



Management and Marketing

College of Business Administration Department of Management and Marketing Annual Evaluation Standards for Non-tenure Track Faculty Prepared by the tenured and non-tenure-track faculty of the Department of Management and Marketing

Approved by:

Irfan Ahmed Digitally signed by Irfan Ahmed
Date: 2025.09.30 11:33:08 -05'00'

Irfan Ahmed, PhD
Associate Professor
Department Chair

09/30/2025
Date: _____

Sharmistha Self Digitally signed by Sharmistha Self
Date: 2025.09.30 11:44:21 -05'00'

Shar Self, PhD
Dean

09/30/2025
Date: _____

College of Business Administration

Department of Management and Marketing
Faculty Evaluation System for Non-tenure Track Faculty
Policy Statement Overview

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).

In the Department of Management and Marketing, non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated, in line with their workload agreements, on their teaching performance as well as activities that demonstrate engagement with and support of the University, the College of Business Administration (COBA), and/or the Department of Management and Marketing.

Faculty evaluations are conducted on an annual basis by the Department Chair, reflecting the faculty activity for the 12-month period beginning January 1 and ending December 31 of the same calendar year. Each faculty member is required by University Policy to provide the Department Chair information describing his or her activities in teaching their assigned courses. The Department Chair is responsible for reviewing these documents and calculating a numerical score ranging from "1" to "5" on FES Form 1, based on university policy and the guidelines contained herein. The Department Chair may award a fractional score (.25, .50, etc.) up to an additional 1.0 in any FES category based on information provided by a faculty member. Non-tenure-track faculty may also provide a report that records their service activities, ongoing professional development, and professional engagement.

A primary use of the annual evaluation of non-tenure track faculty is the determination of merit pay allocations. In the Department of Management and Marketing, 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 order to comply with AACSB requirements, non-tenure-track faculty in the Department of Management 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. Compliance with the provisions of APS 240430 is a minimum requirement for a satisfactory rating for merit pay allocations.

Department of Management and Marketing
FES 1 Performance Standards Evaluation Criteria for Teaching

Effective teaching is the practice of creating a learning environment that fosters intellectual growth, skill development, and understanding of the subject matter. It is a scholarly activity that requires continuous reflection, innovation, and a commitment to student success. In the Department of Management and Marketing, we recognize that teaching effectiveness is highly subjective and that course subject, course modality, course level, faculty preferences, and faculty workload can make comparing teaching effectiveness across instructors based on completion of specific activities or outcomes challenging. Accordingly, the Faculty Evaluation Standard for teaching effectiveness is designed to recognize faculty efforts across a variety of pedagogical activities.

Teaching effectiveness for the purposes of annual FES evaluations is comprised of two inputs, each contributing 50% to the overall measure of teaching effectiveness: the Chair's Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (FES 1) and the Students' Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (FES 2). FES 1 scores shall be based on activities defined as or related to teaching, such as those in this policy document, and shall not be based on or influenced by scores from student evaluations (FES 2).

For FES 1, teaching effectiveness is evaluated based on the following key criteria.

- 1) Instructional Design and Pedagogy
- 2) Student Engagement and Classroom Environment
- 3) Assessment of Learning
- 4) Teaching Professional Development and Continuous Improvement
- 5) Mandatory Policy-Driven Activities

Teaching effectiveness in each of these areas can be demonstrated through various forms of evidence, such as peer feedback, course materials (e.g., syllabi, learning resources, assignments, activities, exams, and sample student work), and narrative reflections.

Instructional Design and Pedagogy (30 percent): Thoughtful creation of course materials, assignments, and learning activities that align with clear learning objectives. Use of varied and appropriate pedagogical methods (e.g., active learning, simulations, guest speakers) to engage students and facilitate learning.

