

1. GENERAL FEATURES OF THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM

- 1.01 The Faculty Evaluation System (FES) is established to provide an equitable, orderly and comprehensive approach to the evaluation of faculty performance at Sam Houston State University (SHSU). The FES is used for purposes of (1) tenure and promotion in academic rank, (2) rewarding meritorious performance through salary adjustments, (3) contract review for probationary faculty members, (4) review of tenured faculty, and (5) decisions concerning future contracts for tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- 1.02 The FES recognizes that faculty members' interests, strengths, and skills evolve throughout their careers (see Academic Policy Statement 790601, *Faculty Workload*). SHSU is best served by striving for a system that has enough flexibility to reward meritorious performance with enough structure to promote fairness and consistency. SHSU's FES process evaluates faculty performance in three (3) categories (see Section 1.04). A fourth category shall be used for faculty with assigned workload credits for patient care. The FES provides faculty, in alignment with their faculty workload assignment, one of four (4) possible evaluation pathways. Each pathway consists of a range of respective weights used in creating the final summary FES score (Table I; Attachment 1). Each department/school or college shall establish specific values within the allotted range for each category for all relevant evaluation pathways and document these values in their workload policy for inclusion in the college workload handbook.
- 1.03 The default evaluation pathway shall be the Balanced pathway. Faculty with interest in selecting an evaluation pathway other than the Balanced pathway must consult with and obtain approval of the department chair and submit an *FES Evaluation Pathway Selection Form* no later than April 1 of the year preceding the annual evaluation period. Accreditation requirements, available departmental resources, and applicable performance standards for tenure and promotion shall influence whether approval is given. Other factors may also be considered; departments and colleges may establish policies that eliminate one or more pathways from consideration.

Upon an unanticipated modification to a faculty member's workload during the evaluation period, faculty may request to change their evaluation pathway upon submission of an *FES Evaluation Pathway Update Form* to the chair, with approval by the chair and dean.

1.04 The three (3) categories recognized for purposes of evaluation are: teaching or librarianship effectiveness, scholarly and/or creative accomplishments, and service. Faculty with assigned workload credits for patient care shall also be evaluated on patient care effectiveness via the FES P. In addition, faculty with assigned workload credits for administration shall have their administrative performance evaluated via an FES X rating from the administrative supervisor. Each category is allotted a range of weights as specified in Table I, "Weights for Faculty Evaluation," attached to this policy statement, and specific weights for each category shall be documented in the department/school or college workload policy. Teaching effectiveness is comprised of two (2) inputs, the chair's/department's rating of teaching effectiveness (FES 1) and the students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness (FES 2). The weights applied to the FES 1 and FES 2 scores are the same to ensure that both the chair's/department's and students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness each contribute 50% of the overall measure of teaching effectiveness. For faculty in the Newton Gresham Library, FES 1 and FES 2 shall be replaced by effectiveness in librarianship. The individual departments (the tenure-granting units) and respective colleges are responsible for the determination and development of specific performance standards to be evaluated in FES 1, FES 3, and FES 4 (as well as FES 2 for the Newton Gresham Library and FES P for patient care performance standards, as applicable). SHSU values continuous improvement efforts and encourages the incorporation of professional development standards within FES 1, FES 3, and FES 4. The categories used in the Faculty Evaluation System are similar to those identified in Academic Policy Statement 800722, *Merit Increases in Salary*, and Academic Policy Statement 900417, *Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty*.

All tenured and tenure-track faculty members at the department level set the specific performance standards for their given department or program. The FES performance standards for each department or unit are subject to the approval of the chair and dean, are retained on file in the Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (hereafter Provost) and are made available to all faculty. The FES performance standards for each department/unit shall be regularly reviewed at least every five (5) years. Any updates to tenure unit FES performance standards shall be submitted to the Office of the Provost no later than October 1 each year and take effect the following calendar year.

1.05 Provisions are made in the Faculty Evaluation System for the following:

- a. Each department may create a faculty advisory committee to assist the chair in evaluating faculty teaching effectiveness or effectiveness in librarianship for the

Newton Gresham Library faculty (FES 1), scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (FES 3), and service (FES 4).

