacceptable reviewers. The faculty candidate will submit a C.V., three publications, and five suggested external reviewers to the chair of his/her department promotion and tenure committee by **June 15th**. Outside 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 reviewers by **June 20th**.

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

Outside reviewers will be asked to specifically comment on the candidate's scholarly work and the significance of the contributions to the discipline. The department chair in consultation with the Committee chair and the candidate will prepare a cover letter addressing the review criteria and the candidate's working environment. The chair of the department promotion and tenure Committee will prepare a list of the external reviewers identifying their positions, home institutions, qualifications relevant to the review, a summary of positive and negative comments and their recommendations on tenure and promotion. The summary and all outside review letters received from accepted reviewers will be advanced with the portfolio. Letters are treated as confidential and shall not be shared with the candidate. The candidate will be provided with a redacted summary of the external review without identifying individuals. The summary will be drafted by the committee chair and approved by the department chair. All external review letters and reviewer identifiers will be removed from the portfolio before it is returned to the candidate at the end of the process.

Response of the department promotion and tenure committee

The department promotion and tenure committee shall provide a written report to the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E through the department chair expressing the recommendation of the committee. The report shall contain the rationale used for reaching its recommendation. The format for this report is found in Appendix A. Committee members must vote positively or negatively; abstentions will be recorded as negative votes by the committee chair. The report shall be signed by each member of the committee and shall be sent to the department chair by **September 30th**.

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 Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E and the dean, and provide a separate evaluation of the candidate to the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E and the dean. The chair shall submit recommendations and meet with the candidate and review the department promotion and tenure committee and the chair's recommendations by **October 15th**.

Response of the Candidate

The candidate will submit a response to the Department Tenure Review Committee and department chair's recommendations. Such response shall indicate concurrence with the recommendations or non-concurrence, but shall be no more than two pages in length. Responses must be submitted to the department chair within two business days of the meeting with the department chair and will be included in the portfolio. The department chair's recommendation, the Department Tenure Review Committee's recommendation, and the candidate's response shall be added to the portfolio and forwarded to the dean and the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E.

Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Engineering

A promotion and tenure committee is established in the College of S&E. The role of the committee is to make recommendations to the dean of the college 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E. This elected faculty member cannot serve consecutive terms unless there are fewer than three eligible faculty members in the department. College administrators at the level of department chair and above shall not serve on the committee. After the election, the dean may appoint one person per department for purposes of equity, diversity, and representation to serve a two-year term on the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E subject to the same requirements and conditions as elected members. Committee members will assume their duties **September 1st** of the year in which they are elected.

After the promotion and tenure committee of the department and the department chair have made their recommendations, the dean (or designee) shall call a meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E. At this meeting, the 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 an independent body, the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E should follow each individual department's guidelines and take into account each department's promotion and tenure committee recommen-

dations for discipline-specific criteria such as evidence of research productivity including the number and type of peer reviewed publications.

If a true 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 remainder of his/her term.

Documentation Available to the Committees and Department Chair

Each department promotion and tenure committee and department chair shall have available for consideration the following documentation supplied by the Office of the S&E Dean:

1. C.V.;
2. Other documentation specified in Appendix C;
3. Evidence to support achievement of the criteria for promotion and/or tenure (refer to Appendices D-G);
4. Copies of all annual faculty goals and objectives documents and annual evaluations;
5. Letters from external reviewers;
6. Other documentation pertinent to a faculty member's evaluation as determined by the dean.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E shall have available for consideration the same documentation supplied by the Office of the S&E Dean and the faculty candidate. In addition the department chair will provide the committee with:

1. The response of the department promotion and tenure committee;
2. The response of the department chair;
3. The response of the candidate.

Response of the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E

The Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of S&E shall provide a written report to the dean expressing the recommendation of the committee. 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 members of the committee. A tie vote is insufficient to recommend tenure or promotion. Tenure and promotion

from assistant to associate professor are not evaluated separately. Explanatory text for the Committee response should be provided using the form provided in Appendix B of this handbook. The report shall be signed by each member of the committee and shall be sent to the dean by **November 1st**.

Role of the Office of the Dean and Withdrawal from Candidacy

After receiving the written recommendations of the college committee, the department committee, the chair, and the candidate response, the dean will meet with the faculty member to inform the candidate of the dean's recommendation and the results of the other levels of review and to give the candidate the opportunity to read the dean's letter. Upon request by the tenure candidate, the dean shall inform the candidate of the numerical results of the department, division, and college votes. The dean shall submit all materials with a formal letter of recommendation to the Office of the Provost by **November 30th**.

A candidate for promotion and/or tenure may withdraw from consideration at any time prior to the forwarding of the dean's letter of recommendation to the Office of the Provost for review by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. 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 contract for one additional year following the term or semester in which the notice is received. This terminal contract will not be renewed subsequently.

Information about the process beyond the college is available in University Policy 12.01.99.C1.05 (Promotion of Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members) and University Rule 12.01.99.C2 (Tenure).

Procedures for Annual Evaluation

Faculty shall be evaluated annually for performance and development. 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 policies and procedures. The dean of the college is responsible for assuring that all eligible faculty members are evaluated. However, the evaluation process is the function of the chair of the department with which the faculty member is associated.

New full-time faculty will be asked to identify draft goals and objectives for the coming year (or portion of the academic year if assuming duties within the year). The chair and faculty member will mutually agree on goals and objectives. The final goals and objectives documents for new faculty members will be placed in the faculty member's personnel files in the Office of the S&E Dean within the first six weeks of the assumption of duties. Each continuing full-time faculty member will review the past year's goals and objectives, generate a self-evaluation and, in consultation with the chair, identify goals and objectives for the coming year. The suggested format

for documenting goals and objectives is found in Appendix J. The department chair or designee will produce a current C.V. as reported from Digital Measures to be added to the faculty member's evaluation materials. Self-evaluations, goals and objectives will be submitted to the chair by **February 15th**. Faculty evaluation meetings with the chair will be completed no later than **April 1st**. The results of this meeting will be recorded on annual evaluation forms (see templates in Appendix K).

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

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

Mid-Term Review

Each untenured tenure-line faculty member shall receive a comprehensive mid-term review by the relevant department's promotion and tenure committee, department chair, dean and provost. In most cases, untenured faculty will be eligible for the mid-term review in the third year of employment in the tenure-line position, in preparation for consideration for tenure in the sixth year of service. In special cases as negotiated and noted in the hiring letter from the provost, untenured tenure-line faculty may be eligible for consideration for tenure earlier than the sixth year of service and may request a mid-term review earlier than the third year of employment. Mid-term review should be completed at least one year before an application for promotion and tenure.

