

**Texas A&M University-Kingsville**

**Undergraduate Program Review**

# **Undergraduate Academic Program Review Guidelines (Revised August 2007)**

## **Introduction**

The undergraduate academic program review provides a systematic and consistent evaluation of an individual program by examining and profiling its performance and compliance with accreditation standards and criteria. The primary role of the programmatic review process is to monitor and adhere to established criteria.

A “program” is defined as the undergraduate degree majors and any certification described in the University catalog under the table “Undergraduate Degrees and Majors Offered.” The term “program” is utilized accordingly in this document to reflect this definition.

Recommendations of the Undergraduate Program Review Standing Committee concerning the value and performance of a given program will focus on the parameters as established in the programmatic review guidelines but in addition may encompass other aspects or criteria not specified in the guidelines. Additionally, the program review process provides recommendations for improving a program to enhance the program’s ability to achieve its stated mission and to respond to the learner outcome measures of the respective curriculum.

The guidelines that follow provide details on the self-study process, a calendar for the process, an annotated outline for report preparation and a five-year master calendar for scheduling the annual program reviews. These guidelines are primarily based upon the accreditation criteria established by the Commission on Colleges of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

Program self-study is a requirement of the faculty and administrators of the programs under review. All members of a given program will be participants in the analysis and survey of the program during the self-study. The members will play an active role in acquisition and interpretation of the collected information that will be utilized in the self-study.

The program review period will consist of the five academic years preceding the year of the review, with the academic year consisting of the fall, spring and summer terms. The Office of Institutional Research website (Intranet) will be a primary source of data for programmatic review. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs is a key information resource regarding extramural grant awards. In addition, all programs will utilize assessment data collected for the annual institutional effectiveness report/departmental report as well as any additional data obtained for agency accreditation or other purposes. Data obtained as per guidelines established by the Council for Assessment and Planning primarily address key aspects of the criteria established by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and thus are a key resource in the data required for programmatic review.

Programs that are accredited by any state or national accreditation agency may petition to waive the program review upon demonstration that the program in question has met, through that accreditation process, all criteria established in the program review guidelines. The program will submit the review used in their accreditation, along with a matrix which shows each

section/element of the UPR and the portion of their report which demonstrates that element. If an accredited program is only in partial fulfillment of the program review criteria, those areas not meeting the program review guidelines must be addressed in the final report. Evidence of compliance with the waived criteria should also be attached to the document. Accreditation by other national or state agencies does allow for a waiver of review, but suitable documentation is still required to grant the waiver of review.

## **Process**

Designated academic departments will prepare and submit self-study reports for all relevant majors/degrees that adhere to the guidelines implemented for programmatic review. The report should provide information that will facilitate the recommendation of the Program Review Standing Committee for (1) unconditional continuation, (2) conditional continuation, (3) probation, or (4) discontinuation/phase-out. The report should also provide information that is essential to monitor ongoing compliance with the SACS criteria and other program-specific accreditation associations or agencies. Modifications to the program review cycle for a given program will be made accordingly during periods of visits by other accreditation agencies or associations. The program review committee will have a designated chairperson to direct the preparation and submission of the final report to the provost, deans and department chairs.

