



**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
Effective January 2026

Approved by:

Diana Brown

Diana Brown, J. D.
Associate Professor
Department Chair

Shar Self

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



**College of Business Administration
Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship
Faculty Evaluation (FES) Standards
Effective January 2026**

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 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 1.04 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).

In accordance with APS 820317 and APS 790601, each year faculty shall select a workload evaluation pathway based on the options provided in the College of Business Administration's Faculty Workload Policy. 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. Regardless of which pathway is chosen, tenure-track and tenured faculty are required to maintain SA or PA status as described within this policy.

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 2025 semester by the BAE faculty. 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" (SA) or "Practice Academic" (PA) category. In no instance should a doctoral-qualified faculty member be "Additional." In any year, doctoral-qualified faculty classified as "Additional" will not be awarded merit pay in the Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship.

COBA's AACSB Qualification Criteria for SA & PA, 2024-2025

Category	Initial Preparation	Ongoing Activities
Scholarly Academic (SA)	<p>Expected to possess a terminal degree or be ABD in the teaching discipline (or in a closely related field). Faculty members holding a terminal degree outside of business, but whose primary teaching responsibilities are in business will be considered to have met the criteria for SA status if they have completed a minimum of 18 hours of graduate coursework in their teaching/related field or have prior college-level teaching experience in their teaching/related field, or have research experience in their teaching/related field, or professional development or have industry experience in the field of teaching sufficient enough to provide a basis for participation in the mix of teaching, intellectual contribution, and service required by the college and the university. Recognized professional certifications or licenses may be used to demonstrate training and expertise in a primary teaching field.</p> <p>Per AACSB, a variety of terminal degrees may be related to the faculty member's field of teaching. Some examples of commonly accepted terminal degrees in business include; 1) doctoral degrees in business or closely related business discipline (PhD or</p>	<p>Six Academic Engagement Activities, including at least two publications in peer-reviewed journals¹ (Level 1 Academic Engagement Activity) in the last six years.² Doctoral faculty with SA status hired to serve as an administrator: To maintain the SA status during his/her tenure, an administrator must meet at least 50% of the SA maintenance standards. Attending conferences / workshops related to accreditation counts as engagement activities. Doctoral faculty with SA status hired to serve as an administrator: To maintain the SA status during his/her tenure, an administrator must meet at least 50% of the SA maintenance standards. Attending conferences / workshops related to accreditation counts as engagement activities.</p>

	<p>DBA); 2) a law degree (JD) for those teaching courses or modules related to law or aspects related to the legal environment of business (e.g., ethics, negotiations, real estate, business contracts, human resource laws, international business law, or entrepreneurial law). Additional terminal degrees may also be appropriate for SA status when the degree is closely related to the faculty member's field of teaching and the faculty member sustains currency through scholarly activities in that field consistent with this standard.</p>	
Practice Academic (PA)	<p>Expected to possess a terminal degree in the teaching discipline (or in a closely related field). PA status applies to faculty members who augment their initial preparation as academic scholars with development and engagement activities that involve substantive linkages to practice, consulting, and other forms of professional engagement.</p>	<p>Six Academic or Professional Engagement Activities in the last six years.³ Doctoral faculty with PA status hired to serve as an administrator: To maintain PA status during his/her tenure, an administrator must meet at least 50% of the PA maintenance standards. Attending conferences/workshops related to accreditation counts as engagement activities. If an administrator fails to meet SA status during his/her tenure as an administrator, he/she may be re-classified as PA and they need to meet at least 50% of PA maintenance standards. Attending conferences / workshops related to accreditation counts as engagement activities.</p>

¹Articles must be in non-predatory journals (with active links) listed under ABDC, SJR, or Cabell's or included in the academic or professional journals list maintained by COBA Faculty Research Committee. Department committees are responsible for identifying externally validated standards for evaluating practitioner journals. Once a practitioner journal has received a quality equivalence rating, this information is to be shared with COBA Faculty Research Committee that maintains the Quality Practitioner Journals list.

²Newly hired faculty who have earned a terminal degree in the teaching discipline in the last six years or are ABD in the last three years are classified as SA faculty.