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

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

Supporting documentation for mid-term review must include a complete C.V. and documentation of teaching effectiveness. Additional documentation (e.g. copies of publications, course syllabi) may be included but must fit in a two-inch thick binder. All materials must be submitted to

the Office of the S&E Dean by the close of business on the **first Monday in March** during the academic year of review.

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

Each department's promotion and tenure committee shall provide by **April 15th** a written report signed by each member of the committee to the dean expressing the recommendation of the committee, with copies to the candidate and the department chair. The department chair shall review the candidate's portfolio and the committee report and submit an independent report to the candidate and the dean by **May 1st**. The department chair shall meet with the candidate to review the comments and recommendations of the committee and the chair. The dean shall review the candidate's portfolio and the reports from the committee and department chair and prepare an independent evaluation. The dean will meet with the tenure-track faculty member to discuss the review. The dean's evaluation will be submitted to the provost with copies to the department chair and the candidate. One copy of each report shall be placed in the candidate's official file in the S&E dean's office. The provost, or designee, will review the evaluations and recommendation and prepare a written evaluation. The provost, or designee, will meet with the tenure-track faculty member to discuss the review. The faculty member will receive a copy of the provost's, or designee's, written comments and recommendations.

Criteria Used in Evaluating Performance and Development

The annual performance and development evaluation of faculty, used for promotion, tenure and merit pay, is based upon A&M-Corpus Christi Faculty Handbook, Section 2.1.2 (faculty responsibilities), Section 2.1.3 (descriptions of teaching, scholarship and service), Section 2.2.1 (promotion), Section 2.2.2 (tenure) and Section 2.2.4 (merit pay). A&M-Corpus Christi Faculty Handbook, Section 2.1.3 includes five major performance criteria: academic preparation, experience, teaching, service, and scholarship. The College of S&E subdivides teaching into three sub-areas, which are (a) knowledge and experience in the teaching field, (b) quality of teaching, and (c) academic advisement and career counseling.

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

Within the ranks of the tenure-line faculty there are three recognizable groups – those faculty primarily supporting undergraduate programs (generally with a 4/4 teaching assignment), graduate faculty primarily supporting Master of Science programs (generally with a 3/3 teaching as-

signment), and graduate faculty supporting Doctor of Philosophy programs (generally with a 1/2 teaching assignment). The nominal effort allocation for faculty of each respective group is summarized in Table 1. Members of these groups differ in proportions of time allowed for research, service and teaching, and also in the resources made available to them for research support. Teaching, research and service are all essential to the growth and sustenance of the college, but relative contributions by faculty of these three groups differ among these criteria. The college recognizes that these differences must be reflected in the evaluation criteria. *Individual faculty may negotiate different effort allocations annually with their department chairs. 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.

Table 1. Nominal Effort Allocation

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

*Based on 3-SCH teaching load per course

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

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

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Service

Teaching Effectiveness

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

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

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

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

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

of presentation, student engagement, inquiry, opportunities for collaboration and possible other items such as student surveys conducted by the evaluator to measure teaching effectiveness. Each department in the college shall develop a specific process and instrument for peer evaluation.

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

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

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

Research

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

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

ful mentoring and financial support of undergraduate and, where applicable, graduate student research.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

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

M.S. Faculty. M.S. faculty members have reduced teaching loads compared to undergraduate faculty, which obligates them to participate in departmental graduate programs. While requirements will again differ by discipline and department, M.S. faculty candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are required to provide evidence of a productive, viable graduate research program. Evidence can include some combination of the following:

- 1) Research articles in which the candidate is a major contributor should be published in peer-reviewed international, national or regional journals. A peer-reviewed review article, invited chapter in a book, or an entire book may be accepted provided it contributes to the candidate's field of study. Textbooks, lecture notes and lab manuals, while time consuming to prepare, are not normally the result of original research, and will be considered as contributing to teaching excellence instead of research.
- 2) Off-campus professional presentations of research results, as talks or posters, at least one of which should be at the national or international level. The candidate should be the presenter in at least one if the works are multi-authored. Invited lectures for international/national or regional meetings of professional societies are also accepted as indicators in this category. The level of institutional support available during the candidate's period of review will be considered by the review committees and the chair.
- 3) Successful direction, as major professor, of an M.S. thesis to completion. Direction of non-thesis M.S. student projects serves as evidence of student mentoring and is considered an important teaching responsibility.
- 4) Function as a member of one M.S. thesis committee directed by another faculty member.
- 5) Evidence of external funding as principal investigator to support the candidate's research and graduate program. Equipment grants primarily used to develop and support the candidate's research and graduate program will be considered in this category. The candidate should provide evidence that equipment acquired through such a grant is critical to the candidate's research program.

Ph.D. Faculty. Ph.D. faculty members have the lowest teaching loads and highest research expectations in the college. For a successful tenure application, Ph.D. faculty must present unequivocal evidence of a strong and independent research program at A&M-Corpus Christi com-

petitive at the national level in their particular discipline. External funding from national and regional sources commensurate to the needs of the research program must be demonstrated. The majority of research publications will appear in strong national and international journals, a portion of which shall be based upon research conducted while the candidate was a member of the department. For tenure and promotion to associate professor, successful supervision of at least one Ph.D. student is expected.

Promotion to Full Professor

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

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

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

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

Service

Service can generally be defined as "work performed for another or a group." A faculty member may contribute service at more than one level including: the department, the university, the city, the nation, and the international levels. Service typically entails working on committees, serving in coordination or leadership roles, having an active role in a professional organization and gen-

erally using one's professional expertise to serve the university and the community. University service encompasses activities done at the request of the department, college or university outside of teaching and research. Such service shall contribute to the management and growth of the department and/or college and will include but not be limited to activities such as participation to committees, program coordination, advising of students, recruiting and overall promotion of the university. Professional service refers to specialized or professional work that is directly related to the unique training and expertise found among university faculty. Indicators of service performance of each recognizable faculty groups shall be defined by each department in the college. As shown in the nominal effort allocation (Table 1), a faculty service contribution of approximately 10% is typically considered for promotion and tenure reviews, but this value may change to take into account the average negotiated effort allocation approved by the dean.

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

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Positions *(Section Approved and Adopted August 2014)*

General

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

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

Non-Tenure Tracks

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

Visiting Faculty – Visiting faculty positions are annual, limited term appointments. Visiting appointments can be made at assistant, associate, or professor rank, depending on qualifications and experience. Visiting faculty may have duties that include teaching, research, and/or service

as detailed in their appointment letter. Visiting faculty must hold a terminal degree in the teaching or related discipline and be appropriately credentialed to the courses they teach prior to the first day of class. Visiting faculty members can be reappointed for up to a total of three years.

