



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: Human Sciences

College/Unit:

☐ CAM	☐ COCJ	☐ CHSS	☐ COM	☐ NGL
☐ COBA	☐ COE	☒ COHS	☐ COSET	

Standard:

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

Contact:

Name (first & last): Ron Reed

SHSU Email: rlr054@shsu.edu

Phone: 936-294-2481

Approved By:

Department Chair

Emily Roper (Dec 13, 2022 11:59 CST)

College Dean

Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs



Sam Houston State University

A Member of The Texas State University System

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SCIENCES

Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in the Department of Human Sciences

FES_HUSC

TEACHING (FES 1 and 2):

Teaching evaluation criteria consist of the following:

1. Chair Evaluation (FES 1)
 - a. Chair and Peer Review of Teaching
 - b. IDEA response rate
 - c. *Administrative (holds class in accordance with scheduled class times/days and academic calendar, compliance with HB 2504, updated CV, complete and accurate course syllabi in compliance with minimum requirement in the faculty handbook, regularly holds office hours, attending dept meetings, maintains compliance with policies pertaining to teaching duties)*
2. Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (FES 2)

Chair Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness (FES 1)

Chair Evaluation:

Chair makes use of written comments from IDEA, type of assignments, type of exams, number of instructor preps, instructor's timely feedback on assignments/exams, number of students, student's verbal or written comments, maintaining of academic dishonesty policy, and overall academic rigor. Annual peer and chair review of teaching, IDEA response rates, and completion of administrative duties as part of factor into the overall averaged FES 1 score.

Additional criteria are considered to adjust the faculty member's FES 1 score, increase or decrease as applicable based on one or more of the following:

- New course development
- Minor course revision
- Academic Community Engagement (ACE course)

- Graduate student achievements
- Undergraduate student achievements
- Uncompensated overloads
- Teaching awards
- Teaching professional development
- Teaching conference presentations
- Teaching conference attendance
- Honor Contracts

FES 1 – Chairs Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness:	
5.0	Extraordinary. Rare. Reserved for extraordinary achievement or recognition.
4.5	Exceptional. Maintains very high standards for students and themselves. Outstanding innovation/motivation in the classroom promoting student success. Substantial evidence of teaching effectiveness.
4.0	Very good. Maintains high standards for students and themselves. Innovative in the classroom.
3.5	Engaging. Motivates students.
3.0	Good. Accessible to students; generally well-regarded.
2.5	Average. Above minimum expectations; acceptable; normal.
2.0	Meets All Minimum Expectations.
1.5	Needs Improvement. Below expectations, or ineffective teacher.
1.0	Substandard. Lowest score possible. Needs substantial, immediate improvement.

Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (FES 2):

The IDEA summary evaluation of teaching effectiveness scores are based on three areas: (1) summary, (2) progress on relevant objectives and (3) ratings of summative questions. The Department of Human Sciences uses the converted average summary score for reporting in FES 2.

RESEARCH (FES 3):

The productive scholar is continuously involved in research, writing, and creative effort that advances knowledge in their field. This includes activities such as research, the integration of knowledge, the dissemination of knowledge, the transformation of knowledge through intellectual work, and/or the application of research to solve a compelling problem in the community.

The quality of productive scholarship refers to the magnitude and impact of the work on the scholarly community and/or practitioners. It should not be evaluated only based on the quantity of the work. The magnitude and impact of the work will be examined holistically, and it can be shown through a multitude of methods. No specific number of publications or pages

of publications will satisfy the criterion. Instead, the quality of the research and the candidate's total research accomplishment should provide evidence of significant contributions to the literature in the relevant field or fields. Increasingly, research, scholarship, or creative activity involves collaboration. The quality of a scholar's work is based on the significance of the contribution, whether it is individual or collaborative.

Quality should be defined as:

Published works - A scholar is expected to publish manuscripts within quality peer-reviewed journals. In addition, a distinction may be supported through publications in various other scholarly outlets. The quality, impact factor, and stature of peer-reviewed journals and other scholarly outlets indicate distinction.

- Articles in peer-reviewed periodicals
- Books
- Book chapters
- Monographs and technical reports
- Abstracts for research publications including poster presentations at conferences
- Articles in non-refereed publications
- Book reviews for peer-reviewed journals or periodicals

Grant activity - A faculty member is expected to pursue research, development, and/or training grants, which may reflect activity at different stages (e.g., pending, funded, and unfunded). This expectation may vary as a function of the availability of funding sources. The quality, stature, and competitiveness of grants are significant indicators of distinction.

- Grant proposals funded as PI or Co-PI or investigator
- Grant participation as an expert (non-PI status)
- Grant proposals submitted as PI or Co-PI or investigator

Research presentations – Presentations at regional, national and international conferences illustrate how the faculty member actively participates in and contributes to the research community and other related audiences. These presentations should thus increase a faculty member's visibility in the broader community and contribute to his/her research agenda.