³Faculty hired as SA (or earlier as academically qualified (AQ)) are expected to maintain their SA status unless there is a compelling justification to allow for reclassification as PA.



College of Business Administration
Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship
FES 1 – Chair’s Evaluation of Teaching Standards

FES 1

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

5.0	Exceptionally Engaged educator. Rare. Reserved for extraordinary achievement or recognition. (e.g., teaching award, paid teaching fellowship). Engages with students and provides timely feedback on assignments. Demonstrates high levels of innovation and impact in multiple ways (e.g., course design, curriculum enhancements, assignments, course management, etc.). Makes significant contributions supporting the mission of the University, college, and department.
4.5	Outstanding educator. Maintains very high standards for students and themselves. Outstanding innovation/motivation in promoting student success in and outside of the classroom. Substantial evidence of teaching effectiveness and impact (e.g., nomination for a teaching award). Actively supports the mission of the University, college, and department. Engages with students and provides timely feedback on assignments.
4.0	Very Good educator. Made significant contributions toward departmental, college, university, or professional teaching, curricular, and/or program initiatives. Actively involved in teaching innovation, training, and/or professional development. Actively supports the mission of the University, college, and department. Evidence of teaching effectiveness. Engages with students and provides timely feedback on assignments. Demonstrates a moderate level of impact.
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 and mission. Involved in teaching innovation, training, or development. Engages with students and provides timely feedback on assignments. At least one piece of evidence of impactful teaching.
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. Supports the mission of the University, college, and department. See list below. Interacts with students, colleagues, and all stakeholders with integrity and respect.
2.5	Adequate educator. Provides adequate instruction but only involved to a minimal degree 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	Unacceptable. Substandard. Needs substantial, immediate improvement.

Evidence of engagement, innovation, and impact will be added into Watermark, as appropriate.

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 and/or impact 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

Faculty may also argue for an upward scoring adjustment to accommodate exceptional conditions that are outside of the professor's control. The burden of requesting such an adjustment and the provision of documentation to support such action rests solely with the faculty member. This information must be included as part of the faculty member's supporting materials and narrative submitted via Watermark. Examples include but are not limited to:

- The chair asking the professor to take a new class that they have never taught with less than a month notification.
- The chair asking the professor to take on another professor's course using a book they are unfamiliar with due to the professor leaving or being unable to teach.
- The bookstore not having the book for the course in a timely fashion when the professor ordered the text correctly.
- A faculty member introducing an innovative approach/technique in their teaching (If we are allowed to make changes to FES 2 then this would be an incentive to try a new approach knowing that the faculty member will not be punished if the innovation is not successful).

It is the obligation of the faculty member to provide a narrative about and evidence of the impact, innovativeness, and/or effectiveness of their teaching, as well as initiatives taken to encourage student engagement. Faculty are encouraged to highlight innovative and engaging professional development activities and impactful contributions to their field. 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	SA or PA required for all doctoral-qualified faculty members
Administers teaching-related policies consistently and in accordance with university policies and the mission of the department/college	Yes/No	3
Adheres to APS 240430 Course Structure and Management, including expectations regarding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syllabus development • Use of the university LMS • Final exam schedule for exams or equivalent projects • Office hours and communication • Scheduled class meetings (see also APS 021120, Face-to-Face, Online, and Hybrid Education) 	Yes/No	3
Submits vita/syllabi by due date	Yes/No	3
Submits textbook requests (including “No book” and “OER” use) by the due dates	Yes/No	3
Complies with federal aid eligibility verifications timeline	Yes/No	3
Submits final grades by university due dates	Yes/No	3
Contributes to assessment, as applicable	Yes/No	3
Maintains appropriate and reasonable grade distribution for the course(s)	Yes/No	3
Completes all required trainings by assigned deadlines	Yes/No	3

Faculty who do not meet the minimum requirements established by the University’s Course Structure and Management policy (APS 240430) will not be eligible for merit in the teaching category. Full merit consideration requires evidence of teaching effectiveness beyond these baseline expectations.



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 Business Administration and Entrepreneurship 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	4.5



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	AACSB qualified, but no evidence of scholarly activities

Only annual contributions/accomplishments are to be included.

