**Annual Evaluation Guidelines**

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

**PURPOSE and PROCESS**

Unit leaders (chairs, directors, supervisors) are asked to review the performance of academic specialists and faculty annually to support their personal and professional growth in alignment with unit, college and university mission and objectives. This review must focus on **outcomes and behaviors** and discuss methods and strategies for **professional development and improvement**. With this in mind, the college developed an Annual Evaluation Process for unit leader(s), academic specialists, fixed-term faculty, and tenure stream faculty to engage in direct and transparent conversations focused on **expectations and goals** at least once per year to strengthen alignment and mutual success. For more information about the development of the *NatSci Annual Evaluation Process* and *Form,* please watch this explanatory [video](https://natsci.msu.edu/faculty-staff/policies-procedures/evaluation-policy-resources/index.aspx).

The **NatSci Annual Evaluation Process** includes the following **steps:**

1. **A diagram of a company

   Description automatically generatedExpectations**.Unit sets goals, expectations, and processes for the annual performance review (*Reporting Framework*).
2. **Input**. Academic specialists and faculty submit materials for performance evaluation such as an *Annual Reflective Statement* and other requested inputs (*Reporting Framework*). A *reflection on student learning* remains optional but is encouraged if the appointment includes teaching.
3. **Feedback**. Unit leaders use this input to complete the *Annual Evaluation Form*.
   * + The rubrics and form provide a structured framework for unit leaders to conduct their review and submit a consistent summary of progress to the college. These summaries support equitable decision-making in the annual allocations from the Merit Raise Pool and the Equity and Excellence Market Pool.
     + **The *Annual Evaluation Form* should NOT be filled out by the individual being reviewed**.
     + Remove from the form evaluation elements that are not relevant to the person being reviewed.
4. **Conversation**. Discuss performance and opportunities for growth. Recommended elements:
   * Discuss career aspirations and provide clear feedback regarding expectations and milestones.
   * Celebrate successes.
   * Set future goals.
   * Address how the unit might better support the individual to reach and sustain strong/leading performance.
   * Unsure understanding of the annual salary review process.
5. **Accountability**. Send the signed *Annual Evaluation Form* to the Dean’s Office as soon as completed, and no later than **June 30,** to assure consideration for annual salary review
6. **Outcomes**. Annual reviews inform the raise allocation process at both the unit and college levels. They should also help identify candidates for awards.

**INSTRUCTIONS and RUBRICS**

Complete the following tables and rubrics.

**Table 1. Evaluatee and Evaluator**

* Record names and dates.

**Table 2: Required Review and Promotion Eligibility**

* Indicate if evaluatee has a mandatory review for reappointment or promotion (tenure stream or continuing) in the coming year or is eligible for other Designation B.
* Indicate if evaluatee plans to apply for an optional promotion (full professor, senior academic specialist).

**Table 3: Annual Evaluation Process in Unit**

* Confirm steps in the review process.

**Table 4: Performance Areas, Appointment/Effort Distribution, and Overall Progress**

* Record official appointment percentages as noted in offer letter or specialist position description form.
* Indicate if the actual contribution is different and make plans to address differences.
* Record rubric performance level for each relevant area as directed below.

**Summary Statements**

Provide summary statements as indicated in the form. Text boxes will expand to accommodate the full response.

* **Overall progress/aggregate performance:** Summarize performance conversation considering appointment type/rank (RPT/C status), career aspirations, and progress towards promotion (e.g., mandatory review date, extensions to the tenure clock, eligibility for Continuing and/or Designation B status). Clearly note areas needing attention and improvement to support goals.
* **Diversity, equity, and inclusion:** 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.

**Performance Area Rubrics**

The information provided for each Rubric is important for equitable decisions within the college. All rubrics are included on subsequent pages of this document. Thank you for taking the time to reflect, discuss, and complete a review for each academic specialist and faculty member in your unit based on the rubrics that were developed by cross-college committees.

For each relevant Rubric:

1. Select the Performance Level (Not Meeting Expectations, Building, Strong, Leading) that best represents the individual’s accomplishments and contributions for the year. Indicate the performance level in Table 4 on Page 1.
2. Complete the **Evidence box** and the **Goals and Support box** for each relevant Rubric (input boxes will expand). Cite specific components of the rubric in the Evidence box.

Each Rubric describes 4 performance levels:

* **Not Meeting Expectations:** Performance is *below expectations* and actions to improve are required.

*This rating indicates a need for learning, growth, and goal accomplishment in an area of contribution to meet expected performance standards.*

* **Building:** Performance*meets most expectations* and improvement goals that are likely to achieve desired results are clearly articulated.

*This rating indicates a time of focused growth and career development and will often apply to individuals new to a position/rank or adding a new area of contribution while developing approaches for success.*

* **Strong:** Performance*meets all expectations*, including regular professional reflection and clear goals.

*This rating indicates success in an area of contribution and that the individual is on track to meet reappointment and promotion benchmarks if relevant.*

* **Leading:** Performance includesexceptional accomplishments with evidence of regular attainment of growth goals. Demonstrates leadership in area of responsibility at unit, college, university, and/or national levels.

*This rating indicates excellence beyond core expectations for an area of responsibility and recognizes performance and leadership that improve attainment of strategic priorities of the unit, college, and/or university.*

**Administration**

Administrative duties include planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting 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 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 |

**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. |

**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 |

**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 |

**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** | 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. | 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. | 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*. | Exceptional grant funding achievements *relative to rank, position, and workload expectations*.  Evidence may also include:   * Continued submission of grant applications to expand research in new areas. * Collaborative engagement to grow impact. * Entrepreneur efforts expanding funding resources. |
| **Investigation/ Creative Effort** | 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. | 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. | 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.  Evidence of intellectual leadership in the field. | Exceptional research activity and scholarly achievements *relative to rank, position, and workload expectations*.  Evidence may include:   * Exceptional research productivity such publications in high impact journals. * Peer recognition/award for disciplinary impact and intellectual leadership. |
| **Researcher Mentoring** | 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. | 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. | 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.  Makes a clear effort to create inclusive learning environments for mentees. | Exceptional mentoring *relative to rank, position, and workload expectations*.  Evidence may include:   * placement of mentees in positions aligned with career goals * mentees research recognized with awards * 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** | 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. | 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. | 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. | 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. * publications selected as editor’s choice in professional journals or highlighted in the press. * exceptional record of speaker invitations at peer universities and scientific conferences. * selection as keynote or plenary speaker. |
| **Lab/Core Facility Operations and Management** | 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. | 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. | 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 promoting inclusive practices and equitable processes for staff and customers. | Lab/Core offers the leading-edge up-to-date equipment/ technologies/protocols.  Exceptional record of innovation via technology development/equipment upgrades to maintain competitive research environment for external funding.  Service quality, efficiency and customer satisfaction exceeds standards in the space.  Exemplary efforts and initiatives to advance a culture of inclusion and equity for staff and customers. |

**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.  Service roles meet expectations of intellectual and organizational leadership for the position/rank. | 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 |

**Teaching**

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

Indicated on the evaluation if 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. ***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. | 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 |