- b. A rating of teaching effectiveness shall be accomplished by combining the chair's/department's evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness and the students' evaluation of classroom teaching effectiveness. The chair's/department's evaluation shall consider the general guidelines in Section 2. The students' evaluation shall follow the guidelines in Section 3. Faculty in the Newton Gresham Library shall be evaluated on their effectiveness in librarianship in lieu of teaching effectiveness.
 - c. A report of scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (FES 3) shall be completed by each faculty member as a means of indicating said faculty member's scholarly and/or creative accomplishments. Each faculty member must submit the appropriate supporting documentation as required in the respective department's FES policy to verify the scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (see Section 4.)
 - d. A report of service activities (FES 4) shall be completed by each member of the faculty as a means of indicating said faculty member's service. All faculty members must submit the appropriate supporting documentation as required in the respective department's FES policy to verify their service activities (see Section 5).
 - e. A summary rating of each faculty member based upon FES 1 through FES 4 shall be completed by using the *FES Summary Report*. The *FES Summary Report* shall be completed by the department chair and shall be signed by both the chair (or administrative equivalent) and the faculty member. A faculty member who fails to sign the *FES Summary Report* shall be ineligible for any merit increases based on productivity in the time period covered by the unsigned *FES Summary Report*. Faculty members who believe the *FES Summary Report* does not accurately reflect their productivity may appeal their summary rating as described in Section 7.01.
 - f. Departments/schools or colleges with faculty assigned workload credits for patient care shall develop an instrument (FES P) to determine a rating of patient care effectiveness. This rating shall be used to complete the *FES Summary Report*.
- 1.06 The *FES Summary Report* is to reflect faculty activity for the twelve-month period beginning January 1 of each calendar year and ending December 31 of the same calendar year. Should faculty members change their workload during this twelve-month period, they shall negotiate with their academic dean and chair (or administrative equivalents) to determine the Table I weights to be used.

- 1.07 Faculty members on professional leave (e.g., development leave) shall complete and be evaluated in the annual FES review. Faculty members on a personal leave of absence (including Family and Medical Leave) shall not complete or be evaluated in the annual FES review unless negotiated otherwise with the Provost through the chair and dean of the respective tenure unit.
- 1.08 Should a faculty member receive an administrative assignment for which workload credits are assigned (see APS 790601, *Faculty Workload*), the faculty member's chair shall complete an *FES X Form* with input from the administrative assignment supervisor. For chairs, deans, assistant/associate deans, and faculty with a 100% administrative workload assignment outside their tenure unit, an *FES X Form* (only) shall be completed by the administrative assignment supervisor in lieu of the chair. Expectations for the administrative assignment shall be established between the faculty member and the supervisor prior to the start of the appointment and be used for the basis of the FES X rating on a one- to five-point continuous scale (with a minimum precision to the whole number from 1 to 5, a minimum "acceptable" score of 3, and a maximum precision to the nearest hundredth). For the *FES Summary Report* portion of the evaluation, the weights for FES 1, 2, 3, and 4 shall not be adjusted, and the faculty member shall receive an *FES Summary Report*-based merit recommendation as if said faculty member does not have a separate administrative assignment. In a like manner, the faculty member's performance of the administrative responsibility shall be evaluated, and a merit recommendation shall be made as if the administrative assignment is the faculty member's sole responsibility. The final merit recommendation (*FES X Form*) shall be the weighted average of the two (2) merit recommendations. The weight for the administrative assignment is calculated as the number of workload credits assigned for the administrative assignment divided by 12, and the weight for the *FES Summary Report* is one (1) minus the administrative assignment weight.
- 1.09 Evaluation for merit pay purposes shall be based on data covering only the specific time period.

2. CHAIR'S/DEPARTMENT'S EVALUATION OF FACULTY TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

- 2.01 The chair's/department's evaluation of teaching shall be based on activities defined as or related to teaching and shall not be based on or influenced by scores or comments from student evaluations. The standards identified in FES 1 shall be approved by the respective

chair and dean and filed with the Provost's Office. The performance standards for FES 1 shall be reviewed, revised, and approved at least every five (5) years.

2.02 Faculty from each department shall define their own performance standards for the chair's/department's rating of teaching effectiveness. A variety of inputs are necessary to give the evaluation maximum validity. Items that may be considered by the chairs and departments include, but are not limited to:

- a. Adherence to expectations of APS 240430, *Course Structure and Management*
- b. Classroom and laboratory instruction, including ensuring that courses are taught with a majority of original course content, with use of third-party content only as appropriate and necessary for student learning and success
- c. Development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods
- d. Publication of and/or development of electronic instructional materials
- e. Supervision of undergraduate and graduate students
- f. Supervision of student artistic/creative performances in a public setting
- g. Teaching professionalism:
 - (1) Holds posted office hours as scheduled, conferences with students as necessary, and provides academic and/or professional advice
 - (2) Submits grades, reports, etc., by established deadlines
 - (3) Maintains high ethical standards of honesty and objectivity
 - (4) Adheres to university/college/department/school timelines, policies, and procedures
 - (5) Attempts to evaluate and improve their teaching
 - (6) Contributes to course and/or program assessments
 - (7) Engages in professional development aimed at improving teaching effectiveness
 - (8) Uses equitable grading practices

