

Texas A&M International University
TAMIU Faculty Senate
Friday September 2, 2022
12:15 p.m.– 2:45 p.m.
WHTC 125

I. The meeting was called to order by the Faculty Senate President, Dr. Ruby Ynalvez at 12:17 p.m.

II. *Roll Call*: Dr. Ruby Ynalvez, Dr. Hayley Kazen, Dr. Marvin Bennett, Dr. Li-Zheng Brooks, Dr. Seong Kwan Cho, Dr. Deepak Ganta, Dr. Puneet Gill, Dr. Tatiana Gorbunova, Dr. San Juanita Hernandez, Dr. Andrew Hazelton, Dr. Kate Houston, Dr. Kameron Jorgensen, Dr. Runchang Lin, Dr. Gilberto Martinez, Dr. James Norris, Dr. Leonel Prieto

III. *Our Guests* were given the floor:

Dr. Pablo Arenaz

Dr. Arenaz announced that our student enrollment is about up to where it was in the Fall of 2020, but our credit hour production is slightly down (~1%) from that time. Since this is a base counting period we need to increase our credit hour production for the Spring so that we can try to get our full formula funding from the State. He also announced that one of his priorities for this year is going to be grantsmanship and grants writing. TAMIU has \$250K for the funding of new faculty research projects and new grant proposals.

Dr. Arenaz mentioned that he was concerned that faculty are reluctant to engage in grant writing, possibly due to:

- Chairs and Deans do not value grant writing at the same level that they value publishing, in terms of faculty's annual evaluations. The comment was that no credit was being given for all of the work that was put into unsuccessful grants.
- There are Chairs and/or Deans who actively discourage grant writing because it is too much work for the department and too much of a strain on departmental resources.
- Some staff in department offices seem to be reluctant to work with faculty who have grant funding in terms of ordering supplies and other work related to the grant.

There was further discussion on the difficulties involved in hiring students and others to support grants that were successful. Also, there have been problems with not being allowed to pay our students competitive salaries for work done on grants.

Dr. Arenaz informed the Senate that TAMIU has created 37 Research Assistantships to aid faculty in their research throughout the University. It was suggested that this information should be disseminated to all of the faculty to make them aware of this opportunity.

Dr. Thomas Mitchell

Dr. Mitchell announced that by the end of this semester we will have a draft of a strategic plan that will then be vetted by everyone for input. We are already working on our self-study for our 10-year SACS reaffirmation. They are currently working on establishing committees to aid in addressing the standards we will have to meet as an institution for the reaffirmation. We also need to develop a new Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for the university. We will be holding some open university brain-storming sessions to help generate new ideas on what the university could do to improve itself.

Dr. Mitchell is currently working with the chairs and deans to see that all faculty receive training on the new INSPIRE platform which will replace Early Alert for reporting students who are having academic difficulties.

The Senate was given 2 items from the Provost on suggested revisions to the Faculty Handbook (see attached). One is a provision for fixed-term faculty who wish to be reclassified to tenure-track. The other is the expectation that full-time faculty be present on campus for at least 4 days out of a regular work week.

Ms. Rosanne Palacios (VP for Institutional Advancement)

It was announced that the VivaTAMIU Faculty and Staff Giving Campaign is currently at 60% of our goal and we still have one month left in the campaign. If a college reaches 100% in giving they are put into a drawing to receive \$5,000. For the last 2 years University College has been the only academic unit to reach that goal. Another \$5,000 will be awarded to the academic unit that shows the greatest increase in the number of donations.

Dr. Robert Wilkinson and Ms. Karol Batey (Office of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning)

Dr. Wilkinson reported on class assessment and using the mean of the median in the assessment. As a staff issue, they have to calculate the mean of the medium by hand, which utilizes an entire staff member's time. AEFIS can automatically calculate an average of the scores, which would free up that staff member to do other needed duties. It was suggested that representatives from the Senate and from the various colleges meet with the Assessment team to decide what metrics should be used in the course evaluations.

