

COBA FES Scoring Guidelines - 2020

FES 1 - Chairs Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness

| | |
|-----|---|
| 5.0 | Extraordinary. Rare. Reserved for extraordinary achievement or recognition (e.g., SHSU professional teaching award; significant teaching achievements; achievement of standards to a greater degree as compared to others). |
| | innovation/motivation in the classroom promoting student success. Substantial evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., nomination for a teaching award, specifically finalist or finalist). |
| 4.0 | Very good. Maintains high standards for students and themselves. Innovative in the class |
| 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 <u>Minimum</u> Expectations. See rubric below for minimum expectations. |
| 1.5 | Needs Improvement. Below expectations, or ineffective teacher. |
| 1.0 | Substandard. Lowest score possible. Needs substantial, immediate improvement. |

Rubric, when evaluating FES1.

- Chair may make a case for an adjustment of the score (up or down) in extenuating circumstances.
- Chair should use multiple inputs (e.g., BB pages, class visits, comments, faculty teaching portfolios, etc.)
- Chair may consider factors such as
 - o new preps
 - o number of preps
 - o faculty overloads
 - o modalities, locations, and pedagogies
 - o overall number of students
 - o instructor's timely feedback on assignments/exams
 - o grade distribution
 - o percentage of drops.
- Chair should consider multiple outlets for student feedback (e.g., letters from Office of Student Affairs saying a faculty member made an impact, verifiable student emails, verbal messages to the chair, comments from IDEA, etc.).
- Chair should be able to penalize a faculty member if there is evidence of a pattern of inflated grade distribution.
- Chair should consider the rigor of the course and course materials:
 - o How does the faculty maintain academic honesty?
 - o Do assignments maintain rigor? (e.g., type of examples of assignments, final exam)

Chair's Teaching Evaluation Rubric (sample)

| Minimum Criteria: | Yes | No | Comments from the Chair: |
|--|-----|----|--------------------------|
| Holds classes and administers the final exam as deemed by the university schedule | | | |
| Reasonably accommodate students with office hours that meet expectations from the faculty handbook | | | |
| In compliance with House Bill 2504 (ita and syllabi) | | | |
| In compliance with Master Syllabi | | | |
| Contributed to assessment if applicable | | | |
| Complies with Attendance Initiative | | | |
| Faculty maintains professionalism during student interactions | | | |
| Comments/Notes | | | |

Recommended instructions for use of the Rubric:

- A faculty member must meet all of the minimum criteria to reach a 2.0 to be considered for merit. (Temporarily not being enforced, pending review of university FES policy)
- Additional Criteria are considered to adjust a faculty member's FES 1 score increase or decrease as applicable
- Faculty should document their work (including all minimum expectations and additional considerations)

FES 2 - Student Evaluations (IDEA Student Surveys)

IDEA provides scores based on “Summary”, “Progress on Relevant Objectives”, and “Ratings of Summative Questions”. COBA uses the Converted Average for the “Summary” score.

IDEA provides three comparison types for “Summary Scores”

1. IDEA Database, 2. Discipline, 3. Institution

COBAs using the “discipline-adjusted summary score” for calendar year 2020. IDEA modified the instrument in Fall 2016, resulting in too small a sample to e9e2j /TT0 1(a <</(v)3 (id)-4 (()10 (t)-a1 ()10 (t)10 (a)4)10 (

FES 3 - Research

5.0 Extraord 3

SHSU COBA Higher Quality and Quality ICs

| <u>Basic Contributions*</u> | |
|--|---|
| Higher Quality | Quality |
| IC outlet is any of the college's approved lists (e.g., ABDC, Cabell's, CRISJR, or Scopus) and is rated A/B or in the top two quartiles. | IC outlet is listed on any of the college's approved lists (e.g., ABDC, Cabell's, CRISJR, or Scopus) with any rating. |
| <u>Applied Contributions*</u> | |
| Higher Quality | Quality |

- Independent consulting work (e.g., products, documentation, scales, workbooks, workshops).
 - Patents: Full and Provisional
- f When determining quality, there should be consideration of the sponsoring organization, how long the sponsoring organization has existed, and/or audience size.
- EX: Practitioner journals with a national or international audience that are published by a highly visible and well-known organization may be deemed higher quality (e.g., ISACA, Internal Auditor, Fraud Magazine, The Futurist, The Fed, Law Review Journal).
 - EX: Regional publications would be a quality outlet (e.g., Today's CPA).

All of the above is contingent on the following Prerequisites to FES 3 Merit Evaluation:

- All tenured and tenure-track faculty must meet the minimum standards for AACSB qualifications (See AACSB Handbook).
- Faculty are required to update Sedona, at least annually, by the FES submission deadline set by their chair. ICs will only be counted if they are submitted to Sedona.

FES 5 - Overall Average

The scores for each of the four areas are weighted to produce an overall FES score. FES for faculty on the research track (normal teaching load of 3) are averaged as follows:

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

Unusual: FES scores for faculty on the teaching track (normal teaching load of 4) are averaged as follows:

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