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

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

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

1. *Research Assistant Professor* – Research assistant professors are entry-level rank faculty positions that require a terminal degree in the appropriate field that is closely aligned to the appointed position, i.e., has content knowledge and research experience in that field.
2. *Research Associate Professor* – Research associate professors require a terminal degree and five years of experience at the research assistant professor rank or at a similar rank. It also requires significant experience related to the position responsibilities.
3. *Research Full Professor* – Appointment to this rank requires the appropriate terminal degree and a record of sustained excellent performance in all areas of appointment. Individuals with five years of experience at the research associate professor rank or at a similar rank may be considered for appointment to the rank of research full professor.
4. Contracts for Research Assistant Professors will be on an annual basis, contracts for Research Associate Professors may be up to two years, and contracts for Research Full Professors may be up to three years.

Clinical Track Faculty – Clinical faculty positions in College of Science & Engineering are faculty who for example hold appointments outside TAMU-CC. The positions bring excellence to the university through highly skilled and experienced practitioners who address a specific need in teaching or training in the college. Clinical faculty should hold a master's degree or have extensive experience (5 years) in a related field, and be appropriately credentialed to the courses

they teach prior to the first day of class. The clinical rank will be specified at the time of hiring. Appointments follow guidelines provided in University Procedure 12.07.99.C0.01 .

1. *Clinical Assistant Professor* – Clinical assistant professors are entry-level rank faculty positions that require a master’s degree in the appropriate field and a minimum of five years of experience as a certified or licensed (as appropriate) practitioner.
2. *Clinical Associate Professor* – Clinical associate professors require a terminal degree and a minimum of five years at the clinical assistant professor rank.
3. *Clinical Professor* – Clinical professors require a terminal degree and a minimum of five years at the clinical associate professor rank.
4. Contracts for Clinical Assistant Professors will be on an annual basis, contracts for Clinical Associate Professors may be up to two years, and contracts for Clinical Professors may be up to three years.

Appointment, Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

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

All appointment letters must indicate that the appointment is non-tenure track, and will expire upon the completion of the appointment, unless extended or dismissal of the faculty member under university policy.

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

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

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

Promotion of Professional Track Faculty

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

1. *Teaching* – The candidate should have demonstrated a high level of competence in the classroom and the ability to successfully teach an adequate variety of courses as evidenced by:

- Favorable evaluation by knowledgeable colleagues of teaching ability and performance based upon course syllabi, statements of course objectives, copies of examinations and other materials as appropriate;
 - Course improvement and development;
 - Favorable evaluation of teaching skills by students in courses.
2. *Service* – The candidate should have demonstrated effective participation in various department/school, college, university, and professional service activities as appropriate, examples of which include
- Service on department/school, college, and/or university committees;
 - Non-committee department/school, college, and/or university service;
 - Professionally-related community service;
 - Service in professional organizations.

Promotion of Professional Associate Professor to Professional Senior Professor – A candidate for the rank of professional senior professor shall be considered after a period of not less than five years following the rank of professional associate professor and is required to have demonstrated a strong commitment to excellence in teaching and service at TAMU-CC. His or her professional record should show an active role as a member of the senior faculty and provide evidence for an expectation of continuous dedication and future contributions to the teaching and service mission of the department/school and the university.

Promotion of Research Track Faculty

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

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

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

Promotion of Clinical Track Faculty

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

Appendix A

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

For a positive response:

Following examination of all documentation provided for its evaluation, and considering the evidence stated in University Policy 12.01.99.C1.05 and University Rule 12.01.99.C2 regarding promotion and/or tenure, the *(department name)* Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Engineering is pleased to inform you of its recommendation that *(faculty member's name)* be awarded *(promotion and/or tenure)*.

The vote of the committee was: *(record vote)*

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

Chair, *(department name)* Promotion and Tenure Committee

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

For a negative response:

Following examination of all documentation provided for its evaluation, and considering the evidence stated in University Policy 12.01.99.C1.05 and University Rule 12.01.99.C2 regarding promotion and/or tenure, the *(department name)* Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Engineering regrets to inform you of its recommendation not to award *(promotion and/or tenure)* at the present time to *(faculty member's name)*.

The vote of the committee was: *(record vote)*

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

Chair, *(department name)* Promotion and Tenure Committee

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Appendix B

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

For a positive response:

Following examination of all documentation provided for its evaluation, and considering the evidence stated in University Policy 12.01.99.C1.05 and University Rule 12.01.99.C2 regarding promotion and/or tenure, the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Engineering is pleased to inform you of its recommendation that (faculty member's name) be awarded (promotion and/or tenure).

The vote of the committee was: (record vote)

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

Chair, College of Science and Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

For a negative response:

Following examination of all documentation provided for its evaluation, and considering the evidence stated in University Policy 12.01.99.C1.05 and University Rule 12.01.99.C2 regarding promotion and/or tenure, the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Engineering regrets to inform you of its recommendation not to award (promotion and/or tenure) at the present time to (faculty member's name).

The vote of the committee was: (record vote)

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

Chair, College of Science and Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Appendix C

Documentation Guidelines

1. Obtain copy of the “College of Science and Engineering Procedures and Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Performance and Development” and the separate documentation for department exemplars. Use college and departmental criteria to decide which supporting materials to include.
2. Review your personnel file in the Office of the S&E Dean to be sure it is accurate and current. Verify that all transcripts and copies of your 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 that you submit.
3. Restrict quantity of supporting materials to fit in a two-inch thick (**maximum**) notebook or binder.
4. Include a copy of your letter to the dean, *copied to the department chair*, which indicates your wish to be considered for promotion to a specific academic rank and/or to receive tenure. This ensures that the committee is clear what you wish to be considered for.
5. Include a current C.V. which specifies your education — degree(s), year(s) received, institution(s), field(s) of study — and related academic or professional experience (include positions, dates).
6. Include letters from peers, the community and students. You may include as many letters as you wish, but focus on obtaining letters from individuals with whom you have worked closely and who are most familiar with your capabilities in an academic environment.
7. Organize the rest of the supporting materials concisely into sections for:
 - A. Academic preparation
 - B. Experience
 - C. Teaching
 1. Knowledge in the teaching field
 2. Quality of teaching
 3. Academic advising/career counseling

- D. Service
 - 1. College/University
 - 2. Community
 - 3. State/Nation
 - 4. International
- E. Scholarship

Consult the guidelines for your department for specific examples of materials you might submit. You may wish to include lists (i.e., a list of your recent professional presentations) as well as actual items (i.e., 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 Policy 12.01.99.C1.05 and University Rule 12.01.99.C2. The faculty member should carefully organize this material with the understanding that the committee is evaluating quality, not quantity.

Do not include copies of your works if they cannot fit in the single notebook or binder; instead simply describe projects and list publications. However, any publications, project reports, or other supporting documents not included in the binder should be available to the committee at short notice if requested.

