

## **ROBERT HOLLAND FACULTY SENATE UNCORRECTED MINUTES OF MARCH 12, 2010**

The Robert Holland Faculty Senate of Mississippi State University held its regular monthly meeting in the Coskrey Auditorium at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, March 12, 2010.

Members absent and excused were: George Adebisi, John Byrd, Sylvia Byrd, Ted Dobson, Jim Dunne, Gary Ervin, Robert Harland, Jeffery Haupt, Ken Hood, Vince McGrath, Charles Palmer, Peter Ryan, Wayne Wells

Members absent were: Dave Dampier, Tom Matney, Greg Munshaw, Rebecca Robichaux.

The meeting was called to order by the Senate President, Hart Bailey.

The minutes of the February 12, 2010, meeting were approved.

### **GUESTS**

#### **DR. JERRY GILBERT, ASSOCIATE PROVOST**

Dr. Gilbert said some things he wanted to do when he begins his new position as Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs was to establish a new era of cooperation between administration and faculty, to work with Dr. Keenum to carry out his vision for the university, and to carry out some ideas from the SCEI report. Initially, he plans to establish a task force for consolidating information technology, start a strategic planning project, and establish a task force to look at the funding model for AOCE. The textbook policy has been passed by IHL. MSU has appointed a textbook committee consisting of the associate deans of each college, the president and vice-president of the Faculty Senate, a representative from the bookstore, and several representatives from Student Affairs. The committee, chaired by Butch Stokes, will establish a campus textbook policy and implement the mandates set in the IHL policy. Dr. Gilbert said that many but not all recommendations from the SCEI report will be implemented – some rather quickly such as the Retirement Incentive and Benchmarking programs and some with lots of dialogue with affected departments. The StatePride program is an initiative between the athletic and academic departments to create a pool of money to be used to reward faculty. Requirements include matching the donation provided by the athletic department with private donations. Through this process we have discovered that not all faculty were assigned to a specific college or department, but this provides incentive to get each faculty member assigned to an “academic home.” Each college will take nominations to be reviewed by a committee of their peers to grant the awards.

#### **MR. THOMAS SELLERS, STUDENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT**

Mr. Sellers introduced himself to the Faculty Senate members and said his top priority as the new Student Association President was to increase the relationship with state lawmakers. He feels that this will help make higher education a top priority in Mississippi. He said some Student Association events coming up are: The Annual Movie Night at Davis-Wade Stadium, The 2<sup>nd</sup> annual Big Event – a community service project benefiting the city of Starkville, and Old Main Music Festival. Sellers also said he looks forward to working with the Faculty Senate on the implementation of the textbook policy.

## REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Faculty Senate Colleagues:

The month of February provided various opportunities for me to represent the Faculty on a number of committees. The President's Select Committee on Efficiencies and Innovations (SCEI) completed its report which was distributed to the campus on February 17th. The committee had been in effect for less than 115 days and the amount of effort committed by the group was remarkable. There were a total of 59 recommendations from the Committee which can be viewed and anonymously commented upon at <https://ssl3.msstate.edu/fs/scei/feedback/>. I would strongly urge each of you to review the document, provide your feedback and encourage your colleagues to do likewise. The comments will continue to be received until March 15th and then the process for further evaluation of each of the SCEI recommendations will begin. The Provost and Executive Vice President's Search committee interviewed five well qualified candidates on campus recently. The Faculty Senate was responsible for meeting with all the candidates for lunch and we had an excellent response for each event. I want to thank those of you that responded and were able to participate in the interviews. The Faculty Senate looks forward to working closely with the person that assumes the Provost and Executive Vice President's position on all matters important to MSU. Senate Vice President Meghan Millea, who also served on the SCEI, organized and conducted the Spring Roundtable last week. She incorporated two general topics from the SCEI report, consolidation and mergers as well as benchmarking, as the focus areas. From talking to those who participated, I believe the process provided a good platform for the start of the discussions of these critical issues. Certainly, it will allow for continued dialogue between all those involved in these matters. Interest in the event was strong, and I want to thank Dr. Millea for organizing the effort and express my appreciation to all those who volunteered to participate. The Senate was also asked to participate in a focus group meeting with Sasaki, the architectural firm developing the Campus Master Plan. In spite of a short lead time, the group of planners was very pleased with the Senators that participated and the responses you provided. These meetings were early in the planning process and there will be future opportunities for the MSU community to provide feedback, through a website, an office on Magruder St., and other meetings on campus. I will provide that information to you as I receive it. The MSU Student Association (SA) recently held their officer elections for the 2010-2011 year. Thomas Sellers, a senior from Canton, was elected SA President. The Faculty Senate congratulates Mr. Sellers and welcomes the opportunity to work with him over the next year on matters of importance to the SA and MSU.