Score	Descriptor	Indicators
5	Far Exceeds Expectations	The faculty member consistently demonstrates excellence in instructional design and pedagogy. Course materials are thoughtfully crafted and fully aligned with clearly articulated learning objectives. A wide range of pedagogical strategies are used intentionally and effectively to maximize student engagement and learning. The instructor demonstrates innovation and often serves as a model for peers in pedagogical practice.
4	Exceeds Expectations	Course design is thoughtful, well-organized, and clearly aligned with learning objectives. The faculty member regularly employs varied and effective teaching methods that engage students and support learning. The faculty member's teaching is consistently effective and student-centered within the scope of their own courses.
3	Meets Expectations	The faculty member meets expectations in instructional design and pedagogy. Course materials and assignments are appropriately structured and generally aligned with learning objectives. Some variation in teaching strategies is evident, with basic efforts to engage students through discussions, group work, or other interactive methods. Teaching is effective and professionally executed, though not particularly innovative or varied.
2	Meets Minimum Expectations	Instructional design and pedagogical methods are inconsistent or underdeveloped. Course materials may lack clear alignment with learning objectives, or assignments may not effectively support intended outcomes. There is limited use of varied teaching strategies, and classroom engagement may be uneven. Greater attention to pedagogical planning and refinement is needed to improve student learning outcomes.
1	Did Not Meet Expectations	The faculty member does not meet expectations in instructional design and pedagogy. Course materials are disorganized or misaligned with learning objectives, and teaching methods are limited, outdated, or inappropriate for the course content. Significant improvement is required to meet instructional standards.

Student Engagement and Classroom Environment (20 percent): Fostering a respectful and supportive learning environment, whether in-person or online. This includes encouraging active participation, providing timely communication and constructive feedback, and being accessible and responsive to student needs.

Score	Descriptor	Indicators
5	Far Exceeds Expectations	The faculty member provides strong documentation of a highly engaging and supportive learning environment. Uses structured strategies to promote participation (e.g., discussions, collaborative activities), specific engaging teaching practices, and clear systems for accessibility and responsiveness (e.g., office hours, check-ins, prompt communication). Feedback practices are detailed and exemplary in both quality and timeliness.
4	Exceeds Expectations	The faculty member documents consistent efforts to foster student engagement. Uses effective practices to encourage participation and provides timely, constructive feedback. Communication practices (e.g., responsiveness to emails, clear expectations) are well established. Faculty member demonstrates thoughtful attention to accessibility and student needs beyond minimum expectations.
3	Meets Expectations	The faculty member presents sufficient evidence that a respectful and supportive learning environment is maintained. Engagement and participation strategies are appropriate but may be standard rather than varied. Feedback is generally timely and constructive, and the faculty member demonstrates basic responsiveness to student needs.
2	Meets Minimum Expectations	Engagement and classroom environment may not consistently support student learning. Participation strategies are limited or underdeveloped, and feedback practices may lack timeliness or detail. The faculty member provides minimal reflection on accessibility, and there may be limited evidence of responsiveness to student needs.
1	Did Not Meet Expectations	The faculty member provides little to no documentation of practices that foster student engagement. Available materials indicate that classroom environment hinders learning, feedback to students is infrequent or missing, and accessibility to students appears limited. There is insufficient evidence of full engagement with core teaching responsibilities related to creating a supportive and engaging learning environment.

Assessment of Learning (20 percent): Development and implementation of appropriate and fair methods of assessment that are clearly aligned with course learning objectives and advance student learning.

Score	Descriptor	Indicators
5	Far Exceeds Expectations	Assessment is used as a pedagogical tool for learning, not just measurement. The faculty member employs multiple innovative, well-integrated, and purposefully sequenced assessments that are closely aligned with learning objectives. The assessment design reflects pedagogical best practices and may serve as a model for colleagues through the transferability, transparency, adaptability, and/or creativity of their approach.
4	Exceeds Expectations	The faculty member implements a well-structured and varied set of assessments that clearly align with course objectives. Assessment types are appropriate for the level and discipline and support student learning. The system is intentionally designed, consistently applied, and demonstrates sound assessment practices that enhance course outcomes.
3	Meets Expectations	The faculty member uses appropriate assessments that generally align with course objectives. The tools may be standard or limited in variety, but they provide a functional measure of student progress. Assessment design is adequate and consistent, though opportunities for greater intentionality and/or variety exist.
2	Meets Minimum Expectations	The assessment approach shows limited alignment with learning objectives or relies on narrow or repetitive formats (e.g., only exams or quizzes). There is minimal evidence of intentional design and the assessments may not adequately capture the range or depth of student learning. Improvement in variety and alignment is needed.
1	Did Not Meet Expectations	There is little or no documentation of assessment practices. The assessments used are misaligned, overly vague, or inappropriate for the learning goals. As a result, the methods do not provide a meaningful evaluation of student learning.