- (9) Revises course content in accordance with developments in the field
- (10) Utilizes supporting educational materials (e.g., handouts, electronic tutorials)
- (11) Adheres to course syllabi
- (12) Uses technology effectively
- (13) Uses innovative pedagogy
- (14) Provides timely and clear feedback to students on assignments, tests, and academic progress
- (15) Works with Services for Students with Disabilities to provide reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities
- (16) Utilizes high-impact teaching practices

This list is not comprehensive. It is only a list of recommendations and is meant to serve as a guide to the faculty and chairs when developing department-specific performance standards.

- 2.03 FES 1 reflects the chair's/department's rating of teaching effectiveness for each faculty member or effectiveness in librarianship for Newton Gresham Library faculty. The final FES 1 score shall be on a one-to-five-point continuous scale as defined in departmental standards (with a minimum precision to the whole number from 1 to 5, a minimum "acceptable" score of 3, and a maximum precision to the nearest hundredth; FES 1= 0.01).

3. STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

- 3.01 Student responses on the instrument selected by SHSU for students to evaluate teaching effectiveness shall be used for administrative decisions (e.g., tenure, promotion, and merit pay) and for development purposes. The Summative Score shall be used as the FES 2 score. For Newton Gresham Library faculty, FES 2 shall be an evaluation of effectiveness in librarianship. Departmental guidelines shall specify which Summative Score (e.g., Raw, Adjusted, etc.) shall be recorded as FES 2.

3.02 Evaluations shall be conducted anonymously online.

4. REPORT ON SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- 4.01 This report shall be completed by each faculty member and submitted to the faculty member's department chair as input for the FES 3 score. The final FES 3 score shall be on a one-to-five-point continuous scale (with a minimum precision to the whole number from 1 to 5, a minimum "acceptable" score of 3, and a maximum precision to the nearest hundredth; FES 3= 0.01).
- 4.02 For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publication. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative works and activities, such as instructional technology; poetry; painting; musical, dance, or theatrical performance or composition; and sculpture. Scholarly activities shall be interpreted to include, but not be limited to, production of basic and applied research, writing and publications, scholarly grant development, scholarly grant acquisition, presentations to professional and learned societies, and professional development directly related to scholarly and/or creative accomplishments. Subject to the approval of the appropriate academic dean, the department chair may add additional subcategories or activities in accordance with department/school/college expectations.
- 4.03 Different disciplines and individuals define creative accomplishments in different ways, engage in different types of artistic endeavors, and evaluate such endeavors differently. As such, the criteria for evaluation may be defined here in only the most general terms. The departments and respective colleges are responsible for the determination and development of specific performance standards to be evaluated in FES 3. Faculty members at the department level shall identify specific performance standards that may be unique to a given department or program. These standards shall be approved by the respective chair and dean and filed with the Office of the Provost. The performance standards for FES 3 shall be reviewed, revised, and approved at least every five (5) years. Ultimately, individuals must be evaluated on the merit of their creative accomplishments and the level of their critical success. In creating performance standards, each college shall address the issue of quality as well as quantity.

5. REPORT ON SERVICE

- 5.01 The report on service shall be completed by each faculty member and submitted to the faculty member's department chair as input for the FES 4 score. The final FES 4 score shall be on a one-to-five-point continuous scale (with a minimum precision to the whole number from 1 to 5, a minimum "acceptable" score of 3, and a maximum precision to the nearest hundredth; FES 4= 0.01).
- 5.02 Service includes service to students, colleagues, program, department/school, college, and the University; administrative and committee service; and service beyond SHSU to the profession, locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally, including academic or professionally-related public service. Activities for which the faculty member received a stipend or release time are typically not considered service activities. However, departments may consider compensated activities justifiable service by identifying specific activities in the performance standards for FES 4 set at the departmental level. Service activities that may be considered, but are not limited to, include:
- a. Committee service
 - b. Student recruitment
 - c. Student advisement
 - d. Acquisition and development of facilities, equipment, and other resources
 - e. Appropriate professional development activities
 - f. Student mentoring
 - g. Student organization sponsorship
 - h. Program/curriculum development
 - i. Faculty-community collaboration for scholarly research
 - j. Faculty-community collaborations for scholarly and/or creative accomplishments
 - k. Faculty-community projects for leadership, economic, or social service development
- 5.03 The departments and respective colleges are responsible for the determination and development of specific performance standards to be evaluated in FES 4. Faculty members at the department level shall identify specific performance standards that may be unique to a given department or program. These standards must be approved by the respective chair and dean and filed with the Office of the Provost. The performance

standards for FES 4 shall be reviewed, revised, and approved at least every five (5) years. The performance standards shall identify types of service that advance the mission and goals of SHSU, the college, and department/school.

