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3.7.2 The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. (Faculty evaluation)

Compliance Status: Compliance

Narrative

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accordance with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. University Rule 12.01.99.C1 Evaluation and Promotion of Full-Time Faculty Members states that "non-tenured and tenured faculty members are evaluated annually," and it indicates the minimum requirements of the evaluation process [1]. As documented below, the evaluations take on many forms and involve multiple reviewers. Faculty evaluations, including annual performance evaluations and teaching evaluations, are housed in the dean's office within each college. Sample reviews are provided in the discussion below. The University Rules and Procedures Manual contains descriptions of responsibilities for tenured and tenure-track faculty members which are used to assess performance [2] [3]. The reviews are not limited to full-time faculty but also include adjuncts and graduate assistants who are instructors of record. Additionally, all classroom instructors, whether they are full-time tenure-track, fixed-term contract (in the College of Nursing and Health Sciences [CONHS] labeled clinical faculty), or part-time (visiting, adjuncts or instructors), are evaluated annually by students.

Faculty assessments in all colleges center on three domains as outlined in University Statement 12.01.99.C1.04 [4] and Faculty Handbook section 2.1.3 [5]: teaching, scholarship and service. Results of such evaluations affect merit raises [6] [7] [8], promotion and tenure [1] [9] [10]. Since Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi considers teaching to be at "the apex of its mission" [4], the teaching domain is addressed separately in the following discussion. Scholarship and service are addressed in the annual review sections below. The System policies and the University rules governing these reviews are published on the Web [11] [12] and are further elaborated in the Faculty Handbook [13].

Evaluation of Teaching

The teaching performance of each faculty member, regardless of contractual or tenure status, and of each graduate assistant who is an instructor of record is evaluated each semester using evaluation instruments completed by the students in each class. Course evaluations are initiated by the University via the deans of each college, who forward evaluation forms to all faculty teaching courses. The evaluations take place during the last month of each semester. Evaluation forms are completed by students only after the faculty member leaves the room. A student volunteer delivers the forms to the applicable dean's office or to a drop-box at the library, if the evaluation takes place after business hours. The evaluations are scored and stored in a database by the Academic Testing Center, and the results are also sent to each college and each faculty member. The course evaluations comprise a significant source of information used by each college in annual faculty evaluations [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19]. For instance, the College of Science and Technology [18]...
requires that the results of course evaluations are discussed "with the faculty member during the annual performance review."

Course evaluations allow students to express their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a given class, and to suggest positive changes. Course evaluation forms ask students to rate professors on a five point scale on various measures such as clarity of instructions, fairness of grading, and the like. A second form asks students to answer open-ended questions such as "The things I liked about this course were..." A sample of each form is included in the documentation [20] [21].

Annual Review of Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty Members
As noted above, the University Rules and Procedures Manual states that all tenured and non-tenured faculty members are to be evaluated annually [1]. The minimum requirements for the annual evaluation include (a) a written evaluation prepared by the department chair, (b) a provision for the faculty member to review the evaluation and respond in writing, (c) review of the evaluation by the dean of the college, and (d) a provision for the dean and the chair to meet with the faculty members when requested [1]. Each college has detailed the annual review process using the same criteria specified by University Rule 12.01.99.C1 Evaluation and Promotion of Full-Time Faculty Members [1]. All colleges require faculty to complete a self-evaluation which initiates the annual review process. The College of Business indicates that faculty are evaluated annually based on their "performance in the areas of teaching, intellectual contributions, and service" [22] [23] [24]. The College of Education's criteria for evaluating faculty performance includes teaching, scholarship, and service and the process is completed via an "annual development and evaluation plan"[19] [25] [26] [27]. The College of Science and Technology indicates that the result of the annual evaluation "provides evidence for recommendations on merit salary increases, promotion, and tenure" [28] [29]. Like the other colleges, Science and Technology provides an opportunity for a faculty member to "reply to the evaluation in writing." The College of Liberal Arts has a similar evaluation process and states that if the "faculty member undergoes promotion or tenure review in an academic year, a separate annual review is not necessary" [15] [30] [31]. The College of Nursing and Health Sciences has an annual evaluation process similar to all the other colleges, but it also includes a "biannual peer performance review by selected peers as a component of the overall performance evaluation process" [32] [33]. Nursing and Health Sciences also has fixed-term contract clinical faculty and these are evaluated on an annual basis in accordance with System Policy 12.07 Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty [34] and University Statement 12.99.99.C2.02 Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Positions [35]. The evaluation process is managed according to the college handbook [36] and includes a review of teaching, scholarship and service, but the principal focus is on teaching. Sample annual reviews of full-time faculty for each of the five colleges are provided below in the supporting documents [37] [38] [39] [40] [41] [42] [43] [44] [45] [46] [47] [48] [49] [50] [51]. Each college's procedures for annual evaluation of full-time faculty comply with University Statement 12.01.99.C1.04 Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service which describes teaching, scholarship, and service [4].

