

Note: University procedure 33.99.99.C0.02, *Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members* is currently under review.

Effective immediately, the university's faculty evaluation criteria for merit stated in section 2.5 below has been modified by the President, in consultation with system's Office of General Counsel, to define meritorious performance as being "Meets Expectations" or above (formerly stated as "an overall rating above Standard"). Note that the rating of "Standard" has been renamed as "Meets Expectations" without any change to the criteria of that rating. This revision allows the university to be consistent with other system member universities and the requirements of the new system Workday platform.

33.99.99.C0.02 Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members



Approved: March 21, 2016
Revised: March 21, 2016
Revised: August 1, 2016
Next Scheduled Review: August 1, 2021

Procedure Statement

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi considers the management of faculty performance to be an ongoing process that consists of performance planning, goal setting, faculty development, regular feedback, and the performance interview. Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi recognizes performance management as an essential function that supports several major objectives:

- To promote the establishment of performance expectations and goals that are consistent with institutional goals and objectives;
 - To formally communicate with faculty regarding performance;
 - To develop maximum performance potential of faculty;
 - To acknowledge faculty for job accomplishments.
-

Reason for Procedure

Each year unit supervisors, in consultation with faculty, will review unit goals and will ensure these goals are consistent with institutional goals. In conjunction with unit goals, unit supervisors will identify individual performance goals for faculty and faculty development and training needs. A faculty member's professional performance is to be evaluated annually, based on criteria that are directly related to the individual faculty member's identified job responsibilities, workload, and established goals, as developed by the supervisor in consultation with the faculty member.

Procedures and Responsibilities

1. GENERAL

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi supervisors will fairly evaluate a faculty member's job performance regardless of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, disability, genetic information, veteran status, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

2. DETERMINING FACULTY EVALUATION RANKING

- 2.1. Three areas of evaluation for faculty members will include teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. Evaluations must be based on the data provided in an appropriate university-approved database (e.g. Digital Measures). Weight will be given to those areas according to the percentage of distribution of workload in regards to teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service. Ranking levels used in evaluating a faculty member will be as follows:

Excellent:

- Well above Standard expectations for full-time faculty members of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or College.
- A faculty member must significantly exceed standard expectations for this rating.

High:

- Above Standard expectations for full-time faculty members of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or College, but does not rise to the level of Excellent.

Standard:

- Meets, but does not exceed, general expectations for faculty performance for full-time faculty members of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or College.

Unsatisfactory:

- Performance is below Standard expectations for a full-time faculty member of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or College.
- The faculty member must improve performance in any area of teaching, research, and/or service that is scored unsatisfactory in the annual review and will be given a written set of expectations for improvement in a defined improvement plan. Unit supervisors may develop, in consultation with faculty, multi-year improvement plans.

- 2.2. Faculty members will be evaluated solely in terms of those areas named in Section 2.1 of this procedure that are a part of their assigned professional duties and relative to their workload profile. For example, some professional faculty members may not be evaluated on scholarly/creative activity, while research faculty may not be evaluated on teaching.
- 2.3. Faculty evaluation letters must include a rating for each area, as well as an overall rating for the annual review period. The faculty member's workload distribution and its relationship to their overall rating must be stated in the evaluation letter. The College Dean will work to ensure that fairness and consistency are achieved across departments.
- 2.4. An overall rating will be assigned for the annual review period, based on the scores assigned in each evaluation area. Regardless of workload, if a faculty member receives an Unsatisfactory rating in one or more evaluation area that results in a combined Unsatisfactory weighting equal to or greater than .50, the faculty member will receive an overall Unsatisfactory rating. If a faculty member

receives an Unsatisfactory rating in the same evaluation area over a contiguous two-year period, regardless of workload, they will receive an Unsatisfactory rating overall.

- 2.5. In order to qualify for a merit pay increase connected to the annual faculty evaluation, faculty members must receive an overall rating above Standard.
 - 2.6. Each College must establish general criteria for faculty to achieve the ranking levels set forth in this procedure. Colleges must adhere to these specific ranking levels listed in Section 2.1 of this procedure. The criteria must be approved by a majority vote of full-time faculty in their respective College. The College Dean will work to ensure that fairness and consistency are achieved across departments.
 - 2.7. At the discretion of the respective College Dean, unit supervisors, in consultation with faculty, will determine more specific unit and/or division-specific criteria in order to comply with the general criteria developed by the respective College in their implementation document.
 - 2.8. Each College must make the criteria therein publicly available to faculty in writing prior to the implementation of the procedure for use in the faculty evaluation process. Each College Dean must submit the College's criteria to the Provost for approval prior to implementation in the faculty evaluation process.
3. FACULTY RESPONSE PROCESS
- 3.1. Faculty members can file a written response to their annual evaluation, which will accompany the evaluation for any subsequent performance reviews.
 - 3.2. If a faculty member disagrees with their evaluation, then the faculty member should present their concerns with their department chair. The department chair will reach a decision as soon as possible, but generally not later than 10 working days from the date the concern was presented.
 - 3.3. In the event that a satisfactory resolution is not reached, the faculty member may bring the concern to their respective dean. The dean will reach a decision as soon as possible, but generally not later than 10 working days from the date the concern was presented. The dean's decision will be final.

Related Statutes, Policies or Requirements

[TAMUS Regulation 32.01.01 Complaint and Appeal Procedures for Faculty Members](#)
[TAMUCC Procedure 12.01.99.C0.03 Responsibilities of Full-Time Faculty Members](#)
[TAMUCC Procedure 12.07.99.C0.01 Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Positions](#)
[TAMUCC Procedure 32.01.01.C0.01 Complaint and Appeal Procedure for Faculty Members](#)

Contact Office

Contact for clarification and interpretation: Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs,
(361) 825-2722.