College of Business Administration
Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship
Faculty Evaluation (FES) Standards

Prepared by the Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty of the Department
of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship
Fall 2022

Approved by:

Traci Austin, Ph. D.
Associate Professor
DPTAC Chair

Joey Robertson, J.D.
Professor
Department Chair

Shar Self, Ph.D.
Dean
College of Business Administration

College of Business Administration
Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship
Post-Tenure Review Standards
Developed Fall 2022

Academic Policy Statement (APS) 820317 (May 2022), "The 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 Business Administration & Entrepreneurship 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 Business Administration & Entrepreneurship adheres to those requirements.

Section 1.03 of APS 820317 allows the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship to develop department-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 (the department substitutes the title "Research"), and 3) Service. Teaching Effectiveness consists of both a Chair Evaluation and Student Evaluations of Teaching. Therefore, there are a total of four (4) individual scores for each faculty member. They are Chair Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (FES 1), Student Evaluations (FES 2), Research (FES 3), and Service (FES 4).

During the Fall 2022 semester, the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship met and developed the departmental standards and scoring process for the four (4) categories. The standards were reviewed during the Fall 2023 semester. The standards are attached hereto.

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.

One of the primary usages of FES scores is the determination of merit pay allocations. In the Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship, faculty members must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation in order to qualify for merit pay. In general, doctoral-qualified faculty should meet the "Scholarly Academic" or "Practice Academic" category. In no instance should a doctoral-qualified faculty member be "Other." In any year, doctoral-qualified faculty classified as "Other" will not be awarded merit pay in the Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship.

FES 1

Initial Evaluation Criteria (to be adjusted by Required Minimum Expectations score, as appropriate):

5.0	Extraordinary educator. Rare. Reserved for extraordinary achievement or recognition. (e.g., teaching award, paid teaching fellowship). Communicates with students and provides timely feedback on assignments.
4.5	Exceptional educator. Maintains very high standards for students and themselves. Outstanding innovation/motivation in the classroom promoting student success. Substantial evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., nomination for a teaching award). Communicates with students and provides timely feedback on assignments.
4.0	Very good educator. Made significant contributions toward departmental, college, university, or professional teaching initiatives. Actively involved in teaching innovation, training, and/or development. Evidence of teaching effectiveness. Communicates with students and provides timely feedback on assignments.
3.5	Engaged educator. Course design, content, and delivery contribute to successful learning objectives and active student engagement. Contributes to departmental, college, university, or professional teaching initiatives. Involved in teaching innovation, training, or development. Communicates with students and provides timely feedback on assignments.
3.0	Competent educator. Communicates with students and provides timely feedback on assignments. Completes all activities required by the chair/dean/president (i.e., specified as "mandatory") unless documented excuse is submitted. See list below.
2.5	Average educator. Provides adequate instruction but is somewhat involved in departmental, college, university, or professional teaching initiatives.
2.0	Participating faculty member. Provides instruction but is rarely involved in departmental, college, university, or professional teaching initiatives.
1.5	Needs improvement. Below expectations, or ineffective teacher.
1.0	Substandard. Needs substantial, immediate improvement.

Examples of teaching innovation, training, or development activities include, but are not limited to:

- New course preparation or redesigns
- New pedagogy or teaching activity
- Guest speakers or embedded writing tutors

- Substantial use of educational technology (e.g., Blackboard, GroupMe, TopHat, Flipgrid, InterviewStream)
- Pedagogical course certifications, fellowships, or programs completed

Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes, but is not limited to:

- Positive feedback, emails, or letters from students or administration
- Mentoring students and/or helping students with professional or academic advancement (e.g., letters, advising students, thesis or dissertation committee, honors contracts, independent studies, extra evaluation of student documents)
- Nomination or receipt of teaching or mentoring award

It is the obligation of the faculty member to provide evidence of the impact and/or effectiveness of their teaching, as well as initiatives taken to encourage student engagement. It is not the responsibility of the department chair to track down this information. It is the obligation of the faculty member to ensure all information is entered into Watermark.

Required Minimum Expectations for use in adjusting FES 1 Initial Evaluation scoring, as appropriate.

