Texas A&M International University
TAMIU Faculty Senate
October Meeting
12:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
STC 230

I. The meeting was called to order by the Faculty Senate President, Dr. Hayley Kazen at 12:01 p.m.

II. *Roll Call:* Dr. Hayley Kazen, Dr. Lourdes Viloria, Dr. Ariadne A. Gonzalez, Ms. Jeanette Hatcher, Dr. Diana Linn, Dr. James Norris, Dr. Andrew Hazelton, Dr. Kameron Jorgensen, Dr. Cynthia Sosa, Dr. Deepak Ganta, Dr. Runchang Lin, Dr. Tatiana Gorbunova, Dr. Li-Zheng Brooks, Dr. Leonel Prieto, Ms. San Juanita Hernandez, Dr. Marvin Bennett, Dr. Kate Houston, Dr. Juan Hinojosa, and Mr. Timothy Rubel.

III. Our guests were given the floor:

Dr. Claudia San Miguel

Dr. San Miguel announced that "Brunch with the Provost" held on October 6 was a success and had a good discussion of undergraduate and graduate programs and degree ideas as well as the top two QEP topics of advising and experiential learning. Dr. San Miguel mentioned she met with the post-tenure review taskforce and she and the taskforce reviewed the A&M system policy and the updates to it with the recent changes to the legislature. She also mentioned they compared the policy to that of the University's, and it seems robust in most areas. One of the areas needing attention is the post-tenure review language. Dr. San Miguel mentioned the language needed can be taken from the Faculty Handbook and be made into its own SAP because it does not exist as its own policy. The taskforce also discussed whether moral turpitude should be clarified or further defined. Some faculty on that taskforce believed it should not since faculty going through a post-tenure review process have the right to appeal. Dr. San Miguel mentioned if the post-tenure review committee finds the faculty member deficient and there are grounds for separation from the university because of a negative post-tenure review process or an element of moral turpitude, there would be a faculty committee assessing that. She mentioned there is an appeal process in place. The taskforce discussed that the post-tenure process language should be included in offer letters as well as a reference to the Faculty Handbook and the policy referencing tenure and defining the service expectations for faculty.

Dr. San Miguel mentioned Dr. Abrego is proposing changes to the payment scheme for a QM course that would give more money to faculty to develop a QM course. She also discussed how QM is changing their standards; the new standards will require faculty to increase student engagement and there might be a synchronous component to QM. Dr. San Miguel mentioned she and Dr. Abrego believed the

payment scheme is too low for work needed to either develop, recertify, or update a QM course. These initiatives are under consideration by Dr. Arenaz and Mr. Castillo.

Dr. San Miguel commented that the Deans' searches are ongoing.

Dr. San Miguel mentioned Academic Partnerships visited TAMIU and will return in November to explore AP with undergraduate programs. She has not agreed that undergraduate programs explore AP since it means 7-week asynchronous semesters. There are challenges with the logistics and at this point, Dr. San Miguel does not believe undergraduate programs would benefit even though Academic Partnerships has the bandwidth to market and promote degree programs. Academic Partnerships also want to explore other graduate programs.

Dr. San Miguel mentioned that Dr. Lola Norris is exploring graduate certificates and a version of an interdisciplinary degree at the graduate level.

Dr. San Miguel announced that the spring 2024 course schedule should go out October 6, and textbook request orders should be completed shortly thereafter. Textbook request orders are due October 20.

Dr. San Miguel mentioned she, the Deans, and Faculty Senate President, Hayley Kazen, met with Follett representatives to discuss their services and are willing to work with faculty to workshop and propose new ways to engage with their services. Follett is also interested in working with OAR. Follett was informed of the challenges faculty face with the process of ordering books and resources for students.

Dr. San Miguel reminded Faculty Senate of the delay start for some classes for the spring 2024 semester. These classes are flagged as Flex-13, and those courses begin February 1, 2024.

