



Sam Houston State University

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND BANKING

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Effective 1/1/2026

Department of Finance and Banking Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Introduction

Academic Policy Statement (APS) 890301(December 2024), "Hiring, Evaluation, Promotion, and Merit for Non-Tenure Track Faculty" is the university policy that guides the processes of hiring, evaluating, promoting, and recommending merit for non-tenure track faculty at Sam Houston State University (SHSU). The SHSU Department of Finance and Banking uses *APS 890301* to guide the Department in processes, timelines, definitions, and requirements related to the annual evaluation of non-tenure track faculty and the recommendation of annual merit increases. Furthermore, *Section 4 of APS 890301* allows the Department of Finance and Banking to develop department-specific standards of performance for conducting the evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty within the department subject to the approval of the department chair, college dean, and university provost.

The faculty evaluation score is weighted primarily on teaching, with no more than 50% of the teaching component derived from student perception surveys. Teaching effectiveness is further assessed through evidence of instructional quality, innovative teaching practices, and the extent of course engagement activities. In addition, service contributions, ongoing professional development, and professional engagement are considered positive factors in the annual evaluation. Faculty members are responsible for documenting their activities in the Watermark Faculty Success portal and addressing them in the annual review narrative. In accordance with *APS 890301*, the annual hiring letter will specify the relative weight assigned to each category of activity used in determining the overall annual evaluation score.

Unique to the College of Business Administration (COBA)

COBA is accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB, International). One of the categories reviewed by AACSB is the faculty qualifications of the college's faculty. COBA determines the requirements for the various status levels of faculty qualifications.

A primary use of FES scores is the determination of merit pay allocations. In the Department of Finance and Banking, faculty merit pay is impacted by whether faculty meet (1) COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation, and (2) the minimum requirements established by the University's Course Structure and Management policy (*APS 240430*).

In the Department of Finance and Banking, non-tenure track faculty must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications related to AACSB accreditation. In general, non-tenure track faculty should meet the "Scholarly Academic", "Practice Academic", "Scholarly Practitioner, or "Instructional Practitioner" category.

FES 1 – Chair’s Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Weight	Categories of Performance Standards	Criteria	Scoring Category
	Faculty Qualifications	<p>AACSB Faculty Qualification Status - In the current year, faculty members must meet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - COBA's standards for faculty qualifications (SA, PA, SP, or IP) related to AACSB accreditation - the minimum requirement in the University’s Course Structure and Management policy APS 240430 <p>Faculty not meeting these standards are assigned an FES 1 score of 1.</p>	YES / NO
50%	Teaching Effectiveness	<p>Teaching Effectiveness Suggested Categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Innovative, effective teaching methods ▪ Societal Impact of teaching ▪ Other relevant impact of teaching ▪ Effective course organization ▪ Current, relevant course material (sharing research, Wall Street Journal, current events, using WRDS) ▪ Techniques to preserve academic integrity ▪ Academic programs (honors contracts, writing initiative, independent study, study abroad) ▪ Adjustment to course content and delivery (continuous improvement) ▪ Faculty development in teaching (ACUE, Engaging Classrooms, Blackboard training, teacher training programs) ▪ Educational leadership (sharing effective teaching techniques in journals or at conferences) ▪ Technology (Blackboard capabilities, ELMO camera, YouTube, Kaltura, etc.) ▪ Other as provided by faculty <p>Faculty provides information to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness.</p>	<p>Scale of 1 – 5</p> <p>5 = Far exceeds expectations 4 = Exceeds expectations 3 = Meets expectations 2 = Below expectations 1 = Unsatisfactory N/A = Not Applicable</p>

FES 1 – Chair’s Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (continued)

Weight	Meeting Other Teaching Requirements	Criteria	Scoring Category
50%	Timely and Effective Communication	Being available for students, responding to emails in a timely manner, Chair or Dean's office does not receive excessive complaints about faculty members not being available or responding to emails.	Scale of 1-5 5 = Far exceeds expectations 4 = Exceeds expectations 3 = Meets expectations 2 = Below expectations 1 = Unsatisfactory
	Professionalism and Mentoring	Faculty are expected to demonstrate professional behavior in all teaching-related activities, both within and outside the classroom. This includes maintaining a respectful and inclusive learning environment and engaging with students and colleagues in a manner that reflects integrity and professionalism. Faculty performance will be evaluated in part by the absence of substantiated complaints regarding unprofessional conduct.	
	Assessment of Student Learning	Participates as required with AACSB and/or SACS assessment processes.	
	Compliance	Completes Department / College / University Requirements such as (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Providing syllabi that complies with university, college, and departmental guidelines. University syllabi guidelines are outlined in the Course Structure and Management APS 240430 (2025). ▪ Submit assignment and exam grades to the Learning Management System gradebook promptly and provide students with current course grade averages in a timely manner. ▪ Administering student evaluations ▪ Adhering to class and final exam schedules ▪ Holding regular office hours ▪ Submitting vitas / syllabi by the stated deadlines. ▪ Completing textbook selections by the stated deadlines. ▪ Completing federal aid (attendance) verifications by the stated deadlines ▪ Responding in a timely manner to departmental, college, or university requests 	

NOTES:

- Faculty receiving the SHSU 'Excellence in Teaching' award will be assigned an FES 1 score of 5.
- Documentation of teaching effectiveness, teaching innovations employed, and/or level of impact or extent of course engagement activities shall be entered wherever appropriate into the Watermark Faculty Success portal and described in the annual review narrative.