It was also proposed to the Senate that an official University Assessment Committee be formed, where members of that committee could get recognition for university service by participating in that committee.

IV. The minutes for the May 5th Faculty Senate meeting were approved with no corrections.

V. New Business

1. Faculty Senate Committees: Senator Ynalvez passed around a list of suggested members to the various senate committees and suggested committee chairs (see attached).
2. The Academic Oversight Committee was charged with discussion of which metric (mean, median or both) will be used on faculty PPE reports.
3. Recommendations for a date for the faculty assembly was also charged to the Academic Oversight Committee.
4. Senators Hernandez and Cho presented the senate with the College of Nursing and Health Sciences' Professional Portfolio Evaluation (see attached). This document was based on the COAS rubric and was approved by the faculty members of the college. The senate was charged with reviewing this document for further discussion and voting during the October meeting.
5. The proposal to create a program assessment university committee was charged to the Committee on Creation, Composition, and Responsibilities of Committees.
6. The COED faculty Senate nomination and election will take place before the October senate meeting.

VI. Old Business:

1. Update on the COAS PPE changes. Members of the senate who would be directly affected by this change were asked to discuss this among themselves and with their faculty and report back to the senate with their findings.
2. Senator Ynalvez agreed to meet with the Assessment Committee to discuss the up-and-coming Administrators' evaluations.

VII. Announcements and Other Business:

It was asked that the Ethics Committee look into several faculty members' concerns about faculty using textbooks that they themselves have written for their classes.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Suggested Revisions of the TAMIU Faculty Handbook

Add under "Others with Faculty Status," page 35, item #7: Fixed-Term Faculty:

Fixed-Term faculty may petition to be reclassified as tenure-track Assistant Professors. Their petition would be evaluated by the promotion and tenure committee of their department or college, by their department chair, by their dean, by the provost, and, finally, by the president. In general, to be reclassified as a tenure-track faculty member, the fixed-term faculty member must have a terminal degree and demonstrate a record of research and publications strong enough to suggest likely success in eventually securing tenure.

Add a second paragraph on page 25 under "Major Faculty Responsibilities" (and before the "Teaching" heading):

All full-time faculty are expected to be on campus at least four days of a regular work week during the fall and spring semesters to fulfill their teaching and service duties, hold office hours, or to conduct research. Any exceptions to this required four-day on-campus presence must have the approval of the college dean and provost.

TAMIU Faculty Senate 2022-2023 Committee
(08-29-22) Assignments

Committee	Chair*	Member	Member
The Budget and Finance Committee	Ganta, D.*	Brooks, L.	Lin, R
The Academic Oversight Committee	Kazen, H* Prieto, L.	Gonzalez, A.	Cho, SK Norris, Jason
The University Ethics Committee	Houston, K.*	Norris, James	Momen, M.
The Committee on Committees	Jorgensen, K.*	Ganta, D.	Hatcher, J
The Awards Committee	Moran, M.*	Hazelton, A./Norris, L.	Hernandez, S.
The Faculty Handbook Revision Committee	Bennett, M*	Hatcher, J	Gorbunova, T.
The Assessment Committee	Brooks, L.*	Houston, K.	Lin, R
The Technology Advisory Committee	Kazen, H*	Bennett, M	Hernandez, S.
The Distance Education and Instructional Technology	Norris, James*	Momen, M.	Moran, M.
Fixed-Term Faculty	Martinez, G.*	Gorbunova, T.	Jorgensen, K.