Appropriate quality and quantity of scholarship are determined annually by department chairs. Scholarship is identified as having a product, involving peer review and being novel, creative or new. The University allows for three types of scholarship: discovery (new knowledge in a field); scholarship of integration and teaching (synthetic works based on other research or work focused on teaching and learning); and application (using knowledge in the field to solve problems as with
consulting work). Service divides into the categories of university, college, and departmental; service to the community, and service to the profession.

**Annual Review of Administrative Faculty**

As discussed in the response to Principle 3.2.10 [52] the evaluation for administrative faculty is guided by University Statement 31.99.99.C1.01 Academic Department Chairs for academic chairs [53] and 31.99.99.C2.01 Assistant and Associate Deans for assistant/associate deans [54]. University Statement 31.99.99.C1.01 [53] and the Faculty Handbook section 2.5.10 [55] describe academic chairs as holding "mid-management positions in the University." Chairs oversee the curricular, personnel and functional aspects of the departments and provide a major leadership role in the academic mission of the university. "Chairs may be selected internally or through an external search." Chairs are subject to annual written evaluations like other faculty in the university. The dean considers faculty input and student teaching evaluations to determine the performance of the chair, reappointment, and merit pay [53] [54]. The faculty input is collected using a series of questions approved by the Faculty Senate [56]. In 2009, the University began collecting the input, using WebCT to ensure the anonymity of the reviewers [57]. Sample reviews of five chairs are provided in the supporting documentation [58] [59] [60] [61] [62].

According to University Statement 31.99.99.C2.01 [54] assistant and associate deans also "hold mid-management positions" and provide a leadership role in the academic mission of the University. Assistant and associate deans are evaluated annually by the dean (in writing). As is the case with chairs, the dean includes input from "faculty and the department chairs" in the evaluation process and in determining reappointment and merit pay [54]. Input to the deans is provided via the aforementioned WebCT survey system that gives faculty the opportunity to participate in the evaluation process [63]. Three sample reviews are included in the supporting documentation [64] [65] [66].

**Annual Review of Instructors and Adjunct Faculty**

Full-time instructors receive annual written evaluations from their department chairs following the same process of tenure and nontenure faculty described above. However, instructors are "full-time teaching appointments, generally with no additional scholarly or service expectations," [35] so their evaluations are based primarily on teaching performance and effectiveness. Instructor evaluations are housed in the office of the dean in each college. Samples are included from each college that currently is employing instructors [67] [68] [69].