The Senate will conduct its annual election of officers (President, Vice-President, and Secretary) at the April meeting. I will be sending out an email to that effect shortly. There are a number of different colleges that will be electing Senators in March and we will be welcoming those new Senators next month. We have a group of Senators, Greg Bentley, Dave Dampier, Eric Dibble, Gary Ervin, Burnette Hamil, Stephen Klein, Jason Lueg, Tom Matney, Meghan Millea, and Rebecca Toghiani who are completing their first term of service. I want to thank each of them for their dedication and effort in the Senate over the last three years. We also have three special Senators, Marita Gootee, Michael Brashier, and David Bridges, who are completing their second term and must cycle off the Senate for at least one year. Each one of these three faculty members has served the Senate in a very dedicated and diligent fashion through their six year tenures as active members and chairs of different committees. Their wisdom and counsel will be sorely missed. Please take a moment to thank each one of these individuals for their high level of service to the MSU community.

Respectfully submitted,  
R. H. "Hart" Bailey

President  
Holland Faculty Senate  
March 8, 2010

## VICE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

**President's Select Committee on Efficiencies and Innovations:** The SCEI completed its charge from the President and the report was released to the University community February 17th. Feedback is being collected via a link on the University homepage. **Academic Dean's Council** met February 15th. The March 1st meeting was canceled due to Provost Search.

Announcements: Master Planning is being conducted. (They were on campus and met with faculty on February 24th.)

Associate Provost, Dr. Gilbert described a schedule for fire drills; several will be conducted over spring break. Building inhabitants will be required to vacate the building during the drill.

Julie Fulgham, Interim Director of the Office of Institutional Research reported on graduation exit surveys.

The extended time limits for graduate degrees that passed the Graduate Council was presented to the Academic Deans for comment.

Dean of Arts and Sciences, Dr. Myers presented a program developed with ITS to reduce paper processes in that college.

Associate Provost, Dr. Gilbert circulated the Academic Amnesty for Graduate Students AOP XX.XX for comment.

There was significant discussion on the StatePride allocations to the colleges that are based on faculty.

**Traffic Committee** met on February 25th. Several agenda items were covered including:

The Wise Center Parking reverted to the all decals parking.

Parking citation fees were reviewed. A new schedule of fees was proposed by the Traffic Policy Committee. The list includes a new citation recommendation for student parking in staff lot.

**Spring Roundtable** was held on March 5th. The discussions covered the benchmarking exercise and merger/consolidations, both topics came from the SCEI report. A full report of the Roundtable will be filed with the Faculty Senate. Participants of the Roundtable included: **BENCHMARKING:** Administrators Faculty Senators General Faculty Dr. Glenn Steele Hart Bailey (facilitator) Julia Hodges Dr. Bill Kibler Jerry Emison Jan Taylor Dr. David Shaw Gary Ervin Michael Berk Cody Coyne Susan Diehl **CONSOLIDATIONS:** Administrators Faculty Senators General Faculty Mike McGrevey Meghan Millea (facilitator) Brendon Hale Greg Bohach Barry Stewart Louis Dawkins George Hopper Brian Rude Richard Baird Gary Myers Stephen Klein Devon Brenner President

Keenum spent half the day with the consolidations group and the other half of the day with the benchmarking group. Participants agreed that it was a productive day of dialogue.

**Provost Search:** Faculty Senators were invited to meet with the 5 candidates for the Provost and Executive Vice President position. Thanks to the Senators who were able to make those meetings.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Meghan Millea  
March 8, 2010

## **EMPLOYEE BENEFITS COMMITTEE**

In regards to an employee considering the Early Retirement Incentive assuming that they will be rehired after a waiting period, a Mississippi legislative bill is being considered to change the waiting period for re-hire to one year.

