

CANR TENURE-SYSTEM FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION FORM

The College of Agriculture and Natural Resources is dedicated to an annual review process that promotes clarity, transparency and uniformity in the written assessment of all faculty. The [MSU Faculty Review Policy](#), 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 and assignment and 2) provide a method for timely feedback to all faculty 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 faculty 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 Tenure-System Faculty Annual Evaluation has been vetted across the college. Feedback from unit leaders, the College Advisory Counsel (CAC) and faculty from each unit have provided valuable feedback that has been incorporated into this document.

Implementation

- A. The definitions for scholarly productivity are based on the faculty-derived and approved document “*CANR – Faculty Statement on Scholarly Activities, Scholarship, and Impact*”¹
- B. The designation “meets expectations” indicates the individual is on track for reappointment, promotion with the award of tenure, or promotion to professor.
- C. Lists within categories are included as possible examples and are not intended to be exclusive or required for achieving a specific level of performance. Additional sheets may be inserted as needed.
- D. All faculty 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 faculty member 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.
- E. Signature by faculty on the evaluation does not signify agreement with the unit leader’s evaluation, but rather acknowledgement that the faculty member has read and discussed the evaluation with their unit leader.
- F. The template will be adjusted based on feedback across the college from faculty and unit leaders after implementation.

¹ As defined in “CANR-Faculty Statement on Scholarly Activities, Scholarship, and Impact”, 2012 (http://www.canr.msu.edu/faculty_staff/faculty_development/demystifying_reappointment_as_assistant_professor#/CANRFacultyStatement)

CANR TENURE-SYSTEM FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION FORM

Name:	Department(s):	Review Year:
Rank:	Position:	
Funding Lines: General Fund: __% AgBioResearch: __% MSUE: __% Workload Expectations: Research: __% Teaching: __% Extension/Outreach: __% Leadership/Service: __%		

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet Expectations Area(s) of deficiency:	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional
Overall: Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations:**			
Overall: Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations – Faculty Response:**			
Summary and Outlook: Progress, Plans, and Future Promotions			

Signatures signify that both the unit leader and the faculty member discussed the annual review. The faculty signature *does not indicate* agreement with the unit leader’s evaluation. ** Insert separate page as needed.

Faculty Member

Date:

Unit Leader:

Date:

TEACHING (relative to rank, position, and workload expectations)

Teaching/Student Engagement	Courses as Instructor:	Undergraduate _____	Graduate _____
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet Expectations. <u>Evidence- problematic classroom or other teaching performance; unreliable advising and/or mentoring, and frequent unavailability; indifference toward or unreasonable resistance to meeting teaching standards.</u> Area(s) of deficiency:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Meets expectations <u>Evidence – in the classroom and alignment of learning outcomes; reliable student academic advising and/or mentoring:</u></p> <p>Fulfills all teaching responsibilities of effective teaching²:</p> <p>Course Materials:</p> <p>Learning Outcomes:</p> <p>Advising/Mentoring:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations <u>Evidence of excellence (beyond meeting expectations):</u></p> <p>Developed significant new course materials:</p> <p>Developed new assessment tools:</p> <p>Developed new curricula/programs:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional <u>Evidence of extraordinary impact (beyond excellence and meeting expectations):</u></p> <p>Prestigious recognition (award, invited conference speaker, etc.):</p> <p>Developed recurring teaching workshop:</p> <p>Developed multi-institution curricular activities:</p>
Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations**			
Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements - Faculty Response**			

² **Effective teaching** – teaching that promotes student learning and other desired outcomes (i.e., being prepared for class, demonstrating comprehensive subject knowledge, motivating students, being fair and reasonable in managing the details of learning, and being interested in the subject matter) (Seldin 2006, McKinney 2007) ****Insert separate page as needed**

RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY³/CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY
(relative to rank, position, and workload expectations)

<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet Expectations <u>Evidence: scholarly or creative activity of a quantity or quality below expectations given rank and position.</u> Area(s) of deficiency:	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets expectations <u>Evidence:</u> Publications in peer-reviewed/primary journals: Publications in non-peer-reviewed/ secondary journals: Research funding: Scholarly conference presentations: Areas of scholarly impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - economic - social - environmental -teaching/learning Research program planning for success:	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations <u>Evidence of excellence:</u> Publications (quality and quantity): Research Funding (competitive): Scholarly conferences (participation/organizing): Scholarly impact(s) economic/social/environmental/: Research team building for institutional success:	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional <u>Evidence of extraordinary impact:</u> Prestigious/outstanding publication as senior/ corresponding author: Prestigious recognition (award, fellow, keynote presentations, etc.): Developed a major grant/project/program that generated significant recognition/ income for the university from a national/international agency/foundation:
Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations**			
Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements – Faculty Response**			

³CANR-Faculty Statement on Scholarly Activities, Scholarship, and Impact, 2012
http://www.canr.msu.edu/faculty_staff/faculty_development/demystifying_reappointment_as_assistant_professor#CANRFacultyStatement

**Insert separate page as needed

EXTENSION/OUTREACH (relative to rank, position, and workload expectations)

<p><input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet Expectations <u>Evidence: problematic or ineffective performance with stakeholders and/or educators; frequently unavailability; indifference toward or unreasonable resistance to meeting Extension standards.</u></p> <p>Area(s) of deficiency:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Meets expectations <u>Evidence: Fulfills extension responsibilities effectively.</u></p> <p>Stakeholder interactions:</p> <p>Stakeholder conference/ meeting presentations:</p> <p>Extension/outreach publications:</p> <p>Extension/outreach funding:</p> <p>Active participation on Extension/outreach team:</p> <p>Extension/outreach planning for program success:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations <u>Evidence of excellence:</u></p> <p>National stakeholder interactions:</p> <p>National stakeholder presentations:</p> <p>Extension/outreach funding:</p> <p>Extension/outreach team building for institutional success:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional <u>Evidence of extraordinary impact:</u></p> <p>Prestigious recognition (award, fellow, keynote presentation, etc.)</p> <p>Development of multi-institutional initiatives for Extension/outreach:</p> <p>Impact on policy, legislation, practice, etc.:</p>
---	--	--	--

Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations**

Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations – Faculty Response**

**Insert separate page as needed

LEADERSHIP/SERVICE (relative to rank, position, and workload expectations)

<p><input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet Expectations <u>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.</u></p> <p>Area(s) of deficiency:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Meets expectations <u>Evidence: effective service at multiple organizational and professional levels appropriate to rank and seniority.</u></p> <p>Professional behavior:</p> <p>Department service:</p> <p>College service:</p> <p>University service:</p> <p>Professional organization service:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations <u>Evidence of areas of excellence and initiative:</u></p> <p>College/campus committee leadership:</p> <p>Professional organization leadership:</p> <p>Research, Teaching, or Extension/Outreach program leadership:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional <u>Evidence of extraordinary impact:</u></p> <p>Prestigious recognition (award, elected office, in professional society, etc.):</p> <p>Generosity of spirit in volunteering:</p> <p>Invited service on national program review:</p>
--	--	--	--

Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations**

Strengths/Weaknesses of Achievements, and Recommendations – Faculty Response**

**Insert separate page as needed