Appendix D

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

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

Scholarship

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

Publication within the discipline is considered the most important indication of scholarship. All forms of peer-reviewed authorship should be included as evidence of accomplishment: peer-reviewed research articles, reviews, books, book chapters, notes, etc. The extent to which these documents support scholarship should be considered on a *per-applicant basis* and clearly related to specific field of research. Applicants are expected to demonstrate a degree of authorship consistent with their particular teaching load (i.e., doctoral, master's, undergraduate level). Faculty for which the university has made a strong investment (e.g., start-up funds) should demonstrate a higher degree of success in publication. Primarily, these publications should provide evidence of the development of an independent research program within the discipline and especially in high-impact journals. Consideration will also be given with regard to the extent to which applicant's works have been cited in peer-reviewed journals within their respective fields. Faculty should provide clarification regarding their individual contribution to co-authored papers, and about the status of any papers in preparation or submitted for review. Applicants are also encouraged to promote authorship by students and to generate publications derived from collaborative

research efforts. Because authorship could take many forms, applicants should strive to clearly describe their specific role in all publications (e.g., graduate advisor, corresponding author, etc.). According to NSF, authorship on papers is recommended only for those who have significantly contributed to the intellectual development of the manuscript. Co-authorship is encouraged and recognized as evidence of collaboration; however, this collaboration should not preclude development of an independent and expanding research program while at A&M-Corpus Christi. Consideration of non-peer reviewed publications will be at the discretion of the departmental committee. At the discretion of the departmental P/T committee, publication record could supersede that of presentations (i.e., a proportionally larger number of publications could be viewed as offsetting 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, full professor) aspired to by the applicant and within the review period. It is recognized that funding can assume various forms (e.g., federal, regional, state, local, and intramural; foundations; private-sector businesses, etc.) and level of contribution to the grant writing process (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Collaborator, etc.). Faculty candidates should clarify their specific contributions to a project and the proportion of project funding for which they are supported. Primary considerations for evaluation of grantsmanship at the doctoral and master's level should be 1) extent to which extramural funding exceeds that of intramural (i.e., investment on the part of the University) and 2) maintenance of an adequate level of funding for support of an expanded research effort (e.g., for the research program, graduate/undergraduate students). What tangible results have come from funds awarded within the review period? Undergraduate faculty are expected to show some effort towards writing of grant proposals of an extramural or intramural nature and describe whether this work is research or service-oriented.

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

Teaching

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

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 full professor, clear demonstration of leadership both within the department and outside the university is expected. The extent to which specific forms of service are counted towards promotion and/or tenure will be addressed on an individual basis by the departmental committee. Faculty members will also be evaluated in terms of service by the chair of the department during annual review.

Specific Guidelines for Tenure

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

Guidelines for Full Professorship

The rank of “full 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 Full Professor have no initial probationary period (i.e., promotion is encouraged, but not required). Thus, faculty members who seek promotion to Full 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. Full Professor status is also bestowed upon faculty considered “leaders” in the Department. For example, leadership can be evidenced by representation of the Department on key committees and panels, development of new programs or initiatives within the department, or establishment of new programs on campus or elsewhere, etc. In addition to departmental leadership, faculty aspiring to Full Professorship, regardless of level, should demonstrate leadership at the national and/or international level.

Use of External Review

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

Level of Effort Related to Workload

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

Appendix E

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

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

Teaching

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

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

The contribution of faculty to teaching also includes efforts related to advising and/or mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students. Successful applicants at the M.S. level should show evidence of having matriculated students in a timely manner and in numbers related to their in-

volvement in teaching. It is understood that those faculty having higher teaching loads might not be able to participate in graduate committee service at levels similar to those having lower teaching loads. It is the responsibility of applicants to describe their level of advising in sufficient detail as to apprise the Departmental Promotion and Tenure of their individual situation.

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

Scholarship Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

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

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

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

- If multi-authored, the candidate should be the lead presenter in at least one presentation.
 - Invited lectures for international/national or regional meetings of professional organizations are also accepted as indicators in this category.
 - The level of institutional support available during the candidate's period of review will be considered by the review committees and the department chair.
3. Successful mentoring of M.S. students in graduate research. This will normally include substantial contributions as a committee member on two or more completed M.S. thesis projects, including serving as major professor on at least one M.S. thesis. In addition:
- A candidate's opportunities to successfully direct M.S. thesis projects in mathematics is tied to the numbers of students enrolled in the Applied & Computational Mathematics (ACM) and Curriculum & Content (CC) tracks of the program. Faculty should be proactive in both contributing to available M.S. thesis committees and developing research opportunities for current and prospective M.S. students.
 - Typically, direction of non-thesis M.S. student projects serves as evidence of student mentoring and is considered an important teaching responsibility. However, schoolteachers in the Curriculum & Content (CC) track often benefit most from classroom-based scholarship. Thus, faculty supporting the CC track may demonstrate graduate research mentoring through non-thesis M.S. curriculum projects, provided such projects make significant contributions to the field of mathematics instruction and exhibit scholarly approaches to project development.
4. Development of external funding in support of the candidate's research and graduate program. This will normally include substantial contribution as principal or co-principal investigator on externally-funded grants or research contracts. In addition:
- Participation as co-principal investigator should include taking a substantial role in both the proposal writing process and the execution of grant activities.
 - Equipment grants primarily used to develop and support the candidate's research and graduate program will be considered in this category. The candidate should provide evidence that equipment acquired through such a grant is critical to the candidate's research program.
 - Unfunded grant proposals and less-substantial contributions as co-principal investigator on one or more externally-funded projects will be considered as secondary evidence in this category.

Scholarship Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Professor

MS 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, service to the community or field, etc.) should also be considered. For those faculty members seeking promotion to full professor, clear demonstration of leadership both within the department and outside the department is expected. The extent to which specific forms of service are counted towards promotion and/or tenure will be addressed on an individual basis by the departmental committee. Evaluation of service will be based on the importance of the service performed, as well as the amount of effort expended in service activities. Because service is typically the least weighted of the three criteria for promotion and tenure, candidates are not expected to have exhaustive documentation. However, when the impact of a service activity or the effort required is not obvious to an experienced faculty evaluator, candidates should take more care in documentation. Faculty members will also be evaluated in terms of service by the chair of the department during annual review.

Specific Guidelines for Tenure

It is understood that tenure confers a higher responsibility of departmental citizenship upon faculty members. Tenured faculty are expected to act in the best interest of the department and the university. Personal qualities such as commitment to the department and its mission, honesty in dealings with fellow faculty, and impartiality towards students are important to the integrity and

growth of the department. Failure to exhibit such personal qualities will be considered evidence of “non-collegiality” and may contribute to a recommendation against tenure and/or promotion. Instances of failure to demonstrate collegiality should be documented, in writing, to the department chair by the departmental committee.