It is the obligation of the faculty member to provide a narrative about and evidence of the impact, innovativeness, and/or effectiveness of their research efforts and intellectual contributions (ICs). 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.

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION & ENTREPRENEURSHIP FES 3 SCORING GUIDE

5	Receive extraordinary achievement or recognition. (e.g., research award, paid research fellowship).
5	A* or top 10% of Q1
4	A or Q1 (below top 10%)
3	B, Q2
2	C, Q3
1.5	Q4
1	Cabells Journalytics (unranked, non-predatory journals); editor-reviewed publication; publication in a journal that does not appear in a predatory list
0.75	Revise and resubmit (maximum of 2)
0.5-0.75	Participating in conference presentations, seminars, continuing education presentations, industry training and presentations, legal briefs, and similar ICs
0.25	“Professional Engagement Activities” such as evidence of progress on a working paper, media recognition of research, attending/participating research-related seminars/trainings
4-5	Book (refereed)
3	new edition of an existing book
2	Book (non-refereed, editor reviewed)
3-4	book chapter (refereed)
1	book chapter (editor reviewed)
1 - 5 points	Practitioner journals, outlets, and intellectual contributions (points vary depending on 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

[†] When determining impact and quality, there should be consideration of the sponsoring organization, how long the sponsoring organization has existed, visibility of the output or organization, acceptance rate, number of citations/downloads, and/or audience size. Refer to the “Guidance for Using the FES 3 Scoring Guide” section in determining and providing evidence regarding the appropriate score for each IC.

Considerations and Guidance for Using the FES 3 Scoring Guide

AACSB Definition of Research

Given that the College of Business Administration is accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB, International), AACSB's guidance about intellectual contributions shapes the college's and department's understanding of quality and impactful intellectual contributions. AACSB defines an IC as "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."

Further AACSB explains in Section 8.1 of their 2020 accreditation standards, "Examples of areas that could evolve into thought leadership include organizing and holding regional, national, or international academic and/or practitioner conferences; holding meetings for academic or professional organizations; publishing working-paper series; publishing academic journals; establishing a case study clearinghouse; or forming research relationships with private-sector, nonprofit, or government organizations." Section 8.2 of the AACSB standards emphasizes the value of collaboration with stakeholders, stating, "Systems, processes, and resources are in place to support engagement with relevant external stakeholders by the school, units within the school, faculty, and learners. These engagements produce credible knowledge, contribute to new venture creation, and/or create commercialization opportunities that ultimately are useful for external communities, apply to the practice of business, and address real issues in society. The collaborations with stakeholders contribute to the school's reputation as a thought leader in its desired area."

Under the AACSB definition, Intellectual Contributions (ICs) may fall into one of the following categories. All ICs should be marked appropriately in Watermark.

- **BASIC:** contributions generate and communicate new knowledge and understanding and/or development of new methods. Contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the theory or knowledge of business. The main audience for basic research is academia.
- **APPLIED:** contributions synthesize new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develop new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refine, develop, or advance new methods based on existing knowledge. Contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the practice of business.
- **TEACHING AND LEARNING (PEDAGOGICAL):** contributions develop and advance new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior. Contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the teaching of business.

Establishing IC Scores

Faculty should make a case regarding the impact and quality of each intellectual contributions (ICs). Arguments should consider the sponsoring organization, how long the sponsoring organization has existed, visibility of the output or organization, acceptance rate, number of citations/downloads, and/or audience size. 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.

It is the obligation of the faculty member to map their publication(s) to the databases as described in the COBA Journals Quality List, BAE Journal Quality List, ABDC, SJR (formerly Scimago JCR), Thomson-Reuters, Cabells, or other guidance provided within this policy. If it is not on these lists, 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 BAE Journal Quality Review Committee and/or the Faculty Research Committee. Scores can be adjusted downward based on the lack of information provided.

Faculty should provide support for each IC's quality and impact level. The following descriptions and examples should be considered when making a case for each IC.

