



TENURE UNIT STANDARD ROUTING SHEET

In support of the following academic policy statements, tenure unit performance standards will be maintained and made publicly available by the Office of the Provost's Faculty Records Team. Per policy, each of these sets of standards will be reviewed every five (5) years, submitted to the Office of the Provost using this routing form for all signatures.

- APS [900417](#), Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
- APS [980204](#), Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)
- APS [820317](#), The Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
- APS [890301](#), Hiring, Evaluation, Promotion, and Merit for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Please note the following:

- Use a separate routing sheet for each set of tenure unit standards.
- Submit files in portable document format (PDF) only.
- Ensure the set of standards being submitted **have been approved** by the tenure unit **and** college dean.

Tenure Unit: _____

College/Unit:

___CAM ___COCJ ___CHSS ___COM ___NGL
___COBA ___COE ___COHS ___COSET

Standard:

___Promotion and Tenure ___Post-Tenure Review ___Faculty Evaluation System (FES)
___Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion ___Non-Tenure Track Faculty Annual Evaluation

Contact:

Name (first & last): _____

SHSU Email: _____

Phone: _____

Approved By:

Mary Funck

Department Chair

Larrietha Self

College Dean

Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs



Department of Finance and Banking

College of Business Administration

Faculty Evaluation System (FES) Standards

Prepared by the Tenured Faculty of the Department of Finance and Banking
Fall 2024

Approved by:

Karen Sherrill

Digitally signed by Karen Sherrill
DN: cn=Karen Sherrill, o, ou, email=kesherrill@shsu.edu,
c=US
Date: 2024.10.01 09:34:29 -05'00'

Karen Sherrill, PhD
DPTAC Chair

Mary Funck

Mary Funck, PhD
Interim Department Chair

Shar Self

Shar Self, PhD
Dean, College of Business Administration



Sam Houston State University

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND BANKING

Faculty Evaluation System (FES) Guidelines

Effective 1/1/2025

Introduction

Academic Policy Statement (APS) 820317 (May 2022), "The Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty" is the university policy that guides the evaluation of faculty performance at Sam Houston State University (SHSU). The SHSU Department of Finance and Banking uses APS 820317 to guide the Department in processes, timelines, definitions, and requirements of the faculty evaluation procedures. These items apply universally across the university and the Department of Finance and Banking adheres to those requirements.

Section 1.03 of APS 820317 allows the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department of Finance and Banking to develop departmental specific standards of performance within the department subject to the approval of the department chair, college dean, and university provost.

The policy (820317) lists three overall categories for purposes of evaluation. They are 1) Teaching Effectiveness, 2) Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments, and 3) Service. Teaching Effectiveness consists of both a Chair (assisted by the faculty) evaluation and Student Evaluations of Teaching. Therefore, there are a total of four (4) individual scores for each faculty member. They are Chair's Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (FES 1), Student Evaluations (FES 2), Scholarly Accomplishments (FES 3), and Service (FES 4).

Unique to the College of Business Administration (COBA)

COBA is accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB, International). One of the categories reviewed by AACSB is the faculty qualifications of the college's faculty. COBA determines the requirements for the various status levels of faculty qualifications.

A primary uses of FES scores is the determination of merit pay allocations. In the Department of Finance and Banking, faculty members must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation to qualify for merit. In general, doctoral qualified faculty should meet the "Scholarly Academic" category. Faculty with significant administrative duties may instead be allowed to meet the standards for the "Practice Academic" category in accordance with the college's faculty qualification criteria and approval of the Dean. In no instance should a doctoral qualified faculty member be listed as "Additional Faculty." In any year, faculty classified as "Additional Faculty" will not be awarded merit pay in the Department of Finance and Banking.

The FES guidelines were developed under the assumption that faculty is provided the appropriate tools and resources for both research and teaching (i.e., Compustat, CRSP, SAS, Stata, WRDS, Learning Management System (currently Blackboard) tools, and other resources and tools).