*recommended by Faculty Senate President to serve as chair

TAMIU Faculty Senate 2022-2023
Committees per Senator

Senator	Committee	Committee
Bennett, Marvin	Faculty Handbook Revision	Technology Advisory
Brooks, Li Zheng	Assessment	The Budget and Finance
Hatcher, Jeanette	Faculty Handbook Revision	Committee on Committees
Ganta, Deepak	The Budget and Finance	Committee on Committees
Cho, Seong Kwan	Academic Oversight	
Gonzalez, Ariadne	Academic Oversight	
Gorbunova, Tatiana	Fixed-Term Faculty	Assessment
Hernandez, San Juanita	The Technology Advisory	The Awards
Houston, Kate	University Ethics	Assessment
Jorgensen, Kameron	The Committee on Committees	Fixed Term Faculty
Kazen, Hayley	Academic Oversight Committee	The Technology Advisory
Lin, Runchang	Budget and Finance Committee	Assessment
Martinez, Gilberto	Assessment Committee	Fixed Term Faculty
Momen, Mehnaaz	Distance Education Committee	University Ethics
Moran, Marcela	Awards	Distance Education
Norris, James	Distance Education	University Ethics
Norris, Jason	Academic Oversight	
Hazelton Andrew ^{fall} Lola Norris ^{spring}	Awards Committee	
Prieto, Leonel	Academic Oversight	

Meeting of Faculty Senate Presidents

9-9-2022 Meeting

1:30pm – 5:00pm

Texas A&M College Station

Attendees: Leonard Love TAMUSA, John Stallone TAMU, Wynn Chin UH, Jim Woosley TAMU, Joey Velasco Sul Ross, Kimberly Syptak Tarleton, David Rembert TAMUPV, Brian Matthews TAMUT, Yasemin Atinc TAMUC, Gilberto Martinez TAMIU, Shelley Harris TAMUCT

1. Introductions
2. Housekeeping
 - a. Hotel (room, food)
 - b. 2 Tailgates (Jim's and Chancellors)
 - c. Yell Practice (meet at 11:30, yellow band)
 - d. New park to visit
3. AAUP – suggested to use as a guide when developing our group, constitution and bylaws
4. Name – suggested Texas A&M System Assembly of Faculty Senates
5. Membership – 1 member per university due to system size (President / Speaker)
6. System benefit
7. Meet – 2x a year in person. Location??
8. Terms – suggested as 2 years, then 1/2/3 staggered
9. Items to discuss
 - a. Budget
 - b. Institutional memory (shared drive, website, SSO)
 - c. Roles (President/VP/Secretary)
 - d. Meetings
 - e. Focus on system level issues
 - f. System-wide conference in future?
 - g. Administrative support, IT, Historian? System office support
10. Voting items:
 - a. Name: Texas A&M System Assembly of Faculty Senates.

Motion: Shelley

2nd: Leonard

Approved: Unanimous

b. Founding Members term: 2 years, then 1/2/3 staggered off

Motion: Shelley

2nd: Yasemin

Approved: Unanimous

c. Interim Board members and roles:

Jim, Speaker

Shelley, Vice Speaker

David, Secretary

Motion: Brian

Motion: Jim

Motion: Jim

2nd: Kimberly

2nd: Brian

2nd: Shelley

Approved: Unanimous, all three motions

11. Next items:

a. Assign tasks

b. Mission / Goals

c. Zoom times

Texas A&M System Assembly of Faculty Senates

9-11-2022 Meeting

10:30am – 12:00pm

Texas A&M College Station

Attendees: Leonard Love TAMUSA, Wynn Chin UH, Jim Woosley TAMU, Kimberly Syptak Tarleton, David Rembert TAMUPV, Brian Matthews TAMUT, Yasemin Atinc TAMUC, Shelley Harris TAMUCT

1. Action item: Jim

- a. Meet with Chancellor (thank you, shirts, institutional memory)
- b. Contact TAMUK, TAMUCC, WTAMU

2. Texas Council of Faculty Senates

- a. October 7-8, 2022
- b. Embassy Suites
- c. Meet Friday at 10:30am

3. Action item: David, Leonard and Brian

- a. Mission/Vision statement

4. Action item: David

- a. Doodle poll for Zoom meeting days/times

5. Action item: Shelley

- a. Create constitution/bylaws template

6. Action item: David

- a. Speak with Chancellor's student group about infrastructure, communication

7. Discussion of budgets and future operating procedures

8. Voting items: Meetings

- a. 1x a month – Zoom
- b. 1x a large semester in person

Motion: Leonard, 2nd: Yasmin, Approved: Unanimous

9. Open invitation: Suggested that Joey and Winn have an open invitation to attend and assist in our development.

10. Adjourn

CONHS Faculty Evaluation Instruments PPE and Evaluation Criteria

The Professional Portfolio Evaluation (PPE) is the primary mechanism for the annual evaluation of faculty members in the College of Nursing and Health Science. All faculty must submit a PPE each year. The information contained in the PPE will provide much of the documentation used to evaluate faculty performance for the year. Department chairs will use the evaluation criteria found in the rubrics for the evaluation of teaching, research, and service found at the end of this document.

