



Sam Houston State University

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND BANKING

Faculty Evaluation System (FES) Guidelines

Effective 1/1/2024

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 103 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 or 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 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 use 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 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

FES 1 –

NOTES:

- f* Faculty receiving the SHSU 'Excellence in Teaching' award will be assigned an FES 1 score of 5.
- f* It is the faculty member's responsibility to fully document their teaching effectiveness activities, providing evidence entered into the Watermark Faculty Success Activities portal where possible.

Suggestions for Chairs:

- f* Chair should use the narrative provided by the faculty member along with student comments from IDEA evaluations.
- f* 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.).
- f* Chair should use multiple inputs (e.g., Blackboard pages, class visits, comments, faculty teaching portfolios, etc.)
- f* Chair should take into consideration:
 - o new

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 mark c3aT10.5 (o)D0.001 Tw 37 (h Twj-8.1f)3.6 (oaT10.5-0.03 c)7.2 .7ngnkag1 (p)6.9.5.9 (S41 Tw 37 (t

FES 3 –Scholarly Accomplishments

Assumpti ons

Finance research is very specific and typically requires use of specific data from approved sources. The FES standards developed for the Finance and Banking f (v)4 (01F)9.4 (in)8i18Ta

f Not reading 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

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

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.

4.5

Very Good

Examples of high impact and moderate investment or moderate impact and low investment activities include but are not limited to:

f Serving on multiple editorial boards for journals.

f Organizing/hosting a conference.

f Chairing or serving on a faculty senate or division committee.

f Associate Editor of a journal.

f Chairing a search committee for faculty, staff, or admmmoSoT(,)-1.5 (o)-1.43.6 (o)14.7 (o)3.6(l)422

<p>3.5</p>	<p>Good</p>	<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"> <i>f</i> Serving in an official capacity in a professional or academic organization. <i>f</i> Conducting workshops <i>f</i> Serving as a track chair at a conference. <i>f</i> Refereeing manuscripts for a journal on one of the four COBA approved lists. <i>f</i> Refereeing conference submissions or internal funding applications. <i>f</i> Volunteers for events to represent department or COBA (e.g., Saturday Sam, Operation Freshman, Bearkat Camp Faculty). <i>f</i> Active participant in a professional or academic organization. <i>f</i> Serving as a mentor to students (e.g., writing recommendation letters, reviewing their job materials, assisting in job/internship/graduation school applications). <i>f</i> Committee member of an impactful committee.
------------	-------------	---

3.0

Participating

Meets minimum service expectations AND

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"> <i>f</i> Attendance at mandatory meetings and department specific events. <i>f</i> Attendance at graduation. <i>f</i> Contributor to committees assigned by Department Chair or Dean. <i>f</i> 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.