**Annual Evaluation Form**

**Academic Specialists, Fixed Term Faculty, Tenure System Faculty**

**Annual Evaluation Summary**

*When completed, please submit this entire form (all pages, with signatures) to the Dean’s Office.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Academic Specialist / Faculty Name:** |  |
| **Current Position:** |  |
| **Reporting Period:** | Calendar year or Academic year |
| **Evaluator Name(s):**  *e.g., Chair, Director, Supervisor, Peer Committee* |  |
| **Date Submitted:** |  |

**Pre-tenure faculty or pre-continuing status specialists:** Review is for a tenure system faculty or an academic specialist with a mandatory review date in the upcoming academic year (performance review needs to discuss promotion expectations and timeline for review, if appropriate – see due dates for [NatSci Reappointment/Continuing System](https://natsci.msu.edu/faculty-staff/policies-procedures/reappointment-promotion-tenure-continuing-system-guidelines.aspx))

**Mid-career faculty:** Review is for a 3rd year or more senior tenured Associate Professor eligible for mid-career review (a 2-page reflective essay describing faculty’s progress in research, teaching and leadership *since the last promotion* is also needed – see [Mid-Career Faculty Review Policy](https://natsci.msu.edu/faculty-staff/policies-procedures/evaluation-policy-resources/mid-career-faculty-review-policy.aspx))

**The Annual Evaluation Process in the Unit included:** *(please mark (x) all that apply)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unit shared with specialists and faculty the intended purpose, importance, and process for annual performance review  (*Reporting Framework Part 1*) | **Expectations** |
|  | Academic specialist/faculty provided materials for evaluation, including a reflective narrative  (Written *Annual Reflective Statement* and other *Reporting Framework Part 2* documents – do not submit to Dean’s Office) | **Input** |
|  | Faculty provided a mid-career reflective essay with progress since last promotion  (Mandatory for mid-career tenure stream faculty) | **Input** |
|  | Chair/Director and academic specialist/faculty reviewed and discussed the feedback provided in this form and set goals and expectations for the next year | **Conversation** |
|  | Other (please describe): |  |

**Key Performance Areas, Appointment/Effort Distribution & Overall Progress:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Area** | **Official Appointment Percentages** | **Actual % Contribution**  (if different)**\*** | **Summary of Rubric Performance Level**  (Evaluate first on next pages, then indicate here - Not Meeting Expectations, Building, Strong, or Leading) |
| Administration |  |  |  |
| Academic Undergraduate Advising |  |  |  |
| Curriculum Development |  |  |  |
| Outreach |  |  |  |
| Research |  |  |  |
| Service |  |  |  |
| Teaching |  |  |  |
| **OVERALL** | **100%** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| *\* If contribution areas differ from official appointment percentages, discuss how to bring into alignment by changing official percentages or adjusting areas of effort.* | | | |
| **Overall Progress / Aggregate Performance***. To conclude performance conversation, clarify mandatory review date (including extensions). Describe overall performance across key areas and considering RPT/C status and career aspirations (e.g., on track for advancement)? Clearly note areas needing attention and improvement to support goals.* | | | |
|  | | | |

**Comments on Culture Contributions & Performance Context**

(Concerns that rise to the level of Civil Rights and/or Title IX violations such as discrimination, harassment, stalking, sexual assault, and relationship violence must be reported to [MSU Office of Institutional Equity](https://civilrights.msu.edu/).)

|  |
| --- |
| **DEI: Describe contributions to advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in the unit/college/university and/or highlight areas for improvement.** *Give specific examples of successes and/or work in progress.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Culture and Climate: Describe contributions to the culture and climate of the unit and/or highlight areas for improvement.** *Give specific examples of successes and/or work in progress.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Context: Describe performance factors beyond individual control within the unit or college – performance enhancers and/or limiters.** *Give specific examples of success factors that are important to sustain, and/or list possible actions to address any concerns or barriers to success.* |
|  |