The Professional Portfolio Evaluation system includes the following categories, which carry the following percentage weights in the overall evaluation of faculty in different categories:

Faculty Category	Teaching (Classroom or clinical)	Scholarship/Research & Creative Work	Service	Chair Evaluation
Non-Tenure Track	70	-	20	10
Tenure-Track	40	45	5	10
Tenured (w/o Research Release)	50	30	15	5
Tenured (with Research Release)	35	45	15	5

By vote of the faculty of the college in 2007 and in accordance with the Post-Tenure Review Process outlined in the *TAMIU Faculty Handbook*, a score of below 70 by a tenured faculty member is deemed evidence of “serious deficiencies” which must be addressed in a professional development plan if a faculty member receives two consecutive evaluations below 70. See the *TAMIU Faculty Handbook* for details.

Description of the Professional Portfolio Evaluation System

Phase I: Teaching

The evaluation of faculty teaching efforts is to be based primarily on the evidence supplied by a teaching portfolio and supplemented by other relevant data. The evaluation will follow the criteria set forth in the rubric for evaluating teaching found at the end of this document. The portfolio must contain both student perceptions of faculty teaching performance (“student evaluations”) and a narrative describing the faculty member’s efforts to achieve or maintain teaching excellence. The narrative must be accompanied by supporting documentation. Among the documents that should be considered for inclusion in the portfolio are:

- Peer evaluations of teaching.
- Student comments and testimonials

- Evidence of attendance at teaching workshops and conferences on pedagogy and field of practice.
- Students' scores on tests/standardized tests and/or clinical skills showing evidence of learning, possibly pre- and post-test results.
- Students' work showing evidence of learning which would include, but are not limited to, such items as workbooks, class logs, portfolios, essays, creative works, projects, and presentations in local, regional, and national conferences.
- Teaching Independent Study courses that have academic credit hours
- Teaching Independent Study courses that do not have academic credit hours
- Development of continuing education units or short courses that are for non-credit
- Supervision of undergraduate student research
- Documentary evidence of assistance to students outside of class with course-related problems, advisement, securing employment, letters of recommendation, workshops, and tutorial sessions.
- Special course materials prepared by the professor for students, such as workbooks, manuals, specialized instructional packets, and collections of readings.
- Copies of corrected students' work (classroom or clinical) showing suggestions for improvement and encouragement.
- Evidence of innovation and/or general improvements in course development and delivery. For example, evidence in innovation in teaching methods and production of textbooks, or educational "software"; evidence-based teaching strategies, including technologies that promote student success.
- Development of teaching materials for on-campus or on-line course delivery.
- Instruction in WIN sections.
- Instruction in Honors sections.
- Evidence of the use of student and professional feedback to improve teaching.
- Evidence of participation in programmatic or development grants related to teaching/learning
- Presents innovations in teaching techniques and/ or evidence-based clinical practices at regional, national, or international professional conferences
- Quality Matters™ certification for courses developed for online delivery.

The preceding list is merely suggestive. Any evidence of teaching excellence should be included in the portfolio.

Evaluation Criteria

The descriptive criteria for the evaluation rubrics below were developed by college faculty committees containing representatives from all college departments. For each level of performance, the committees have identified the appropriate score for the university's official faculty evaluation and for the score range on the college's PPE faculty evaluation, which is used for merit pay purposes. Scores 3 and above or 70% or above are deemed satisfactory. Scores 2 and below are deemed unsatisfactory. As with all rubrics, the following rubrics are meant to provide a list of descriptive statements typical of those meriting a certain score. Evaluators, however, must inevitably use their best judgment in interpreting whether or not a faculty member has met all or simply most of the descriptive criteria to merit a particular score. As an example, an evaluator

may not consider student evaluations of much use for determining the quality of teaching if the percentage of respondents for a class falls well below the department mean.