Tenure serves as recognition of past work and holds a promise of future accomplishments. All candidates should present a record of achievements that provides a clear indication of the capacity to continue making professional contributions at A&M-Corpus Christi. Bringing credit for years of previous service does not lessen this requirement. The totality of work documented in the portfolio from credited time and during actual service must meet guidelines set forth in this appendix. The portfolio must also include documentation of substantial work done at the university during the probationary period while employed at the university and provide convincing evidence of the capacity to continue making professional contributions at A&M Corpus Christi.

Guidelines for Full Professorship

The rank of “full 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 Full Professor have no initial probationary period (i.e., promotion is encouraged, but not required). Thus, faculty members who seek promotion to Full Professor will be held to higher standards of teaching, scholarship, and service than those aspiring to the Associate level. The need for objective external review of applicants is most critical at this level. External evaluation should be of a true “review” nature and undertaken by qualified authorities in the applicant’s field. External reviewers must all hold appointments as Full Professors within an academic department, or be nationally recognized experts in their field capable of evaluating the candidate’s scholarly contributions. Simple reiteration of the accomplishments of applicants is unacceptable. Accomplishment should, itself, be evaluated in terms of importance to the field of study. Full 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. Un-

dergraduate faculty are typically assigned higher teaching loads and, by extension, should be responsible for substantially reduced research effort. As above, actual workload characteristics will be determined for individual faculty during the annual review. For this reason, it is important that members of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics Promotion and Tenure committee should have access to annual reviews that should be included in the applicant's portfolio.

Appendix F

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

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

Scholarship

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

Publication within the discipline is considered the most important indication of scholarship. All forms of peer-reviewed authorship should be included as evidence of accomplishment: peer-reviewed research articles, reviews, books, book chapters, notes, etc. The extent to which these documents support scholarship should be considered on a per-applicant basis and clearly related to area of expertise. Applicants are expected to demonstrate a degree of authorship consistent with their particular teaching load (i.e., doctoral, masters, undergraduate level). Faculty for which the University has made a strong investment (e.g., significant start-up funds) should demonstrate a higher degree of success in publication. Primarily, these publications should provide evidence of the development of an independent research program. Research transferred to Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi as part of previous funding awards will be considered. Applicants are also encouraged to promote authorship by students and to generate publications derived from collaborative research efforts. Because authorship could take many forms, appli-

cants should strive to clearly describe their specific role in all publications (e.g., graduate advisor, corresponding author, etc.). Authorship on papers is recommended only for those who have significantly contributed to the intellectual development of the manuscript. As stated, co-authorship is encouraged and recognized as evidence of collaboration; however, this collaboration should not preclude development of scientific leadership as evidenced by an independent and expanding research program while at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. Consideration of non-peer reviewed publications will be at the discretion of the departmental committee.

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

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

Teaching

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

At present, the most common metric for evaluation of quality of teaching is student evaluations. It is recognized that teaching evaluations, by themselves, do not provide a complete understanding of quality or level of effort. Applicants should show evidence of teaching effectiveness,

which may include 1) a clear statement of teaching philosophy and responsibilities; 2) a summary of steps taken to improve teaching (e.g., changes resulting from self-evaluation, review of teaching-related journals, and participation in programs designed to improve teaching skills); 3) results of student course evaluations and the extent to which they have changed during the probationary period; 4) a description of modification of teaching style based upon peer review; 5) any testimonials regarding success of former students; and 6) any documentation of teaching development activity from the Center for Teaching Effectiveness. Other criteria to be considered include instructional design and innovation (e.g., are course objectives effective, are they aligned with departmental curricular goals, etc.); instructional delivery (e.g., presentation skills, use of media, approach to discovery); instructional assessment; and quality of course management (e.g., meets University, College and Department management deadlines); facility at teaching a variety of courses, leadership at the campus, regional, state or national level in pedagogy, development of curricula, texts, laboratory manuals or other media for instruction, awards, attendance at teaching symposia/seminars, and other measures. Applicants must ensure that the departmental P/T committee is aware of any change in specific teaching load over the review period as it will impact the review process. Those applicants categorized as doctoral faculty should be teaching at least one graduate-level course, where possible. Additional means of evaluation of quality of teaching (e.g., peer review) will also be considered and arranged by the Department as needed.

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

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

Service

Service represents not only participation on committees but a vast number of administrative, recruiting, leadership and outreach tasks necessary for Programs, Departments, the College and University to function effectively and efficiently. Service to one's profession is also important. Appointment to boards, committees or review panels on the basis of one's expertise, serving as an officer in a professional organization, or organizing professional conferences and symposia all represent significant service activities. While in concept overall effort in terms of service should be relatively similar for all faculty regardless of rank, it is understood that distribution of service can vary both for individuals and in terms of commitments to the Program, Department, College and University as well as community, state, region, nation and profession. In general and initial-

ly, 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 Full Professor, clear demonstration of leadership both within and outside the University is expected. The extent to which specific forms of service are counted towards promotion and/or tenure will be addressed on an individual basis by the departmental committee. Faculty will also be evaluated in terms of service by the chair of the department during annual review.

Level of Effort Related to Workload

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

Assistant Professor Mid-Term Review

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

Specific Guidelines for Tenure

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

Guidelines for Full Professorship

The rank of "Full 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 Full 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.

Appendix G

School of Engineering and Computing Sciences Supplementary Tenure and Promotion Criteria, Standards and Priorities (Adopted October 2012; Revised May 2014)

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

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

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

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

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

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

- In the research category, the nominal levels of achievements of candidates on 3/3 workload assignments (or 9-SCH per semester) are 3 full-length research articles, 2 conference papers, and evidence of external funding that supports the candidate's research program (and graduate program as appropriate). The level of achievements of candidates on re-assigned workloads will be prorated accordingly. For example, the levels of achievements of candidates on 1/2 workload assignments (or 3-SCH and 6-SCH workload assignments per academic year) are 6 full-length research articles, 4 conference papers, and success with competitive external funding.

Affirmative and supportive letters from external reviewers on the quality, significance and impact of the candidate's research are essential for positive recommendation.

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

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix H

Faculty Governance (Adopted August 2014)

Dean

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

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

Voting Rights

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

College of Science and Engineering Committees and Councils

- **College of S&E Chairs/Directors Council**

Purpose or Function: This council is charged with assisting the dean in strategic and operational planning and in making administrative decisions.

Membership: The dean; the associate deans; the chairs of the Departments of Life Sciences, Mathematics and Statistics, and Physical and Environmental Sciences; director of the School of Engineering and Computing Sciences; the coordinators of Ph.D. programs; and the directors of the Center for Coastal Studies, Center for Water Supply Studies, and Conrad Blucher Institute for Surveying and Science.