Minimum Expectations and Activities	Scoring	Example
AACSB Faculty Qualification Status.	Yes / No	Required for all SA faculty members
Administers teaching-related policies	Yes/No	3
Adheres to class schedule/ holding class for the allotted time and at the right time and for the right length of time	Yes/No	3
Holds regular office hours	Yes/No	3
Submits vita/syllabi by due date	Yes/No	3
Selects textbooks timely	Yes/No	3
Complies with federal aid eligibility verifications timeline	Yes/No	3
Administers final exams per university schedule	Yes/No	3
Submits final grades timely	Yes/No	3
Contributes to assessment, as applicable.	Yes/No	3
Maintains appropriate and reasonable grade distribution for the course(s)	Yes/No	3

College of Business Administration
Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship
FES 2 – Students' Evaluation of Teaching Standards

Per the university's *Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty* Academic Policy Statement (APS 820317), the Department of General Business and Finance 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 "Summary Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness" 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 Business Administration & Entrepreneurship department, **"Adjusted Averages"** compared to the **"IDEA Discipline"** scores will be used to determine how each faculty member is evaluated.

It is the obligation of the faculty member to ensure all information is entered into Watermark.

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 =	**4.50**

College of Business Administration
Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship
FES 3 – Research Standards

FES 3 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RUBRIC

Score	Use Scoring Guide to determine points and map to department FES 3 standards
5	AACSB qualified plus cumulative score of at least 5.0 from Scoring Guide below
4.5	AACSB qualified plus cumulative score of at least 4.5 from Scoring Guide below
4	AACSB qualified plus cumulative score of at least 4.0 from Scoring Guide below
3.5	AACSB qualified plus cumulative score of at least 3.5 from Scoring Guide below
3	AACSB qualified plus cumulative score of at least 3.0 from Scoring Guide below
2.5	AACSB qualified plus cumulative score of at least 2.5 from Scoring Guide below
2	For faculty without any publications in the current year or publications that have a total value of 2 or less: AACSB qualified plus a paper at a major conference
1.5	For faculty without any publications in the current year or publications that have a total value of 1.5 or less: AACSB qualified plus some scholarly activity such as working papers/submissions/conference presentations/ revise & resubmits etc.
1	Not AACSB qualified and no scholarly activities

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION & ENTREPRENEURSHIP FES 3 SCORING GUIDE

5	A* or top 10% of Q1
4	A or Q1 (below top 10%)
3	B, Q2
2	C, Q3
1	Q4, Cabell's Journalytics, editor-reviewed publication
0.5	Revise and resubmit (maximum of 2)
3.5	Book (refereed)
1.5	new edition of existing book
2	Book (non-refereed, editor reviewed)
1.5	book chapter (refereed)
1	book chapter (editor reviewed)
1 - 4 points	Practitioner journals (points vary depending on readership and impact)*
1- 4 points	Discipline-appropriate publications (points vary depending on readership and impact)*
5	NSF or NSF type grant
2- 4 points	External grants > 5,000 (depending on level of grant)
1.5 - 2 points	External grant <5,000 (depending on level of grant)
1.5	SHSU research grant
1	COBA research grant

* see attached rubric

Notes:
Only annual contributions/accomplishments are to be included.

It is the obligation of the faculty member to map their publication(s) to the databases mentioned below. If it is not on this list, the faculty member is expected to make a case for inclusion of the publication based on impact and readership, and the level/value to which the journal maps. Faculty members may also petition the Department Chair to request a quality evaluation of an unlisted journal/publication from the Faculty Research Committee. Scores can be adjusted downward based on lack of information provided. It is not the responsibility of the department chair to track down this information. It is the obligation of the faculty member to ensure all information is entered into Watermark.

Faculty members are expected to make a case to show impact and have a research agenda. Faculty members can make a case for an upward adjustment based on the quality/quantity of work involved and impact.

For publications with a total value equal to or less than 1.5, other scholarly accomplishments can be considered to calculate the final score.

Since by this system a faculty member could reach a score above 5.0, such a score would automatically qualify the candidate for the COBA research award.

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION & ENTREPRENEURSHIP FES 3 RUBRIC

Acceptable, Quality, and Higher Quality IC Categories

Discipline-Specific Contributions*			
Acceptable (1)	*Acceptable (2)*	*Quality (3)*	*Higher Quality (4)*
Non-peer reviewed item published in a non-blacklist journal; book review, full-paper conference proceedings, book chapter.	Peer-reviewed book review, full-paper conference proceedings, internal grants, book chapter.	Peer-reviewed, non-blacklist journal; external grants (e.g., $5,000 or less).	Peer-reviewed regional, national, or international journal or listed in one of the four lists; (ABDC, Scimago, JCR Thomson-Reuters, Cabells); external grant (e.g., over $5,000).
Applied Contributions*			
Applied research addressing a real-world problem, or organizational advancement.	Applied discipline-specific research addressing a real-world problem, or organizational advancement.	Applied discipline-specific research validated by peers addressing a real-world case, problem, or organizational advancement.	Sustained applied discipline-specific research validated by peers addressing a real-world case, problem, or organizational advancement that also rises to a level of prominence or recognition.