Dr. Jonathan Martinez

Mr. Martinez discussed the Reading the Globe initiative and the common read experience at the University. He explained the initiative and described how students in first year seminar read a book with an international focus and through that book, students are encouraged to critically think about social and cultural awareness and connect it to a local context and a connection to college life and life skills. Dr. Martinez mentioned TAMIU's uniqueness in that students travel to the country where the book's story took place and the common read's author visits campus to engage with students. Since 2008, TAMIU students have visited 19 countries and this year's students will travel to Japan in March 2024. Students are selected by submitting an essay, and then 25 students are chosen to interview and finally, a group of 15 students is selected to travel with TAMIU faculty and staff. The University covers most of the costs including lodging and flights among other necessities.

Dr. Martinez announced that he is seeking faculty recommendations for 2024's

common read. Dr. Martinez also provided a QR code giving faculty access to submit a book recommendation. Dr. Martinez communicated the criteria for book selection. Dr. Martinez mentioned a book selected will be made by February 2024.

Dr. Lola Norris

Dr. Norris addressed the Senate to discuss the composition of the Graduate Council to include a member of e-learning. This was requested by Dr. Abrego and the e-learning member would be ex-officio. Dr. Norris mentioned that 57% of graduate courses are online, and it would be helpful for someone who can assist with questions pertaining to technology. Dr. Norris agreed with the suggestion. The language will be adjusted to include that the head of distance learning will appoint the e-learning member to Graduate Council. A motion to vote for a member of e-learning to serve as ex-officio of the Graduate Council was raised by Dr. Juan Hinojosa. It was seconded by Drs. Kameron Jorgenson and Ariadne Gonzalez. Unanimous approval was reached.

IV.   The minutes for the September 1, 2023, Faculty Senate meeting were approved with no corrections.

V.   New Business:

1. Senator Kazen presented a draft of the Faculty Senate's proposed mission statement (see attachments). Senator Hinojosa proposed to include "collaboration" for it to read, "The mission of the Faculty Senate of Texas A&M International University is to foster a community of mutual respect and cooperation within the University, working to ensure effective communication and collaboration between faculty and administration." A motion to vote to approve the proposed mission statement with the addition of "collaboration" was raised by Senator Bennett and was seconded by Senator Rubel. Unanimous approval was reached.

2. Senator Hernandez presented the changes to the College of Nursing and Health Sciences PPE. Faculty Senate discussed the proposed changes as Senator Hernandez explained the changes made to the PPE. Senator Hernandez informed the Senate that CNHS faculty agreed and voted to approve the changes made to the PPE. Faculty Senate unanimously approved the PPE changes.

3. Senator Kazen updated Faculty Senate on CourseLeaf. Senator Kazen informed the Senate that Dr. San Miguel will appoint faculty to the CourseLeaf committee. Faculty will be able to make edits and/or changes to their syllabi. University policies will be imported to template as well as course information. This will probably be piloted wintermester 2024, and it is projected all faculty will use the CourseLeaf materials beginning fall 2024. Senator Sosa suggested the committee provide multiple templates for undergraduate, graduate, online, flex, sub-terms courses, so that faculty can choose the most appropriate template needed.

4. Senator Kazen informed Faculty Senate that Dr. San Miguel sent an email to all faculty and discussed with Deans' Council of the proper P&T process of voting by secret ballot and knowledge of criteria after a concern from a faculty member was raised.

5. Senator Kazen informed Faculty Senate of a motion in DEITC to increase the QM pay. Dr. Abrego proposed a new QM revision with significant changes and a second with minimal changes but were not approved. Senator Kazen said there may be other funding avenues.

6. Senator Kazen reminded all committees to upload minutes and other reports and information to Microsoft Teams to inform her to post to Faculty Senate website.

VI.   Old Business:

1. Senator Kazen met with Dr. Kilburn to discuss intellectual property and he informed her that anything faculty create (e.g., slides and lecture notes) in a face-to-face modality, belongs to faculty. The only exceptions to this are 1) if a faculty member is paid for QM and 2) if faculty create something that can be monetized and they utilize University resources. Senator Kazen will reach out to OGC to verify the information.