Selection: By virtue of the administrative position.

Term of Service: Not applicable.

Duties Begin: New members assume this duty upon assuming the administrative position.

Chair: Dean of the college.

- **College of S&E Steering Committee**

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

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

Selection: Elected by the departments/schools 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: Appointed by the dean.

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

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

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

Selection: One member is appointed by the chair/director of each department/school.

Term of Service: Two years, staggered terms.

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

Chair: Elected by the committee.

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

Purpose or Function: The committee will establish regular meeting times and will review and recommend to the dean on new degrees and minors, changes to existing degrees and minors, 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 nine members. Eight voting members are representatives from the departments and school, 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 or school. All elected members must have at least three years of experience at TAMU-CC. At least one member from each department/school 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 S&E Distinguished Lecturers Selection Committee**

Purpose or Function: The committee will establish regular meeting times and will review and recommend to the dean on potential speakers to invite to campus for the College Distinguished Lecturer Series.

Membership: The committee consists of four members. All tenured, tenure-track, professional track, research track, clinical track faculty and instructors are eligible to serve on the committee.

Selection: Appointed by the dean.

Term of Service: Two years, staggered terms.

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

Chair: Appointed by the dean.

- **College of S&E Library Committee**

Purpose or Function: Monitors the acquisition of library resources relevant to the needs of the college's faculty and students. The committee also coordinates the division of library funds among the academic and research units within the college.

Membership: The committee consists of four 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/school.

Term of Service: Three years, staggered terms.

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

Chair: Elected by the committee.

- **College of S&E Promotion and Tenure Committee**

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

Membership: The committee consists of five tenured full professors. Department chairs, associate deans and the school director shall not serve on the committee.

Selection: Each department or school elects one tenured full professor to the committee by vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty; the dean appoints one additional committee member.

Terms of Service: For elected members—two years, staggered terms; for dean's appointee—one year.

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

Chair: Elected by the committee.

- **College of S&E Research Enhancement Committee**

Purpose or Function: This college-level committee is responsible for receiving and evaluating grant proposals and recommending college-level grant awards from research enhancement program funds. The committee's policies and award procedures must be consistent with the eligibility and award selection criteria in the statute. A copy of the College of S&E 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 S&E representatives on the University Research Enhancement Committee, which also has two-year, staggered terms for the college representatives. All tenured, tenure-track and research track faculty are eligible to serve on the committee. Committee members are not eligible to apply for research enhancement grants. The committee also consults with professional track and clinical track faculty as appropriate.

Selection: One member is elected by each department/school.

Term of Service: Two years, staggered terms.

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

Chair: Elected by the committee.

- **College of S&E Ad Hoc Committees**

Ad hoc committees are appointed from time to time by the dean, the chairs/directors council or the college committees to address specific issues or to perform specific tasks as given by the dean or given to respective council/committees.

Appendix I

College of Science and Engineering Grade Appeal Process

(Adopted by College of S&E Faculty, 13 January 2014)

The College of Science and Engineering (S&E) follows the student grade appeals procedures described in the Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Handbook of Rules and Procedures (http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/Rules_Procedures/), Procedure 13.02.99.C2.01. A brief summary of the College of S&E procedures and links to the forms used in the grade appeal process are found on the College of S&E Grade Appeal website (<http://sci.tamucc.edu/students/GradeAppeal.html>). Note that students who violate academic integrity and regulations (see current University Catalog) by plagiarism, other academic dishonesty or disruptive behavior will be held accountable by faculty and may have their grades adjusted accordingly. If a student feels that punitive measures (including lowering a grade) because of his or her academic misconduct have been applied in error, then the student should appeal the allegation of conduct violations. Conduct appeals follow a different process than the one described here (see Procedures 13.02.99.C1 and 13.02.99.C3.01 of the Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Handbook of Rules and Procedures). Likewise, complaints concerning student-faculty interactions that do not involve grades follow a different process (see the Complaint Resolution web page at <http://www.tamucc.edu/marcom/complaints/>). The process outlined below is designed for the student who questions a final grade for a course in the College of Science and Engineering providing that the assigned grade is based on the student's performance.

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.¹ In the syllabus for each course, the instructor is responsible for outlining objectives and setting standards, for clearly stating how a student's performance and proficiency will be evaluated, and for explaining the relationship between the evaluation instrument(s) and the student's final letter grade in the course. Students are responsible for class attendance, for learning the content of any course of study and for maintaining standards of academic performance established for each course in which they are enrolled.

Informal Presentation of Questions and/or Requests to an Instructor

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

¹Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students, 1967.

The Formal Grade Appeal Process

All requests for a formal grade appeal must be made in writing. To facilitate this process and document the grade appeal proceedings, a packet of forms (the “Student Grade Appeal Record”) is available at <http://sci.tamucc.edu/students/GradeAppeal.html>. The proceedings, findings, and recommendations shall *not* be open to the general public or available to any individuals other than those involved with the case. The procedures that follow apply to all programs in the College of Science and Engineering.

Foundations of a Grade Appeal. Personal issues such as simple dissatisfaction with a grade, potential loss of a scholarship or assistantship, etc. are *not* grounds for a successful appeal. The following instructions are given to all individuals and committees who will evaluate a grade appeal. The student should note these and bear them in mind when deciding whether or not to appeal a grade, and when preparing a grade appeal.

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

A student who believes the matter is not satisfactorily resolved by the informal student-instructor discussion, and that the situation meets the foundations for an appeal, may initiate the formal appeal process. After the appeal process is initiated, the student has the right to withdraw the appeal at any time during the process. (Written confirmation of the student’s request to withdraw the appeal is required.) Unless withdrawn, each appeal must be resolved at some level, and the appropriate documents signed. Documentation of all resolved or withdrawn appeals is filed in the S&E Dean’s Office.

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

- **Initiation of the Formal Grade Appeal Process.** A student can only initiate the formal grade appeal process *after* a final grade in a course has been officially recorded on the student’s transcript. To initiate the process, the student completes the “Student’s Request” (Form 1 of the packet) and submits the packet to the instructor.
- **Instructor’s Review of the Student’s Grade Appeal.** If an instructor has received an appeal packet from a student between semesters, review of the student’s appeal should begin by the first day of the semester after the grade in question was recorded. (That is: the instructor should begin to review an appeal of a fall semester grade by the first day of the spring semester; the instructor should begin to review an appeal of a spring semester

or summer semester grade by the first day of the fall semester.) Whenever possible (i.e., when both the instructor and student will be available during the summer semester), the instructor should begin review of the appeal of a spring grade on the first day of the first summer session.

