



Revised: Fall 2025

**College of Business Administration  
Department of Accounting  
Faculty Evaluation System (FES) Standards**

Prepared and Adopted by the Tenured and Tenure-Faculty of the Department of Accounting

Fall 2025

---

Cassy Henderson, Ph.D.  
Professor  
Department Chair

---

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



**College of Business Administration  
Department of Accounting  
Faculty Evaluation System (FES) Standards**

*Academic Policy Statement (APS) 820317 (January 2025), "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 Accounting 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 Accounting adheres to those requirements.*

*Section 1.04 of APS 820317 allows the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department of Accounting 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 (the department substitutes the title "Research"), 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 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 Accounting met and developed the departmental standards and scoring process for the four (4) categories. They were updated in Fall 2024, Spring 2025, and Fall 2025 by the tenured and tenure-track faculty. The standards and scoring process are provided on the following pages.

**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 Accounting, faculty members must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation in order to qualify for merit. In general, tenure-track faculty should meet the "Scholarly Academic", "Practice Academic", "Scholarly Practitioner, or "Instructional Practitioner" category. Tenure-track faculty classified as "Other or Additional Faculty" will not be awarded merit pay in the Department of Accounting. Faculty qualifications are defined in COBA's Guidelines for Faculty Sufficiency/Qualifications and Research Quality/Impact Metrics document and posted in the COBA College Level File in Microsoft Teams.