2. Senator Kazen informed Faculty Senate that OIT's restrictions on downloading information to an external hard drive are limited to personal identifiable and sensitive information. Faculty are asked to contact OIT if they are adhering to the restrictions but are still having issues.

3. Senator Kazen reported that she informed Monica Robledo of the feedback provided by Faculty Senate related to faculty authored materials. Faculty Senate's feedback was to keep the process as close to what is in place. The only issue is that it is not an SAP; it is a process. It is preferred for it to be formalized.

4. Senator Houston suggested that Faculty Senate develop a short survey to solicit faculty feedback on whether moral turpitude be defined. Senator Kazen will communicate the Senators' concerns of not defining moral turpitude to the post-tenure review taskforce first. Another concern Senator Kazen will communicate to the post-tenure review taskforce relates to ensuring faculty receive a concrete timeline of the post-tenure process. She will also inquire about the taskforce's working timeline.

5. Senator Kazen informed the Faculty Senate that DEI FAQs were posted.

VII.   Committee Reports:
       1. Academic Oversight Committee:

       Senator Viloria reported that the committee met and will meet monthly on

Wednesdays at 11:00 a.m. The next meeting will be held virtually on October 18. Discussion topics surrounded student evaluations. The University and faculty are doing a lot of work in increasing student evaluations. The AOC recommended to obtain data from other System schools to see how they are managing student evaluations and participation rates. The committee also discussed the benefits of meeting with the Faculty Senate's Assessment Committee for a good course of action and evaluating the CNHS's revision of the 50% teaching effectiveness student evaluation portion to possibly make a recommendation and incorporate in other Colleges.

2. Budget and Finance Committee:

Senator Hinojosa reported that the committee discussed the changes in pay schedules and solicited information from Mr. Juan Castillo. Changes in the pay schedule were made to assist new faculty and adjunct faculty. Senator Kazen solicited information from other System universities and four responded and reported a September 1-May 31 pay schedule. Senator Hinojosa reported that from those schools who responded, TAMIU is the only school to have the 8 month and ½ month pay schedule. The committee also discussed summer pay and the teaching load limits and will further discuss with the Fixed-Term Committee. Senator Hinojosa reported that the committee discussed the changes to the merit pay schedule and possible adjustments to cost of living. They will follow-up on those issues. Senator Hinojosa also reported that the committee will meet to discuss summer salaries and possible adjustments.

3. University Ethics Committee:

Senator Houston reported that the committee met and discussed several topics. The committee agreed to meet monthly on the second Wednesday at 11:00 a.m. and will open the meetings to all faculty except when discussing sensitive issues and/or information. The committee's priorities for the academic year deal with increasing the communication link between Honor Council and faculty and review the scope and mission of the Ethics Committee and work towards creating a hub to have faculty access it as a resource for information for different processes and expectations. The committee will review other schools' mission statements, how schools define the scope and parameters of an ethics committee, and how faculty accesses information needed from ethics committees.

4. Committee on Creation, Composition, and Responsibilities of Committees:

Senator Hatcher reported that they have met every two weeks. Some of the discussions and work surround the Graduate Council and the committee is close to resolving the changes and gaps in committees. There is more work to be done.

5. Awards Committee:

Senator Gonzalez reported that the committee met virtually on September 26 and will decide when they will meet during their next meeting. They discussed the awards timeline that will be sent to Deans and Chairs soon. A suggestion to make all faculty aware of the awards timeline and the open nomination process from Senator Sosa was made. Digital portfolios will be the only format to submit. Senator Sosa will create a how-to video in creating an online portfolio and/or a training that will be communicated to the nominees. Faculty Senate agreed to have this year's classroom observations for DTY and OTY submitted via electronic forms rather than email. The committee is receiving feedback to highlight junior faculty and faculty accomplishments to post to the Senate's Instagram account.

6. Faculty Handbook Revision Committee:

Senator Bennett reported that the committee is currently waiting for information that will go in the Faculty Handbook. The mission statement approved in New Business will go into the Faculty Handbook and the Graduate Council changes. Senator Bennett reminded the Senators to inform the committee on what needs to be done so that they can work on these endeavors.