Suggestions for Chairs:

- Chair should use the narrative provided by the faculty member along with student comments from IDEA evaluations.
- Chair should consider multiple outlets for student feedback (e.g., letters from Office of Student Affairs saying a faculty member made an impact, verifiable student emails, verbal messages to the chair, etc.).
- Chair should use multiple inputs (e.g., Blackboard pages, class visits, comments, faculty teaching portfolios, etc.)
- Chair should take into consideration:
 - new course preparations
 - number of course preparations
 - faculty overloads
 - modalities, locations, and pedagogies
 - high overall number of students
 - rigor of the course and course materials (e.g., exams and assignments)
 - willingness to innovate with the understanding that not all new ideas work well
 - grade distributions that exhibit unusual patterns relative to the course over more than one year or excessive Q drops without explanation from the faculty member
 - other duties and responsibilities not covered above

Sample Scoring for FES 1:

Weight	Categories of Performance Standards	Scoring Category	Score Awarded
	General - AACSB Qualification Status and compliance with the University's Course Structure and Management policy APS 240430.	YES / NO	YES
50%	Teaching Effectiveness	Scale of 1 – 5	3.5
50%	Meeting Other Teaching Requirements	Scale of 1 – 5	
	- Timely and Effective Communication		3.0
	- Professionalism and Mentoring		4.0
	- Assessment of Student Learning		2.0
	- Compliance		3.0
"Meeting Other Teaching Requirements" Average			3.0
FES 1 score = 50% x 3.5 + 50% x 3.0 =			3.25

FES 2 – Student Evaluations

The Department of Finance and Banking will use the instrument selected by SHSU for students to evaluate teaching effectiveness for FES 2. Currently, that instrument is the IDEA Evaluation System. As defined by section 3.01 of policy APS 820317 for tenured and tenure-track faculty, for each faculty, an average of the “Combined Averages of Summative Ratings” score for each class taught within the evaluation period (year) shall be used as the faculty’s FES 2 score. The same process shall be used to evaluate non-tenure track faculty. Specifically, for members of the Finance and Banking department, “Adjusted Averages” compared to the “IDEA Discipline” scores will be used to determine how each faculty member is evaluated.

Summary Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness	
View:	Adjusted Averages <input type="button" value="v"/>  Compare to: IDEA Discipline <input type="button" value="v"/>

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

FES 4 – Service

For non-tenure track faculty from whom service is expected, the department identifies levels of service engagement for faculty including, (1) Service to students, (2) Service to the Department, (3) Service to the College, (4) Service to the University, (5) Service to the Profession, and (6) Service to other entities not specifically listed above.

Faculty should list each of their service activities and gauge for each activity the associated IMPACT and the INVESTMENT of time and effort. Documentation of the level of impact or extent of engagement in the faculty member's service activities shall be entered wherever appropriate into the Watermark Faculty Success portal and described in the narrative included in the annual review.

Service activities can be considered (1) low, (2) moderate, or (3) high impact.

- Low impact activities affect only a small number of people, and the service activity does not produce a substantial effect.
- Moderate impact increases the scope (number of persons) and influence of the service activity relative to low impact activities.
- High impact activities produce substantial changes for large groups of people.

Service activities can be considered (1) low, (2) moderate, or (3) high investments of time and effort.

- Low investment activities require nominal time investment (< 10 hours per semester) and can be completed without extensive research or collaboration and/or are accomplished without the need for iterative meetings.
- Moderate investment activities increase time commitment to 10 – 30 hours per semester and/or increase effort to include multiple meetings per semester with a substantial need to research and/or collaborate.
- High investment activities require a significant time commitment (multiple hours per week over a substantial portion of the year) with a high need to communicate and collaborate.

Any feedback received from chairs of committees regarding faculty participation and impact can be incorporated into faculty FES 4 scores.

Individual full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members *may* also be evaluated on their program responsibilities. The diversity of what constitutes a “program” for the purposes of the annual performance evaluation should be determined collaboratively among the faculty member, chair, and dean prior the evaluation year. Points of negotiation between the faculty member and dean include, but are not limited to program leadership, program management, program outputs (e.g., events, services, initiatives), and program outcomes.

In addition, although non-tenure track faculty are not normally expected to conduct research or otherwise engage in more traditional forms of scholarly achievement or output, any such activities can be deemed to substitute for or otherwise else supplement any service obligations.