Dr. Gilbert said he was told that the waiting period had already been reduced to 90 days with the hope of a further reduction to 45 days.

**BUSINESS TO BE SENT TO COMMITTEES** **None**

## **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

#### **7.1.1 AOP 12.11 Degree Requirements - Undergraduate**

AOP 12.11 Degree Requirements -- Undergraduate was presented for consideration. A motion was made to approve AOP 12.11 Degree Requirements -- Undergraduate as presented by the Associate Deans Council. Motion passed.

#### **7.1.2 AOP 12.16 Academic Suspension and Dismissal**

AOP 12.16 Academic Suspension and Dismissal was presented for consideration. A motion was made to approve AOP 12.16 Academic Suspension and Dismissal as presented by the Associate Deans Council and modified by the Academic Affairs Committee. Motion passed.

**ANCILLARY AFFAIRS** **NO REPORT**

**CHARTER AND BYLAWS** **NO REPORT**

### **FACULTY AFFAIRS**

#### **7.2.1 AOP 13.22 – Guidelines for Adjunct Faculty, Visiting Faculty, Visiting Scholar and Visiting Executive Appointments**

AOP 13.22 Guidelines for Adjunct Faculty, Visiting Faculty, Visiting Scholar and Visiting Executive Appointments was presented for consideration. A motion was made to approve AOP 13.22 Guidelines for Adjunct Faculty, Visiting Faculty, Visiting Scholar and Visiting Executive Appointments as presented by the Associate Deans Council and modified by the Faculty Affairs Committee. Motion passed.

#### **7.2.2 Faculty Annual Review Process**

The Faculty Annual Review Process was presented for consideration. A motion was made to approve the Faculty Annual Review Process as presented by the Associate Deans Council and modified by the Faculty Affairs Committee. Motion passed.

### 7.3.3 Faculty Annual Review Form

The Faculty Annual Review Form was presented for consideration. After much discussion, the modifications to the document include:

- 1- A statement that the department faculty had to approve the revisions for changes in evaluation standards

*“Solicitation of comments and majority approval by the department faculty of all proposed changes must be in accordance with MSU Principles of University Governance guidelines and occur prior to January 1st of the year under review.”*

- 2- Signature lines were added to the annual evaluation form, related to a faculty member either not agreeing with an evaluation or a faculty member not agreeing with the evaluation and requesting an appeal.

*“THREE THE SIGNATURES LISTED MUST BE OBTAINED BELOW*

*Faculty Member:*

*I have met with the department head and acknowledge discussion of this appraisal.*

*Faculty Member Signature:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Comments Attached:*

*-1- Additional Information*

*Faculty Member Signature:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*-2- Appeal Requested*

*Faculty Member Signature:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Department or Unit Head:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Director or Dean:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*The faculty member will be provided with a copy the final review, including all signatures and all comments/ recommendations/ assessments. The faculty member reserves the right to respond to any comments and to have all of those responses included in the final version of the Faculty Annual Review/Evaluation.”*

- 3- The following statement: *“The department head/supervisor shall not impose standards that are inconsistent with or and do not exceed; the standard of the discipline or the department’s promotion/tenure documents. [i] standards of the department’s promotion and tenure documents; [ii] standards for an individual/ specific academic discipline; [iii] availability of necessary resources; [iv] respective FTE assignment; [v] finite opportunities existing within a given academic field; or a [vi] realistic level of expectation.”*

A motion was made to approve the Faculty Annual Review Form as presented by the Associate Deans Council and modified by the Faculty Affairs Committee and Faculty Senate. Motion passed.

**STUDENT AFFAIRS**

**NO REPORT**

**UNIVERSITY RESOURCES**

**NO REPORT**

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**None**

**OLD BUSINESS**

**None**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**None**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:42.

Submitted for correction and approval.

