1. GENERAL FEATURES OF THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM

1.01 The Faculty Evaluation System is established to provide an orderly, comprehensive approach to the evaluation of faculty performance at Sam Houston State University. The system is designed to maximize objectivity and minimize bias. The evaluation system is important for purposes of (1) faculty development, (2) promotion in academic rank, (3) rewarding meritorious performance through salary adjustments, (4) contract review for probationary faculty members, and (5) decisions concerning future contracts for non-tenured and non-tenure track faculty members.

1.02 The Faculty Evaluation System is intended to recognize and reward excellence serving to advance the mission and goals of the University. The Faculty Evaluation System (FES) recognizes that faculty members' interests, strengths, and skills evolve throughout their careers (see Academic Policy Statement 790601, *Faculty Instructional Workload*). The University 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 each of three categories (see Section 1.03). The FES provides a table of weights (Table I) for both the normative nine-credit-hours-per-semester- and twelve-credit-hours-per-semester-workloads (see Academic Policy Statement 790601, *Faculty Instructional Workload*) and identifies the respective weights used in creating the final summary FES score (see Section 6).

1.03 The Faculty Evaluation System recognizes three categories for purposes of evaluation. These three categories are: teaching effectiveness, scholarly and/or creative accomplishments, and service. Each of these categories will be assigned a weight as specified in Table I, "Weights for Faculty Evaluation," attached to this policy statement. Teaching effectiveness is comprised of two inputs, the Chair's Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (FES 1) and the Students' Rating 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 and students' ratings contribute 50% of the overall measure of teaching effectiveness. The respective colleges are responsible for the determination and development of specific performance standards to be evaluated in FES 1, FES 3, and FES 4. Input from faculty members at the department/school and/or program level is strongly encouraged in identifying specific performance standards that may be unique to a given

department/school or program. The University 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, *Promotions in Rank and Advances in Salary Within Rank*, and Academic Policy Statement 900417, *Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion*.

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

a. A rating of teaching effectiveness to be accomplished by combining the chair's evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness and the students' evaluation of classroom teaching effectiveness. The chair's evaluation will consider the general guidelines in Section 2. The students' evaluation will follow the guidelines in Section 3.

b. A report of scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (FES 3) is to be completed by using the "Report on Scholarly and/or creative Accomplishments." This report is to be completed by each faculty member as a means of indicating his/her scholarly and/or creative accomplishments. Each faculty member must submit the appropriate supporting documentation as required in the respective college's FES policy to verify the scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (see Section 4.)

c. A report of service activities (FES 4) is to be completed by each member of the faculty as a means of indicating his/her service. Each faculty member must submit the appropriate supporting documentation as required in the respective college's FES policy to verify his/her service activities (see Section 5).

d. A summary rating of each faculty member based upon FES 1 through FES 4 is to be completed by using the "FES Summary Report" (Attachment 1). This "FES Summary Report" is to be completed by the department/school chair and is to be signed by both the chair 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. A faculty member who believes the FES Summary Report does not accurately

reflect his/her productivity may appeal his/her summary rating as described in Section 6.

1.05 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 a faculty member change his/her workload during this twelve-month period, he/she will negotiate with his/her academic dean and chair to determine the weights from Table I to be used.

1.06 Should a faculty member receive an administrative FES X assignment (see APS 790601), the faculty member will receive a separate evaluation for the FES X assignment by the supervisor of the assignment as well as the FES 5 evaluation. The weights for FES 1, 2, 3, and 4 are not adjusted and the faculty member receives an FES 5-based merit recommendation as if he/she does not have a separate FES X assignment. In a like manner, the faculty member's performance of the FES X responsibility is evaluated and a merit recommendation is made as if the FES X assignment is the faculty member's sole responsibility. The final merit recommendation is the weighted average of the two merit recommendations. The weight for FES X is the proportional reduction in the teaching load and the weight for FES 5 "one minus the FES X weight."

1.07 The timelines for the completion of the forms are to be established by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

1.08 Evaluation for merit pay purposes should be based on data covering only the specific time period.

2. CHAIR'S EVALUATION OF FACULTY TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

2.01 A department/school chair may decide to use a faculty committee to assist him/her in evaluating faculty teaching effectiveness.