- **Final Deadline for Student to Initiate the Formal Grade Appeal.** A student must initiate the formal written appeal no later than 15 business days after the first class day of the next regular long (15-week) semester. (That is, if the student wishes to appeal a fall semester grade, the student must submit a packet with a completed “Student’s Request” portion [Form 1] to the instructor within 15 business days after the beginning of the spring semester. Forms concerning grades assigned in the spring semester or in either summer session must be submitted within 15 business days after the beginning of the fall semester.)
- **Hearings by the College Grade Appeals Committee (CGAC).** The CGAC holds hearings during fall semester, spring semester and summer semester (usually late in the first summer session or early in the second summer session). This committee will *not* meet during the intersessions or “minimesters.” If the timing of an appeal process would place a CGAC hearing in the intersession or “minimester,” the hearing will be deferred until the next semester.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **Deadline:** For traditional on-campus courses, the formal written appeal should be initiated no later than 15 business days after the first class day of the next regular long (15-week) semester after the grade was assigned.

The Instructor's Written Response to the Student. After reviewing the student's written appeal, the instructor will provide a written response stating his or her decision and affirming that this stage of the appeal process is completed.

- **Form:** To document his or her decision, the instructor completes the "Instructor's Response" portion of Form 2 in the packet received from the student.
- **Notification of Decision and Submission of Documents:** The instructor electronically submits the packet to...
 1. the student;
 2. the appropriate department chair or school director; and
 3. the associate dean for academic affairs in S&E.

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

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

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

- **Form:** The student uses the "Student's Acknowledgment" portion of Form 2 (a check box and date) to document his or her decision, and to affirm that this stage of the appeal process is completed
- **Submission:** The student electronically submits the packet with completed Forms 1 and 2 to...
 1. the instructor;
 2. the appropriate department chair or school director; and
 3. the associate dean for academic affairs in S&E.

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

- **Deadline:** The student should submit his or her acknowledgment no later than five (5) business days after receiving the instructor's response or—if there has been no response from the instructor—five (5) business days after the instructor's period for action has ended. If the student does not submit a written reply by the deadline, then the college is not required to process the appeal further, and the original grade will remain unchanged.
- **Potential Outcomes:**
 - If the matter is resolved to the student's satisfaction, the appeal will be considered terminated and the instructor will print the completed packet and arrange to have the student (and instructor) sign the "Signatures" portion of Form 4 on the hard copy. At this point, the instructor will deliver hard copies of all forms and documents pertinent to this appeal to the Dean's Office to be filed. If the instructor approves the student's appeal, a grade change is likely to be necessary and the instructor must submit a change-of-grade form.
 - If the matter is *not* resolved to the student's satisfaction, then the student may continue the appeal by having the chair/director review the appeal.

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

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

- **Form:** To state his or her findings and document his or her decision, the chair/director completes the “Response of the Department Chair or School Director” portion of Form 3. If the chair/director finds a mutually satisfactory resolution, the form should state any actions agreed upon.
- **Notification of Decision and Submission of Documents:** The chair/director electronically submits the packet to...
 1. the student;
 2. the instructor; and
 3. the associate dean for academic affairs in S&E.The chair/director should retain a copy for his or her own files. The chair/director should also submit copies of all other documents or evidence pertinent to the appeal with the packet.
- **Deadline:** The chair/director normally makes a decision so that (if no satisfactory resolution can be found) the matter can be referred to the S&E associate dean for academic affairs within 5 business days.

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

- **Form:** The student and instructor use the “Student Acknowledgment” or the “Instructor Acknowledgment” portion of Form 3 (check boxes and dates) to document their decisions, and to affirm that this stage of the appeal process is completed.
- **Submission:** The student and instructor electronically submit the packet to...
 1. the appropriate department chair or school director; and
 2. the associate dean for academic affairs in S&E.
- **Deadline:** The student and instructor should submit their responses no later than five (5) business days after receiving the chair’s/director’s response or—if there has been no response from the chair/director—five (5) business days after the chair’s/director’s period for action has ended. If the student or instructor does not submit a reply by the deadline, then the college is not required to process the appeal further, and the resolution or decision of the chair/director will be enacted.
- **Potential Outcomes:**
 - If both the student and instructor agree to the resolution or decision of the chair/director, the appeal will be considered terminated and the chair/director will print the completed packet and arrange to have the student, instructor (and chair/director) sign the “Signatures” portion of Form 4 on the hard copy. At this point, the chair/director will deliver hard copies of all forms and documents pertinent to this appeal to the Dean’s Office to be filed. The chair/director should follow up to ensure that any actions agreed upon are executed.
 - If either the student or instructor rejects the chair’s/director’s decision, the Dean’s Office reviews the appeal.

Actions at the College Level: Dean / Associate Dean. If either the student or instructor does not accept the chair’s/director’s decision, the appeal is reviewed by the S&E Dean’s Office. The associate dean’s role in arriving at a final decision is twofold: 1) he or she convenes the

College Grade Appeal Committee (CGAC) and schedules a hearing before them; and 2) after the hearing, the associate dean reviews the findings of the CGAC and composes the final decision from the College of Science and Engineering Dean's Office.

Deadline for Convening the GCAC and Scheduling the Hearing: The associate dean will schedule a hearing before the CGAC normally within 20 business days after receiving the request for a CGAC hearing from the student (but with some flexibility to accommodate student and faculty schedules).

Notification of Dean's Office Decision: After the CGAC submits its report, the associate dean will compose and send written notification of the decision to the student and the instructor involved. **This decision is final and may not be appealed.**

- **Form:** The final decision will be recorded on the "College Response by the Dean's Office" portion of Form 4.
- **Notification of Decision and Filing of Documents:** The associate dean notifies all parties of the final decision, prints the packet with all Forms (1-4) completed, and arranges to have all parties sign the "Signatures" portion of Form 4 on the hard copy. The original, signed packet of forms and copies of other materials relevant to the appeal are filed in the S&E Dean's Office.
- **Deadline:** The final decision is normally reported within five (5) business days after the associate dean receives the CGAC's findings and recommendations.

Actions at the College Level: The College Grade Appeal Committee (CGAC).

The associate dean convenes the CGAC to determine the facts of the case and attempt to affect a fair and appropriate resolution to the complaint. Depending on the circumstances of the case, the CGAC may recommend to the associate dean to: 1) uphold the original grade of the instructor, or 2) change the grade in question to a specific alternate grade. The decision of the committee is determined by a majority vote.

- **Form:** The chair of the College of S&E Grade Appeal Committee completes the "Grade Appeal Committee's Report" portion of Form 3 to document the committee's decision. The numerical distribution of the votes should be recorded (without associating a name with a vote). The form should include a short summary of the facts of the case, the hearing, and the specific recommendations of the committee. Dissenting opinions may be included in the description.
- **Submission:** The chair of the CGAC submits the packet with completed Forms 1, 2 and 3 to the associate dean.
- **Deadline:** The chair of the CGAC will submit the "Grade Appeal Committee's Report" to the associate dean normally within five (5) business days after completion of the hearing and committee deliberations.

