



TENURE UNIT STANDARD ROUTING SHEET

In support of the following academic policy statements, tenure unit performance standards will be maintained and made publicly available by the Office of the Provost's Faculty Records Team. Per policy, each of these sets of standards will be reviewed every five (5) years, submitted to the Office of the Provost using this routing form for all signatures.

- APS [900417](#), Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
- APS [980204](#), Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)
- APS [820317](#), The Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Please note the following:

- Use a separate routing sheet for each set of tenure unit standards.
- Submit files in portable document format (PDF) only.
- Ensure the set of standards being submitted ***have been approved*** by the tenure unit ***and*** college dean.

Tenure Unit: Department of Computer Science

College/Unit:

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> CAM | <input type="checkbox"/> COCJ | <input type="checkbox"/> CHSS | <input type="checkbox"/> COM | <input type="checkbox"/> NGL |
| <input type="checkbox"/> COBA | <input type="checkbox"/> COE | <input type="checkbox"/> COHS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COSET | |

Standard:

- Promotion and Tenure
 Post-Tenure Review
 Faculty Evaluation System (FES)

Contact:

Name (first & last): Bing Zhou

SHSU Email: bxz003@shsu.edu

Phone: 936-294-1590

Approved By:



 Department Chair



 College Dean

 Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs

Faculty Evaluation System
Department of Computer Science

December 14, 2022

1. Teaching Effectiveness

- a. FES 1 – Chair’s Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness (Appendix: Faculty Classroom Observation Rubric)

	Rating	Weight	Score
Preparation for Teaching		0.40	
Evaluation of Student Achievement		0.20	
Response to Individual Student Needs		0.20	
Professional Demeanor		0.20	
	Sum of scores		

- b. FES 2 – Students’ Evaluations (IDEA Student Surveys)

The greater value between the summary raw IDEA score and the summary adjusted IDEA score will be used.

$$\text{IDEA Score} = \text{MAX} (\text{avg} (\text{raw}), \text{avg}(\text{adjust}))$$

2. Research (FES 3)

Evaluation Rubric:

	Score	Description
Workshop	1	peer-reviewed conference proceeding
Conference	2	peer-reviewed conference proceeding
Journal	3	peer-reviewed journal publication
Patents	5	approved patent application
Internal Grant Submission	3	submission of grant proposal for internal funding as PI or Co-PI
Internal Grant Award	6	PI or Co-PI receipt of internal grant
External Grant Submission	5	submission of grant proposal for external funding as PI or Co-PI
External Grant Award	10	PI or Co-PI receipt of external grant
Book	5	published book
Book Chapter	2	published book chapter
Artifact	5	publicly available software, tool, or equivalent

The total research score of each faculty will be ranked and normalized into value [1, 5].

3. Service (FES 4)

Evaluation Rubric:

	Score	Description
Committee	1	Member of department, college, or university committee
TFNP	3	Teaching with no compensation
Reviewer	0.5	Reviewer of manuscripts submitted to journals or conferences
Editor	1	Journal or book editorship
ABET	2	Evaluation of ABET result, assistance on onsite visit, compilation of annual report, etc.
CAE	2	Evaluation of CAE result, compilation of annual report, CAE outreach activity, etc.
Assessment	1	Management of course assessment data, evaluator for capstone project, etc.
Other	0.5	other internal or external service not mentioned above

The overall service score of each faculty will be ranked and normalized into value [1, 5].

4. Overall Average (FES 5)

For each research track faculty member normal teaching load 3–3), an overall average (FES 5) score is calculated by the weighted average (i.e., the sum of all the FES scores (FES 2 – FES 4) multiplied by the weights for normative twelve-credit-hours-per-semester workload (Table I in Attachment 3 of *The Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty* (APS 820317)) as follows:

$$\text{FES1} \times 20\% + \text{FES2} \times 20\% + \text{FES3} \times 40\% + \text{FES4} \times 20\%$$

For each teaching track faculty member teaching load of 4–4), an overall average (FES 5) score is calculated by the weighted average with weights for normative nine-credit-hours-per-semester workload (Table I in Attachment 3 of APS 82317), different from the ones for research track faculty, as follows:

$$\text{FES1} \times 25\% + \text{FES2} \times 25\% + \text{FES3} \times 25\% + \text{FES4} \times 25\%$$

Faculty Classroom Observation

Observation Date: _____ Faculty Evaluator: _____ Faculty Being Observed: _____

Course: _____ Semester: _____ Location: _____

Scale: 1 = Never; 7 = Frequently, NA = Not Applicable

Preparation for teaching

- 1 Arrived and finished class on time
- 2 Is well-prepared/organized for class
- 3 Effectively used classroom resources – board, PowerPoint etc.
- 4 Indicated where the class was headed
- 5 Explained the material clearly
- 6 Indicated important points to remember
- 7 Explained the thought process behind a concept
- 8 Stimulated interest in material

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

Evaluation of Student achievement

- 9 Effectively directed and stimulated discussion
- 10 Used assignments, quizzes etc. to gauge student understanding
- 11 Engaged students in hands-on activities
- 12 Actively asked questions and sought feedback
- 13 Concluded class with a quick summary of material covered

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

Response to individual student needs

- 14 Is tolerant of different opinions expressed in class
- 15 Addressed questions to individual students
- 16 Adjusted pace of class to students' level of understanding

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

Professional Demeanor

- 17 Treated students with respect
- 18 Showed genuine interest in students
- 19 Created positive, supportive classroom learning environment
- 20 General communication skills
- 21 Was enthusiastic about class and students

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

Summary Score

- 22 Is effective, overall, in helping students learn

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Suggestions:: _____

Received by Chair/Department _____

Date _____