FES 1 – Chair’s Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Weight	Categories of Performance Standards	Criteria	Scoring Category
	Faculty Qualifications	AACSB Faculty Qualification Status - In the current year, the faculty member must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications (SA or PA) related to AACSB accreditation. Faculty not meeting AACSB Faculty Qualification Status are assigned an FES 1 score of 1.	YES / NO
50%	Teaching Effectiveness	<p>Teaching Effectiveness Suggested Categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Innovative, effective teaching methods ▪ Societal Impact of teaching ▪ Other relevant impact of teaching ▪ Effective course organization ▪ Current, relevant course material (sharing research, Wall Street Journal, current events, using WRDS) ▪ Techniques to preserve academic integrity ▪ Academic programs (honors contracts, writing initiative, independent study, study abroad) ▪ Adjustment to course content and delivery (continuous improvement) ▪ Faculty development in teaching (ACUE, Engaging Classrooms, Blackboard training, teacher training programs) ▪ Educational leadership (sharing effective teaching techniques in journals or at conferences) ▪ Technology (Blackboard capabilities, ELMO camera, YouTube, Kaltura, etc.) ▪ Other as provided by faculty <p>Faculty provides information to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness.</p>	<p>Scale of 1 – 5</p> <p>5 = Far exceeds expectations 4 = Exceeds expectations 3 = Meets expectations 2 = Meets minimum expectations 1 = Does not meet minimum expectations N/A = Not Applicable</p>

FES 1 – Chair’s Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (continued)

Weight	Meeting Other Teaching Requirements	Criteria	Scoring Category
50%	Timely and Effective Communication	Being available for students, responding to emails in a timely manner, Chair or Dean's office does not receive excessive complaints about faculty members not being available or responding to emails.	<p>Scale of 1-5</p> <p>5 = Far exceeds Expectations 4 = Exceeds Expectations 3 = Meets Expectations 2 = Below Expectations 1 = Unsatisfactory</p>
	Professionalism and Mentoring	Professional behavior within and outside of the classroom. Dean / Chair does not receive excessive complaints about faculty member’s behavior.	
	Assessment of Student Learning	Participates as required with AACSB and/or SACS assessment processes.	
	Compliance	<p>Completes Department / College / University Requirements such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Providing timely syllabi that comply with university, college, and departmental guidelines. ▪ Administering student evaluations ▪ Adhering to class and final exam schedules ▪ Holding regular office hours ▪ Submitting vitas / syllabi by the stated deadlines. ▪ Completing textbook selections by the stated deadlines. ▪ Completing federal aid (attendance) verifications by the stated deadlines ▪ Responding in a timely manner to departmental, college, or university requests 	

NOTES:

- Faculty receiving the SHSU 'Excellence in Teaching' award will be assigned an FES 1 score of 5.
- Documentation of teaching effectiveness, teaching innovations employed, and/or level of impact or extent of course engagement activities shall be entered wherever appropriate into the Watermark Faculty Success portal and described in the annual review narrative.

Suggestions for Chairs:

- Chair should use the narrative provided by the faculty member.
- Chair should consider multiple outlets for student feedback (e.g., letters from Office of Student Affairs saying a faculty member made an impact, verifiable student emails, verbal messages to the chair, etc.).
- Chair should use multiple inputs (e.g., Blackboard pages, class visits, comments, faculty teaching portfolios, etc.)
- Chair should take into consideration:
 - new course preparations
 - number of course preparations
 - faculty overloads
 - modalities, locations, and pedagogies
 - high overall number of students
 - rigor of the course and course materials (e.g., exams and assignments)
 - willingness to innovate with the understanding that not all new ideas work well
 - grade distributions that exhibit unusual patterns relative to the course over more than one year or excessive Q drops without explanation from the faculty member.