In the course of conducting business, the University often requires the assistance of part-time nontenure-track faculty. System Regulation 33.99.05 Part-Time Employment [70] provides guidance for part-time faculty members. The University Faculty Handbook section 2.4.3 [71] aligns with and supports the system regulation. University Procedure 12.99.99.C2.01 Responsibilities of Adjunct Faculty Members [72] and Faculty Handbook 2.1.4 [73] details the responsibilities of adjunct faculty which pertain to teaching and advising students. Because part-time faculty are primarily charged with teaching, their annual evaluations follow the procedures shown above for evaluation of teaching. Appointments of adjunct faculty follow the University Procedure 12.99.99.C1.01 Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty [74] which states that all requests to recruit and appoint faculty will "originate with the Dean of the appropriate college and will be forwarded to the Provost.” Verification of credentials is the responsibility of the dean and the chair.
The chair is responsible for performing the annual written evaluations of adjuncts. These reviews are also housed in their respective colleges, and samples are included in the supporting documents [75] [76] [77] [78].

Some colleges have developed specific guidelines for the review of adjuncts. For example, the College of Business has established a policy for supervising adjunct faculty that includes the statement that the "primary component of the evaluation of these part-time/adjunct faculty member is teaching" [79]. Similarly, the College of Liberal Arts has an Adjunct Handbook [80] that includes comments about adjunct faculty evaluations and indicates that they will receive "written annual evaluations" from the department chair or other permanent faculty designated by the chair.

Annual Review of Graduate Teaching Assistants
Graduate students not only enrich the University through their studies and scholarship; they also bring their expertise to bear in the classroom. University Rule 33.99.08.C2 Graduate Teaching Assistants provides guidance on hiring, mentoring, and evaluating graduate teaching assistants who are instructors of record [81]. This rule and the implementation in Faculty Handbook (section 2.5.5) specify that "Departments employing teaching assistants will conduct an evaluation of each assistant each semester" [81]. Not all colleges employ graduate students to instruct, but those that do so follow the university rule of evaluating each teaching assistant each semester as noted in the teaching evaluation section above. Four sample reviews are provided in the supporting document [82]. The written reviews are maintained by the colleges.

Graduate assistants who teach in the University Core Curriculum First-Year Program (UCCP) are supervised by the First-Year Seminar Coordinator (FYSC), who trains and evaluates them each semester [83]. The FYSC visits the classes and meets with the graduate assistant to discuss his or her teaching as well as his or her course evaluations. The FYSC uses the same written procedures as chairs use when reviewing graduate assistants, adjuncts, and others. A sample review of UCCP graduate assistants is included below [84].

Promotion and Tenure
The Texas A&M University System Policy 12.01 Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure sets the "basis upon which tenure/tenure-track faculty may be hired, tenured, and dismissed" [85]. Tenure, as defined by the A&M System policy "means the entitlement of faculty members to continue in their academic positions unless dismissed for good cause" [85]. For tenure-track faculty, in particular, System Policy 12.02 indicates that annual "performance reviews are an important part of the tenure review process" [9]. System Policy 12.02 Institutional Procedures for Implementing Tenure states that the "president of each system academic institution submits, through the chancellor, for approval by the Board of Regents (board) detailed procedures in effect at that institution for implementing Systems Policy 12.02" [9]. In a similar fashion, University Rule 12.01.99.C1 Evaluation and Promotion of Full-Time Faculty Members sets forth the procedures for promotion [1].

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Rule 12.01.99.C2 Tenure sets the university standards for tenure. To receive tenure, a "faculty member must demonstrate broad knowledge of the discipline, and in-depth knowledge in one or more parts of the field, be a capable and competent teacher, be productive in scholarly or creative activity, display leadership in the college and university by serving on committees, councils, or special projects, and be active professionally in his/her..."
academic discipline”[86]. Similarly, University Statement 12.01.99.C1.04, Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, states that, “Consistent with its strong commitment to instruction, the university requires that teaching effectiveness count in promotion to all ranks”[41]. For tenure/tenure-track faculty, teaching also includes "academic advisement and career counseling," and teaching is assessed in the tenure and promotion process via teaching portfolios, classroom observations, peer collaboration, and other instruments. Student evaluations are also used to help assess the quality of the teaching.