AACSB Definition of Research:

- Definition of IC: "Original works intended to advance the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business and management. Further, they may have the potential to address issues of importance to broader society. They are scholarly in the sense that they are based on generally accepted research principles, are validated by peers, and are disseminated to appropriate audiences. Intellectual contributions are a foundation for innovation."
- Under the AACSB definition, Intellectual Contributions (ICs) may fall into one of the following categories:
  - Basic contributions are directed toward increasing the knowledge base and the development of theory. The main audience for basic research is academia.

- Applied draws from basic research and uses accumulated theories, knowledge, methods, and techniques to solve real-world problems and/or issues associated with practice. The main audiences for applied research are business, industry, the professions, and government.

Additional Notes about Research Categories:

- Chairs can make a case for an adjustment to the score (up or down) in extenuating circumstances. Faculty members may also petition the Department Chair to request a quality evaluation of an unlisted journal/publication from the Faculty Research Committee.
- Faculty should provide support for each IC, as to the level of quality.
  - For Basic Contributions: Faculty should document placement on the above-mentioned lists and any given metrics. When an IC outlet is not on the above-mentioned lists, the faculty member should provide evidence that an IC outlet is of Quality or Higher Quality on a respected list outside of the aforementioned lists, and they should submit that documentation to their chair for evaluation.
  - For Applied Contributions: If a faculty member is participating in applied research endeavors, they can make the case for how their work should be considered by providing evidence of impact to their chair. Examples of applied research and considerations about quality are listed below:
    - Examples of applied research include, but are not limited to the following:
      - Participating in collaborative endeavors with schools, industry, or civic agencies.
      - Providing public policy analysis for local, state, inter/national government agencies.
      - Publishing in non-academic media (e.g., newsletters, radio, television, magazines).
      - Independent consulting work (e.g., products, documentation, scales, workbooks, workshops).
      - Briefs to appellate courts or the Supreme Court in the state of Texas.
      - Publishing in discipline-specific practitioner journals.
      - Patents: Full and Provisional
    - When determining quality, there should be consideration of the sponsoring organization, how long the sponsoring organization has existed, and/or audience size.
      - EX: Practitioner journals with a national or international audience that are published by a highly visible and well-known organization may be deemed higher quality (e.g., IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, Law Review Journal).
- Faculty can make a case for a 5.0 by using the following additional data about their publications or research: awards, impact factor, quartiles, number of citations/downloads, or other information supporting the extraordinary nature of the publication/research.

FES 4 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS EVALUATION CRITERIA

5.0	Exceptional: Recognized, Significant, and Impactful participant in service to students, department, college, university and/or professional organization. Must achieve one of the following:
	• Won the SHSU Excellence in Service Award.
	• Active participant in service in at least three levels (e.g., students, department, college, university, professional organization) PLUS one of the following:
	   1. Service award from a very reputable organization (e.g., national or international association)
	   2. Service award from college or department.
	   3. Service award from academic or professional organization (e.g., regional association).
	   4. Actively contributing to a COBA initiative.
	   5. Serving as dissertation committee member outside of COBA or SHSU.
	   6. Serving on multiple editorial boards for journals.
	   7. Conducting workshops or joint workshops or training workshops.
	   8. Serving as editor of a journal.
	   9. Organizing/hosting a conference.
	   10. Program chair or program planner for a conference.
	• At least one of the above PLUS three or more Very Good activities.
	• At least one of the above PLUS five or more Good / Engaged activities.

4.5	Very Good: Significant and Impactful participant in service to students, department, college, university and/or professional organization. Must achieve at least two of the following: • Chair of an impactful committee. • Elected or appointed officer or board member in a professional/academic organization. • Serving as the faculty leader of study abroad • Taking students to conferences or field trips • Serving in other official capacities in a professional or academic organization besides what is listed above. • Active participant in service at multiple levels, not exclusive to committee work.

