



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
- APS 890301, Hiring, Evaluation, Promotion, and Merit for Non-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 Criminal Justice and Criminology

College/Unit:

☐ CAM

☒ COCJ

☐ CHSS

☐ COM

☐ NGL

☐ COBA

☐ COE

☐ COHS

☐ COSET

Standard:

☐ Promotion and Tenure

☐ Post-Tenure Review

☒ Faculty Evaluation System (FES)

☐ Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion ☐ Non-Tenure Track Faculty Annual Evaluation

Contact:

Name (first & last): Jason Ingram

SHSU Email: jri004@shsu.edu

Phone: 294-1698

Approved By:

Department Chair

College Dean

Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs

FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM OF TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology GENERAL POLICY STATEMENT

The University's Faculty Evaluation System recognizes three dimensions of professional activity for evaluation purposes: teaching effectiveness, scholarly and/or creative accomplishments, and service. In the College of Criminal Justice, faculty evaluations are conducted on an annual basis by the Department Chair, reflecting the faculty activity for the 12-month period beginning January 1 of 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 each of the three dimensions. The Department Chair is responsible for reviewing these documents and calculating a numerical score ranging from "1" to "5" on each dimension 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 on any FES category based on information provided by a faculty member. This document merely represents a set of guidelines for faculty evaluations. Exemplary performance or circumstances not specifically covered by the guidelines will be evaluated by the Department Chair and scored in a manner that is consistent with the intent of these general guidelines. Per University Policy, the FES is used for purposes of (1) tenure and promotion in academic rank, (2) rewarding meritorious performance through salary adjustments, (3) contract review for probationary faculty members, (4) review of tenured faculty, and (5) decisions concerning future contracts for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Additionally, each faculty member shall provide the Department Chair with a "self-evaluation score" showing his or her numerical assessment of the activity level on each dimension included in the evaluation process. In instances where a distinction is made between activities based on "subjective" standards, it is incumbent on the faculty member to provide clear and compelling evidence in support of the score they give themselves in their self-assessment. The Department Chair has the responsibility to review the materials provided by each faculty, including the "self-evaluation scores," and to determine the score that best reflects that faculty's performance within each dimension being evaluated. In accordance with University Policy, the Department Chair shall have a conference with each member of the faculty to discuss the results of the annual review of performance in each dimension.

Probationary Faculty Portfolio:

In accordance with college and/or department/school policy, each probationary faculty member will present a portfolio and update it on an annual basis. The portfolio should provide information relating to teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service. Examples of materials to be included *for the current calendar year* are: current vita, copies of all publications, copies of grant proposals, grant award letters, conference presentations, examples of teaching materials (syllabi, exams, activities, etc.), copies of all IDEA evaluations.

Faculty Review Committee:

The Department Chair may convene a faculty committee of one or more individuals representing each tenured/tenure-track rank to assist the chair in evaluating teaching effectiveness (FES 1),

scholarly activity (FES 3), and service (FES 4). However, the input of the committee is advisory in nature and the final scoring determination remains with the Department Chair.

FES Composition:

As per SHSU Academic Policy Statement 820317, the Faculty Evaluation System is composed of the following categories:

**Teaching Effectiveness
(FES 1 and FES 2)**

Teaching effectiveness 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). The Student's Rating of Teaching Effectiveness will be an average of the Summary Evaluation for each student evaluation score as defined by university policy. The chair may exclude a student evaluation course score used in the calculation of this FES section based on unique circumstances to prevent adverse biasing consequences in cases where outliers, experimental teaching methods, or other such events would unfairly impact the faculty member's ratings. The burden of requesting such an increase and the provision of documentation to support such action rests solely with the faculty member at the time of portfolio submission. FES 1 shall be based on activities defined as or related to teaching and shall not be based on or influenced by scores from student evaluations.

**Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments
(FES 3)**

Scholarly activities shall be interpreted to include, but are not limited to, production of basic and applied research, writing and publications, scholarly grant development, scholarly grant acquisition, presentations to professional and learned societies, and professional development directly related to scholarly and/or creative accomplishments.

**Service
(FES 4)**

Service includes service to students, colleagues, program, department/school, college, and the University; administrative and committee service; and unpaid service beyond the University to the profession, locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally, including academic or professionally related public service.