**College of Business Administration  
Department of Accounting  
FES 1 - Teaching Standards**

Revised: Fall 2025

<b>AACSB Status - Department of Accounting faculty members must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation in order to qualify for merit. Tenure-track faculty classified as "Other or Additional Faculty" will not be awarded merit pay in the Department of Accounting. Faculty qualifications are defined in COBA's Guidelines for Faculty Sufficiency/Qualifications and Research Quality/Impact Metrics document and posted in the COBA College Level File in Microsoft Teams.</b>			<b>Status</b>	<b>Merit Eligible Yes / No</b>
AACSB Faculty Qualification Status	In the current year, the faculty member must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation. In general, doctoral qualified faculty should meet the "Scholarly Academic" or "Practice Academic" (rare; only in special circumstances) category. In no instance should a doctoral qualified faculty member be "Other." Doctoral qualified faculty not meeting "Scholarly Academic" or "Practice Academic" status will receive a score of 1 on FES 1.			
<b>APS 240430 - Course Structure and Management Policy</b>			<b>Meets Minimum Expectations Yes / No</b>	
Course Structure and Management Compliance	In the current year, the faculty member must meet the minimum requirements established by the University's Course Structure and Management policy (APS 240430). Faculty not meeting the minimum requirements will receive a score of 1 on FES 1. Faculty must demonstrate evidence of teaching effectiveness beyond these baseline expectations.			
<b>Section 1 Performance Criteria</b>	<b>Detailed Criteria Description</b>	<b>Suggested Scoring</b>	<b>Score Awarded</b>	<b>Weight</b>
Course Syllabi	Course syllabi provide clear and comprehensive information about the course structure, objectives, evaluation methods, course-level student learning outcomes, and any required departmental, college, or university policies. A detailed semester schedule of assignments and due dates is provided. Syllabi align with APS 240430 and the mission of department/college and are provided on a timely basis.	1.0 = meets expectations 0.5 = minor improvements needed 0.0 = does not meet minimum expectations or no evidence		<b>5%</b>
Professional Development	Seeks to improve teaching through appropriate professional development activities such as continuing education, seminars, conferences, workshops, etc. Development includes acquiring and maintaining an active state approved license (CPA) in a discipline related field. Development also includes acquiring and maintaining active professional certifications from a recognized professional organization in an appropriate discipline-related field. Faculty are encouraged to highlight innovative and engaging professional development activities and impactful contributions to their field.	1.0 = meets expectations 0.5 = minor improvements needed 0.0 = does not meet minimum expectations or no evidence  <i>Score awarded is multiplied by 2</i>		<b>10%</b>
Assessments of Student Learning	Faculty member performs and submits all university, college, and department required assessments of student learning (including results, reports, forms, and other requirements) on a timely basis.	1.0 = meets expectations 0.5 = minor improvements needed 0.0 = does not meet minimum expectations or no evidence  <i>Score awarded is multiplied by 2</i>		<b>10%</b>
<i>Provide reason(s) for not being awarded "1.0 = meets expectations" on any criteria above</i>				
<b>Section 1 Criteria Total Points/Weight</b> <i>Total Points = Course Syllabi Score + (Professional Development Score*2) + (Assessments of Student Learning Score*2)</i>			<b>0.00</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Section 2 Performance Criteria</b>	<b>Detailed Criteria Description</b>	<b>Suggested Scoring</b>	<b>Score Awarded</b>	<b>Weight</b>
Course Design and Materials	Course design and material are aligned with course objectives, level of the class, and are relevant to current business / accounting practices. Course design and materials reflect appropriate standards, academic integrity, student preparation for future courses, and the skills and knowledge needed for future business careers including analytical and problem-solving skills. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate technology and innovative teaching methods and materials to impact student learning and implement strategies to engage students in real-world applications. Course materials are up-to-date and reflect rich content knowledge of the discipline. Appropriate techniques and strategies are used to achieve learning objectives. The course is delivered in a manner which encourages active learning, engagement, interaction, and participation as appropriate. Quality enrichment resources such as guest speakers, field trips, case studies, special projects, and other resources are used to enhance the learning environment where appropriate. Faculty are encouraged to evaluate and improve course design and materials to enhance teaching effectiveness.	5.0 = far exceeds expectations -- exceptional 4.0 = exceeds expectations 3.0 = meets expectations 2.0 = below minimum expectations 1.0 = far below minimum expectations or no evidence		<b>18.75%</b>
Assignments	Assignments include any activity used for assessing student work including homework, projects, exams, etc. Assignments are aligned with course learning objectives as well as college and university level goals (technology, writing, etc.) as appropriate. Assignments have clear instructions and due dates and hold students to appropriate standards. Students have access to timely, clear, and constructive feedback on all assignments/assessments (typically within one week of the due date) and their academic progress. Faculty are encouraged to evaluate, develop, improve, and implement innovative assignments that will engage students, foster learning, and support course learning objectives.	5.0 = far exceeds expectations -- exceptional 4.0 = exceeds expectations 3.0 = meets expectations 2.0 = below minimum expectations 1.0 = far below minimum expectations or no evidence		<b>18.75%</b>
Course Management	Classes are held at the scheduled time, location, and for the proper length of time. Instructor is organized, prepared, and conducts class in an orderly manner. The faculty member establishes and maintains office hours and/or other appropriate means for student interaction and replies to student communications in a timely and responsive manner to foster relationships and engage students in the learning process. The Chair or Dean's office does not receive excessive complaints about faculty members not being available or responding to emails. The university's semester schedule, final exam schedule, and any other calendar items are maintained. Requests for accommodations from Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) office are responded to appropriately. There is no extreme pattern of grade inflation or deflation in courses. <b>Faculty post assignment and exam grades to the LMS gradebook promptly and provide students with current course grade averages in a timely manner.</b> Faculty are encouraged to evaluate and improve course management practices to foster an effective learning environment.	5.0 = far exceeds expectations -- exceptional 4.0 = exceeds expectations 3.0 = meets expectations 2.0 = below minimum expectations 1.0 = far below minimum expectations or no evidence		<b>18.75%</b>