**Administration**

*Administrative duties include planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting (POSDCORB) activities related to program or unit operations and maintenance of key documents, correspondence, and files. Some roles will have an explicit appointment percentage; however, since many roles include administrative work within other areas of responsibility, you may opt to include this rubric to acknowledge the potentially significant time investments that contribute to unit, program, or college success. This rubric should be completed in collaboration with the person overseeing the administrative duties, if different from the primary supervisor.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Not Meeting** **Expectations** | **Buildin****g** | **Strong** | **Leading** |
| Does not meet the expectations of administrative duties as outlined in the position description, fails to adhere to college/university policies, or has ineffective professional interactions with peers or direct reports, with no clear efforts to improve.  May include work that is disorganized, inaccurate, incomplete, and/or misses important deadlines. | Meets most expectations of administrative duties as outlined in the position description or other standards.  Has articulated clear goals and active steps to reach full performance with administrative responsibilities.  Acknowledges/takes responsibility for problems and works to address them including seeking mentoring as needed (may or may not be successful). | Consistently and successfully manages administrative responsibilities as outlined in the position description or other standards.  Proactively corrects deficiencies or mistakes.  Aligns administrative work with NatSci mission, values, and strategic priorities.  Completes administrative duties in a way that contributes positively to unit development and to an inclusive and equitable unit culture. | Accomplishments in all areas under Strong, plus highly effective administrative decisions, processes, leadership, and communication.  Evidence may include:   * administrative system improvements that result in significant contributions to objectives of the unit, college, or university * administrative interactions that provide leadership in unit or institutional efforts to enhance DEI |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evidence.** Describe specific evidence or examples that led to your Administration rating.*Note how performance does or does not align with expectations relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Goals & Support.** Identify areas for growth and provide specific improvement recommendations related to Administration. *Also list ways in which the unit will support individual efforts.* |
|  |

**Advising (Academic Undergraduate)** *Academic advisors assist, support, and develop undergraduate students to reduce time to degree, increase graduation rates, close opportunity gaps, create an inclusive community, and help students become globally engaged citizens.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Not Meeting Expectations** | **Building** | **Strong** | **Leading** |
| Advising practice does not meet [*MSU Core Expectations for Academic Advisors*](https://undergrad.msu.edu/programs/academic-advising#core-expect), including up-to-date knowledge of policies, procedures, resources, and tools.  No evidence of efforts to create an inclusive environment.  Minimal engagement with students.  Limited or no attention to how advising practice plays a role in student success (e.g., approaches advising as largely a course scheduling activity). | Clear evidence of efforts to develop an Advising practice that meets all *MSU Core Expectations for Academic Advisors*, including up-to-date knowledge of policies, procedures, resources, and tools.  Clear effort to create inclusive environments and foster a sense of belonging.  Evidence of positive student engagement.  Evidence of specific goals and efforts to develop a holistic advising approach that positively impacts student progress, retention, time to degree, and career outcomes. | Clearly established Advising practice that adheres to *MSU Core Expectations for Academic Advisors* and maintains the most up-to-date knowledge of policies, procedures, resources, and tools.  Clear evidence of success creating an inclusive environment and fostering a sense of belonging.  Evidence of positive and proactive student engagement.  Evidence of holistic Advising approaches with positive impacts on student progress, retention, time to degree, and favorable career outcomes.  Clear professional development goals and future Advising plans with high likelihood of successful completion. | Accomplishments in all areas under “Strong” plus exceptional contributions to Advising.  Evidence may include:   * bringing forward ideas and designing approaches or programs to enhance student success within NatSci * mentoring to positively influence and enhance success of other Advisors within the unit, college, or university * leadership and impact in the Advising profession at MSU and externally. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evidence.** Describe specific evidence or examples that led to your Advising rating.*Note how performance does or does not align with expectations relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Goals & Support.** Identify areas for growth and provide specific improvement recommendations related to Advising. *Also list ways in which the unit will support individual efforts.* |
|  |

**Curriculum Development** *Curriculum development involves providing content-related support to course, curriculum and/or instructional development activities.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Not Meeting** **Expectations** | **Building** | **Strong** | **Leading** |
| Not meeting unit curriculum development expectations, with no demonstrated effort to improve.  No indication that evidence is used to understand the impact of curricular change on student learning. | Meets most curriculum development expectations for the unit and is making demonstrated effort to improve.  Evidence of concrete, specific curriculum goals for the coming year, and reflection on past progress. | Meets unit curriculum development expectations.  Uses evidence to understand the impact of curricular development on student learning.  Effectively implements evidence-based curricular reform or innovations to enhance student learning and/or inclusion | Exceptional contributions to Curriculum Development.  Evidence may include:   * significant impact on student learning and/or progression * work across courses/units to improve overall curriculum * mentoring colleagues in curriculum development * development of curricula and teaching strategies designed to enhance inclusion |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evidence.** Describe specific evidence or examples that led to your Curriculum Development rating.*Note how performance does or does not align with expectations relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Goals & Support.** Identify areas for growth and provide specific improvement recommendations related to Curriculum Development. *Also list ways in which the unit will support individual efforts.* |
|  |