WEIGHTS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

In instances where faculty members have a change to their workload during the evaluation period or will not receive any FES 2 scores during the 12-month period (due to approved administrative appointments, course releases, workload buyouts, or low student response rates, etc.) the faculty member shall negotiate with their academic chair to determine the summary score weights to be used.

Attached are the general FES criteria/guidelines for the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology as approved by the faculty on September 9, 2024.

FES 1: Chairs Rating of Teaching Effectiveness

A Maximum score for this category (Chair's Rating) is 5.0. Scores must be on a 1-to-5-point continuous scale (with a minimum precision to the whole number from 1 to 5, and a maximum precision to the nearest hundredth; 0.01). In all cases it is the faculty members' responsibility to provide evidence that would justify each rating. Evidence supporting each rating includes: examples of syllabi, assignments, exams, etc.; peer evaluations of teaching conducted by one or more tenured faculty; additional assessment materials as prepared by faculty member (e.g., pre/post test scores of student learning, mid-term evaluations, etc.).

Minimum Score	Criteria
1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not meet minimum standards for professionalism or course content and pedagogy Failed to follow Department, University, Texas State University System policy as it relates to professionalism or course content and pedagogy
2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mostly met minimum standards for professionalism or course content and pedagogy Maintains a campus presence and holds appropriate office hours, and Adheres to scheduled class meeting times, completes Federal Aid Eligibility Validation (FAEV), submits textbook orders, and posts final grades by stated deadlines
3.0	<p>In addition to evidence satisfying criteria for 2.5 rating:</p> <p>Expected Standards for Professionalism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Punctual and regular in meeting classes; reasonably available for student conferences and counseling; maintains high ethical standards of honesty and objectivity; maintains professional demeanor and conduct in classroom and during office hours; collaborating with colleagues with regard to curriculum and departmental issues, and Attending at least 2 commencement or new student convocation ceremonies, and Regular attendance at Department and College faculty meetings Regular attendance at Departmental and College events and activities, not including faculty meetings¹ <p>Expected Standards for Course Content and Pedagogy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation: course syllabi that include objectives, course requirement, grading system, absentee policy, and Presentation: clear, organized; use of appropriate instructional strategies and technologies; well-planned and well-defined assignments; development of instructional materials appropriate to course, and Teaches appropriate and relevant materials pertaining to subject matter(s) of the course Student Achievement: grading system is fair and clearly defined in syllabus; assignments are purposeful and appropriate; evaluation tools are appropriate; students received feedback in reasonable time period; faculty member is sensitive to special needs of individual students, and Regularly reviews and updates assigned courses
3.5	<p>In addition to evidence satisfying criteria for 3.0 rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporating Academic Community Engagement (ACE) and/or other community-based initiatives into course curriculum, or Incorporating active-learning exercises into course curriculum, or Teaching an honors course section, or Completion of a teaching development workshop or conference, or

¹ This includes, but is not limited to, Beto chair presentations, Honor's Day events, New Student Convocation, PhD Student preview, faculty recruitment activities, College picnics, Saturdays at Sam, etc.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading students in independent study courses, directed readings courses, or honors contracts in addition to regular course load, or • Participation on a completed thesis/dissertation/portfolio as a committee member
4.0	<p>In addition to evidence satisfying criteria for 3.0 rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of additional teaching development workshops or conferences, or • Deliver 2 or more new courses or 2 or more courses the faculty member has not taught within the previous 3 calendar years², or • Participation on more than 1 completed thesis/dissertation/portfolio as a committee member, or • Chair a completed thesis or PhD student portfolio
4.5	<p>In addition to evidence satisfying criteria for 3.0 rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of a teaching <i>certificate</i> program, including Blackboard certifications and ACUE Fellowship available through SHSU, or • Evidence of substantial mentoring students outside of the classroom³, or • Chair a dissertation committee to completion, or • Receive a College teaching award or teaching award from a sub-committee or division of a professional academic organization
5.0	<p>In addition to evidence satisfying criteria for 3.0 rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of exceptional mentoring students outside of the classroom⁴, or • Chair 2 or more completed thesis/dissertation/portfolio, or • Receive a recognized University, State, National, or International teaching award, or • Engage in multiple professional development as it relates teaching and mentoring activities (e.g., more than 2 activities from criteria 4.0 and 4.5)

² This does not include courses that have already been developed for on-line delivery. This does not include courses taught during the summer.