**College of Business Administration**  
**Department of Accounting**  
**FES 1 - Teaching Standards**

Revised: Fall 2025

Professionalism	Faculty member is respectful in interactions with students, colleagues, and all internal and external stakeholders. Faculty member is honest and maintains unquestionable integrity. Faculty member adheres to all university, college, and department policies, requests, and deadlines (e.g., CV submissions, syllabi submissions, textbook selections, federal aid eligibility, final grade submissions, and Watermark updates). Faculty member completes required training (e.g., sexual violence training and cybersecurity) sessions by established due dates. Faculty member adheres to the syllabus. Faculty member responds in a timely manner to departmental, college, or university requests.	5.0 = far exceeds expectations -- exceptional 4.0 = exceeds expectations 3.0 = meets expectations 2.0 = below minimum expectations 1.0 = far below minimum expectations or no evidence		18.75%
<b>Section 2 Criteria Average/Weight</b>			<b>#DIV/0!</b>	<b>75%</b>
<p><b>NOTE:</b> The above criteria descriptions are not exhaustive or all inclusive. Faculty are encouraged to highlight innovative approaches used to create an engaging learning environment and demonstrate the impact they have on student participation and/or learning outcomes.</p> <p>It is the obligation of the faculty member to ensure that all information is entered into Watermark.</p>		<p><b>NOTE #1:</b> All Scores above are suggestions only and may be adjusted slightly up or down depending on quality, quantity, impact, engagement, reputation, or other appropriate factors related to teaching.</p> <p><b>NOTE #2:</b> Receiving the University Teaching Award will result in a FES score of 5.</p> <p><b>NOTE #3:</b> 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.</p>		
<b>Section 1 score * .25 + Section 2 average * .75 = Current Year FES 1 Score:</b>				<b>100%</b>



**College of Business Administration  
Department of Accounting  
FES 2 - Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Per the university's Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Academic Policy Statement (APS 820317), the Department of Accounting 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, a simple 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, "Adjusted Averages" compared to the "IDEA Discipline" scores will be used to determine the FES 2 score.

**Sample Scoring for FES 2**

<b>Course</b>	<b>IDEA Score</b>
Course1	4.5
Course2	4.4
Course3	4.6
Course4	4.3
Course5	4.4
Course6	4.6
Course7	4.7
<b>Average FES 2</b>	<b>4.5</b>