Sample Scoring for FES 1:

Weight	Categories of Performance Standards	Scoring Category	Score Awarded
	General - AACSB Qualification Status	YES / NO	YES
50%	Teaching Effectiveness	Scale of 1 – 5	3.5
50%	Meeting Other Teaching Requirements	Scale of 1 – 5	
	- Timely and Effective Communication		3.0
	- Professionalism and Mentoring		4.0
	- Assessment of Student Learning		2.0
	- Compliance		3.0
"Meeting Other Teaching Requirements" Average			3.0
AACSB Faculty Qualification Status Met			YES
FES 1 score = 50% x 3.5 + 50% x 3.0 =			3.25

FES 2 Student Evaluations

Per the university's *Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Academic Policy Statement* (APS 820317), the Department of Finance and Banking will use the instrument selected by SHSU for students to evaluate teaching effectiveness for FES 2. Currently, that instrument is the IDEA Evaluation System.

As defined by section 3.01 of policy APS 820317, for each faculty, an average of the "Combined Averages of Summative Ratings" score for each class taught within the evaluation period (year) shall be used as the faculty's FES 2 score. Specifically, for members of the Finance and Banking department, "Adjusted Averages" compared to the "IDEA Discipline" scores will be used to determine how each faculty member is evaluated.

Summary Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness	
View:	Adjusted Averages 
Compare to:	IDEA Discipline 

Sample Scoring for FES 2

Course	IDEA Score
Course ₁	4.5
Course ₂	4.4
Course ₃	4.6
Course ₄	4.3
Course ₅	4.4
Course ₆	4.6
Course ₇	4.7
Average = FES 2 =	4.5

The chair has discretion to make an adjustment to the FES 2 rating for specific courses for exceptional conditions that are outside of the professor's control. The burden of requesting such an adjustment and the provision of documentation to support such action rests solely with the faculty member.

Examples include but are not limited to:

- The chair asking the professor to take a new class that they have never taught with less than a month notification.
- The chair asking the professor to take on another professor's course using a book they are unfamiliar with due to the professor leaving or being unable to teach.
- The bookstore not having the book for the course in a timely fashion when the professor ordered the text correctly.

FES 3 – Scholarly Accomplishments

Assumptions

Finance research is very specific and typically requires use of specific data from approved sources. The FES standards developed for the Finance and Banking faculty rely on the following critical assumptions.

We assume that faculty will have access to:

- Required databases (e. g., CRSP and Compustat, and others as needed).
- Some means of obtaining data from the required databases (e.g., WRDS).
- Tools needed to perform data analysis (e.g., STATA, SAS, STAT transfer, etc.).

Without such data and tools, the expectations for FES 3 outlined in this policy are less feasible.

Evidence of the level of impact associated with the scholarly work shall be entered wherever appropriate into the Watermark Faculty Success portal and described in the narrative included in the annual review.

Guidelines for FES 3 Scoring

Scholarly activities are designed for faculty to keep current, improve their teaching, and/or promote SHSU's reputation in Finance, Banking, and /or related fields. Such intellectual contributions (ICs) can be directed toward increasing the knowledge base and the development of theory, applied (e.g., case studies), or pedagogical.

While the qualifications for tenure, post tenure review and accreditation look at a six-year window, the FES is a yearly assessment. Therefore, activities that have not resulted in a publication need to be considered (effort). Further, the impact of a publication cannot be properly assessed in the year of publication, ergo impact from previous efforts should also be considered (cumulative marginal impact).

FES 3 activities may be evaluated across three categories:

- Effort
- Current Results
- Cumulative Marginal Impact

Effort – This category represents activities that were pursued in the year evaluated but have not resulted in a publication. Examples include (but are not limited to):

- Presentations
- Working papers
- Submissions
- Internal Grants
- Seminars/training on tools or techniques
- For this category, faculty might consider reporting information such as conversion rate from working paper to publication and consistent theme(s) in their research pipeline.

Current Publications– This category represents actual publications and/or external grants in the assessed year.