³ Activities include the following: mentoring a student who presents research at a conference, supervising a summer fellowship, supervising a McNair scholar, publishing one research article with a student or students in which the student is the first or second author, mentoring a student who is nominated for or receives an award, serving as the faculty advisor to a SHSU student organization, and mentoring a student(s) who applies for a grant. Minimal, expected faculty activities, such as meeting with students outside of class, giving advice about professional and academic matters, and writing letters of recommendation, are not to be included in this category. If a faculty member engages in mentoring activities not included on those listed above, it is the faculty member's responsibility to present a detailed description of the activity and explain why it constitutes mentoring that extends beyond minimal expectations.

⁴ Exceptional mentoring is to include activities or achievements with more than 1 student in more than 2 activities (i.e., 2 students and 3 mentoring activities).

FES 3: Scholarly and Creative Activities

Minimum Score	Criteria ⁵
1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No apparent activity
2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstration of research/scholarly work submitted for review in a peer-reviewed journal but not published, or Publication of 1 chapter of an original work in a scholarly/peer-reviewed book, or Presentation at a state, regional, or national conference, or Submission of a research grant/contract for internal or external funding
3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publication of 1 article in a peer-reviewed journal, or Publication of 2 or more original works as chapters in a peer reviewed book(s), or Publication of a revision of a textbook, or Receipt of an internally-funded research grant/contract as the PI or Co-PI.
3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publication of an academic, refereed, edited book of reprints, or Publication of 2 articles in a peer-reviewed journal, not high impact, or Publication of only 1 article in a high-impact peer-reviewed journal, or Receipt of or continued work on an externally funded research grant(s)/contract(s) as the PI or Co-PI, for \$25,000 or more.
4.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publication of 2 or more peer-reviewed articles in academic journals with one being a high impact publication⁶, or Receipt⁷ of an externally funded research grant/contract as the PI or Co-PI, for \$50,000 or more, or Other exemplary scholarly achievements (e.g., honor or recognition from a state or local scholarly association for research/scholarly contributions)
4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publication of 2 articles in a peer-reviewed journal, both being high impact journals, or Publication of academically related, refereed, edited book of original work, or Receipt of an externally funded research grant/contract as the PI or Co-PI, for \$75,000 or more Receipt ⁷ of a College research award or research award from a sub-committee or division of a professional academic organization
5.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publication of 3 or more peer-reviewed articles in academic journals, with at least 2 appearing in high impact publication, or Any 4.0 or 4.5 criteria and one high impact publication, or Original publication of a textbook, or Publication of a book that is an academic original work of scholarship (not including dissertations published as books in dissertation collections), or Receipt ⁷ of an externally funded research grant/contract as the PI or Co-PI, for \$100,000 or more

⁵ Significant contribution to the scholarly work can result an additional fractional score, up to .50 total. This includes, lead authorship, use of primary data collected, working with a student, presenting the paper yourself. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide documentation of their contribution.

⁶ Publications may be designated high impact when they are published in a journal with an impact factor at or above 2.0. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate the quality of the publication to be designated high impact. One method a journal's quality can be established is through impact factor scores. Documentation and/or presentation of other metrics to establish the quality of the publication shall be provided by faculty to the Department Chair when FES materials are submitted.

⁷ The score associated for the receipt of an externally funded grant is only for the year the grant was awarded. In subsequent years of a multi-year grant, continued work falls under the score of 3.5.

- Receive a University, State, National, or International research award from a recognized professional organization.

FES 4: Service

FES 4 will be assessed on time investment, leadership role, and impact on the department, college, university, profession, or discipline-related community service. Scores will be based on evidence provided by the faculty during the FES evaluation period (calendar year). Although service is not only measured in terms of counting specific hour increments, the following guidelines are provided as examples. In general, a score of 2 corresponds to less than one hour of service per month; a score of 3 corresponds to approximately one hour of service per week; a score of 4 corresponds to approximately four hours of service per week; a score of 5 corresponds to approximately six hours of service per week. Faculty at the beginning of their careers (generally in the first three years as assistant professor) may receive a score of 3 for less than one hour of service per month. In general, non-remunerated service activities will be weighted more heavily.