- Peer-reviewed papers and presentations at regional, national and international conferences
- Invited presentations at national and international conferences
- Peer-reviewed papers and presentations at state and regional conferences

Awards and Honors –

- Recognition as a leading scholar by a professional association (Associate to Full)
- Recognition as a promising scholar by a professional association (Assistant to Associate)
- Institutional, state, national, and international awards for scholarly work

- Research fellowships in support of a faculty member's work

Other related scholarship activities –

- Creative works or activities, surveys or instrumentations, patents and copyrights
- Intervention programs prevent, ameliorate, or remediate persistent negative outcomes or optimize positive outcomes for individuals or groups
- Documented contributions to public policy at the local, state, national, or international levels (for example, written testimony and policy briefs)
- Documented research contributions to the university, college or department with impact on decision-making, policy, or program planning

Engaged Practice –

- Contributions to the industry or field of study through consultation, research, or original creative work
- Connection to current best practices through direct interaction with industry or field of study

FES 3 - Research	
5.0	Exceptional. For high achievements, publications, and/or recognition.
4.5	Outstanding. The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in at least two or more topic areas of research as defined above. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.
4.0	Excellent. The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in at least two or more topic areas of research as defined above. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.
3.5	Very Good. The candidate has made sustained contributions in at least two or more topic areas of research as defined above. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.
3.0	Good. The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in two or more topic areas of research as defined above. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda of work and suggests that significant contributions will be made over time.
2.5	Satisfactory. The candidate has made sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research as defined above. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda of work and suggest that contributions will be made over time.
2.0	Progressing. Meets minimum expectations of at least one research product from categories listed above.
1.5	Unsatisfactory. Inconsistent or minimal evidence. The candidate has made insufficient contributions to research/creative activity as defined above.

1.0	No evidence of research activity.
-----	-----------------------------------

**each category above 2 must meet the minimum satisfactory expectations plus additional criteria as outlined.*

SERVICE (FES 4):

Categories for standards of service contributions are as follows:

Exceptional

- Exceptional service as a major officer/board member/committee chairperson in an international, national, or state professional organization and/or public sector agency (it is the faculty member's obligation to provide evidence of this contribution).
- Serving as any faculty senate officer, e.g., chairperson, chairperson-elect, etc.
- Recognition of service excellence in the form of a service award or special acknowledgement of service to the university or academic discipline/profession.
- Exceptional contribution as chair of a major university committee or college council, e.g., Chair or member of President's, Provost's, or Dean's search committees, Head of Convocation Committee or Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, etc.
- Exceptional contribution to departmental, college, and/or university committees (it is the faculty member's obligation to provide evidence of this contribution)

Excellent - Outstanding

- Significant contribution to departmental, college, and/or university committees (it is the faculty member's obligation to provide evidence of this contribution)
- Active member of major university committee (Graduate Council, College Council, Faculty Senate, Budget, and Priorities Committee, etc.)
- Making a significant contribution to the department (i.e., coordinating workshops, recruitment events, taking on uncompensated, extraordinary departmental responsibilities, etc.)
- Making a significant contribution as a professional expert in a community, state, or regional activity
- Significant unpaid professional consulting activities (it is the faculty member's obligation to document the nature and extent of activities)
- Service as a director/coordinator of a program in the department above and beyond any form of compensation. The department head may up-grade or down-grade rating based on their evaluation of quality of service provided by director/coordinator
- Planning/organizing a state, national or international academic or professional conference or event
- Active participation as a professional expert with national media or television.

Good – Very Good

- Substantive contribution to departmental, college, and/or university committees (it is the faculty member's obligation to provide evidence of this contribution)
- Substantive contribution as an advisor to a university student organization
- Presentation of research, creative accomplishment, etc. to a community organization representing the university
- Active participation with media in area of professional expertise, including acceptance for publication of an article or book review in the local newspaper
- Volunteering one's professional service to community organization(s)
- Making a substantive contribution that helps support the public affairs mission of the university as evidenced through article in Today at Sam, new papers, or news story on television network, etc.
- Organizer, chair, or discussant at a professional meeting
- Conduct research related workshops at local, state, national, or international events
- Member of editorial board of professional/practitioner journal/peer-reviewed journal
- Editor of college or department-related non-peer-reviewed professional journal
- Multiple reviews of manuscripts for scholarly journal or publisher
- Book review in a non-referred periodical
- Reviewer of external grant/contract application
- Reviewer of prospectus or proposal for a textbook or scholarly book
- Serve as officer in district or regional professional organization

Progressing - Satisfactory

- Attending department and college sponsored events, meetings, and activities
- Participating in at least two ceremonies per year of either commencement and/or convocation unless absence is approved by the Chair and/or Dean.
- Contributor to committees assigned by Department Chair or Dean.
- Serves on DPTAC Committee (if applicable)

No evidence - Unsatisfactory

- Minimal to no evidence of service on department, college, or university committees.

FES 3 - Service	
5	Outstanding. Reserved for extraordinary achievement or recognition (e.g., a service award). Contributions of more than one at the "outstanding" category.
4.5	Outstanding. Significant contributions at the departmental, college, university, or professional level with at least one activity in the "outstanding" category.
4.0	Excellent. Made significant contributions in at least two areas at the departmental, college, university, or professional level in the "excellent" category.
3.5	Excellent. Achieves good criteria plus one significant contribution at the departmental, college, university, or professional level in the "excellent" category.

3.0	Good. Substantive contribution to departmental, college, and/or university committees. Achieves at least two activities in the “good” category.
2.5	Good. Achieves satisfactory criteria plus one activity in the “good” category.
2.0	Satisfactory. Meets minimum expectations as detailed in the “satisfactory” category.
1.5	Unsatisfactory. Needs Improvement. Below satisfactory in meeting expectations.
1.0	Unacceptable. Needs substantial improvement.

**each category above 2 must meet the minimum satisfactory expectations plus additional criteria as outlined.*

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

This departmental criteria and standards for the faculty evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty has been approved by the reviewer(s) listed below and represents the criteria and standards from the date of this document until superseded.

Original Date: November 2022
 Reviewer(s): Tenured & Tenure-track Faculty in the Dept. of Human Sciences
 Chair of the Department of Human Sciences
 Review Cycle: Five years
 Review Date: Fall 2027

Approved: _____ Date: _____
 Dr. Emily A. Roper
 Dean, College of Health Sciences