- Higher quality publications are defined as any peer-reviewed Intellectual Contribution (IC) outlet in one of the college's approved lists (e.g., ABDC, Cabell's, JCR, SJR, or Scopus) and is rated A*, A/B or is in the top two second quartiles of SJR.
- Quality publications are defined as any peer-reviewed IC outlet, at the time of submission, which is not on Cabell's predatory list of journals (or similar listing). C (ABDC) or Q3 or Q4 (SJR) or listed in Cabell's Journalytics without any additional quality metrics.
- Not reaching quality publications are defined as any non-peer reviewed publication with no recognition by ABDC, Cabell's, JCR, SJR, or Scopus. Other practitioner- or discipline-specific publications may rise to levels of quality if specific standards of quality or impact are properly documented. For this category, faculty might consider reporting information such as acceptance rate of publication and/or any quality metrics for the journal in which they published.

Categories of Accomplishments	Criteria	Scoring Categories for EACH scholarly activity:
Faculty Qualification	In the current year, the faculty member must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications (SA or PA) related to AACSB accreditation. Faculty not meeting AACSB Faculty Qualification Status are assigned an FES 3 score of 1.	Yes/No
Research Article(s)	Published a research article/case study/technical note in a peer review academic journal, which is recognized on one of the four journal lists: ABDC, SJR, Cabell's Journalytics, and/or JCR.	<p>5.0 points: A* of ABDC <i>and/or</i> Q1 of SJR or JCR with indicator that the journal ranks among the top 10% of discipline-related journals¹</p> <p>4.0 points: A of ABDC <i>and/or</i> Q1 of SJR or JCR but not among the top 10% of discipline-related journals</p> <p>3.0 points: B of ABDC <i>and/or</i> Q2 of SJR or JCR</p> <p>2.0 points: C of ABDC <i>and/or</i> Q3 or Q4 of SJR or JCR <i>and/or</i> Cabell's Journalytics</p> <p>1.0 points: Editor-Reviewed Publications <i>and/or</i> Publications defined as any non-peer reviewed publication with no recognition by ABDC, Cabell's, JCR, SJR, or Scopus not Cabell's predatory list of journals (or similar listing).</p> <p>3.5 points: Book (refereed)</p> <p>1.5 points: New edition of existing book</p> <p>2.0 points: Book (non-refereed, editor-reviewed)</p> <p>1.5 points: Book chapter (refereed)</p> <p>1.0 points: Book chapter (editor-reviewed)</p>
Practitioner Journals	Published a research article/case study/technical note in a practitioner journal.	1 - 4 points at the discretion of the chair, given proper evidence to justify the awarding of FES points.

Discipline-appropriate publications	Published a research article/case study/technical note in a discipline-appropriate journal.	1 - 4 points at the discretion of the chair, given proper evidence to justify the awarding of FES points.
Research Award	Awarded a research award from a reputable organization (e.g., university, national, or international association).	Automatically receives a 5.0 on FES for being awarded the SHSU university research award. All other research awards may be awarded FES points at the discretion of the chair.
Research Grant	Awarded a research grant from a reputable organization (e.g., university, national, or international association).	Additional FES points awarded at the discretion of the chair. Points may also be awarded, at the chair's discretion, for grant submissions that are not selected for funding.
Patent	Awarded a Patent.	Additional FES points awarded at the discretion of the chair.
Other	Demonstratable pipeline of research activity, scholarly activities such as conference presentations, journal submissions, revise and resubmits, or evidence of significant marginal impact of prior work	Up to 1 point of additional FES points at the discretion of the chair.

¹ A top tier Journal is one of the top ten journals in Finance, Business, Economics, or a related field as defined by SJR (Scopus database from Elsevier) or JCR (Journal Citation Reports from Clarivate) using any of their rating criteria, or a journal in Finance or a related field that has criteria equal to or better than those of a top ten journal from SJR or JCR or A* in ABDC. The faculty must provide evidence of the journal being top tier. For example: If the faculty publishes in a Journal that is not top ten, but has an Eigenfactor value, citation count and acceptance rate consistent with a top ten journal, then it should be considered top tier. Similar criteria can be used to justify the level of quality for publications in other journals that may not be listed by any of the sources listed.