**Outreach** *Outreach involves engagement and scholarship that fosters public access to university expertise and resources. Areas may include children, youth, and families; community and economic development; health and well-being; PreK-16 education; scholarship of engagement; and service-learning and civic engagement.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Not Meeting Expectations** | **Building** | **Strong** | **Leading** |
| Does not meet unit outreach expectations as outlined in *Annual Reporting Framework*, with no clear effort to improve.  Little or no evidence of knowledge sharing activities, partnership engagement, or successful outreach project management.  No clear effort to create an inclusive environment or support DEI efforts in outreach. | Meets most unit outreach expectations and demonstrates clear efforts and goals for improvement.  Evidence of efforts to expand/ improve knowledge sharing activities, partnership engagement, and/or outreach project management.  Makes a clear effort to create inclusive environments and foster diversity and equity in outreach projects. | Meets unit outreach expectations to foster public access to university expertise and resources.  Successfully manages outreach responsibilities and projects to disseminate knowledge to the public through community-based activities.  Creates an inclusive, diverse and equitable environment in outreach activities.  Evidence of setting and achieving goals for professional outreach and program development. | Exceptional contributions toward unit/ college/university outreach priorities.  Evidence may include:   * creates new high-impact knowledge sharing activities with the broader community * builds and maintains relevant external partnerships * holds leadership roles related to outreach in professional organizations * external recognition for outreach * activities and events result in deeper engagement (e.g., expanding attendance, recruiting) * excels in outreach project development and management * provides leadership in creating an inclusive, diverse, and equitable environment in outreach programs |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evidence.** Describe specific evidence or examples that led to your Outreach rating.*Note how performance does or does not align with expectations relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Goals & Support.** Identify areas for growth and provide specific improvement recommendations related to Outreach. *Also list ways in which the unit will support individual efforts.* |
|  |

**Research** *As a robust performance area within the college, Research responsibilities vary over a career, across units, and from role to role. Please provide an evaluation for the relevant activities within the context of unit and position expectations. For example, some people have a primary responsibility to secure grant funding; others support grant proposals; others do not play a role in grant funding.*