---

Dana Pomykal Franz, Secretary

## **Policy and Procedure**

### ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW PROCESS

#### **BACKGROUND**

Based on the spring survey of faculty conducted several years ago by the Robert Holland Faculty Senate, many faculty members expressed dissatisfaction with how annual reviews are conducted. Assigning numbers to faculty work was considered a particularly onerous practice. A great degree of variability existed between different departments in the way numerical scores were calculated and implemented for various purposes (e.g. merit salary increases -vs- promotion and tenure). Other concerns expressed by faculty included; [i] application in some units of an inflexible and inaccurate electronic reporting system; [ii] assignment of ratings for teaching/instruction equivalent to the average score on student teaching evaluations; [iii] use of evaluation criteria that were not presented to faculty in advance and sometimes involving application of arbitrary criteria; [iv] composition of annual reviews as a platform for insulting faculty member; [v] questionable significance of annual reviews in some departments or units; [vi] variability in appeals procedures across different colleges, if they existed or were allowed at all, and in general seemed to be ineffective; and [vii] incidences of administrative acknowledgement/recognition of non-employment related activities/responsibilities.

During the Holland Faculty Senate meeting in February, 2007 the Faculty Affairs Committee presented a draft document that was forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs which detailed ideas for the development and implementation of a framework for the annual review process in order to create greater consistency and accountability campus wide. The major recommended changes included; [i] increasing the correlation between Faculty Annual Reviews and Promotion and Tenure Departmental Guidelines (University P&T Article 7.3); [ii] Faculty Annual Reviews should focus on annual goals and objectives; and [iii] a true Faculty Annual Review Appeals Process should be formulated.

In developing these ideas, the committee met with Ruth Prescott from the Office of Academic Affairs and asked for advice from several department heads. The Office of Academic Affairs subsequently developed an AOP for Faculty Annual Reviews which was submitted to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate for inclusion in the January 2008 meeting. The first draft from the Office of Academic Affairs incorporated many of the suggestions from the Holland Faculty Senate, but not all of them. The Faculty Affairs committee submitted a revised draft that was intended to serve as a compromise. Reinserted was an appeals process instead of a simple review. Deleted was a verbal 5-step ranking process. The recommendation from the Faculty Affairs Committee at that time was to replace the 5 verbal rankings with a simple unsatisfactory, satisfactory or excellent system similar to the P&T document to which the annual reviews are supposed to be integrated with since the university P&T document stipulates that annual evaluations must be consistent with the promotion and tenure criteria for a department. After review by the Dean's Council, and Office of the Provost, all changes were accepted except for the proposed change from 5 to 3 verbal descriptors.

In the April 3, 2009 report from the Faculty Affairs Committee, it was recommended that all changes be accepted and the following 5 verbal descriptors be accepted

Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Good, Exemplary, and Superior

In letter dated July 13, 2009 that was received from Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Jerome Gilbert a request was extended to the Holland Faculty Senate to review the policies and

form pages currently utilized in the Faculty Annual Review process. On September 11, 2009, Holland Faculty Senate President Dr. Hart Bailey requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the process and reporting forms utilized to perform Faculty Annual Evaluations/Reviews and formal appeals on the MSU campus.

## DISCUSSION:

- 1- In the guidelines established for department heads/supervisors related to the appeals process for annual faculty reviews, it currently states:

*The department head/supervisor shall not impose standards that are inconsistent with or exceed the standard of the discipline or the department's promotion/tenure documents. Any changes in the annual review or in the standards must be provided to the faculty by the department head by January 1 of the year under review. Changes in the annual review process or the standards shall be sent to the faculty for comment before implementation.*

### Concerns with Suggested Revisions

- a- The statement regarding standards imposed by department heads/supervisors provides insufficient guidance or criteria, so the following amendment is proposed to provide greater clarification (changes suggested by Faculty Senate in **bold font**).

“The department head/supervisor shall not impose standards that are inconsistent with or ~~and do not~~ exceed; [i] standards of the department's promotion and tenure documents; [ii] standards for an **individual/specific academic** discipline; [iii] **availability of necessary resources; [iv] respective FTE assignment; [v] finite opportunities existing within a given academic field; or a [vi] realistic level of expectation.**”

- b- The mode of distribution department heads utilize to communicate proposed changes in evaluations standards has not been precisely described. Based on this consideration, it is recommended that the followed revisions be adopted (**bold font**):

#### Previous Version

Any changes in the annual review or in the standards must be provided to the faculty by the department head by January 1 of the year under review. Changes in the annual review process or the standards be sent to the faculty for comment before implementation.