The review process will be coordinated by a Program Review Standing Committee (PRSC) and ad-hoc subcommittees. The PRSC will consist of three members from each college, serving staggered three-year terms to ensure continuity. Two of the members from each college will be appointed by the provost and respective dean. The third member will be appointed by the Faculty Senate. One dean, with no programs currently being reviewed, and one chair, from a program not being reviewed, will also be members of the PRSC for one-year terms. The PRSC's role will include preparing final reports, ruling on the extent of exemptions from the full review process, and assigning the ad-hoc subcommittees. Each ad-hoc subcommittee will be responsible for a designated review of several programs or a department's group of programs and will include three members from the PRSC. The number of programs assigned to a given ad-hoc subcommittee for review will vary based on the number of programs being reviewed in a given cycle. One of the PRSC members on each ad-hoc subcommittee shall be from the reviewed program or department's college but not that program or department; the other two shall be from two other colleges; and the three should be of different terms. Additionally, each program will utilize one reviewer from outside the University, who will provide review and comments based on the written Program Review document (no site visit). The external reviewer will be considered a member of the ad-hoc subcommittee. An honorarium will be paid to the external reviewer. The name of the reviewer, with alternates, will be provided to the chair of the PRSC no later than the date that the review is submitted to the respective College Dean. Reviewers will be decided upon through collaboration of the program coordinator and the Department Chair, and then approved by the Dean of the College. Depending on the number of reviews per PRSC member, ad-hoc subcommittees may be enlarged to include other faculty to share the work; but a PRSC member shall be the chair. After initial completion of the self-study report by the program faculty, the department chair and dean shall review it, after which it shall be submitted to the designated ad-hoc subcommittee for review, evaluation, and formulation of recommendations.

The ad-hoc subcommittee members review the report in an effort to assess the viability and quality of the program. These members first determine if all requested information is included in

the report; if there are areas lacking documentation, the report is returned to the department/program with a request to complete the questioned section(s). When satisfied that the report is complete, judgments are made as to strengths and weaknesses of the program, program viability, recommendations for improvement, and a recommendation regarding continuation of the program. That final recommendation falls into one of the following categories:

- (1) Unconditional Continuation;
- (2) Conditional Continuation -The program can continue, but the recommendation(s) for improvement must be addressed and an implementation schedule/plan must be developed;
- (3) Probation - Serious deficiencies were identified or the department failed to turn in a report. Failure to submit a report or failure to develop a plan for corrective action will place the program in jeopardy of being phased out; or
- (4) Discontinuation/Phase-out - Previously-identified deficiencies have not been addressed or previously-requested reports have not been honored. Phase-out of the program will begin by not accepting new majors into the program. A schedule for complete phase-out will be developed after an analysis of the number of students remaining in the pipeline for the particular major.

Subcommittee members have the responsibility to maintain objectivity within themselves and among the group. Background information from persons within the same College or Department as the program under review should pertain only to the program information, and not to any issues which might have occurred within the College or Department.

The report and the findings and recommendations of the ad-hoc subcommittee will then be presented to the PRSC; the PRSC will then distribute the report to the dean and department chair. After review by the dean and department chair, the ad-hoc subcommittee chair will meet with the department chair and dean to discuss the report and findings and recommendations. The department chair and dean may add their comments to the report. The ad-hoc subcommittee chair will forward the report and findings and recommendations to the PRSC along with any comments submitted by the department chair and/or dean. The PRSC will formulate a final report (which includes strengths/weaknesses/recommendations) and forward it to the provost. The PRSC will also prepare an executive summary which addresses the findings and the recommendations, including any comments or recommendations of the department chair and dean. The findings and recommendations of the Program Review Report will be incorporated into the department and college IE plans. The provost will provide the executive summary of the report to the Council for Assessment and Planning and other relevant committees. The provost will provide the president with a summary report for each program reviewed, including proposed actions and recommendations of the program review committee.

The PRSC's Program Review Report will be reviewed by the department/program/faculty and department chair, and a "plan of action" will be written in response which will address the recommendations. All recommendations must reflect the results of the assessment process used in the program review. Included in the plan of action will be an estimated time line and the names and title of those responsible for each task. This plan will be submitted to the PRSC within two weeks of receiving the PRSC's report. The plan will become a part of the Program Review

Report. In addition, members of the PRSC, the department chair and the dean will sign the report.

The following year, the PRSC past chair will remind the department chairs and deans of the need to submit a follow-up progress report. If conditions are not met or problems not rectified by that time, an explanation must be submitted as part of the follow-up progress report. Further actions may be recommended. The PRSC past chair will write a response to the follow-up progress report and indicate in any further action is needed. The PRSC past chair will distribute this response and recommendation to the department faculty, department chair, dean and provost, with a copy to the Council for Assessment and Planning (CAP).