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 contribution in the any area of service can result an additional fractional score, up to 1.0 total.

Minimum Score	Criteria
1.0	No apparent service activity
2.5	Evidence of some basic service activities expected of university faculty.
3.0	Engages in service levels that meets minimum faculty expectations with evidence of activities that positively impact the department, college, university, profession, or discipline-related community
4.0	Engages in service levels expected of university faculty with evidence of (1) time investment beyond that expected for a score of 3.0, and (2) an impact on the department, college, university, profession, or discipline-related community beyond that expected for a score of 3.0
5.0	Faculty members receiving this score will have a service record for the evaluation period with evidence of (1) significant time investment (2) significant leadership role and (3) significant impact on the department, college, university, profession, or discipline-related community. OR Receipt of a service award or other recognition for outstanding professional/agency based service

The following is a non-exhaustive list of service activities. A combination of these activities could result in a score of 3.0 – 5.0 as determined by the Department Chair or FES committee, with more activities or those further down the list worth more. Faculty members are encouraged to submit activities that do not appear on this list. In all instances, faculty members must provide evidence of time investment, leadership, and impact.

Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology and College of Criminal Justice

- Organize a guest lecture for the college, or department
- Participating and contributing member of a Department of CJC or College of CJ committee
- Chair of one Department of CJC or College of CJ committee
- Serve as a mentor for tenure-track faculty (specific activities must be documented)

***Participation on multiple Department and College committees and committees that involve substantial and demonstrated time commitment or is of substantial import will increase the score by fractional points, up to an additional 1.0*

Profession

- Reviewer of manuscripts for professional academic journal(s) or publisher(s)
- Chair/discussant for panels at national/international professional conferences
- Appointed to a major national organization sub-committee
- Member, editorial board of a scholarly or professional journal
- Editor of discipline-related non-peer-reviewed national journal
- Reviewer of external technical assistance/agency-based grant/contract application for state, national or international granting agencies/organizations
- Reviewer of external research/contract grant application for state, national or international granting agencies/organizations
- Member of a recognized criminal justice/social science/education-related task force or commission
- Elected officer of a *regional or multi-state* criminal justice/social science/education related professional association
- Program Chair of a scholarly professional association meeting
- Elected position in a Division, Section, or Sub-Committee of a national or international professional organization
- External reviewer of candidates for tenure/promotion;
- Elected officer of a major *national or international* criminal justice/social science/education-related agency level professional association
- Program Chair of a *national* criminal justice/social science/education association's annual meeting;
- Editor of a discipline-related peer-reviewed journal
- External reviewer of discipline-related educational program

University

- Participating and contributing member of university level committee
- Chair of university level committee
- Elected to university or college committee / task force by peer vote
- Elected to Faculty Senate
- ***Participation on multiple University committees and committees that involve substantial and demonstrated time commitment or is of substantial import will increase the score by fractional points, up to an additional 1.0*

Community

- Regular attendance at agency level professional meetings, but not presenting
- Member of local (city/county level) discipline-related task force
- Member of board of directors for local discipline-related agencies

- Committee member of practitioner / agency-based professional association
- Editor of agency-based / practitioner discipline-related *newsletter*
- Provide technical assistance and professional workshops provided to discipline-related agencies which benefit criminal justice and enhance the reputation of the Criminal Justice Center, including efforts related to LEMIT, CMIT, CVI, IHS, or CICA

FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM OF NONTENURE TRACK FACULTY

Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

In the College of Criminal Justice, evaluations of nontenure track (NTT) faculty 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 as it relates to the faculty member's workload assignment as expressed in their annual or semester departmental offer letter. The Department Chair is responsible for reviewing these documents and calculating a numerical score ranging from "1" to "5" on each dimension 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 on any FES category based on information provided by a faculty member. This document merely represents a set of guidelines for faculty evaluations. A faculty member may not be considered below expectations for an area not explicitly identified as an expectation in the faculty member's semester/annual departmental offer letter. Accomplishments outside of expectations may contribute positively to the faculty member's evaluation at the chair's discretion; however, such positive contributions may not compensate for being below expectations in any area. Per University Policy, the FES is used for purposes of (1) promotion in rank, (2) rewarding meritorious performance through salary adjustments, and (3) decisions concerning future contracts.