Teaching Professional Development and Continuous Improvement (20 percent):

Demonstrated commitment to continuous improvement as an educator, grounded in reflective practice. Examples may include seeking and incorporating feedback from students, peers, or mentors; exploring, implementing, and evaluating new or evidence-based teaching strategies; and/or participating in professional development related to pedagogy or disciplinary expertise. It may also involve sharing effective teaching practices with colleagues, engaging in teaching-focused communities, or contributing to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) through presentations, publications, or other forms of scholarly dissemination about teaching practices.

Score	Descriptor	Indicators
5	Far Exceeds Expectations	Provides strong, clear evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching through reflection, feedback, and implementation of new strategies. Regularly participates in professional development and shares effective practices with others. May contribute to teaching and learning at a broader level (e.g., workshops, presentations, SoTL).
4	Exceeds Expectations	Shows consistent engagement in improving teaching. Participates in professional development activities and uses feedback or reflection to make thoughtful updates to teaching. May occasionally share strategies with others.
3	Meets Expectations	Engages in some teaching-related professional development and makes occasional updates to teaching. Uses feedback when available. Demonstrates activities related to teaching improvement but may not document it in depth.
2	Meets Minimum Expectations	Minimal evidence of teaching-related professional development or reflection. Rarely seeks out feedback or updates teaching practices. Engagement in continuous teaching improvement appears infrequent or incidental.
1	Did Not Meet Expectations	No evidence of teaching-related professional development or efforts to improve instruction. No indication of reflection, feedback use, or teaching updates.

Mandatory Policy-Driven Activities (10 percent): Courses are held at scheduled time, location, and for the proper length of time. The faculty member establishes and maintains office hours and/or other appropriate means for student interaction. The university's semester schedule, final exam schedule, and any other calendar items are maintained, including submitting a vita and syllabi at the appropriate time. Requests for accommodation for the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) office are responded to appropriately.		
Score	Descriptor	Indicators
5	Far Exceeds Expectations	Consistently meets expectations
4	Exceeds Expectations	Meets most expectations
3	Meets Expectations	Meets some expectations
2	Meets Minimum Expectations	Meets minimum expectations
1	Did Not Meet Expectations	Did not meet expectations

NOTES:

- A faculty member automatically receives a 5.0 on FES 1 for winning the University teaching award. Other teaching awards are at the discretion of the Chair.
- Faculty members are responsible for providing information in the FES 1 narrative to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness, teaching innovations employed, and/or level of impact or extent of course engagement activities. In addition, documentation of these items should be entered wherever appropriate into the Watermark Faculty Success portal.
- Communication expectations and activities are self-reported by faculty and should include specific, published policies on response times for student emails and grading turnaround.
- Other factors that the Chair may consider at their discretion include:
 - Evidence of teaching impact (e.g., non-course evaluation student recognition)
 - Techniques to preserve academic integrity
 - Supporting academic programs (e.g., honors contracts, writing initiative, independent study, study abroad, etc.)
 - Faculty development in teaching (e.g., ACUE, Engaging Classrooms, Blackboard/TLC training, etc.)
 - Educational leadership (e.g., sharing effective teaching practices at conferences)
 - Use of technology (e.g., Blackboard capabilities, YouTube, Kaltura, etc.)
 - 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 as provided by faculty

Department of Management and Marketing
FES 2 Performance Standards Evaluation for Students' Evaluation of Teaching

Per the university's *Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty* Academic Policy Statement (APS 820317), the Department of Management and Marketing 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. Per policy, the Department shall specify whether to use the "Raw" or "Adjusted" Summary Evaluation Scores. IDEA does not report downward adjustments in the report to faculty, only upward adjustments. The Department of Management and Marketing will use the **Adjusted Averages** Summary Evaluation Scores.