#### Revision

Any changes in the annual review **process** or in the **evaluation** standards **proposed** by the department head **must be provided in both hardcopy and electronic format to all department faculty. Solicitation of comments and majority approval by the department faculty of all proposed changes must be in accordance with MSU Principles of University Governance guidelines and occur prior** to January 1<sup>st</sup> of the year under review.

- 2- The original criteria that have been applied to justify an appeal for a Faculty Annual Evaluation/Review can be perceived as narrow, vague or non-specific. In order to more effectively reflect legitimate reasons that warrant initiation of an appeal for a Faculty Annual

Evaluation/Review decision (rating) or assessment, it is proposed that “statement #5” and “statement #6” below serve as additional guidelines (**bold font**).

**-5- The annual review performance expectations exceed the limitations of the respective FTE assignments.**

**-6- The annual review does not reflect a correlation between performance expectations and availability of necessary resources.**

-3- The number and the type of verbal descriptors suggested for implementation in annual faculty reviews have varied substantially in recent years.

The Holland Faculty Senate Executive Committee is recommending that the 4 verbal descriptors listed below be applied in the revision of the Faculty Annual Review/Evaluation form but without the inclusion of any imprecise defining language.

**Unsatisfactory**  
**Needs Improvement**  
**Satisfactory**  
**Excellent**

-4- In some instances the true final version of faculty annual evaluations have not been forwarded to faculty for signature. Instead, instances have been reported where information has been added to annual faculty reviews at a later date following a faculty member’s signature and then subsequently been interpreted during the course of tenure and promotion evaluations performed at some future point in time.

To address these concerns, the revisions in **bold font** below are being proposed.

~~THREE~~ **THE SIGNATURES LISTED BELOW\* MUST BE OBTAINED BELOW**

Faculty Member:

I have met with the department head and **acknowledge discussion of this appraisal.**

Faculty Member Signature:\* \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments Attached:**

**-1- Additional Information**

**Faculty Member Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**-2- Appeal Requested**

**Faculty Member Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Department or Unit Head:\* \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Director or Dean:\* \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**The faculty member will be provided with a copy the final review, including all signatures and all comments/recommendations/assessments. The faculty member reserves the right to respond to any comments and to have all of those responses included in the final version of the Faculty Annual Review/Evaluation.**



## **ACADEMIC OPERATING POLICY AND PROCEDURE**

### ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW PROCESS

MEMORANDUM     Glen Steele  
TO:                 Interim Provost and Associate President for  
                         Academic Affairs

All Holders of Mississippi State University  
Academic Operating Policy and Procedure  
Manual

DATE:              March 12, 2010

SUBJECT:          Review: Faculty Annual Review Process

SOURCE:          Robert Holland Faculty Senate:  
                         Faculty Affairs Subcommittee

#### PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy and Procedure (AOP) is to promote our understanding of both standards and procedures concerning the annual review of faculty.

#### REVIEW:

This AOP will be reviewed every four years (or whenever circumstances require an earlier review) by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (APAA) with recommendations for revision to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

#### POLICY/PROCEDURE:

The annual review of faculty is an important part of the faculty member's professional development and of the university's need for regular assessment. The annual reviews may be part of the promotion/tenure, post-tenure review, and merit raise processes. As such, the annual review should be based on the faculty member's job description and offer letter along with any documented modifications to these items, goals and objectives stated in the previous annual review, and the department and college promotion and tenure documents.

The annual review is a way for the faculty member to detail achievements and for the department head or appropriate supervisor to inform the faculty member about the unit's or departmental goals and the faculty member's role in achieving those goals. Accordingly, the annual review process should be viewed as a positive process in the faculty member's career.

The Office of Academic Affairs will send to the faculty an annual review form for reporting their accomplishments over the last calendar year. Units may develop their own annual review forms. They must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs.

The focus of the annual review will be the discussion of the previous year's accomplishments and setting goals/objectives for the upcoming year. It will also address progress toward tenure and/or promotion in cases where the faculty member is at the assistant or associate professor level.

The annual review procedure shall be as follows:

- 1- The faculty member submits the annual evaluation form and contributing documents to the department head/supervisor.
- 2- The department head/supervisor shall write an evaluation of the faculty member, based on the evaluation form and supporting materials, providing the faculty member with a copy.
- 3- The faculty member and department head/supervisor shall discuss the previous year's accomplishments and goals and objectives for the current year.
- 4- The annual review signed by both parties shall be submitted to the dean.
- 5- If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the review, the faculty member will have ten working days after signing the annual review to request an additional review beyond the department head as outlined in this document.