I. Teaching

5 (90-100) Faculty maintains and presents evidence of exceptional standards of teaching and learning. Students are presented with clear objectives, held to the highest academic standards, and consistently challenged to think critically on the subject matter. Students develop a clear understanding of their responsibility in learning. The students should indicate their opinion that the instructor effectively presents relevant information, and the course materials are well prepared and organized. Feedback on student works regularly and timely. Evaluation and grading perceived as fair. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a score of “5” for teaching are most often 4.7 or higher.

4 (80-89) Faculty maintains and presents evidence of very high standards teaching and learning. Students are presented with clear objectives, held to high academic standards and regularly challenged to think critically on the subject matter. The students should indicate their opinion that the instructor effectively presents relevant information, and the course materials are well prepared and organized. Feedback on student works regularly and timely. Evaluation and grading perceived as fair. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a score of “4” for teaching are most often 4.0 or higher.

3 (70-79) Faculty maintains and presents evidence of high standards of teaching and learning. Students are presented with clear objectives, held to the high academic standards and regularly challenged to think critically on the subject matter. Students opinions indicate some dissatisfaction with preparation and/or organization. Feedback on student works regularly and timely. Evaluation and grading perceived as fair. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a score of “3” for teaching are most often 3.5 or higher.

2 (60-69) Evidence indicates low standards of teaching and learning. Little evidence of students being sufficiently challenged to think critically. Course objectives not clearly stated. Somewhat ill-prepared or disorganized. Instructor displays little motivation or enthusiasm. Students indicate little feedback on submitted work. Evaluation and grading perceived as unfair. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a “2” for teaching are most often below a 3.5.

1 (59-60) Evidence indicates low standards of teaching and learning. Little evidence of students being sufficiently challenged to think critically. No course objectives, preparation, organization. Instructor resists change and rejects constructive criticism. Evaluation and grading perceived as unfair. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a “1” for teaching are most often below a 3.5.

0 (<50) Evidence reflects no interest in teaching or learning. Instructor shows no motivation for improvement. No course objectives, preparation, organization. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a “0” for teaching are most often below a 3.5.

Phase II: *Research, Scholarly Activities, and Creative Work*

The evaluation of a faculty member's engagement in research, publication, and other scholarly products will be based on the criteria described in the evaluation for research in the rubric found at the end of this document. The evaluation will be determined by evidence of the three types of activities listed below:

A. Pre-publication Activities

Credit for properly documented and significant pre-publication activities is important to provide incentives for faculty to engage in major, multi-year research projects. These activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Drafts of grants submitted for funding
- Exploration of archival collections or existing datasets
- Creation of research materials (e.g., questionnaires)
- Data collection and analysis
- Field and lab research activities
- Drafts of papers in progress (reports, articles, book chapters, and books, etc.)

Documentation for all activities described in the narrative should be made available to the Department Chair, who, in turn, will give appropriate research credit for the pre-publication activities.

B. Publications

These activities include books, articles, scholarly reports, and other publications (e.g., creative as well as scholarly). The narrative of scholarly activities described above should be followed by a listing, with appropriate explanation and documentation of publications, grant applications, and other scholarly products during the past year, examples of which are listed below:

- Completion of a grant proposal that has been approved for external funding.
- Sole authorship of a book
- Sole authorship of an article in a refereed journal.
- Co-authorship of an article in a refereed journal.
- Co-authorship of a book
- Editing of a book or journal.
- Sole authorship of a chapter in a book.
- Co-authorship of a chapter in a book.
- Sole or co-authorship of a research paper or other document published as part of conference proceedings.
- Sole authorship of an article in a non-refereed journal.
- Co-authorship of an article in a non-refereed journal.
- Sole authorship of a research monograph published for distribution among professionals affiliated with a research agency.
- Co-authorship of a research monograph published for distribution among professionals affiliated with a research agency.

