

# 12.01.99.C0.06 Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members



Revised: April 11, 2022  
Next Scheduled Review: April 11, 2027  
[Revision History](#)

---

## Procedure Summary

---

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi (TAMU-CC) 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. TAMU-CC 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

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 job responsibilities outlined in their notice of appointment, workload, and established goals, as developed by the supervisor in consultation with the faculty member.

---

## Procedure

---

### 1. GENERAL

TAMU-CC 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 RANKINGS

2.1. The areas of evaluation for faculty members will be based on their responsibilities outlined in their notices of appointment and may include teaching, librarianship,

scholarship and creative activity, and/or service. Evaluations must be based on the data provided in an appropriate university-approved faculty information management system. Weight will be given to those areas of responsibility according to the percentage of distribution of workload. Ranking levels used in evaluating a faculty member will be as follows:

- Excellent:
  - Exceptional performance exceeding expectations for full-time faculty members of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or academic unit (e.g., colleges and library).
- High:
  - Exceeds performance expectations for full-time faculty members of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or academic unit but does not rise to the level of Excellent.
- Meets Expectations:
  - Meets expectations for performance for full-time faculty members of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or academic unit.
- Unsatisfactory:
  - Performance is below expectations for a full-time faculty member of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or academic unit.
  - The faculty member must improve performance in any area of teaching/librarianship, scholarship and creative activity, 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. In consultation with the faculty member, the immediate supervisor may develop a multi-year improvement plan.

2.2. Academic units must adhere to these specific ranking levels listed in Section 2.1 of this procedure. Each academic unit must establish general criteria for faculty to achieve the ranking levels set forth in this procedure. The criteria must be approved by a majority vote of full-time faculty in their respective academic unit. The academic unit dean will work to ensure that fairness and consistency are achieved across departments.

2.3. At the discretion of the respective dean, department chairs/supervisors, in consultation with faculty, will determine more specific department and/or discipline-specific criteria in order to comply with the general criteria developed by the respective academic unit in their implementation document.

2.4. Each academic unit 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 dean must submit the academic unit's criteria to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval prior to implementation in the faculty evaluation process.

### 3. PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESS

- 3.1. Faculty members will be evaluated in terms of those areas named in section 2.1 of this procedure that are part of their assigned professional duties and relative to their workload profile and that the evaluator is in an actual position to properly assess the faculty members performance. For example, some professional faculty members may not be evaluated on scholarship and creative activity, while research faculty may not be evaluated on teaching.
- 3.2. Faculty evaluation letters must include a rating for each appropriate area of responsibility, as well as an overall rating for the annual review period. The letter must also state whether the faculty member is making adequate progress toward promotion, tenure, and/or post-tenure review, as applicable. The faculty member's workload distribution and its relationship to their overall rating must be stated in the evaluation letter. The academic unit dean will work to ensure that fairness and consistency are achieved across departments.
- 3.3. An overall rating will be assigned for the annual review period, based on the weighted scores assigned in each evaluation area. Regardless of workload, if a faculty member receives an Unsatisfactory rating in one (1) or more evaluation area that results in a combined Unsatisfactory weighting equal to or greater than 50% of their overall rating, 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.
- 3.4. In order to qualify for a merit payment connected to the annual faculty evaluation, faculty members must receive an overall rating of Meets Expectations or higher.

### 4. FACULTY RESPONSE PROCESS

- 4.1. Faculty members can file a written response to their annual evaluation, which will accompany the evaluation for any subsequent performance reviews.
- 4.2. If a faculty member disagrees with their evaluation, then the faculty member should present their concerns to their department chair/supervisor. The department chair/supervisor will reach a decision as soon as possible, but generally not later than 10 working days from the date the concern was presented.
- 4.3. 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.

## 5. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 5.1. If the faculty member receives an Unsatisfactory rating in any category/categories (teaching, librarianship, scholarship and creative activity, and/or service) or an overall rating of Unsatisfactory from their department chair/supervisor, the faculty member, in collaboration with the department chair/supervisor, shall establish a short-term professional development plan addressing any/all Unsatisfactory areas (individual categories or overall rating) within 30 days of the performance review. This plan must include performance improvement benchmarks.
- 5.2. The original written evaluation and development plan shall be submitted to the dean.
- 5.3. Normally, the development plan period will be for one (1) academic year. The department chair/supervisor will assess evidence of improvement midway through the plan and discuss progress with the faculty member.
- 5.4. The successful completion of the professional development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The department chair/supervisor will assess evidence of improvement at the completion of the development plan at or before the next performance review of the faculty member. If the faculty member is deemed to have made insufficient progress by the end of the plan period, the department chair/supervisor in conjunction with the dean, will take appropriate administrative action up to and including recommendation for dismissal.

---

## Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements

---

System Policy [\*12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure\*](#)

System Regulation [\*32.01.01, Complaint and Appeal Procedures for Faculty Members\*](#)

University Procedure [\*12.01.99.C0.03, Responsibilities of Full-Time Faculty Members\*](#)

University Procedure [\*12.07.99.C0.01, Fixed-Term Faculty Members\*](#)

University Procedure [\*32.01.01.C0.01, Complaint and Appeal Procedure for Faculty Members\*](#)

This procedure supersedes:

- 33.99.99.C0.02, Performance Review of Full-Time Faculty Members

---

## Contact Office

---

Contact for clarification and interpretation: Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs,

(361) 825-2722