Annual reviews shall be completed by March 15. If the department head has not completed the review by the deadline, the faculty member may request that the annual review be conducted by the dean. If the faculty member has not submitted an annual review, the department may complete the review process without the consent or cooperation of the faculty member. Either party, faculty member or department head, may request an extension of deadlines to the Office of Academic Affairs in extreme circumstances.

The department head/supervisor shall not impose standards that are inconsistent with or ~~and do not exceed; the standard of the discipline or the department's promotion/tenure documents.~~

***[i] standards of the department's promotion and tenure documents; [ii] standards for an individual/specific academic discipline; [iii] availability of necessary resources; [iv] respective FTE assignment; [v] finite opportunities existing within a given academic field; or a [vi] realistic level of expectation."***

Any changes in the annual review ***process*** or in the ***evaluation*** standards ***proposed*** by the department head ***must be provided in both hardcopy and electronic format to all department faculty. Solicitation of comments and majority approval by the department faculty of all proposed changes must be in accordance with MSU Principles of University Governance guidelines and occur prior*** to January 1<sup>st</sup> of the year under review.

Each year the faculty member and the head/supervisor shall identify goals and objectives for the coming year. These goals and objectives should be consistent with the faculty member's efforts towards tenure, promotion, and fulfilling the faculty member's career goals. The department head/supervisor should indicate in writing, whether in the opinion of the head/supervisor, the yearly goals and objectives are consistent with the career objectives of the faculty member and consistent with the overall goals of the department/unit. Department heads/supervisors must uphold the standings of promotion/tenure while respecting the faculty member's academic freedom.

In the written section of the annual review, the faculty member shall discuss progress on the previous year's goals and accomplishments. The department head and the faculty member shall discuss the faculty member's progress and include a written assessment of such in the annual review. The department head should provide an evaluation, reflecting the faculty member's progress towards promotion, tenure, and/or career goals.

If the head and the faculty member agree on the goals and objectives for the upcoming year and on the assessment of the previous year's accomplishments, both should sign the annual review form, completing the annual review process.

If the head and the faculty member cannot reach agreement on appropriate goals and objectives or on the assessment of the previous year's accomplishments, the nature of the disagreement should be detailed in addenda by the head and by the faculty member.

The annual review form shall have the following signature lines for the department head and for the faculty member:

"I agree with the annual review. Signature \_\_\_\_\_ See addenda [ ]

I disagree with the annual review. Signature \_\_\_\_\_ See addenda [ ]"

#### **Additional Review Requested by the Faculty Member**

The faculty member may request an additional review of the annual review document for the following reasons:

1. The process violated the standards set out in the department's promotion/tenure documents;
2. The expectations and standards applied are inconsistent with the goals and objectives set out in the previous year's evaluation.
3. The annual review is critical of the faculty member's performance, but offers no specifics on what was deemed inadequate or on how to overcome the points where the performance is below standards.
4. The process was unfair, not objective, and/or reflects personal bias.

**-5- *The annual review performance expectations exceed the limitations of the respective FTE assignments.***

**-6- *The annual review does not reflect a correlation between performance expectations and availability of necessary resources.***

The faculty member shall request within 10 working days of signing the annual review that the dean review the document. Within 10 working days the dean should meet separately with the department head and the faculty member to discuss the disagreement over the annual review. Within 10 working days, the dean will report back in writing to the faculty member the results of the meetings and his/her decision of agreement or disagreement with the department head's evaluation. The dean, based on his/her findings, may request a new review of the faculty member by the department head or tenured faculty in the department of equal or higher rank.

If either the faculty member or the administrators include annual reviews as part of the promotion and tenure process, all documents created under this A.O.P. shall be provided.

**Mississippi State University**  
**Faculty Annual Review Form**

For the period of January 1, \_\_\_\_\_ to December 31, \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Title and Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

Department/Unit: \_\_\_\_\_ School/College/Division: \_\_\_\_\_

The annual review will consist of a combination of the assessment of how well the faculty member met the annual goals for the review period and an assessment of the overall accomplishments of the faculty member. The faculty member must first complete Parts B and C, and then the department head must complete Part A. The confidentiality of these documents must be maintained by all parties involved.