The deadline for submission of the program's self-study report is described in the following time line:

## Calendar Revised August 2007

Activity	Responsible Parties	Completion Date
<b><u>YEAR ONE</u></b>		
Appoint Undergraduate Program Review Standing Committee (PRSC) and Announce Review Schedule to Deans and Chairs	Provost	September 16
Appointment of Ad-hoc Sub-committee Reviewers	Program Review Standing Committee (PRSC) Chair	September 26
Proposed external reviewer and alternates presented to Dean of the program's College (Dean of the College is responsible for contacting the external reviewer and determining willingness and availability to review).		October 1
Petition to Waive an Accredited Program from the Review Process	Dean/Department Chair and Program Faculty	October 7
Name of external reviewer submitted to PRSC Chair	Dean	October 21
Respond to Petition to Waive An Accredited Program from The Review Process	PRSC Chair	October 21
Submit Completed Program Self-study to Dean	Department Chair, Faculty	December 9
Submit Self-Study Report to PRSC	Dean	January 13
Distribute Copies of Self-Study Report to Ad-hoc Sub-committee	PRSC Chair	January 27

Submit Program Review Reports To PRSC	Ad-hoc Sub-committee Chairs	February 28
Distribute Program Review Reports to Dean and Department Chair	PRSC	March 7
Meet With Dean and Department Chair	Ad-hoc Sub-committee Chairs	March 20
Submit Program Review Reports And “Plan of Action” to PRSC with Comments from Dean And Department Chair	Ad-hoc Sub-committee Chair	April 3
Send Final Report, “Plan of Action” And Executive Summary To Provost with Copies to Dean And Department Chair	PRSC	April 21

**YEAR TWO**

*Remind Departments to Write Follow-up Progress Report	PRSC Past Chair	January 17
*Write Follow-up Progress Report On Previous Year’s Program Review, Recommendations, And “Plan of Action”	Department Chair and Dean to PRSC Past Chair	March 20
*Respond to Follow-up Progress Report to Department Faculty, Department Chair, Dean and Provost with Copy to CAP	PRSC Past Chair	April 14

\*These dates are repeated until conditions are cleared.

**Texas A&M University – Kingsville**  
**Undergraduate Program Review**  
**Master Calendar- Revised September 2008**

The following time line provides for review of the university undergraduate programs per year for a five-year review cycle.

In any given year, two colleges will not be reviewed so that at least one dean is available to serve on the Program Review Standing Committee.

**2007 – 2008**

College of Agriculture and Human Sciences  
    Agriculture Science  
    Human Science  
College of Arts and Sciences  
    Art – additional review recommended  
        2005-2006  
    Chemistry  
    Geology – Physics  
    Mathematics  
College of Education  
    Kinesiology  
    Community Health

**2008 – 2009**

College of Agriculture and Human Sciences  
    Range and Wildlife Management  
    Agribusiness  
College of Arts and Sciences  
    English  
    History  
    Music  
    Performance  
College of Business Administration  
    Computer Information Systems  
    Finance  
University College  
    Applied Arts and Sciences

**2009 – 2010**

College of Business Administration  
    Management  
    International Business Management

**2009 – 2010 (cont)**

College of Engineering  
    Chemical Engineering  
    Industrial Technology  
    Mechanical Engineering  
    Civil Engineering

**2010 – 2011**

College of Agriculture and Human Sciences  
    Plant and Soil Science  
    Animal Science  
College of Arts and Sciences  
    Psychology  
    Criminology  
    Social Work  
    Communication Science and Disorders  
    Spanish  
College of Education  
    Interdisciplinary Studies

**2011 – 2012**

College of Arts and Science  
    Biology  
    Biomedical Sciences  
    Communications  
    Political Science  
    Sociology  
    Theatre Arts  
College of Business Administration  
    General Business Administration  
    Accounting  
    Marketing  
College of Engineering  
    Architectural Engineering  
    Electrical Engineering  
    Computer Science