Composition of the College Grade Appeal Committee (CGAC). For the College of Science and Engineering, the committee to consider student grade appeals will consist of three (3) faculty members, one of whom will serve as chair, and two (2) students. To allow for replacement of committee members unable to serve, or substitutions for any member of the committee who may have a conflict of interest or be in any way involved in a particular case, members of this committee will be chosen from a larger “central pool.”

- **Selection of members for the central pool:** The appointment of members is left to the School and Departments within the College. Members will serve for one semester or summer term with the possibility of reappointment for up to one year.
- **Faculty members:** The chair of each department and the director of the school 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 or director to determine the availability of the faculty member for this service prior to submitting the list.) This will provide a pool of 12 faculty members for the College of Science and Engineering.
- **Students:** Students will be selected to serve on the CGAC based on the level of the student filing the appeal (i.e., undergraduate students will hear the appeal from an undergraduate student and graduate students will hear the appeal from a graduate student). To serve, a student must be currently enrolled, be majoring in an area within the College of Science and Engineering and have no less than a 3.0 cumulative GPA. To hear an undergraduate appeal, a student member must be a junior or senior (by number of hours); to hear a graduate appeal, a student must be a graduate student who has completed at least one long (i.e., spring or fall) semester at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. The chair of each Department and the director of the School will provide one (1) student from his or her area. Undergraduate students will be drawn from the membership of a student organization that is recognized by the University Council of Student Organizations. Graduate students will be selected from graduate students who are on campus during the semester in question. (It is incumbent upon the chair or director to determine the qualifications and availability of the suggested student member for this service prior to submitting the name.) This will provide a pool of at least four (4) students. In addition, the Student Senators representing the College of Science and Engineering will also be included in the pool of students whenever possible (the associate dean will check their qualifications and availability).
- **Selection of members for the CGAC:** The associate dean chooses three (3) faculty and two (2) students from the central pool (by drawing of names), and informs the CGAC members the student and the instructor. While neither the student nor the instructor has a right to peremptory challenge or challenge for cause of any CGAC member, either party may raise an objection to members of the panel. This must be done in writing within five (5) business days of receiving the names of CGAC members, and the reason for the objection to a panel member must be clearly stated. In that event, the CGAC (including the member to which an objection has been raised) will meet to consider the objection in closed session. During this closed session the member in question states whether or not he or she chooses to recuse himself or herself. Before the committee votes, the member in question leaves the room and the remaining members then vote to remove the member or

to continue with the member impaneled. The decision is based upon majority vote. In a tied vote, the choice originally stated by the member in question is accepted. When a member is removed because of an objection from either party, the associate dean selects a new member for the CGAC (by drawing a name from the central pool), with the newly chosen member being subject to the “objection rules” stated above. The associate dean again notifies all parties. If no objections are received to the substitution (as outlined above and within the timeframe stated above), the CGAC members will be considered “approved” and the associate dean can schedule a time for the hearing.

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

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

- **Absence of the Instructor and/or Student:** Once a hearing date and time is set with the concurrence of all parties, the hearing may proceed as scheduled even if the student or instructor decides that he or she cannot attend.
- **Absence of a CGAC Member:** Once the a hearing date and time is set with the concurrence of all parties, if a member of the CGAC unable to serve, four (4) members will constitute a quorum. In the event of a tied vote, the CGAC will file its report and the dean/associate dean will determine the final outcome in his or her summation.
- **“Electronic” Attendance:** Students not residing at or near Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi may request to attend the hearing via video conference call, or other electronic medium as appropriate. Likewise, an instructor who is unavailable for a long period and unable to be physically present may also request to attend the hearing through an appropriate electronic medium.
- **Counsel:** Each party to the hearing may be accompanied by another person in an advisory capacity only; such a person may not testify or ask questions.

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

Appendix J

College of Science and Engineering Annual Goals and Objectives Format Template

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE EVALUATION PERIOD *(dates)*

Name: _____

TEACHING GOALS. This section should include any new courses or labs you will be developing, new methods or projects you will be incorporating into existing courses or labs, or planned actions to improve knowledge and remain current in area of specialization or new subject areas. It should also include any developmental activities planned to enhance advising and mentoring capabilities at the undergraduate or graduate level.

SERVICE GOALS. In this section outline plans for service to...

- The department, college and university: including Faculty Senate, student organization sponsor, outreach and recruitment activities;
- The local community, state and nation: including activities, popular presentations and publications, presentations and reports, membership or leadership in organizations and advisory boards;
- The profession: including leadership and participation in professional organizations.

SCHOLARSHIP GOALS. List and describe planned research and writing activities, including manuscripts and grant proposals to be submitted, as well as presentations planned for professional conferences and meetings.

Faculty Member

Date

Space for chair to comment if he/she so desires:

Appendix K

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

College of S&E Annual Evaluation Templates: Form 1

Annual Evaluation
College of Science and Engineering
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, 5 - Exemplary

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

College of S&E Annual Evaluation Templates: Form 2

Effort Allocation for Next Year

Name: _____

| | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Effort Allocation (%) | Faculty Proposed | Chair Approved |
| Teaching | _____ | _____ |
| Research | _____ | _____ |
| Service | _____ | _____ |

Comments on effort allocation as appropriate:

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

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

*Based on 3-SCH teaching load per course

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

 Chair/Director

 Dean

 Signature Date

 Signature Date

 Signature Date

College of S&E Annual Evaluation Templates: Form 3

Data from Digital Measures

Faculty Performance Evaluations: Clarification and Descriptions of Rating Terminology.

The three areas of evaluation include teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service/department citizenship and other duties as defined in University Statement 12.01.99.C1.03 “Responsibilities of Full-Time Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members” which can be found at http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/Rules_Procedures/PDF/120199C103.pdf. Faculty members will be evaluated only in terms of areas that are part of their job duties. Evaluations must be based on the data provided in Digital Measures.

Scores will then be weighted based on the workload profiles and/or ranking systems developed by each college.

Faculty evaluation letters will include a rating for each area, as well as an overall rating for the review period.

Descriptions of rating terminology:

1. **Unsatisfactory:** performance is below minimum expectations. The faculty member must improve performance in this area and should be given a written set of expectations for improvement.
2. **Standard:** meets expectations for faculty performance as established by the department and/or college
3. **High:** above expectations for full-time faculty members in the department and/or college.
4. **Excellent:** well above normal expectations for full-time faculty in the department and/or college, but does not rise to the level of exemplary. A faculty member must significantly exceed the minimum expectations to receive this rating.
5. **Exemplary:** exceptional level of achievement considered significant when compared nationally.