Cumulative Marginal Impact –This category represents the impact of previously published or unpublished work. For this category, faculty might consider reporting information such as, but are not limited to:

- Marginal downloads occurring in the review year
- Marginal citation counts occurring in the review year and the location of the journal citing the paper
- Request for notes
- Readership (number of subscriptions)
- Circulation, number of members in the sponsoring organization

Faculty should document the quality and impact of each of their activities in the three Scholarly Activities categories (effort, current results, and cumulative marginal impact), providing evidence where possible. Multiple initiatives can be in the same category. It is the faculty member's responsibility to document all research activities within the Watermark Faculty Success Activities portal. Evidence regarding the quality and/or impact of different research activities shall be included in the narrative provided as part of the annual FES/Annual Review workflow process.

Points earned for scholarly accomplishments are cumulative (up to five points). Faculty earning an FES score of 5.0 become candidates for the COBA Research Award.

Notes

- Faculty members are required to score their publication(s) using the guidelines above. If a publication is not on this list, the faculty member is expected to make a case for the inclusion of the publication based on impact and readership, and which level/value it maps to. Scores may be adjusted downward based on a lack of information. Scores may be adjusted upward upon compelling justification that a specific journal rating from an official list is too low and should carry a higher rating score.
- Faculty members are expected to make a case to show impact and have a research agenda. Faculty members can make a case for an adjustment (upward of points) based on the quality/quantity of work involved and its impact.
- Since by this system a faculty member could technically score >5, such a score would automatically qualify a faculty member as a candidate for the COBA research award. COBA is looking into providing additional professional development funds as well.
- Faculty members cannot carry forward their current year publications. However, they can choose among the year of acceptance, the year of online publication, and the year of assignment to a volume and issue (if they are different) to be counted.

FES 4 - Service

The department identifies levels of service engagement for faculty including, (1) Service to students, (2) Service to the Department, (3) Service to the College, (4) Service to the University, (5) Service to the Profession, and (6) Service to other entities not specifically listed above.

Faculty should list each of their service activities and gauge for each activity the associated IMPACT and the INVESTMENT of time and effort. Documentation of the level of impact or extent of engagement in the faculty member's service activities shall be entered wherever appropriate into the Watermark Faculty Success portal and described in the narrative included in the annual review.

Service activities can be considered (1) low, (2) moderate, or (3) high impact.

- Low impact activities affect only a small number of people, and the service activity does not produce a substantial effect.
- Moderate impact increases the scope (number of persons) and influence of the service activity relative to low impact activities.
- High impact activities produce substantial changes for large groups of people.

Service activities can be considered (1) low, (2) moderate, or (3) high investments of time and effort.

- Low investment activities require nominal time investment (< 10 hours per semester) and can be completed without extensive research or collaboration and/or are accomplished without the need for iterative meetings.
- Moderate investment activities increase time commitment to 10 – 30 hours per semester and/or increase effort to include multiple meetings per semester with a substantial need to research and/or collaborate.
- High investment activities require a significant time commitment (multiple hours per week over a substantial portion of the year) with a high need to communicate and collaborate.

Any feedback received from chairs of committees regarding faculty participation and impact can be incorporated into faculty FES 4 scores.

The list below is meant to serve as a guide but is not an exhaustive list of all activities that count for service. A faculty member can make a case for service not included in the list or included in a different category but must establish the service activity's impact and describe the faculty member's investment of time and energy.