**College of Business Administration  
Department of Accounting  
FES 3 - Intellectual Contributions (IC) Standards**

Revised: Fall 2025

AACSB Status - Department of Accounting faculty members must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation in order to qualify for merit. Tenure-track faculty classified as "Other or Additional Faculty" will not be awarded merit pay in the Department of Accounting. Doctoral qualified faculty not meeting "Scholarly Academic" or "Practice Academic" status will receive a score of 1 on FES 3.		Status	Merit Eligible Yes / No
AACSB Faculty Qualification Status	In the current year, the faculty member must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation. 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."		
<b>Brief Criteria Title</b>	<b>Detailed Criteria Description</b>	<b>Suggested Scoring</b>	<b>Score Awarded</b>
Intellectual Contributions	<p>Intellectual contributions are original works intended to advance the theory, practice, and/or teaching of accounting and business. 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.</p> <p>Impactful quality intellectual contributions are those that are accepted, disseminated, and recognized for their intrinsic merit and impact within the academic, professional, and/or business communities. These contributions are recognized by qualified end-users as quality research that has value through use. Impactful quality intellectual contributions are evidenced by the differences made or innovations fostered by such contributions—e.g., what has been changed, accomplished, or improved.</p> <p align="center"><u><b>Types of Intellectual Contributions</b></u></p> <p>Peer Reviewed Journals Editorial Reviewed Journals Academic/Professional Meeting Proceedings Academic/Professional Meeting Presentations Competitive Research Awards Received Textbooks (full or chapters) Cases Computer Software Other Teaching Materials</p> <p align="center"><u><b>Intellectual Contributions (ICs) may fall into one of the following categories:</b></u></p> <p><b>Basic contributions</b> - generate and communicate new knowledge and understanding and/or development of new methods; directed toward increasing the knowledge base and the development of theory</p> <p><b>Applied contributions</b> - use accumulated theories, knowledge, methods, and techniques to solve real-world problems and/or issues associated with practice; synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge</p> <p><b>Pedagogical contributions</b> - address the support, influence, and improvement of teaching and learning; develops and advances new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior</p> <p align="center"><u><b>IC Impact – For classification purposes, impact is divided into two classifications.</b></u></p> <p><u><b>Higher Quality</b></u> An IC published (or accepted for publication) in an IC outlet that is rated A*, or A, or B in ABDC or is in the 1st two quartiles in SJR An IC validated by peers addressing a real-world case, problem, or organizational advancement that also rises to a level of prominence or recognition (e.g., adoption at multiple universities or professional organizations at the state, national, or international level)</p> <p><u><b>Quality</b></u> An IC published (or accepted for publication) in an outlet that is rated C in ABDC or is in the lower two quartiles in SJR An IC listed in Cabells' "Journalytics" that is not listed in ABDC or SJR An IC validated by peers or professional community addressing a real-world case, problem, or organizational advancement An IC that enhances the reputation and recognition of the faculty member, the department, the college, and/or the university and which does not meet the criteria for Higher Quality</p> <p align="center"><u><b>Examples of Accounting ICs include but are not limited to the following</b></u></p>	<p>5.0 – Extraordinary. ABDC = A*, SJR top 10% of Q1, NSF or NSF type grant, or the university Research Award.</p> <p>4.5 – Exceptional. Undefined.</p> <p>4.0 – Very Good. ABDC = A, or SJR Q1 (below top 10%).</p> <p>3.5 – Quality Contributor. 1st edition Book (refereed).</p> <p>3.0 – Good. ABDC = B, or SJR = Q2</p> <p>2.5 – Active. Undefined.</p> <p>2.0 – Contributor. ABDC = C, SJR = Q3, Book (non-refereed, editor reviewed).</p> <p>1.5 – Developing. Book Chapter (refereed), New Edition of an Existing Book.</p> <p>1.0 – Non-Active / Minimal Activity. Lowest score possible. SJR = Q4, Cabell's Journalytics, Editor reviewed publication, Book chapter (editor reviewed), No evidence of IC activity.</p> <p>Other Scoring Opportunities:</p> <p>Practitioner Journal (points vary depending on readership and impact) -- 1-4 points Discipline-appropriate Publication (points vary depending on readership and impact) -- 1-4 points External Grant &gt; \$5,000 (depending on level of grant) -- 2-4 points External Grant &lt; \$5,000 (depending on level of grant) -- 1.5-2 points Research Award (other than University Award, depending on the nature of the award) -- 1-4 points</p> <p>Evidence of some research activity (e.g. working papers, drafts, revise and resubmits, paper presentations, SHSU Research Grant, COBA Research Grant, etc.) -- 1-2 points</p>	