7. Assessment Committee:

Senator Brooks reported that the committee met and discussed increasing the response rate of student evaluations. They will discuss the following: how to ensure students that faculty cannot view results until after the semester ends, extending the evaluation period from 1 to 2 weeks, advise faculty to provide in-class time to complete evaluations for face-to-face classes, digital versus paper evaluations, among other similar concerns. They will also solicit information on how faculty are evaluated in their teaching portfolios and propose other means of teaching evaluation.

8. Distance Education and Instructional Technology Committee:

Senator Kazen reported on the proposed stipend compensation for faculty to develop QM courses but was not approved. She will meet with Dr. San Miguel to further discuss the budget to increase the QM stipend.

9. Technology Advisory Committee:

Senator Kazen reported that they are working on changing the committee's description. This is ongoing. They are also creating FAQs related to downloading information to external hard drives.

10. Fixed-Term Faculty Committee:

Senator Sosa reported on the reclassification draft (see attachments) presented to

the Faculty Senate and will present a draft of the reclassification policies during the November meeting. Senator Sosa also reported the issue of summer pay for fixed-term faculty. Senator Kazen asked the committee to write a proposal addressing the limits of summer teaching loads for fixed-term faculty and present to the Faculty Senate.

VIII.   Announcements and Other Business:

1. Senator Kazen informed Faculty Senate that the Staff Senate visited with Dr. Arenaz concerning Labor Day. She will keep the Senate informed of any updates related to include Labor Day as a holiday.

2. Senator Kazen reminded Senators to upload committee meeting minutes to Microsoft Teams so that they are uploaded to the website.

IX.   The next 2023-2024 Faculty Senate meeting will be November 3, 2023, and Senator Kazen will send an agenda soon.

X.   The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Faculty Senate of Texas A&M International University is to foster a community of mutual respect and cooperation within the University, working to ensure effective communication between faculty and administration. The Faculty Senate is empowered to act as the representative and resolving authority of the faculty, and it facilitates faculty participation in shared governance which includes making recommendations to the President and the Provost in matters that concern faculty.

Graduate Council

Request by Dr. Lola Norris, Interim Dean of the Graduate School

A request has been made by Dr. Abrego to add a member of the Office of eLearning to the Graduate Council as an ex-officio member. Given how many of our graduate courses are online now, I think it is a good idea. The Graduate School would support this addition. This is a university committee and its membership and composition is described in the Faculty Handbook.

CONHS Faculty Evaluation InstrumentsPPE 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 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 inthe *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 below. 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 evidence of at least 5 items below demonstrating 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:

Note: Annual Teaching Evaluation score is composed of 50% from AEFIS Teaching Evaluation score (median) and 50% from the achievement of any 5 items listed below.

- 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 or non-faculty made exams that objectively evaluate students' comprehension of standard course/discipline related course content
- 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, 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, review sessions, advisement, securing employment, letters of recommendation, workshops and tutorial sessions.
- Special course materials prepared by the professor for students, such as workbooks, study guides, concept maps, manuals, specialized instructional packets, 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
- Presentations of 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.
- Completion of professional development workshops such as ACUE, PROF workshops, etc. to improve teaching and learning practices.

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 the opinion that the instructor effectively presents relevant information, and the course materials are well prepared and organized. Feedback on student works regular 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 4.5 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 the high academic standards and regularly challenged to think critically on the subject matter. The students should indicate the opinion that the instructor effectively presents relevant information, and the course materials are well prepared and organized. Feedback on student work regular 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 work regular 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, 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 a 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, monograph, book manuscript 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 of 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 principal researcher or last author as 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 journals published by the Social Science and or Science Citation Index 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 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, 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.

Some Suggestions for the Faculty Handbook

Under "Definition of Faculty Status" and the Major Subheading of "Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty" (p.37)

Fixed-Term faculty completing their initial 3-year appointment or later who wish to be reclassified as tenure-track faculty must apply for this reclassification following the time-line for promotion and tenure.