## Part I C Overview

- I-01. Provide a brief description of the program including any background information that would be helpful to the reviewers. Provide a brief summary of program developments and achievements during the past five years including a summary of the results of assessment of program and student learner outcomes.
- I-02. Provide a table showing the number of majors and semester credit hours (SCH) generated by the program over the last five years. Comment on enrollment trends over this period and any resulting significant impacts upon the program. Provide documentation of program actions and efforts to respond to trends. (NOTE: If the program is also conducted on the System Center-San Antonio campus, data for the two campuses should be presented separately, as illustrated below.)

### SAMPLE TABLE

<b>Table A.1 Undergraduate Semester Credit Hours in MGMT Courses</b>					
	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
SCH in core courses - Kingsville	1,179	972	1,038	933	1,248
SCH in major-specific courses - Kingsville	942	804	864	1,110	1,065
<b>Subtotal - TAMUK</b>	<b>2,121</b>	<b>1,776</b>	<b>1,902</b>	<b>2,043</b>	<b>2,313</b>
SCH in core courses - SC-SA		99	255	672	750
SCH in major-specific courses - SC-SA		258	516	816	1,149
<b>Subtotal - SC-SA</b>		<b>357</b>	<b>1,287</b>	<b>1,488</b>	<b>1,899</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,121</b>	<b>2,133</b>	<b>3,189</b>	<b>3,531</b>	<b>4,212</b>
Notes:					
(1) Core courses are: MGMT 3321, MGMT 4327, and MGMT 4325					
(2) Major-specific courses are: MGMT 3311, MGMT 3325, MGMT 4324, MGMT 4328, MGMT 4329 and MGMT 4331					
(3) All academic years include SCH generated in summer sessions.					

<b>Table A.2 Number of MGMT Majors</b>					
	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Majors at Kingsville	69	66	89	99	110
Majors at SC-SA		25	50	79	107
<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>217</b>

- I.03 Provide a copy of the recommendations of the Program Review Subcommittee from the previous Program Review, along with the second year follow-up report. Discuss further actions taken during the ensuing period which addressed those recommendations.

### **Part II: Planning and Evaluation Process**

- II-01. Describe the department/program's mission and the goals delineated for achieving this mission. Correlate the department/program mission with the university mission statement and explain how the two complement each other.
- II-02. Describe the program's review and planning process. Provide a time line for the development and implementation of such a process if one does not currently exist. Programs that currently have such a review process should include a description of the mechanics of the process (i.e., who is involved, how often the program is evaluated, and how the results are utilized to improve the program).
- II-03. Describe the evaluation of program faculty and how these evaluations are utilized to improve program quality.
- II-04. Identify assessment measures utilized to evaluate program quality, to include Student Learner Outcomes. Describe the process for assessment of Student Learner Outcomes.

### **Part III: Curriculum**

- III-01. List approved degrees, minors and certifications offered by the program. If appropriate accreditation is available, provide the current status of accreditation efforts and suitable documentation
- III-02. List requirements for admission to the program.
- III-03. Provide a list of the courses and the number of sections, based upon 12<sup>th</sup> class day rolls, of each course offered by the program in any given semester. Provide information regarding the role of these courses in supporting other programs, the core curriculum, and if they are required or recommended for the program degree.



### **Table B (Continued)**

Describe the general requirements for a degree in the reviewed program. Include any internship or senior theses required in addition to the course work.

Courses offered by other programs that support (required or recommended) the reviewed program's curriculum:

Courses offered by the reviewed program that are required for elementary and secondary education certification of other programs:

List the courses offered by other programs which meet specific needs of the program. Indicate which courses are required and which are recommended.

List the courses offered by the program that are required for elementary and secondary education certification.

Provide documentation that curriculum is kept up-to-date (i.e., describe how courses have been modified, added or deleted over the past five years).