**College of Business Administration  
Department of Accounting  
FES 3 - Intellectual Contributions (IC) Standards**

	<p>Publications (acceptances) in highly recognized, peer-reviewed or editorial reviewed journals as listed in recognized rating lists</p> <p>Publications (acceptances) in a peer-reviewed or editorial reviewed journal of the recognized international or national academic or professional organizations (including sections or regions) for a given discipline such as the American Accounting Association, the AICPA, the American Management Association, the American Finance Association, the American Marketing Association, etc.</p> <p>Case studies of research leading to the adoption of new teaching/learning practices</p> <p>Published Case studies</p> <p>Textbooks and chapters, teaching manuals, instructional cases, etc.</p> <p>Publications that focus on research methods and teaching</p> <p>Recognitions of IC contribution (e.g., Best Paper Award), Fellow Status in an academic society, and other recognition by professional and/or academic societies for intellectual contribution outcomes</p> <p>Presentations and workshops conducted at recognized national and international academic and professional meetings (e.g., meetings of the recognized leading academic or professional association or society within a particular discipline)</p> <p>Publishing in discipline-specific practitioner journals</p> <p>Publishing/disseminating in non-academic media (e.g., newsletters, radio, television, magazines)</p> <p>Creation and publication of continuing professional education courses/materials for practicing professionals</p> <p>Presentation of continuing professional education workshops/seminars for practicing professionals</p> <p>Development of instructional software used by faculty at other institutions</p> <p>Inclusion of IC in the syllabi of other professors' courses</p> <p>Use of IC in doctoral seminars</p> <p>Competitive grants awarded by major national and international agencies (e.g., NSF and NIH) or third-party funding for research projects and publication of results</p> <p>Grants for research that influence teaching/pedagogical practices, materials, etc.</p> <p>Research-based learning projects with companies, institutions, and/or non-profit organizations</p> <p>Consulting reports</p> <p>Independent consulting work (e.g., products, documentation, scales, workbooks, workshops)</p> <p>Briefs to appellate courts or the Supreme Court in the state of Texas or other states</p> <p>Participating in collaborative endeavors with schools, industry, or civic agencies</p> <p>Providing public policy analysis for local, state, inter/national government agencies</p>		
<p><b>NOTE:</b> The above list of examples is not exhaustive or all inclusive. A faculty member may offer other items for consideration by providing an explanation and justification for an item to be considered as an intellectual contribution.</p> <p>Faculty are encouraged to highlight impactful and/or innovative intellectual contributions and engagement activities relative to academia and the accounting profession. Engagement through intellectual contributions may include invitations to present research or share expert knowledge with academic and practitioner audiences.</p> <p>It is the obligation of the faculty member to ensure that all information is entered into Watermark.</p>		<p><b>NOTE # 1:</b> For ICs with a total value equal to or less than 1.5, other scholarly accomplishments can be considered to calculate the final score.</p> <p><b>NOTE #2:</b> Faculty members are required to map their ICs to the the databases mentioned here. If not on this list, the faculty member will make a case for inclusion, and level/value, of the IC based on impact and readership. Scores can be adjusted downward based on lack of information provided.</p> <p><b>NOTE #3:</b> All Scores above are suggestions only and may be adjusted slightly up or down depending on quality, quantity, impact, engagement, reputation, or other appropriate factors related to the IC (Faculty Member must make the case).</p> <p><b>NOTE #4:</b> Since publications are additive, a faculty member can score &gt;5. Such a score would automatically qualify as a candidate for the next COBA research award (not a guarantee of awarding).</p>	
<b>Current Year FES 3 Score:</b>			



**College of Business Administration  
Department of Accounting  
FES 4 - Service Standards**

Revised:

