**College of Social Science Annual Evaluation Form**

**For Fixed-Term Faculty and Academic Specialists**

The MSU Faculty Handbook states that individual faculty must be evaluated on an annual basis based on their appointment/assignment and provided with a written assessment of their performance. Further, the review process should be: 1) clearly defined to communicate whether or not faculty are meeting expectations for their appointment/assignment and 2) provide a method for timely feedback on their performance regardless of the number of faculty within a given unit. All evaluation procedures are to incorporate the principles included in the University model policy for regular faculty review, and be applied uniformly to all fixed-term faculty and academic specialists (when appropriate) in the unit. **The context of all evaluations are to be based on the standards for publications, funding sources, teaching standards / pedagogies, and outreach missions that are appropriate to the discipline(s) within the academic home of each faculty member.**

To that end, a template for Annual Evaluation has been vetted across the college. Unit leaders and the members of the College Faculty Advisory Counsel (FAC) have provided valuable feedback that has been incorporated into this document.

Implementation

1. Each fixed-term faculty/academic specialist (employee) should fill out each portion of the form (Oversall Summary Page and Parts A-G) that is relevant given their assignment. Sections for employee to complete are shaded green, all others are to be completed by the supervisor/unit leader.
2. Supervisor(s) or unit leader completes evaluation component of each Part completed by employee and the overall summary evaluation sections
3. Lists within categories (Needs Improvement, Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations) are included as possible examples and are not intended to be exclusive or required for achieving a specific level of performance.
4. The evaluation should provide the individual with an assessment of progress towards promotion (if applicable).
5. Each individual will have the opportunity to respond to any points within the evaluation document. Additionally, they may prepare a separate, more comprehensive document that identifies the points that are in disagreement and the reasons why they disagree. The document prepared by the individual is to be attached to the written evaluation for the permanent record of the annual evaluation that is held in the unit and in the Office of the Dean.
6. Signature by the employee on the evaluation does not signify agreement with the supervisor/unit leader’s evaluation, but rather acknowledgement that the individual has read and, if desired, discussed the evaluation with their unit leader.
7. Only the summary page of this form will be included in the review packet for promotion, with the remaining pages retained by the unit. The additional pages will be available to the Promotion Review Committee upon request.

**CSS Fixed-Term Faculty/Academic Specialist Annual Evaluation Form**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Employee Name:**Click or tap here to enter text. | **Department(s):** Click or tap here to enter text. | **Review Year:** Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Title/Rank:**Click or tap here to enter text. | **Any unique aspects of position:** Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Workload Expectations (refer to position description for percentages):****Teaching (Part A):** Click or tap here to enter text.**% Research (Part B):** Click or tap here to enter text.**% Advising (Part C):**Click or tap here to enter text.**% Outreach (Part D):**Click or tap here to enter text.**Curriculum Development (Part E):** Click or tap here to enter text.**% Service (Part F):** Click or tap here to enter text.**%****Administration (Part G):** Click or tap here to enter text.**%** |

**OVERALL SUMMARY (relative to rank, position, and workload expectations)**

**To Be Completed By Supervisor**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Ne**eds Improvement****Area(s) of deficiency:** | [ ]  **Meets Expectations** | [ ]  **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Overall: Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations:**  |
|  |
| **Summary and Outlook: Progress, Plans, and Future Promotions**  |
|  |
| **To Be Completed By Employee:** **Overall: Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements – Employee Response (include separate page if needed)** |
|  |

**Signatures signify that both the supervisor/unit leader and the employee discussed the annual review. The employee signature *does not indicate* agreement with the supervisor/unit leader’s evaluation.**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Employee Date:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Primary Supervisor Date:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Unit Leader: Date:

**Part A: Teaching**

|  |
| --- |
| **Teaching/Student Engagement** **Number of Courses as Instructor:****Undergraduate \_\_\_\_\_ Of which, Tier II writing \_\_\_\_ Graduate \_\_\_\_\_** |
| **Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations** ***SELF EVALUATION -TEACHING (250 WORDS MAX)*** |
|  |
| [ ]  **Needs Improvement** Evidence- problematic classroom or other teaching performance; unreliable advising and/or mentoring, and frequent unavailability; indifference toward or unreasonable resistance to meeting teaching standards.**Area(s) of deficiency:** | [ ]  **Meets Expectations**Evidence – in the classroom and alignment of learning outcomes; reliable student academic advising and/or mentoring:Fulfills all teaching responsibilities of effective instruction[[1]](#footnote-2)* Course Materials.
* Learning Outcomes.
* Advising/Mentoring.
 | [ ]  **Exceeds Expectations**Evidence of exceeding expectaions (beyond meeting expectations): * Developed significant new course materials.
* Developed new assessment tools.
* Developed new curricula/programs.
* Awards.
* Created Materials or approaches that are adopted elsewhere.
 |
| ***SUPERVISOR/UNIT LEADER’S EVALUATION*:** |

**Part B: Research**

|  |
| --- |
| **Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations*****SELF-EVALUATION – RESEARCH (250 words max):***  |
|  |
| [ ]  **Needs Improvement**Evidence: scholarly or creative activity of a quantity or quality below expectations given rank and position. **Area(s) of deficiency:** | [ ]  **Meets Expectations** Evidence:* Publications in peer- reviewed journals.
* Publications in non-peer-reviewed outlets.
* Research funding.
* Scholarly conference presentations.
* Research program planning for success.
 | [ ]  **Exceeds Expectations**Evidence of exceeding expectaions:* Publications (quality and quantity).
* External research funding
* Scholarly conferences (participation/organizing).
* Prestigious recognition (award, fellow, keynote presentations, etc.):
* Scholarly impact(s)
 |
| ***SUPERVISOR/UNIT LEADER’S EVALUATION:*** |