Each college has processes in its own manual outlining further specifics of the timetable within the college and requirements for tenure[87][88][89][90][91][92]. University Rule 12.01.99.C4 Granting Extension of Tenure Probationary Period states that "The probationary period for a faculty member will not exceed seven years of full-time service at the university beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time assistant professor or a higher rank"[93]. This rule also establishes the criteria and process for extension of the tenure probationary period: "A faculty member must submit a written request for 'extension of the tenure probationary period' to his/her department head. The request should state in detail the extraordinary circumstances supporting the request and include all relevant documentation. If approved, the department chair will forward the request to the dean for approval and on to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for final approval"[93].

For promotion and tenure cases, each faculty member is responsible for putting together his or her packet. The documentation for the application for tenure and/or promotion must include a current curriculum vitae; an account of teaching assignments and teaching loads which must be listed by semester and for a specified number of years; course syllabi, student evaluations, teaching portfolio, and student outcomes assessment; and other documentation that provides additional evidence of teaching such as teaching innovations, new course development, and other activities related to teaching effectiveness and teaching quality. Evidence of scholarly or creative activity, a list of contributions to the university, community, and profession with the dates, types of service and appropriate documentation, documentation of workshops or seminars attended, and any consulting activities must also be included. Additionally, individual colleges may require supplementary information such as peer reviews of teaching, program development, or scholarly production. Candidates may also include further documentation that they deem relevant.

The actual promotion and tenure review process begins in the departments with a departmental committee. That departmental committee forwards its recommendation to the department chair who in turn forwards the recommendation along with his recommendation to the dean of the college. The dean forwards the recommendations to the college promotion and tenure committees that are responsible for making a recommendation to the dean. Once the dean has the committee's recommendation, he or she makes her recommendation and forward the entire process to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. That committee consists of membership from all the colleges. Its recommendation is forwarded to the provost, along with all the other recommendations and the original tenure and/or promotion packet. The Provost is charged with further evaluating the candidate and with making a recommendation to the President. Ultimately, the Board of Regents of the Texas A&M University System makes the final judgment regarding tenure, based upon the recommendation of the System Chancellor and all the others who have participated in the process. The System Chancellor approves all faculty promotions. Copies of the two most recent Board of
Regents' tenure agenda items are available for review in the supporting documents [94] [95].

**Post-Tenure Review**
Texas Education Code 51.942 requires a post-tenure review policy [96]. The Texas A&M University System Policy 12.06 Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness requires that each academic institution, "must periodically evaluate the performance of tenured faculty" [10]. Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi University Rule 12.06.99.C1 Post-Tenure Review states that, "Post-tenure review is designed to provide a periodic comprehensive evaluation of tenured faculty members. It is a supplement to the usual annual evaluation of faculty performance for merit evaluation. The underlying philosophy is to help tenured faculty members to continue to be productive members of the University community. Post-tenure review shall be required of all tenured faculty who receive two consecutive annual reviews with ratings of "unsatisfactory"" [97]. The University Rule is available on-line for access by all faculty. Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi submits reports annually to The Texas A&M University System Office [98] [99] [100] [101].

**Faculty Grievance Policy**
On occasion, faculty members may feel the need for redress. The purpose of the Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi University Procedure 32.01.01.C1.01 on Complaint and Appeal Procedure for Faculty Members is to "promote prompt and efficient investigation and resolution of grievances that are not addressed elsewhere in System policies or regulations or University rules and procedures and applies to all members of the faculty" [102]. Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Faculty Handbook covers general grievances concerning "wages, hours of work, conditions of work, or illegal discrimination." These complaints escalate until resolution from the department chair, to the dean, then the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and then to an ad hoc university investigation committee which consists of five tenured faculty members appointed by the provost [103]. The faculty grievance process allows a faculty member to address what he or she may feel to be an unfair review.

**Conclusion**
As demonstrated above, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi employs multiple measures to review and evaluate the effectiveness of all Texas A&M- Corpus Christi faculty and instructors, including graduate assistants who are instructors of record. The review procedures are published in multiple locations such as the Provost's policy Web site and the faculty handbook, and the results are shared with the faculty in order to continue to improve teaching, research, and service at the University.
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