- Sole authorship of a research paper published for distribution among professionals affiliated with a research agency.
- Co-authorship of a research paper published for distribution among professionals affiliated with a research agency.
- Sole authorship of a teaching syllabus, reference bibliography or teaching exercise which is published in a professional association's resource manual.
- Editor of a newsletter.
- Co-editor of a newsletter.
- Software publication– to be treated as publication in a refereed or non-refereed journal.
- Book review.
- Works published, exhibits shown, performances given.
- Patents.

C. Involvement in Professional Organizations and Meetings.

Activities include, but are not limited to, presentations, panels, workshops, sessions chaired or moderated at conferences, and other external venues for which professional participation of an individual has been solicited.

- Workshop or paper presentation at a national conference.
- Workshop or paper presentation at a state or regional conference.
- Moderator or session chair at a national, state, or regional conference.
- Discussant or respondent for a session at a national conference.
- Discussant or respondent for a session at a state or regional conference.
- External reviewer of journal submissions, grants, monographs, books, and manuscripts by another scholar.
- External reviewer for promotion and tenure decisions for a faculty member at another university.
- Attendance at a national conference in the area of expertise.
- Attendance at a state or regional conference in the area of expertise.
- Participation in the planning of a national, state, or regional conference.
- Officer of a professional organization.
- Member of a committee of a professional organization.

Note to Tenure-Track Faculty: Tenure is not a “sum of the parts.” In the relationship between yearly evaluations and final decisions about tenure and promotion, do not assume that acceptable yearly evaluations add up to tenure. For instance, a faculty member might earn a “3” in research each year because of presenting conference papers, but if at the end of the tenure-track period the faculty member has not published sufficiently, then tenure is almost certainly to be denied.

Note on Co-Authorship: Generally, sole authorship carries greater credit than co-authorship. Also, the position of the author's name in the series of co-authors generally signifies the weight of the author's contribution to the research or the writing, but the protocols of each discipline vary in how this contribution is signified (e.g., first author as a principal researcher or last author as a principal researcher or alphabetical equality).

Note on Selectivity/Status of Publication: The faculty member in submitting the PPE should describe to the chair and the dean the nature of his or her contribution to a co-authored publication. The faculty member should also provide to the chair and the dean whatever evidence is available to demonstrate the influence or status or selectivity of the journal or publisher in which the publication appeared.

Note on International/National Referred Journals

International/national referred journals must be SCOPUS, SCIE, or an SSCI index journal. Quality publications that are not indexed above should be verified by faculty with evidence.

- 5 (90-100):** Faculty must have one of the following: 1). published 1 or 2 articles in a national/international refereed journal or a book, in his/her field of study (i.e., 1st author, mentor, corresponding author; or at least 25% contribution); 2). have a grant approved; or 3). the faculty member demonstrates his/her impact in the field by providing citation counts (e.g., 2-4 citations) published by the Social Science and/or Science Citation Indexes of his/her work.
- 4 (80-89):** Faculty must have one of the following: 1). published an article in a refereed journal (generally defined) and one or more conference papers at major conferences in the field; or 2). the faculty member wrote one or more competitive grants that were not funded and made demonstrable progress in his or her own research (e.g., manuscripts, conference papers).
- 3 (70-79):** Faculty must have completed all of the following: 1). presented at least one paper at a regional or national conference in his/her own field; 2). have an active research agenda; 3). and have working papers (as evidenced by manuscripts in draft form, research data, etc.).
- 2 (60-69):** Faculty in this category have an active research agenda but failed to publish, write a grant, or produce evidence of substantial progress toward the publication of an article during the year. Such a faculty member, however, has remained current in his or her field and is likely to publish or secure a grant in subsequent years:
- 1 (50-59):** Faculty in this category do not have an active research agenda but are current in their fields and are capable of being more productive than they have been. They may attend conferences.
- 0 (<50):** Faculty in this category do not have an active research agenda and are not current in their fields.