**Part C: Advising**

|  |
| --- |
| **Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations*****SELF-EVALUATION – ADVISING (250 words max):***  |
|  |
| [ ]  **Needs Improvement**Evidence: problematic or ineffective performance dealing with students; provides inaccurate or incomplete information; does not engage with other advisors; does not stay current on policies.**Area(s) of deficiency:** | [ ]  **Meets Expectations** Evidence: Fulfills responsibilities effectively.* Advises expected number of students.
* Responds to students in timely fashion.
* Provides accurate information.
* Updates student records.
* Participates in NSO.
* Performs degree audits.
 | [ ]  **Exceeeds Expectations**Evidence of exceeding expectations:* Develops tools to enhance advising.
* Provides multiple avenues to meet with students.
* Creates resources to assist students.
* Mentors other advisors.
* Develops new NSO tools.
* Has advising capacity that exceeds expectations.
 |
| ***SUPERVISOR/UNIT LEADER’S EVALUATION:*** |

**Part D: Outreach**

|  |
| --- |
| **Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations*****SELF-EVALUATION – OUTREACH (250 words max):***  |
|  |
| [ ]  **Needs Improvement**Evidence: problematic or ineffective performance with stakeholders and/or educators; frequently unavailability; indifference toward or unreasonable resistance to meeting standards.**Area(s) of deficiency:** | [ ]  **Meets Expectations**Evidence: Fulfills responsibilities effectively. * Stakeholder interactions:
* Stakeholder conference/ meeting presentations:
* Outreach publications:
* Outreach funding:
* Active participation on Outreach team:
* Outreach planning for program success:
 | [ ]  **Exceeds Expectations**Evidence of exceeding expectations: * National stakeholder interactions/presentations.
* Outreach funding.
* Outreach team building for institutional success.
* Prestigious recognition (award, fellow, keynote presentation, etc.)
* Development of multi-institutional initiatives for Outreach.
* Impact on policy, legislation, practice, etc.
 |
| ***SUPERVISOR/UNIT LEADER’S EVALUATION:*** |

**Part E: Curriculum Development**

|  |
| --- |
| **Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations*****SELF-EVALUATION – CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (250 words max):***  |
|  |
| [ ]  **Needs Improvement**Evidence: **Area(s) of deficiency:** | [ ]  **Meets Expectations** Evidence:* Assist faculty in curriculum management and change planning.
* Work with undergraduate and graduate directors to formulate new courses.
 | [ ]  **Exceeeds Expectations**Evidence of Exceeding Expectations:* Improve the efficiency (overlap and enrollment) and reduce redundancy of course offerings.
* Improve measures and assement procedures of student learning outcomes.
* Work with undergraduate and graduate directors to anticipate student interest and workforce development opportunities for new courses.
 |
| ***SUPERVISOR/UNIT LEADER’S EVALUATION:*** |

**Part F: Service**

|  |
| --- |
| **Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations*****SELF-EVALUATION – SERVICE (250 words max):***  |
|  |
| [ ]  **Needs Improvement** Evidence: little or no meaningful or useful activity in serving department, college, university or professional organizations in important ways. Or behavior of professionally unacceptable kind or harmful effect.**Area(s) of deficiency:** | [ ]  **Meets Expectations** Evidence: effective service at multiple organizational and professional levels appropriate to rank and seniority.* Professional behavior.
* Department service.
* College service.
* University service.
* Professional organization service.
 | [ ]  **Exceeeds Expectations**Evidence of exceeding expectations:* Campus committee leadership
* Professional organization leadership.
* Research, Teaching, or Extension/Outreach program leadership.
* Prestigious recognition (award, elected office, in professional society, etc.)
* Invited service on national program review.
 |
| ***SUPERVISOR/UNIT LEADER’S EVALUATION:*** |

**Part G: Administration**

|  |
| --- |
| **Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations*****SELF-EVALUATION – ADMINISTRATION (250 words max):***  |
|  |
| [ ]  **Needs Improvement**Evidence: unprofessional behavior that impacts morale and/or productivity; cannot effectively de-escalte issues; does not effectively use data to make decisions; does not complete projects on time; does not update website; lack of attention to detail.**Area(s) of deficiency:** | [ ]  **Meets expectations**Evidence: Fulfills responsibilities effectively. * Runs unit scholars program.
* Evaulates transfer credits.
* Supervises staff and/or students.
* Maintains historical records.
* Participates in hiring and/or training or new advisors.
* Manages student emergencies.
* Reviews and submits updated curriculum content.
 | [ ]  **Exceeds Expectations**Evidence of exceeding expectations: * Enhances unit scholars program.
* Creates systems to facilitate transfers.
* Creates onboarding material & processes.
* Monitors and updates website.
* Provides evaluation to advisors and students.
* Provides assessment for student services.
 |
| ***SUPERVISOR/UNIT LEADER’S EVALUATION:*** |

1. Effective instruction is defined here asteaching that promotes student learning and other desired outcomes (i.e., being prepared for class, demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of the subject, motivating students, being fair and reasonable in managing the course, and demonstrating interest in the subject matter) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)