Teaching Effectiveness (FES 1 and FES 2)

Per Academic Policy Statement 890301, no more than 50% of the teaching evaluation may be based on surveys of student perceptions of teaching. Therefore, teaching effectiveness is comprised of two inputs, each contributing 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). The Student's Rating of Teaching Effectiveness will be an average of the Summary Evaluation for each student evaluation score as defined by university policy. FES1 shall be based on activities defined as or related to teaching and shall not be based on or influenced by scores from student evaluations.

Service (FES 4)

Service includes service to students, colleagues, program, department/school, college, and the University; administrative and committee service; and unpaid service beyond the University to the profession, locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally, including academic or professionally related public service. For nontenure track faculty whose offer letters include service expectations, FES 4 scores align with those provided in the FES for tenured/tenure-track faculty in the department.

WEIGHTS FOR NTT FACULTY EVALUATION

For nontenure track faculty with no research or service expectation based on their offer letter, FES 1 shall contribute 50% and FES 2 shall contribute 50% of the overall measure of teaching effectiveness. For nontenure track faculty with no research expectation based on their offer letter, FES 1 shall contribute 40% and FES 2 shall contribute 50% of the overall measure of teaching effectiveness, and FES 4 shall contribute 10% to the final summary score.

FES 1: Chairs Rating of Teaching Effectiveness for Nontenure Track Faculty

A Maximum score for this category (Chair's Rating) is 5.0. Scores must be on a 1-to-5-point continuous scale (with a minimum precision to the whole number from 1 to 5, and a maximum precision to the nearest hundredth; 0.01). In all cases it is the faculty members' responsibility to provide evidence that would justify each rating. Evidence supporting each rating includes: examples of syllabi, assignments, exams, etc.; peer evaluations of teaching conducted by one or more tenured faculty; additional assessment materials as prepared by faculty member (e.g., pre/post test scores of student learning, mid-term evaluations, etc.).

Minimum Score	Criteria
1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not meet minimum standards for professionalism or course content and pedagogy Failed to follow Department, University, Texas State University System policy as it relates to professionalism or course content and pedagogy
2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mostly met minimum standards for professionalism or course content and pedagogy Adhered to scheduled class meeting times completes Federal Aid Eligibility Validation (FAEV), submits textbook orders, and posts final grades by stated deadlines
3.0	<p>Expected Standards for Professionalism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Punctual and regular in meeting classes; reasonably available for student conferences and counseling; maintains high ethical standards of honesty and objectivity; maintains professional demeanor and conduct in classroom and during office hours; collaborating with colleagues with regard to curriculum and departmental issues, and Regular attendance at Departmental and College events and activities, not including faculty meetings <p>Expected Standards for Course Content and Pedagogy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation: course syllabi that include objectives, course requirement, grading system, absentee policy, and Presentation: clear, organized; use of appropriate instructional strategies and technologies; well-planned and well-defined assignments; development of instructional materials appropriate to course, and Teaches appropriate and relevant materials pertaining to subject matter(s) of the course Student Achievement: grading system is fair and clearly defined in syllabus; assignments are purposeful and appropriate; evaluation tools are appropriate; students received feedback in reasonable time period; faculty member is sensitive to special needs of individual students, and Regularly reviews and updates assigned courses
4.0	<p>In addition to evidence satisfying criteria for 3.0 rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporating Academic Community Engagement (ACE) and/or other community-based initiatives into course curriculum, or Incorporating active-learning exercises into course curriculum, or Teaching an honors course section, or Completion of a teaching development workshop or conference, or Developed proposal for 1 new course Leading students in independent study courses, directed readings courses, or honors contracts in addition to regular course load.
4.5	<p>In addition to evidence satisfying criteria for 3.5 rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of additional teaching development workshops or conferences, or

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver 2 or more new courses or 2 or more courses the faculty member has not taught within the previous 3 calendar years⁸
5.0	<p>In addition to evidence satisfying criteria for 3.0 rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of a teaching <i>certificate</i> program, including Blackboard certifications and ACUE Fellowship available through SHSU, or • Receive a College, University, State, National, or International teaching award or teaching award

⁸ This does not include courses that have already been developed for on-line delivery. This does not include courses taught during the summer.