

6. REPORT ON NON-TEACHING ACTIVITIES SUPPORTIVE OF DEPARTMENTAL, DIVISIONAL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

6.01 This report is to be completed by each faculty member and submitted to his/her department/division chair on FES Form 5.

6.02 Non-teaching activities supportive of departmental, divisional, college, or university programs are interpreted to include: committee service; student recruitment; student advisement; acquisition and development of facilities, equipment, and other resources; and program development.

7. SUMMARY RATING REPORT

7.01 This report is to be completed by the department/division chair on FES Form 6. Once completed, this form is to be signed by the chair and by the faculty member. The signature of the faculty member represents an indication that the completed report has been reviewed with the faculty member by the chair.

7.02 Judgements of faculty performance for each of the four activity areas are to be made with a seven-point rating scale as defined below:

7 EXCEPTIONAL

This rating should be used only in rare cases. It carries the implication that the individual's performance in a particular area of activity reflects the highest degree of productivity and effectiveness.

6 OUTSTANDING

5 VERY GOOD

4 GOOD

This rating should always be interpreted in a favorable light. In any group, no matter what level, there is a middle range of performance. This rating implies that the individual has been productive and effective in the area that is being evaluated. It is

Sam Houston State University
 Academic Policy Statement 820317
 The Faculty Evaluation System
 (Attachment - FES Form 6)
 Page 15 of 15

Teaching effectiveness ratings are to be taken directly from the chair and student rating sheets. These ratings are weighted averages and should be recorded to the nearest tenth. Ratings by the students and by the chair should be weighted equally (each comprises 50% of the teaching activity score). The remaining activity areas are each to be evaluated as a whole.* For example, scholarly and artistic endeavor (II) should be evaluated and assigned an overall rating from 1 to 7. No attempt need be made to assign weights to each of the individual activities listed on the information sheet for this category.

Activity	Rating (1 2 3 4 5 6 7)	x	Departmental Weights	=	Score
I. Teaching					
A. Chair Rating	_____	x	(0.20-0.30)	_____	= _____
B. Student Rating	_____	x	(0.20-0.30)	_____	= _____
II. Scholarly and Artistic Endeavor	_____	x	(0.10-0.30)	_____	= _____
III. Professional Growth and Professional Activities	_____	x	(0.05-0.20)	_____	= _____
IV. Non-Teaching Activities Supportive of University Programs	_____	x	(0.10-0.25)	_____	= _____
Sum of Scores					_____

*There are some occasions when a faculty member accepts a special assignment of major importance to the department/division, to the university, to the state, or to the country which limits his/her ability to meet all criteria at the prescribed level. In such cases it is the right and responsibility of those who evaluate his/her work to give him/her due credit and to consider him/her for rank promotion and/or merit pay.

Chair's Signature _____

Faculty Member's Signature _____

REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

FES Form 4

This form is to be completed by each faculty member and submitted to his/her department/division chair.

- A. Professional Associations (List current memberships, meetings attended and source of funding for travel, committee appointments, elected offices, honors, etc.)
1. National/International
 2. Regional
 3. State
 4. Local
- B. Continuing Professional Education (List participation in workshops, seminars, courses, self-study, etc. Indicate title, place, dates, time involved, credit hours--if applicable.)
- C. Professional Service (Service to schools, governmental agencies, private enterprise, community service, etc.)

expected that this rating will be the one which is most frequently applied.

3 ACCEPTABLE

2 MINIMALLY ACCEPTABLE

1 UNSATISFACTORY

The individual's performance in the area which is being evaluated has not been productive or effective.

- 7.03 Each department/division should use the 1 - 7 scale as a basis for meritorious, highly meritorious, or exceptionally meritorious recommendations to the dean for promotion and/or merit pay increases for faculty members.

Approved:


Elliott I. Bowers

Revised May 26, 1989