- *For Basic Contributions*
 - Basic contributions are directed toward increasing the knowledge base and the development of theory. The main audience for basic research is academia.
 - Faculty should document placement on the previously 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 previously mentioned lists, and they should submit that documentation to their chair for evaluation.
 - If the faculty member can provide evidence that an IC outlet is of quality or higher quality on a respected list outside of the previously mentioned lists, they should submit that documentation to their chair for evaluation.
- *For Applied Contributions*
 - Applied contributions draw from basic research and use 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.
 - 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:
 - Providing public policy analysis for local, state, inter/national government agencies
 - Participating in collaborative endeavors with schools, industry, or civic agencies
 - Publishing in non-academic media (e.g., newsletters, radio, television, magazines)
 - Independent consulting work (e.g., products, documentation, scales, workbooks)
 - Submits briefs to the Supreme Court in the state of Texas
 - Developing deliverables for use by industry or civic partners
 - Publishing in discipline-specific practitioner journals.
 - Patents: Full and Provisional

- When determining impact and quality, there should be consideration of the sponsoring organization, how long the sponsoring organization has existed, visibility of the output or organization, acceptance rate, number of citations/downloads, 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).
- Higher Quality (4-5 points)
 - An IC published (or accepted for publication) in a peer-reviewed regional, national, or international journal, or listed in the ABDC, SJR, or Cabell's with a rating in the top 2 quartiles
 - 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)
- Quality (3 points)
 - An IC published (or accepted for publication) in an outlet that is rated B in ABDC or is in the lower two quartiles in SJR
 - An anonymously peer reviewed IC listed in Cabell's "Journalytics" with an acceptance rate in the top two quartiles
 - 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
- Highly Acceptable (2 pts)
 - An IC published (or accepted for publication) in an outlet that is rated C in ABDC
 - A peer- or editor-reviewed IC in a reputable and accessible outlet (e.g., peer-reviewed book review, peer-reviewed full-paper conference proceedings)
 - An anonymously peer reviewed IC listed in Cabell's "Journalytics" with an acceptance rate in the bottom two quartiles
 - An IC that uses applied discipline-specific research to address a real-world problem or organizational advancement
- Acceptable (1 pt)
 - An non-peer-reviewed IC published in a non-blacklist outlet; book review, full-paper conference proceedings
 - An IC that that uses applied research to address a real-world problem or organizational advancement

Scoring Adjustments

Faculty members can make a case for an upward score adjustment based on the quality/quantity of work involved and impact. The score assigned is at the discretion of the Chair given proper evidence. Faculty should always make a case to the department chair for the highest IC score possible. In all circumstances, the discipline-specific list of journals maintained by the BAE Journal Quality Review Committee shall apply.

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 BAE Journal Quality Review Committee Faculty Research Committee.

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.



College of Business Administration
Department of Business Administration & Entrepreneurship
FES 4 – Service Standards

FES 4 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS EVALUATION CRITERIA

5.0	<p>Exceptionally Engaged: Recognized, Significant engagement and impact in service to students, department, college, university and/or professional organization.</p> <p>Must achieve one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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:<ol style="list-style-type: none">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 Very Good / Engaged activities.
4.5	<p>Outstanding: Significant engagement and impact in service to students, department, college, university and/or professional organization. Must achieve at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Engaged activities. • At least one of the above PLUS five or more Engaged / Active activities.
4.0	<p>Very Good: Note-worthy impact and engagement in service to students, department, college, university and/or professional organization. Must achieve at least three of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairing a peer review committee (e.g., DPTAC). • At least one of the above PLUS four or more Active activities. • At least one of the above PLUS six or more Active/Average activities.
3.5	<p>Engaged: Active engagement and impact on one contributing committee. Engages students with clients; participates in ACE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>Competent: Engagement in service to students, department, college, university and/or professional organization. Must achieve at least three of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>Adequate: 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at the biannual Dean's meetings. • Department meetings and any other department specific events (e.g., seminar series, job talks). • Attendance at graduation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at COBA Scholarship Award Night. • Contributor to committees assigned by Department Chair or Dean. • Serves on DPTAC Committee (if applicable).
2.0	Participating. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Minimally contributes to service as assigned.
1.5	Needs Improvement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attended 25-50% 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. • Rarely contributes to service or university, college, or department initiatives
1.0	Unacceptable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attended less than 25% 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 the obligation of the faculty member to provide a narrative about and evidence of the impact, innovativeness, and/or effectiveness of their service contributions (ICs). 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.

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.