#### **Part IV: Undergraduate Instruction**

- IV-01. Provide documentation regarding the administration of the program courses. In particular, provide evidence of proper course syllabi and implementation of the student evaluation guidelines described in these course syllabi. Changes in curricula to improve instruction should also be documented and should demonstrate a critical consideration of the learner outcome assessment.
- IV-02. What approaches are utilized in teaching the key subject areas of the program to foster student learning (e.g., innovative teaching methods, small-group discussion, cooperative learning, and multimedia). Describe non-traditional course work such as intersession or short courses, internships, independent studies, research projects, guest speakers, cooperative education, field work, TTVN and web-based courses and indicate what efforts are made to ensure proper instruction and assessment of these courses. In particular, what attempts are made to ensure quality instruction in these courses.

#### **Part V: Advising of Undergraduate Students**

- V-01. Describe the advisement and orientation process by the program faculty and program professional advisors. Include evidence of advisor training and ongoing regular evaluation of the advising process. Provide additional information regarding the advising of students about careers and higher degree programs such as graduate and professional school.

#### **Part VI: Assessment of Student Performance and Outcomes**

- VI-01 Describe the ongoing assessment processes used in the reviewed program. In particular, address the evaluation of the instructional process and the faculty. Assessment of student performance and preparation should be addressed and should reflect the use of suitable and appropriate evaluation mechanisms such as national standardized tests, major field exams, licensing exams, capstone courses, and surveys of employers. In addition, include information on placement of students in graduate and professional programs.

- VI.02 Provide evidence of any novel or unique approaches besides standard examinations for evaluation of learner outcomes. Supporting evidence such as student research publication and presentation or other documentation should be provided.
- VI-03. Provide the Program SLO reports from the yearly Institutional Effectiveness Reports for the past five years in Appendix \_\_. In Table \_\_, present a matrix of program SLO's vs. course SLO's. In a narrative following that Table, address the coverage of all the SLO's. Summarize the student and program assessment outcomes and any recommendations or implementations that have occurred as a consequence of these assessments (e.g., curriculum committee proposals and implementation of writing across the curriculum). Document any relevant actions undertaken by the program to rectify or enhance the program curriculum.
- VI-04. If Core Curriculum, General Education, courses are included in the program, provide results of General Education Student Learner Outcome Assessments on those courses.

### **Part VII C Faculty Profile**

- VII-01. Prepare a table that lists all full-time and part-time faculty (as defined by SACS) and any teaching assistants reported on teacher load reports. Do not list or include graduate laboratory or teaching assistants that are not reported on teacher load reports. Provide a copy of the Credentials Evaluation Summary, to include Justification of Faculty Qualifications if applicable, for all faculty members (full- and part-time) used in the program during the review period. Include age, gender, ethnicity, level of education, tenure status, and years at Texas A&M University-Kingsville in the faculty profile.



VII-02. Prepare a table that lists the full-time equivalents (FTE) of full-time, part-time and teaching assistants that provide instruction in the reviewed program. An FTE is defined as a twelve-hour teaching load. Include descriptions of any FTE release time and compensated overloads. Provide justification for these deviations from the standard FTE for the program faculty. Provide evidence that the current program teaching load is in compliance with institutional policy particularly the 20% guideline on undergraduate programs. (The 20% guideline dictates that a program should not have more than 20% of the total SCHs taught by part-time faculty. Faculty on release time are still considered full-time and should not be listed as part-time faculty unless their total FTE is less than 1.0.

**Table D**

**Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Instruction in the Undergraduate Program**

	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>
Number of undergraduate sections taught by full-time faculty*					
Number of undergraduate sections taught by part-time faculty**					
Number of undergraduate sections taught by teaching assistants					
Number of FTEs for full-time faculty members teaching undergraduate sections					
Number of FTEs for part-time faculty members teaching undergraduate sections					
Number of FTEs for teaching assistants teaching undergraduate sections					
Number of compensated overloads					
Total number of released times or equivalent FTEs					
Total number of FTE faculty in the program					

\*SACS defines full-time faculty as permanent faculty that are assigned a 12 hour teaching load.