Fall 2025

AACSB Status - Department of Accounting faculty members must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation in order to qualify for merit. Tenure-track faculty classified as "Other or Additional Faculty" will not be awarded merit pay in the Department of Accounting. Doctoral qualified faculty not meeting "Scholarly Academic" or "Practice Academic" status will receive a score of 1 on FES 4.		Status	Merit Eligible
AACSB Faculty Qualification Status	In the current year, the faculty member must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation. In general, doctoral qualified faculty should meet the "Scholarly Academic" or "Practice Academic" (rare; only in special circumstances) category. In no instance should a doctoral qualified faculty member be "Other."		
Brief Criteria Title	Detailed Criteria Description	Suggested Scoring	Score Awarded
Awards Received	Faculty member received a service award from university, college, department, academic, professional or community organization, and/or reputable organization.	<p><b>5.0 – Extraordinary/Rare.</b> (e.g., distinguished award; extraordinary impact as faculty advisor of a student organization that received an award, made conference/meeting presentations, and/or made some extraordinarily impactful contribution; development of a new student organization)</p> <p><b>4.5 – Exceptional.</b> (e.g., major award; served as editor for a journal [may be increased for serving as editor for multiple journals]; Faculty Advisor met baseline, attended meetings/conferences and created a new impactful event or hosted multiple impactful events [e.g., Day of Literacy, JCP Suit Up, Professional Development Seminar]; served as conference chair/program chair, host, or chair of academic/professional/community committee; served as executive officer or on board of directors of an academic/professional/community organization)</p> <p><b>4.0 – Very Good/Notable.</b> (e.g., noteworthy award; served as associate editor for a journal [may be increased for serving for multiple journals]; Faculty Advisor met baseline, hosted impactful events and attended meetings or conferences; served as conference chair/program chair, host, or chair of academic/professional/community committee; served as non-executive officer of an academic/professional/community organization)</p> <p><b>3.5 – Quality.</b> (e.g., served as editorial board member for a journal [may be increased for serving on multiple editorial boards, Faculty Advisor met baseline and hosted an impactful event [e.g., JCP Suit Up event, community/professional service event]; conference chair/program chair, host, or chair of academic/professional/community committee; member of five or more committees)</p> <p><b>3.0 – Good.</b> (e.g., Faculty Advisor [baseline] advises and attends all organization's local events; reviewer for journal/conference/external review [may be increased if reviewer for multiple journals/conferences/external reviews]; member of three to four committees; met active expectations and attended other SHSU events and/or contributed to three or more other events)</p> <p><b>2.5 – Active.</b> (e.g., met expectations and advised students or wrote letters of recommendation)</p> <p><b>2.0 – Meets Expectations.</b> (e.g., attended most mandatory events and attended/contributed to one to two committees, was professional when interacting and engaging with fellow faculty, staff, students, and all internal and external stakeholders)</p> <p><b>1.5 – Below Minimum Expectations.</b> (e.g., attended approximately half of mandatory events)</p> <p><b>1.0 – Does Not Meet Minimum Expectations.</b> (e.g., faculty advisor but very little interaction with student organization; did not participate in assigned committee; no attendance at mandatory events)</p>	
Faculty Advisor of a Student Organization	Faculty member served as a faculty advisor/sponsor for a discipline-related student organization (e.g., BGS, BAP, NABA, ACFE, VITA).		
Editor, Associate Editor, Editorial Board Member, Reviewer	Faculty member served as journal editor, associate editor, journal editorial board member, journal/conference/external reviewer.		
Conference Chair/Program Chair or Host	Faculty member served as a conference chair/program chair/executive director/host for a university, department, and/or academic/professional/community organization conference (e.g., program chair for AAA Southwest Annual Meeting)		
Chair of Academic/Professional/Community Committee	Faculty member served as chair of an active university, college, department, and/or academic/professional/community organization committee (e.g., Chair of the Awards Committee of the AAA Forensic Accounting Section, Chair of Faculty Senate).		
Officer/Board Member of an Academic/Professional/Community Organization	Significant, active leadership role in a discipline-related academic, business, professional or community organization (e.g., Chapter Advocate for BAP, Serving on Board of Directors for AAA, BAP, NABA, ACFE, TX CPA Society, Serving as an Officer of a AAA Section)		
Committee Service	Faculty member served on an active committee of a university, college, department and/or academic, professional or community organization (e.g., Member of the Awards Committee of the AAA Forensic Accounting Section).		
Professionalism and Attendance at Mandatory and Non-Mandatory Events (i.e., Events Designated by University, College, or Department Leadership as Required)	Faculty are professional when interacting and engaging with fellow faculty and staff, students, and all internal and external stakeholders. Faculty member attended mandatory events of the university, college and department (e.g., departmental meetings, Meet the Firms, Dean's meeting, DPTAC). Additional recognition may be awarded for attendance and contributions to non-mandatory events such as graduation, advising/mentoring students, speaking to incoming freshman at Bearkat camp, attendance at New Student Convocation or Saturday at SAM, attendance at student organization meetings and college career panels, and writing letters of recommendation.		
<p><b>NOTE:</b> The above criteria and descriptions are not exhaustive or all inclusive. A faculty member may offer other items for consideration (e.g., providing trouble-shooting support to faculty at other universities using previously published SAP case materials) by providing an explanation and justification for an item to be considered as a service activity.</p> <p>It is the obligation of the faculty member to ensure that all information is entered into Watermark.</p>		<p>NOTE # 1: Scores above 2.0 may be adjusted upward to include service covered in scales below the particular score (excluding service items listed lower than 2.0).</p> <p>NOTE # 2: All Scores above are suggestions only. Quality, quantity, impact, innovation, engagement, reputation, and/or other appropriate factors related to the service will be taken into consideration. Faculty are to discuss these factors in their annual FES service narrative when documenting the merit of their service activities.</p>	
<b>Current Year FES 4 Score:</b>			