1. In order to be reclassified from fixed-term to tenure-track at the assistant professor rank, faculty members must submit to the department chair a letter of application along with a dossier in support of the application by September 1. The letter and the supporting documents should make the case that the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to conduct and publish research of a quality that suggests the ability to be successful eventually in earning tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor.

2. The department chair will make these materials available to members of the department promotion and tenure committee for at least one week prior to its annual meeting in September to consider all applications for reclassification, tenure, and/or promotion.

3. The department promotion and tenure committee will follow its customary procedures for a confidential discussion and vote on the merits of the application. A member of the committee will write a report to the department chair stating its recommendation and rationale.

4. The department chair, college dean, and provost will then write letters of recommendation to the president following the time-line required in the promotion and tenure process.

5. The President will consider the recommendations of the department's tenured faculty, the department chair, the college dean, and the provost and make a final decision.

6. Fixed-term faculty successful in being reclassified as tenure-track assistant professors will then be eligible to receive a 3 SCH course release to conduct research from the default tenure-track/tenure load of 12 SCH a semester. Unless credit toward tenure is granted by the president when reclassifying the faculty member, the faculty member will be eligible to apply for tenure and promotion at the beginning of the 6th year as a tenure-track assistant professor.

Reclassification draft

Summer Teaching for 2023

1. Full-time faculty may teach up to 2 classes in the summer or, because of labs, up to 7 total hours during the summer, preferably in the same summer session. That is the limit. We do not want full-time faculty teaching more than that for several reasons, chief among them the desire to give them time to increase their research productivity and, long term, to prevent burning them out.
2. The dean and provost must approve any overloads (>7 SCH) for full-time faculty in the summer.
3. The cap per course for summer has been raised, though the basic concept of paying 1/12 (or 8.33%) of the faculty member's 9-month salary for a 3 SCH course, with an upper limit, has not changed. However, the total budget for summer has not. Colleges cannot exceed the total amount spent last year on summer. Chairs and deans will need to balance adjunct and full-time faculty assignments to remain within budget.

Adjunct Faculty:
The rate per class in the summer is the same as for the fall and spring.

Full-Time Faculty:
1 SCH = 2.77% of the faculty member's 9-month salary, with a maximum pay limit for 7 hours or fewer set at $2,000 per 1 SCH or $6,000 for a 3 SCH course. Faculty making more than $72,029 will hit the maximum limit. This limit has been raised from $5,500 to $6,000 per a 3 SCH course and has been approved by President Arenaz.
3 SCH = 8.33% of the faculty member's 9-month salary, with a total limit for a 3 SCH course set at $6,000.
Overloads (>7 SCH): $1,000 per SCH regardless of the faculty member's 9-month salary.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Please have your Administrative Assistants coordinate the cancellation of classes with notifications to HR, Budget & Payroll, and the Office of the Provost. Failure to do this has led to overpayments for teaching classes that did not exist, which in turn led to faculty having to reimburse TAMIU. Not good.

Texas A&M International University
TAMIU Faculty Senate – Fixed Term Faculty Committee
September Overview

Committee Concerns
- Reclassification
  - Fixed-Term Faculty to Tenure Track
    - A draft was developed prior to this year (see back of this page)
    - Dr. San Miguel shared 2 thoughts about 1) when to apply and 2) research requirements.
    - Recommend that the faculty member can apply starting the 3rd year of their 3-year appointment.
    - Recommend that the research requirement clarification to include "evidence of planning, conducting, or publishing work" should be included instead of "demonstrated the ability to conduct and publish research…"
  - Others with Faculty Status
    - Considerations for adjunct or visiting instructors who want to move into either fixed-term faculty or tenure-track classification.
- Summer Teaching Loads
  - Fixed-term and other full-time faculty should be allowed to teach more than 2 courses for summer teaching at the full rate (1 SCH 2.77%, 3 SCH 8.33%). (see back of page)