2.02 Teaching may include, among other things, classroom and laboratory instruction; development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; publication of and/or development of electronic instructional materials; and supervision of undergraduate and graduate students. The chair's rating of faculty teaching effectiveness should be based on as much information as can be reasonably obtained. FES 1 Worksheet (see

Attachment 2) may be used. A variety of inputs are necessary to give the evaluation maximum validity. Two primary sources of information may be a teaching portfolio prepared by the faculty member and a conference with the individual being evaluated. Other inputs may include, but are not limited to, comments from students, student outcome measures, and results of assessment measures. Each college/department/school should define its own performance standards for the chair's rating of faculty teaching effectiveness. Items that may be considered by the chairs include, but are not limited to:

Professionalism

- Adheres to scheduled class meeting times
- Is reasonably available for student conferences and counseling; maintains appropriate office hours
- Submits grades, reports, etc. in a timely manner
- Maintains appropriate professional demeanor in teaching situations
- Maintains high ethical standards of honesty and objectivity
- Adheres to university/college/department/school timelines, policies, and procedures
- Regularly prepares for teaching
- Attempts to evaluate and improve own teaching
- Commitment and contribution to course and/or program assessments
- Engages in professional development aimed at improving teaching effectiveness
- Uses fair and appropriate grading practice(s)

Content and Pedagogy

- Appropriateness and relevance of material covered in the class to subject matter of the class
- Supporting educational material (e.g., handouts, electronic tutorials)
- Appropriate use of pedagogical resources
- Adherence to syllabus
- Appropriateness, relevance, and quality of syllabus content
- Effective use of technology
- Effective utilization of innovations
- Timely, clear, informative, and appropriate feedback to students on assignments, tests, and on student progress in general beyond grades
- Making reasonable accommodations for individual students requiring the same

- Incorporation of civic engagement, service-learning, community-based teaching strategies or internships

In accordance with college and/or department/school policy, each faculty member may present a teaching portfolio and update it on an annual basis. The portfolio should provide information relating to teaching effectiveness. Because of the wide variety of programs and teaching situations, departments/schools should develop criteria as to the appropriate content, limitations, and uses of portfolios.

2.03 FES 1 reflects the chair's rating of teaching effectiveness for each faculty member on a one-to-five scale. The FES 1 worksheet or a similar tool will be used by the chair to document the chair's rating of teaching effectiveness.

3. STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

3.01 Student responses on the IDEA Center's "Survey Form – Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses" are used for administrative decisions (e.g., tenure, promotion, and merit pay) and for development purposes. The IDEA "Summary Evaluation Score" will be used as the FES 2 score.

3.02 The IDEA Center's "Survey Form – Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses," at the discretion of the dean of the college, may be obtained directly from the Office of Institutional Research by department/school chairs for distribution to the faculty.

3.03 Evaluations may be conducted online or in class. For in-class evaluations, the evaluation will be conducted during the first 20-25 minutes of the period. The instructor may not be present in the classroom while the students are completing the form. The instructor should read the prepared college statement on teaching evaluation and then appoint a student or colleague per department/school/college guidelines to distribute, gather, and deliver the forms to the department/school chair's office. The instructor must exit the classroom prior to the distribution of the forms.

3.04 Federal and state law protects each student's privacy rights. For this reason, the class instructor should not have access to completed individual survey forms or score summaries until after all grades have been submitted to the

Registrar. Even then, any information on the forms that identifies a student shall be redacted prior to being provided to the instructor.

4. REPORT ON SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

4.01 This report is to be completed by each faculty member and submitted to his/her department/school chair as input for the FES 3 score. The final FES 3 score will be on a one-to-five point scale.

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 are not 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/school 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 can be defined here in only the most general terms. Each college/department/school should define its own specific criteria. Ultimately, individuals must be evaluated on the merit of their creative accomplishments and the level of their critical success.

4.04 The respective colleges are responsible for the determination and development of specific performance standards to be evaluated in FES 3. Input from faculty members at the department/school and/or program level is encouraged in identifying specific performance standards that may be unique to a given department/school or program. In creating performance standards, each college is encouraged to address the issue of quality as well as quantity.

5. REPORT ON SERVICE

5.01 This report is to be completed by each faculty member and submitted to his/her department/school chair as input for the FES 4 score. The final FES 4 score will be on a one-to-five point scale.