Sample Scoring for FES 2

Course	IDEA Score
Fall Course 1	4.1
Fall Course 2	4.4
Fall Course 3	4.6
Spring Course 1	4.3
Spring Course 2	4.4
Spring Course 3	4.6
FES 2 = Average =	4.4

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.
- Documentation of activities intended to support and advance the mission and success of COBA through service to various constituencies can be provided in a separate narrative,

Department of Management and Marketing
FES 4 Performance Standards Evaluation Criteria for Service

Faculty service is defined as contributions that utilize a faculty member’s professional expertise to benefit students, the department, college, university, profession, discipline, and/or broader community. Effective service is characterized by active and meaningful engagement that supports the mission and goals of the institution and profession.

For non-tenure track faculty from whom service is expected, the department identifies four levels of service engagement for faculty, described below. The Faculty Evaluation expectations for service are designed to enable faculty participation across a variety of service activities, with contributions being evaluated primarily based on engagement and impact. Evaluations are based on evidence provided by the faculty member during the annual review period (calendar year).

Faculty service can be demonstrated through a wide range of activities, such as:

- *Service to Students:* Supporting students outside of the classroom. Examples might include: academic advising, resume review, mentoring, or other academic or career-related support.
- *Service to the Department/College/University:* Engaging in a meaningful way with the internal functions and governance of the institution. Examples might include committee service, program development, accreditation work, mentorship of junior faculty, or advising a student organization.
- *Service to the Profession:* Utilizing academic and professional expertise to support disciplinary and professional organizations. Examples might include serving on editorial boards, reviewing manuscripts, organizing conferences, or holding leadership or advisory roles in academic or professional societies.
- *Community and Public Engagement:* Applying professional knowledge to address community needs and foster partnerships between the university and the public. Examples might include providing expertise to non-profit organizations, participating in outreach events, or invited-speaker presentations.

These criteria are not meant to be exhaustive, and each faculty member can include any information that they believe to be relevant to evaluating his or her service. *Significant contributions in any area of service can result in an additional fractional score, up to 1.0 total.*

Score	Criteria
5.0	Exceptional, sustained service contributions, such as serving a major leadership role (e.g., program or conference chair, president, executive director, assessment coordinator, editor/editorial board). Makes a significant, recognized impact on the department, college, university, profession, or discipline-related community. Examples may include developing new assessment tools, leading effective committees, and achieving broad recognition (service awards or honors).
4.0	Substantial service contributions, leadership, and clear evidence of broader impact within the department, college, university, professional associations, or the discipline. May include chairing committees, coordinating major assessment/reporting activities, developing new service initiatives, mentoring peers, or playing a leadership role in a student organization or external association.

	Goes beyond basic participation, regularly collaborates, and improves institutional or professional processes.
3.0	Engaged in service to students, department, college, university, discipline, or professional service. Service participation should demonstrate some evidence of positive impact, although it does not involve extensive leadership or major initiatives.
2.0	Minimal service to students, the department, college, university, profession, discipline, and/or broader community during the review period. Contributions are limited, or their impact is minimal. The faculty member may be fulfilling basic requirements but is not actively contributing to service in any of these areas.
1.0	No evidence of service to students, the department, college, university, profession, discipline, and/or broader community during the review period.

NOTES:

- All forms of service count, such as assessment work, committee participation/leadership, professional and scholarly service, external engagement, editorial work, and advising student groups.
- Faculty members are responsible for providing information in the FES narrative to demonstrate their service activities. In addition, documentation of these items should be entered wherever appropriate into the Watermark Faculty Success portal.
- Faculty may provide documentation on other service activities (not mentioned in the above) by including a brief statement describing the nature, scope, and outcomes of the service activity.
- Time commitment may be considered, but the score ultimately focuses on engagement, leadership, impact, and the quality of contributions.