FES 4 - Service

Score	Categories of Performance Standards	Criteria
YES / NO	Faculty Qualifications	AACSB Faculty Qualification Status - In the current year, the faculty member must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications (SA or PA) related to AACSB accreditation. Faculty not meeting AACSB Faculty Qualification Status are assigned an FES 4 score of 1.
5.0	Extraordinary	<p>Rare service participant. Reserved for extraordinary levels of service or recognition.</p> <p><i>Must Achieve one of the following:</i> Awarded the SHSU Excellence in Service Award</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Meets minimum service expectations AND demonstrates service in at least three of the six levels (i.e., students, department, college, university, professional organization, or public service) AND participates in at least two high impact, high investment service activities.</p> <p>Examples of Extraordinary high impact and high investment activities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Service award from a reputable organization (e.g., national or international association) ▪ Service award from college or department. ▪ Service award from academic or professional organization. ▪ Faculty advisor to a student organization. ▪ Journal Editor ▪ Conference Program Chair or President

4.5	Very Good	<p>Meets minimum service expectations AND demonstrates service in at least three of the six levels (i.e., students, department, college, university, professional organization, or public service) AND participates in at least two high/moderate impact, high/moderate investment service activities.</p> <p>Examples of high impact and moderate investment or moderate impact and low investment activities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Serving on multiple editorial boards for journals. ▪ Organizing/hosting a conference. ▪ Chairing or serving on a faculty senate or division committee. ▪ Associate Editor of a journal. ▪ Chairing a search committee for faculty, staff, or administrative positions. ▪ Chair of a contributing committee ▪ Engages students with clients; participates in ACE.
4.0	Engaged	<p>Meets minimum service expectations AND demonstrates service in at least two of the six levels (i.e., students, department, college, university, professional organization, or public service) AND participates in at least two moderate impact, moderate investment service activities.</p> <p>Examples of moderate impact, moderate investment activities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Serving as proceedings editor for an academic or professional organization. ▪ Editorial Board Member of a journal. ▪ Serving as dissertation committee member outside of COBA or SHSU. ▪ Chairing a peer review committee (e.g., DPTAC). ▪ Participating in accreditation or assessment activities (e.g., MAT or GAT leader). ▪ Serving as a mentor for faculty (e.g., TLC Pathfinders program)

3.5	Good	<p>Meets minimum service expectations AND demonstrates service in at least two of the six levels (i.e., students, department, college, university, professional organization, or public service) AND participates in at least two service activities that are considered moderate impact, low investment OR low impact, moderate investment.</p> <p>Examples of moderate-impact low investment or low impact, moderate investment activities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Serving in an official capacity in a professional or academic organization. ▪ Conducting workshops ▪ Serving as a track chair at a conference. ▪ Refereeing manuscripts for a journal on one of the four COBA approved lists. ▪ Refereeing conference submissions or internal funding applications. ▪ Volunteers for events to represent department or COBA (e.g., Saturdays at Sam, Operation Freshman, Bearkat Camp Faculty). ▪ Active participant in a professional or academic organization. ▪ Serving as a mentor to students (e.g., writing recommendation letters, reviewing their job materials, assisting in job/internship/graduation school applications). ▪ Committee member of an impactful committee.
3.0	Participating	<p>Meets minimum service expectations AND attends but rarely leads or becomes heavily involved in service activities.</p> <p>Demonstrates service in at least one of the six levels (i.e., students, department, college, university, professional organization, or public service) AND participates in at least two service activities that are considered low impact, low investment or above.</p> <p>Examples of low-impact, low investment activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Member of one non-impactful committee (e.g., parking). ▪ Serving as a session chair at a conference. ▪ Participating in round table discussions with the Dean. ▪ Service on conference committee. ▪ Writing letter of recommendation/support for colleagues Serving on an accreditation or assessment committee.

2.5	Fair	<p>Meets only Minimum Expectations. Completion of the minimum service requirements unless absence is excused by the Chair or Dean.</p> <p>Examples of minimum service expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Attendance at mandatory meetings and department specific events.▪ Attendance at graduation.▪ Contributor to committees assigned by Department Chair or Dean.▪ Participation at DPTAC Committee meetings (if applicable).
2.0	Below Minimum	Does not meet minimum expectations. Needs immediate improvement
1.0	Unacceptable	Well below minimum expectations. Little to no service activity. Lowest score possible.