\*\*Early retirement faculty that teach are considered non-tenure track.

VII-03. Discuss the needs of the program with regard to faculty size and availability to teach course loads that reflect the demands of the student population.

VII-04. Describe the role of teaching assistants in the program curriculum. What are their teaching responsibilities? What training and orientation do they receive? What supervision exists to monitor the teaching assistants and how is their instruction evaluated? How is the evaluation utilized to improve their teaching effectiveness?

VII-05. Provide a table displaying scholarly productivity/activity of faculty members, to include publications in nationally recognized peer-reviewed journals, presentations at peer-reviewed conferences, and other contributions to scholarship. Describe the strengths of the program faculty with respect to scholarly activity and teaching effectiveness. Discuss the impact these strengths have upon the quality and reputation of the program.

### Part VIII: Departmental Resources

VIII.01. Provide an analysis of the program's fiscal resources for the five-year review period in the form of actual expenditures (not budgeted amounts) in the relevant funding categories such as operating, faculty salaries, teaching assistant salaries, faculty development, and travel. The analysis may be provided in either tabular or graphical form or both.

**SAMPLE TABLE**

<b>Table E Expenditures for the MGMT Program</b>					
	<b>1999-00</b>	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2001-02</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2003-04</b>
Faculty salaries - core courses - Kingsville	52,535	52,535	61,072	62,959	67,943
Faculty salaries - major courses - Kingsville	55,951	56,120	65,629	70,148	62,268
<b>Subtotal - TAMUK</b>	108,186	108,655	126,701	133,107	130,211
Faculty salaries - core courses - SC-SA		16,875	33,599	44,880	50,230
Faculty salaries - major courses - SC-SA		40,813	62,663	42,377	81,917
<b>Subtotal - SC-SA</b>		57,688	96,262	87,257	132,147
<b>Total Faculty Salaries</b>	108,186	166,343	222,963	220,364	262,358
Staff salaries	0	0	0	0	0
Student worker salaries	1,266	1,048	1,645	1,228	2,546

<b>Table E</b>					
<b>Expenditures for the MGMT Program</b>					
	<b>1999-00</b>	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2001-02</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2003-04</b>
Faculty development	95	338	915	1,049	2,925
Travel	7,888	3,460	3,588	4,163	7,505
Other	366	0	45	500	610
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>117,801</b>	<b>171,189</b>	<b>229,156</b>	<b>227,304</b>	<b>275,944</b>

VIII-02. Discuss the impact of program fiscal resources upon its ability to accomplish its designated goals.

VIII-03. Describe any support received from outside sources (e.g., gifts, research grants, curriculum enhancement grants and contracts over the past five years. Document any impact of these additional monetary sources upon the reviewed program.

### **Part IX: Program Review Findings and Recommendations**

IX-01. Describe the primary strengths of the program.

IX-02. Profile external factors which may positively impact the program in the next five-year cycle (increased student enrollment, higher academic preparedness and performance of students, expanded career opportunities or increased demand by professional/graduate schools).

IX-03. Describe any weaknesses of the program.

IX-04. Profile external factors which may negatively impact the program in the next five-year cycle (loss of talented students to other institutions, loss of external funding, limited or decreased job availability, decreased demand for higher degrees).

IX-05. Incorporate the various strengths and weaknesses of the program to make recommendations for improvements and/or modifications in the program and its curriculum. Justify the recommended actions or changes by referring to the appropriate program review findings documented in this report.