Phase III: Service

Service encompasses a variety of professionally related activities through which members of the faculty profession employ their academic expertise for the benefit of the University, the community, and the profession. Texas A&M International University places a strong emphasis on service to the University and its mission. A faculty member provides service to the University through active participation and leadership in college and University committees, councils, special projects, or duties for which the faculty member is held accountable. Community service by TAMIU faculty is recognized in any and all of those areas. For purposes of evaluation, however, activities must relate to one's academic field or discipline or else be clearly approved by the University. Participation and leadership in professional activities and associations may be considered service when it does not include peer review. Certificates of recognition, letters of appreciation, official minutes, newsletters, products of projects, and other tangible evidence of service rendered may document Service of all types. (From the TAMIU Faculty Handbook) Service to the University and the community is expected of all CNHS faculty members who are tenured, tenure track, or non-tenure track. There are minimum service obligation expectations per year for all faculty, based on your faculty track.

Tenure-Track & Tenured Faculty

- Tenure-track with years 1-3 at TAMIU: two college obligations in addition to one university/community/professional/student obligation per academic year
- Tenure-track with years 4-6 at TAMIU: two college obligations in addition to two university/community/professional/student obligations per academic year
- Tenured faculty: three college obligations in addition to two university/community/professional/student obligations per academic year

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

- Assistant-level with years 1-3 at TAMIU: two college obligations in addition to one university/community/professional/student obligation per academic year
- Assistant-level with years 4-5 at TAMIU: two college obligations in addition to two university/community/professional/student obligations per academic year
- Assistant-level with more than 6 years at TAMIU or Associate-level: three college obligations in addition to three university/community/professional/student obligations per academic year

In this context, "service obligations" will be interpreted to mean a wide variety of possible tasks. Faculty will be evaluated for merit pay based on the service activity during the annual PPE. A narrative is to be included in their PPE discussing the service activities, and the roles/responsibilities of the faculty. Documentation such as committee minutes, advising rosters or other proof of involvement, will further strengthen the faculty's evaluation.

Service obligations may include but are not limited to the following:

Department/College/University

Service on departmental, college or University committee includes such as membership on either a standing or specially appointed committee, development of degree programs and new courses, recruitment and/or open house participation, and chairperson on a committee. All faculties are

assigned to specific college committees, those who are chair or co-chairs for the committee with active participation will be evaluated as such.

1. Special consideration will be given to service on the following committees: Faculty Senate, Grievance Committees, University Honor Council, Institutional Review Board, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, College and University Promotion and Tenure Committees, and College and University Curriculum Committees.
2. Special consideration will also be given to service as a faculty mentor to junior faculty, a program coordinator or a volunteer to be chair or co-chair of committees.
3. For non-tenured faculty, research and/or grant writing/submissions are optional and will be given special consideration.

Community

Supervision of a non-mandatory student internship/project that benefits a community organization, service on a community committee, service on a community committee board, and participation in the events of a community organization or outreach program.

Student

- Advisor/supervisor/sponsorship of a student club or honor society, supervision of a field trip, service on university committees relating to Student Affairs.
- Teaching non-credit Independent Study courses
- Documentary evidence of assistance to students outside class with course-related problems, advisement, securing employment, letters of recommendation, workshops and tutorial sessions.
- Instruction in Honors program

Professional

Consulting services or workshops in the area of expertise, speaking engagements, service to professional organizations and professional association development.

Evaluation Criteria

- | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|
| 5 | Extraordinary | Exceeds excellent expectations with more than additional service activities and/or two special consideration service activities (See 1, 2, &3). |
| 4 | Excellent | The minimum service requirements plus two additional service activities and/or one special consideration service activity. |
| 3 | Good | Meets the minimum service requirements. It is expected that all CNHS faculty would rank at this level at a minimum. |
| 2 | Less than expected | Passive participant in college committees and/or did not meet the minimum service requirements |
| 1 | Poor | Absence from college committees. Makes no effort in engaging students or self in a professional manner. |