(Concerns about Research Misconduct must be reported to [MSU Research Integrity Office](https://rio.msu.edu/).)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Position-relevant expectations (*rate all that apply*): | **Not Meeting** **Expectations** | **Building** | **Strong** | **Leading** |
| **Grant Funding**  Applies  N/A | **Not Meeting Expectations**  Minimal efforts to support applications for grant funding, at a quantity or quality below *unit expectations given rank, position, and workload*, with lack of reflection on progress or evidence of effort to increase grant funding. | **Building**  Grant funding contributions or leadership meets most *unit expectations given rank, position, and workload expectations*, with concrete, achievable goals for the coming year and evidence of effort to improve. | **Strong**  Grant funding contributions (e.g., grant proposal writing and submission) or leadership meets *unit expectations given rank, position, and workload expectations*.  Research funding levels and/or partnerships meet *unit expectations given rank, position, and workload expectations*. | **Leading**  Exceptional grant funding achievements *relative to rank, position, and workload expectations*.  Evidence may include:   * consistent and sufficient research funding and/or partnerships |
| **Investigation/ Creative Effort**  Applies  N/A | **Not Meeting Expectations**  Minimal amount of research activity, and/or quality below *unit expectations given rank, position, and workload*, with lack of reflection on progress and evidence of effort to improve. | **Building**  Research activity meets most *unit expectations given rank, position, and workload expectations*, with concrete, appropriate research goals for the coming year with reasonable likelihood of completion. | **Strong**  Research activity meets *unit expectations given rank, position, and workload expectations*.  There is evidence of clear future research plans with high likelihood of successful completion. | **Leading**  Exceptional research activity and scholarly achievements *relative to rank, position, and workload expectations*.  Evidence may include:   * leadership in the research field and disciplinary impact |
| **Lab/Core Facility Operations and Management**  Applies  N/A | **Not Meeting Expectations**  Lab/Core lacks the latest up-to-date equipment/ technologies/protocols.  Research community advising on new technologies/equipment required for external funding is weak or lacking.  Services are not provided in a timely or professional manner. | **Building**  Lab/Core is early stages of becoming established.  Lab/Core equipment/technology are falling behind, but efforts are being made to secure funding needed to upgrade.  Lab/Core is building relationships to research community to better advise on new technologies/ equipment to maintain competitive research environment for external funding.  Lab/core is in process of recruiting and training a competent and professional staff. | **Strong**  Lab/Core offers standard equipment/ technologies/protocols.  Advises research community on standard technologies/equipment to maintain competitive research environment for external funding.  Services are provided mostly in a timely and professional manner by a competent and professional staff.  Record of advancing DEI in staff. | **Leading**  Lab/Core offers the leading-edge up-to-date equipment/ technologies/protocols.  Advises research community on latest technologies/equipment to maintain competitive research environment for external funding.  Services are provided in a timely and professional manner by a competent and professional staff.  Record of advancing DEI in staff. |
| **Researcher Mentoring**  Applies  N/A | **Not Meeting Expectations**  Has mentoring responsibilities but engages minimally with under-graduates, graduate students, or post-doc research advisees, contributing to delays in progress, retention, time to degree, and/or favorable career outcomes, with lack of reflection on relationships and evidence of effort to improve.  Does not complete required annual written reports for graduate students.  Does not create a supportive, inclusive environment in research group.  Tolerates incivility. | **Building**  Mentoring quality (e.g., availability, active listening, and guidance) meets most *unit expectations given rank, position, and workload expectations,* with specific goals and evidence of effort to improve.  Seeks consultation with colleagues to identify approaches that fit the unique needs, strengths, and weaknesses of mentees. | **Strong**  Mentors future researchers in accordance with [MSU Guidelines for Graduate Student Mentoring and Advising](https://mmg.natsci.msu.edu/sites/_mmg/assets/MSU%20Guidelines%20for%20Graduate%20Student%20Mentoring%20and%20Advising.pdf).  Evidence of mentoring of undergraduate, graduate, and/or postdoctoral researchers in an inclusive and equitable manner.  Successful mentoring of undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-doc researchers as evidenced by their timely progress and quality work outputs.  Supports mentees’ pursuit of experiences aligned with career goals. | **Leading**  Exceptional mentoring *relative to rank, position, and workload expectations*.  Evidence may include:   * placement of mentees in positions aligned with career goals * offering career skill development workshops for multiple students to participate in (e.g., invite visiting professionals, grant writing) * contributions to student mentoring with impact beyond research group * mentoring mentors – serving as a role model and sounding board to other faculty in mentoring students * directing a training grant overseeing mentorship of students across research groups |
| **Dissemination of Findings**  Applies  N/A | **Not Meeting Expectations**  Minimal amount of dissemination of research output in sources such as peer-reviewed journals or other position- and discipline-relevant publications or information channels, with lack of reflection on publication output and evidence of effort to improve. | **Building**  Peer-reviewed scholarship, and/or research dissemination in other position- and discipline-relevant sources meets most *unit expectations given rank, position, and workload expectations,* with concrete, achievable goals for the coming year and evidence of effort to improve. | **Strong**  Meets *unit expectations given rank, position, and workload expectations* for appropriate dissemination of research output in sources such as peer-reviewed journals or other discipline-relevant publications.  Evidence of disciplinary or professional impact through invited presentations or conference activity. | **Leading**  Exceptional research dissemination achievements *relative to rank, position, and workload expectations*.  Evidence may include:   * publication in high-impact peer-reviewed journals, or other prominent discipline-relevant outlets |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evidence.** Describe specific evidence or examples that led to your Research rating.*Note how performance does or does not align with expectations relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Goals & Support.** Identify areas for growth and provide specific improvement recommendations related to Research. *Also list ways in which the unit will support individual efforts.* |
|  |

**Service** *Academic service includes contributions of time, energy, and the leadership that apply professional training and competence to issues and problems of significance internally (e.g., via committee work, mentoring of colleagues) and to scholarly and professional organizations.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Not Meeting Expectations** | **Building** | **Strong** | **Leading** |
| Little or no meaningful activity in serving the unit, college, institution, or profession.  Level or quality of service does not meet unit expectations as described in the *Annual Reporting Framework*, with no evidence of efforts to improve contributions. | Investments in serving the unit, college, institution, or profession meet most *unit expectations given rank, position, seniority, and workload expectations*, with concrete goals for the coming year and evidence of taking action to improve contributions. | Level and quality of service meets *unit expectations given rank, position, seniority, and workload expectations*.  Consistent and effective service atorganizational and/or professional levels appropriate to rank, seniority, and milestones for career aspirations.  Effectively collaborates on service efforts in an inclusive and equitable manner. | Exceptional service contributions toward unit/college/university strategic priorities.  Evidence may include:   * high quality service contributions in multiple organizational and/or professional roles * effective leadership in service activities * mentoring colleagues and/or creating groups to support overall success and career milestone goals * commitment to service efforts to enhance DEI |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evidence.** Describe specific evidence or examples that led to your Service rating.*Note how performance does or does not align with expectations relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Goals & Support.** Identify areas for growth and provide specific improvement recommendations related to Service. *Also list ways in which the unit will support individual efforts.* |
|  |

**Teaching** *For the purposes of this evaluation, teaching focuses on instruction in undergraduate and graduate courses, including classes, labs, seminars, field and clinical settings.*

There is evidence that the [MSU Code of Teaching Responsibility](https://reg.msu.edu/academicprograms/Print.aspx?Section=514) has been violated, or that a hostile classroom environment has been created.