TO BE CONDUCTED BY THE PROGRAM REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW STANDING COMMITTEE:

The PRSC's Program Review Report must identify the final outcome of the review as:

(1) Unconditional Continuation;

(2) Conditional Continuation -The program can continue, but the recommendation(s) for improvement must be addressed and an implementation schedule/plan must be developed;

(3) Probation - Serious deficiencies were identified or the department failed to turn in a report. Failure to submit a report or failure to develop a plan for corrective action will place the program in jeopardy of being phased out; or

(4) Discontinuation/Phase-out – Previously identified deficiencies have not been addressed or previously requested reports have not been honored. Phase-out of the program will begin by not accepting new majors into the program. A schedule for complete phase-out will be developed after an analysis of the number of students remaining in the pipeline for the particular major.

Texas A&M University-Kingsville

PROGRAM REVIEW EXTERNAL READER CONTRACT

Contract Number: L-document number

This contract is entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ by Texas A&M University-Kingsville, hereinafter called University or TAMUK and Name and SSAN hereinafter called the Contractor.

WITNESSETH that the Contractor and Texas A&M University-Kingsville, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises, and agreements herein contained, agree as follows:

SCOPE OF SERVICES: The Contractor shall provide the services to TAMUK as set forth in the Contract Documents, to include a written review with recommendations of the Undergraduate Program Review of (name of program) provided by TAMUK as per the attached instructions. Final report shall be submitted to TAMUK by (due date).

PERIOD OF CONTRACT: This contract shall commence on date sent and shall terminate on due date (or shortly after).

COMPENSATION AND METHOD OF PAYMENT: The Contractor shall be paid (insert amount). This shall constitute the total amount to be paid which includes reimbursement for all travel and out of pocket expenses. Payment shall be made through the procedures of the University Accounting System to the Contractor after the performance of services.

CONTRACT DOCUMENT: The contract documents shall consist of this signed contract and the Purchase Order.

Dispute Resolution Process:

(1) The dispute resolution process provided for in Chapter 2260 of the Government Code shall be used, as further described herein, Texas A&M University-Kingsville and the contractor to attempt to resolve any claim for breach of contract made by the contractor:

(A) A contractor's claim for breach of this contract that the parties cannot resolve in the ordinary course of business shall be submitted to the negotiation process provided in Chapter 2260, subchapter B, of the Government Code. To initiate the process, the contractor shall submit written notice, as required by subchapter B, to the Director of Procurement & General Services. Said notice shall specifically state that the provisions of Chapter 2260, subchapter B, are being invoked. A copy of the notice shall be given to all other representatives of Texas A&M University-Kingsville and the contractor otherwise entitled to notice under the parties' contract. Compliance by the contractor with subchapter B is a condition precedent to the filing of a contested case proceeding under Chapter 2260, subchapter C, of the Government Code.

(B) The contested case process provided in Chapter 2260, subchapter C, of the Government Code is the contractor's sole and exclusive process for seeking a remedy for any and all alleged breaches of contract by Texas A&M University-Kingsville if the parties are unable to resolve their disputes under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph.

(C) Compliance with the contested case process provided in subchapter C is a condition precedent to seeking consent to sue from the Legislature under Chapter 107 of the Civil Practices and Remedies Code. Neither the execution of this contract by Texas A&M University-Kingsville nor any other conduct of any representative of Texas A&M University-Kingsville relating to the contract shall be considered a waiver of sovereign immunity to suit.

(2) The submission, processing and resolution of the contractor's claim is governed by published rules adopted by the Office of the Attorney General, pursuant to Chapter 2260, as currently effective, hereafter enacted or

subsequently amended.

(3) Neither the occurrence of an event nor the pendency of a claim constitutes grounds for the suspension of performance by the contractor, in whole or in part.

(4) The designated individual responsible on behalf of Texas A&M University-Kingsville for examining any claim or counter claim and conducting any negotiations related thereto as required under §2260.052 of H.B. 826 of the 76<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature shall be the Director of Procurement & General Services, MSC 104, Room 121 College Hall, Kingsville, Texas 78363

In WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this contract to be duly executed intending to be bound thereby.

CONTRATOR:

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-KINGSVILLE

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature (Dean of the College)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Printed/Typed Name

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Printed/Typed Name

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_