	• Service award from an academic or professional organization at the local level. • Contributing to the success of a task force addressing an issue facing the college or the university. • Chairing a search committee for faculty, staff, or administrative positions. • Serving on an accreditation or assessment committee. • Refereeing manuscripts for a journal on one of the four COBA approved lists. • Refereeing grant proposals or external funding applications. • Serving as executive committee member or scientific committee member at a professional organization. • Serving as proceedings editor for an academic or professional organization. • Associate Editor of a journal. • Editorial Board Member of a journal. • Faculty advisor to a student organization. • At least one of the above PLUS three or more Very Good activities. • At least one of the above PLUS five or more Very Good / Engaged activities.
4.0	Engaged: Impactful participant in service to students, department, college, university and/or professional organization. Must achieve at least three of the following: • Serving as a mentor to students (e.g., writing recommendation letters, reviewing their job materials, assisting in job/internship/graduation school applications). • Chair of a contributing committee • Committee member of an impactful committee. • Committee member of two non-impactful committees. • Division program planner in a professional/academic organization. • Division Chair in a professional/academic organization. • Active participant in two or more committees at multiple levels. • Active participant in a search committee for faculty, staff, or administrative positions. • Participating in accreditation or assessment activities (e.g., MAT or GAT leader). • Refereeing conference submissions or internal funding applications. • Serving as an appointed or elected head of any academic group (e.g., division, department, college, university levels). • Chairing or serving on a faculty senate or division committee. • Chairing a peer review committee (e.g., DPTAC).

	• At least one of the above PLUS four or more Good activities. • At least one of the above PLUS six or more Good/Average activities.
3.5	Active participant on one contributing committee. Engages students with clients; participates in ACE. • Participating in round table discussions with the Dean. • Participation in college/university wide governance bodies or related activities. • Serving as a mentor for faculty (e.g., assisting in their professional development and/or assisting in their IC contributions but not as an author). • Organizer or leader of workshops, panels, or meetings. • Assistance to Student Affairs initiatives. • External tenure and promotion review • Writing letter of recommendation/support for colleagues • Giving presentations or performances for the public. • Presenting seminars on problems, issues, and/or concerns for general public or trade groups. • At least one of the above PLUS four or more Average activities.
3.0	Average: Participant in service to students, department, college, university and/or professional organization. Must achieve at least three of the following: • Volunteers for events to represent department or COBA (e.g., Saturdays at Sam, Operation Freshman, Bearkat Camp Faculty). • Member of one non-impactful committee (e.g., parking). • Serving as a track chair or session chair at a conference. • Service on conference committee. • Promoting SHSU, COBA, or Department through promotional material or media. • Promoting the image, prestige, and/or perceived value of a discipline or profession. • Participation in community affairs as a representative of the University. • Representing the college or university in a public forum. • Active participant in a professional or academic organization.
2.5	Fair: Completion of the minimum service requirements required by the chair (i.e., specified by the chair as a "mandatory" event) unless absence is documented and excused by the chair. Examples • Attendance at the biannual Dean's meetings. • Department meetings and any other department specific events (e.g., seminar series, job talks). • Attendance at graduation. • Attendance at COBA Scholarship Award Night.

		• Contributor to committees assigned by Department Chair or Dean. • Serves on DPTAC Committee (if applicable).
2.0		Needs Improvement. • Attended 51-74% of the minimum service requirements required by the chair (i.e., specified by the chair as a "mandatory" event) without documented excuse granted by the chair. • Rarely contributes to service as assigned.
1.0		Unacceptable. • Attended less than 50% of the minimum service requirements required by the chair (i.e., specified by the chair as a "mandatory" event) without documented excuse granted by the chair. • Blocks or hinders university, college, or department initiatives.

The table above is meant to serve as a guide, but is not an exhaustive list. A faculty member can make a case for service not included in the list.

The Chair will make a list of mandatory activities for the faculty at the beginning of each semester.

Chairs of committees should report back to the department chair about the level of participation committee members provided.

In addition to documenting service as listed above, it is the obligation of the faculty member to provide evidence of the impact of their service activities, including

1) Service to the students
2) Service to the department
3) Service to the college
4) Service to the university
5) Service to the profession
6) Service to others

It is not the responsibility of the department chair to determine this information. It is the obligation of the faculty member to ensure all information is entered into Watermark.

If AACSB Faculty Qualification Status = "No," then the faculty member is automatically not eligible for merit increase.