6. SUMMARY RATING REPORT

- 6.01 The *FES Summary Report* and *FES X Form* (when applicable) shall be completed by the department chair and submitted to the Faculty Information System. The *FES X Form* shall be completed in collaboration with the faculty member's supervisor for the administrative assignment.
- 6.02 There shall be an individual conference between the faculty member being evaluated and the chair. At this meeting, the evaluation shall be discussed.
- 6.03 Following discussion of the *FES Summary Report* and *FES X Form* (when applicable), the document(s) shall be signed by the chair and by the faculty member. When the faculty member under evaluation is the chair, the *FES Summary Report* and *FES X Form* shall be signed by the dean in lieu of the chair. The signature of the faculty member represents merely an indication that the completed report/form has been reviewed by the chair with the faculty member and does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the report's contents. The faculty member's signature does not preclude the faculty member from appealing the summary report. A faculty member who fails to sign the *FES Summary Report* or *FES X Form* is ineligible for any merit increases based on productivity in the time period covered by the unsigned *FES Summary Report* or *FES X Form*. The final score on the *FES Summary Report* or *FES X Form* shall serve as the basis for recommendations to the dean for merit pay.
- 6.04 When the faculty member under evaluation is a dean or other faculty member with a 100% administrative workload assignment outside their tenure unit, only the *FES X Form* shall be used. The form shall be reviewed by the administrative supervisor with the faculty member and shall be signed by both parties.

7. APPEAL OF THE FES SCORE

- 7.01 Faculty members may appeal their *FES Summary Report* score to their academic dean. Faculty members who wish to appeal must submit in writing their rationale for the appeal

accompanied by appropriate documentation within ten (10) working days of receiving the *FES Summary Report*. The academic dean shall respond to the appeal within ten (10) working days. If not satisfied with the dean's decision, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost within ten (10) working days of receiving the dean's decision. The decision of the Provost is final.

8. TIMELINE

By February 1

Faculty shall submit to the Faculty Information System all appropriate FES documents along with other pertinent materials necessary to conduct an annual performance review aligned with the performance standards set by the respective department.

By April 15

Chairs of the various tenure units (or other administrative supervisors, as applicable) shall complete and review with each faculty member their *FES Summary Report* and *FES X Form*, as applicable.

Faculty shall have a validated *FES Evaluation Pathway Selection Form* on file with the chair to be applied during the following calendar year. Faculty with 100% administrative workload assignments are exempt from this requirement.

By October 1

Tenure units shall submit any updates to FES performance standards to the Office of the Provost. Updates shall apply the following calendar year.

APPROVED: <signed>
Alisa White, Ph.D., President

DATE: 8/27/2026

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

This academic policy statement (APS) has been approved by the reviewer listed below and represents SHSU's Division of Academic Affairs' policy from the date of this document until superseded.

Original: March 17, 1982
Reviewer: Academic Affairs Council

Review Cycle: Five years*
Review Date: Fall 2031

Approved: <signed>
Sumanth Yenduri, Ph.D.,
Provost and Sr. Vice President
for Academic Affairs

Date: 8/26/2026

*Effective January 2018, Academic Policy Statements will be reviewed on a rotating 5-year schedule. To transition to a distributed review load, some policies may be reviewed prior to the 5-year timeframe, with subsequent reviews transitioning to the 5-year schedule.

Attachment 1

TABLE I: WEIGHTS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

Specific values within each allotted range are determined by the values documented in the department/school or college workload policy. Pathway availability is governed by section 1.03 of this policy.

RESEARCH-INTENSIVE EVALUATION PATHWAY

Teaching	Scholarly and Creative Activity	Service
30-40%	50-60%	10-20%

TEACHING/LIBRARIANSHIP-INTENSIVE EVALUATION PATHWAY

Teaching	Scholarly and Creative Activity	Service
50-60%	10-30%	20-30%

BALANCED EVALUATION PATHWAY

Teaching	Scholarly and Creative Activity	Service
30-40%	30-40%	20-40%

PATIENT CARE-INTENSIVE EVALUATION PATHWAY

Teaching	Scholarly and Creative Activity	Service	Patient Care
30-40%	10-20%	10-20%	20-40%

For faculty in the Newton-Gresham Library, teaching shall be replaced by librarianship.