The list below is meant to serve as a guide but is not an exhaustive list of all activities that count for service. A faculty member can make a case for service not included in the list or in a different category but must establish the service activity's impact and describe the faculty member's investment of time and energy.

FES 4 - Service

Score	Categories of Performance Standards	Criteria
YES / NO	Faculty Qualifications	AACSB Faculty Qualification Status - In the current year, the faculty member must meet COBA's standards for faculty qualifications (SA, SP, PA, or IP) related to AACSB accreditation. Faculty not meeting AACSB Faculty Qualification Status are assigned an FES 4 score of 1.
5.0	Extraordinary	<p>Rare service participant. Reserved for extraordinary levels of service or recognition.</p> <p><i>Must Achieve one of the following:</i> Awarded the SHSU Excellence in Service Award</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Meets minimum service expectations AND demonstrates service in at least three of the six levels (i.e., students, department, college, university, professional organization, or public service) AND participates in at least two high impact, high investment service activities.</p> <p>Examples of Extraordinary high impact and high investment activities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Service awards or recognition from a reputable organization (e.g., national or international association) ▪ Service award from college or department. ▪ Service award from academic or professional organization. ▪ Faculty advisor to a student organization. ▪ Journal Editor ▪ Conference Program Chair or President ▪ Event Chair or Organizer ▪ External trade organization leadership, engagement, recognition and/or awards ▪ External business organization leadership, engagement, recognition and/or awards ▪ Industry speaker or presenter at external events ▪ Organizing student/industry engagement opportunities

4.5	Very Good	<p>Meets minimum service expectations AND demonstrates service in at least three of the six levels (i.e., students, department, college, university, professional organization, or public service) AND participates in at least two high/moderate impact, high/moderate investment service activities.</p> <p>Examples of high impact and moderate investment or moderate impact and low investment activities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Serving on multiple editorial boards for journals. ▪ Organizing/hosting a conference. ▪ Organizing/hosting an industry event ▪ Chairing or serving on a faculty senate or division committee. ▪ Associate Editor of a journal. ▪ Chairing a search committee for faculty, staff, or administrative positions. ▪ Chair of a contributing committee ▪ Engages students with business professionals; participates in ACE.
4.0	Engaged	<p>Meets minimum service expectations AND demonstrates service in at least two of the six levels (i.e., students, department, college, university, professional organization, or public service) AND participates in at least two moderate impact, moderate investment service activities.</p> <p>Examples of moderate impact, moderate investment activities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Serving as proceedings editor for an academic or professional organization. ▪ Editorial Board Member of a journal. ▪ Serving as dissertation committee member outside of COBA or SHSU. ▪ Chairing a peer review committee (e.g., DPTAC). ▪ Participating in accreditation or assessment activities (e.g., MAT or GAT leader). ▪ Serving as a mentor for faculty (e.g., PACE Pathfinders program)

3.5	Good	<p>Meets minimum service expectations AND demonstrates service in at least two of the six levels (i.e., students, department, college, university, professional organization, or public service) AND participates in at least two service activities that are considered moderate impact, low investment OR low impact, moderate investment.</p> <p>Examples of moderate-impact low investment or low impact, moderate investment activities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Serving in an official capacity in a professional or academic organization. ▪ Conducting workshops ▪ Serving as a track chair at a conference. ▪ Refereeing manuscripts for a journal on one of the four COBA approved lists. ▪ Refereeing conference submissions or internal funding applications. ▪ Volunteers for events to represent department or COBA (e.g., Saturdays at Sam, Operation Freshman, Bearkat Camp Faculty). ▪ Active participant in a professional or academic organization. ▪ Serving as a mentor to students (e.g., writing recommendation letters, reviewing their job materials, assisting in job/internship/graduation school applications). ▪ Committee member of an impactful committee.
3.0	Participating	<p>Meets minimum service expectations AND attends but rarely leads or becomes heavily involved in service activities.</p> <p>Demonstrates service in at least one of the six levels (i.e., students, department, college, university, professional organization, or public service) AND participates in at least two service activities that are considered low impact, low investment or above.</p> <p>Examples of low-impact, low investment activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Member of one non-impactful committee (e.g., parking). ▪ Serving as a session chair at a conference. ▪ Participating in round table discussions with the Dean. ▪ Service on conference committee. ▪ Writing letter of recommendation/support for colleagues Serving on an accreditation or assessment committee.

2.5	Fair	<p>Meets only Minimum Expectations. Completion of the minimum service requirements unless absence is excused by the Chair or Dean.</p> <p>Examples of minimum service expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regular attendance at mandatory meetings and department specific events. ▪ Contributor to committees assigned by Department Chair or Dean.
2.0	Below Minimum	Does not meet minimum expectations. Needs immediate improvement
1.0	Unacceptable	Well below minimum expectations. Little to no service activity. Lowest score possible.