5.02 Service includes service to students, colleagues, program, department/school, college, and the University; administrative and committee service; and unpaid service beyond the University 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 may not be considered for service activities. Activities that may be considered, but are not limited to, include:

- Committee service
- Student recruitment
- Student advisement
- Acquisition and development of facilities, equipment, and other resources
- Appropriate professional development activities
- Student mentoring
- Student organization(s) sponsorship
- Program/curriculum development
- Faculty-community collaboration for scholarly research
- Faculty-community projects for leadership, economic, or social service development

5.03 The respective colleges are responsible for the determination and development of specific performance standards to be evaluated in FES 4. The performance standards should identify types of service that advance the mission and goals of the University, college, and department/school.

6. SUMMARY RATING REPORT

6.01 The "FES Summary Report" is to be completed by the department/school chair.

6.02 There must be an individual conference between the faculty member being evaluated and the chair. At this meeting, the evaluation will be discussed. The faculty member should be encouraged to provide any relevant

information. Faculty members needing improvement should be encouraged to seek appropriate assistance in creating and implementing a development plan.

6.03 Once completed, the "FES Summary Report" is to be signed by the chair and by the faculty member. The signature of the faculty member represents merely an indication that the completed report has been reviewed with the faculty member by the chair 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 rating report. A faculty member who fails to sign the "FES Summary Report" is ineligible for any merit increases based on productivity in the time period covered by the unsigned "FES Summary Report." The final score on the "FES Summary Report" will serve as the basis for recommendations to the dean for merit pay.

6.04 A faculty member may appeal his/her FES Summary Rating Report score to the chair and/or academic dean. The faculty member must submit in writing his/her rationale for the appeal accompanied by appropriate documentation. If not satisfied with the dean's decision, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The decision of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs is final.

APPROVED: /signed/
James F. Gaertner, President

DATE: 11/10/09

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

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

Original Date: March 17, 1982
Reviewer(s): Council of Academic Deans
Academic Policy Council

Review Cycle: March 1, ENY*
Review Date: March 1, 2012

Approved: /signed/
David E. Payne
Provost and Vice President
for Academic Affairs

Date: 11/11/09

*=Even Numbered Year

Attachment 1

FES SUMMARY REPORT

Teaching effectiveness ratings are weighted averages and should be recorded to the nearest tenth. Ratings by the students and chair should be weighted equally (each comprises 50% of the teaching activity score). The remaining activity areas are each to be evaluated as a whole. For example, scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (FES 3) should be evaluated and assigned an overall rating from 1 to 5. The weights for each of the categories vary depending upon each faculty member's normative teaching load as described in Table I.

Faculty Member's Workload Assignment (check one):
____ Normative nine credit hours per semester
____ Normative twelve credit hours per semester

FES Category	**Rating**	**x**	**Weight**	**=**	**Score**
1. Chair's Rating of Teaching Effectiveness	_____	x	_____	=	_____
2. Students' Rating of Teaching Effectiveness	_____	x	_____	=	_____
3. Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments	_____	x	_____	=	_____
4. Service	_____	x	_____	=	_____
	Sum of Scores – FES 5				_____

* Weights for each category area are determined by referencing Table I of this policy.

The signatures below indicate only that the department/school chair and faculty member met to discuss the faculty member's annual evaluation pertaining to APS 820317 and does not necessarily indicate the faculty member's concurrence with the same.

Chair's Signature: _____

Faculty Member's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Attachment 2

FES 1 WORKSHEET
Chair's Rating of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness Worksheet

Faculty Member's Name: _____
Identification Number: _____ Date: _____

Using the guidelines in Section 2 of APS 820317 and/or the appropriate college/department/school criteria, please document evidence/rationale for the chair's rating of teaching effectiveness score listed below. The broad categories listed in Section 2.02 are reproduced for your convenience.

Professionalism

Content and Pedagogy

Other

Chair's Rating of Teaching Effectiveness: _____

Attachment 3

TABLE I: WEIGHTS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

NORMATIVE TWELVE-CREDIT HOURS-PER-SEMESTER WORKLOAD

FES 1 Chair's Rating	FES 2 Students' Rating	FES 3 Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments	FES 4 Service
.25	.25	.25	.25

NORMATIVE NINE-CREDIT-HOURS-PER-SEMESTER WORKLOAD

FES 1 Chair's Rating	FES 2 Students' Rating	FES 3 Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments	FES 4 Service
.20	.20	.40	.20