***If the Code Violations box is checked, do not submit a Teaching Rubric rating.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Not Meeting Expectations** | **Building** | **Strong** | **Leading** |
| Not meeting unit teaching expectations, with little or no evidence of reflection on student learning and/or attempts to improve student outcomes.  **\*NOTE: Reflection on student learning is *optional* for AY 2022-23** | Meets most unit teaching expectations, with clear evidence of thoughtful reflection on teaching progress and student learning, articulation of specific teaching goals for the coming year, and effort to improve. | Meets unit teaching expectations.  Uses evidence-based teaching practices to create an environment and classroom culture to encourage students to engage in their learning.  Thoughtfully reflects on teaching and uses evidence of student learning and mastery of learning objectives to guide decisions about classroom instruction and develop revisions to instruction.  Makes a clear effort to create inclusive learning environments.  If available for the role, achieves satisfactory student perceptions of learning gains and instructional quality. | Accomplishments in all areas in Strong, plus exceptional contributions to teaching.  Evidence may include:   * teaching leadership or mentoring within unit, college, institution, or profession * contributing significantly to unit culture in support of teaching and learning * participating in peer teaching groups to exchange ideas among trusted colleagues * secures grants to support high-quality instruction * a strong record of advancing DEI through instruction or mentoring * outstanding student perceptions of learning gains and instructional quality |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evidence.** Describe specific evidence or examples that led to your Teaching rating.*Note how performance does or does not align with expectations relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Goals & Support.** Identify areas for growth and provide specific improvement recommendations related to Teaching. *Also list ways in which the unit will support individual efforts.* |
|  |

**Annual Evaluation Form Acceptance**

**Faculty / Academic Specialist:** Please mark (X) one and sign below to confirm receipt of this Annual Evaluation Form.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | I have a written response, and the response is attached. |
|  | I have a written response and have sent it directly to [natscidean@msu.edu](mailto:natscidean@msu.edu). |
|  | I do not have a written response to this review. |

**Please refer any unresolved questions or concerns about this annual review to** [**natscidean@msu.edu**](mailto:natscidean@msu.edu)**.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Faculty or Academic Specialist Signature** | **Date** |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator Signature(s)** | **Date** |
|  |  |

*Please submit the signed Annual Evaluation Form to the Dean’s Office as soon as completed and not later than June 30 to assure consideration for annual salary review.*

**Input from Annual Evaluation Form to Annual Salary Review**

Annual salary raises for non-union faculty and academic specialists are funded centrally. For non-union faculty and academic specialists, the Board of Trustees approves a salary ***Merit Raise Pool***, which is based on a certain percentage of university-wide faculty and academic specialist salaries. NatSci retains a portion of its merit raise pool (***Dean’s Withhold***) and the remainder of the pool is distributed to the units. For example, if the raise pool is 3%, the college may keep ~0.5% in the Dean’s Withhold, and 2.5% is given to the units. Units follow their internal procedures for determining how the merit raise pool is distributed within the unit, and the chair/director sends the unit merit raise recommendations to the college. College leadership reviews all the unit recommendations and uses the Dean’s Withhold to honor prior commitments (e.g., retentions) and to address salary inequities. The college looks for general alignment of recommendations with annual performance evaluations that are turned in to the college each year. Annual raises for UNTF faculty are determined by the UNTF contract for the UNTF portion of their appointments.

A separate ***Equity and Excellence Market Pool*** funded by the Provost’s Office is also distributed to the college. All faculty and academic specialists are eligible for Equity and Excellence Market raises. The amount varies by year but is typically in the range of 1-2% of the overall salary pool. Equity and Excellence Market raises are used to both 1) recognize faculty and academic specialists who are consistently recognized as meritorious by peers at MSU or at comparable institutions (e.g., major national/international award, flight risk), and 2) recognize faculty and academic specialists who are making a significant contribution to the college and whose salaries are materially below peers. NatSci asks units to make Equity and Excellence raise recommendations and these recommendations must have an explicit written rationale. College leadership also considers non-union faculty and academic specialists not recommended by unit leader and makes recommendations for Equity and Excellence raises to the Provost’s Office, which has final approval on these raises.