**PART A.** To be completed by administrator conducting the review.

-1- Narrative assessment of how the faculty member performed in achieving the previous year's goals and objectives. State whether the achievement of the goals were ~~unsatisfactory, unsatisfactory, fails to meet expectations, needs improvement, needs improvement, does not meet all expectations~~, satisfactory, ~~satisfactory, meets expectations, or excellent, excellent, exceeds expectations, or superior greatly exceeds expectations~~. (Attach listing of goals from the previous year's review).

If the faculty member is an assistant or associate professor, there must be a statement about his or her progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

-2- Narrative assessment of previous year's accomplishments in the following areas as appropriate. State whether the faculty member's achievements were ~~unsatisfactory, unsatisfactory, fails to meet expectations, needs improvement, needs improvement, does not meet all expectations~~, satisfactory, ~~satisfactory, meets expectations, or excellent, excellent, exceeds expectations, or superior greatly exceeds expectations~~.

Assignment: Teaching \_\_\_\_\_ %; Research \_\_\_\_\_ %; Service or Extension \_\_\_\_\_ % = 100%

Teaching:

Advising undergraduates:

Advising Graduate students:

Research:

Service and outreach:

1. Overall assessment of the year's performance:
2. If the faculty member is an assistant or associate professor, there must be a statement about his or her progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

~~THREE~~ THE SIGNATURES LISTED BELOW\* MUST BE OBTAINED BELOW

Faculty Member:

I have met with the department head and **acknowledge discussion of this appraisal**

Faculty Member Signature:\* \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments Attached:**

**-1- Additional Information**

Faculty Member Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**-2- Appeal Requested**

Faculty Member Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Department or Unit Head:\* \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Director or Dean:\* \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**The faculty member will be provided with a copy the final review, including all signatures and all comments/recommendations/assessments. The faculty member reserves the right to respond to any comments and to have all of those responses included in the final version of the Faculty Annual Review/Evaluation.**

\* if disagreement is indicated, the faculty member must state the objection on the following page, otherwise, the page should be left blank. The disagreement statement should be completed before the dean signs above.

Disagreement Statement - To Be Completed by the Faculty Member If Applicable.

If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation of the department or unit head, an explanation of the disagreement should be detailed below by the faculty member. - This page should be blank if there is agreement with the department head's assessment. -

**PART B** – To Be Completed by the Faculty Member

**Faculty Member's Goals and Objectives for the Upcoming Year.**

1. Please list specific goals that you plan to accomplish in the next calendar year. These will be evaluated in the next review cycle.

Agreement:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Head

**PART C** – To Be Completed by the Faculty Member

**Previous Year's Accomplishments**

1. Previous year's accomplishments should be detailed below for each of the requested areas.

A. Teaching (See Faculty Handbook, Fall, '97, Section N, p. 34 and Section C.2, p. 53.)

1. Evidence of Quality of Instruction (check items submitted)

The faculty member is expected to provide material describing his/her teaching activities and documentation supporting effectiveness. This material could include any of the following, or any other items deemed appropriate (check those included):

student evaluations \_\_\_\_\_, measures of student success \_\_\_\_\_, peer reviews \_\_\_\_\_, department head review \_\_\_\_\_, recognition of outstanding teaching \_\_\_\_\_, developmental activities \_\_\_\_\_, self-evaluation of each course taught \_\_\_\_\_, instructional materials used: course outlines \_\_\_\_\_, test materials \_\_\_\_\_, other \_\_\_\_\_.

2. Academic Advisement

Undergraduate Advisees: \_\_\_\_\_. (number of students)

Master's students: major professor \_\_\_\_; minor professor \_\_\_\_; comm. member \_\_\_\_

Specialist students: major professor \_\_\_\_; minor professor \_\_\_\_; comm. member \_\_\_\_

Doctoral students: major professor \_\_\_\_; minor professor \_\_\_\_;

comm. member \_\_\_\_

Other:

Brief description of responsibilities

3. Courses initiated/innovations instituted/other teaching contributions  
(include new courses initiated, special lectures in other courses, generation of teaching aids, activities supportive of teaching, student achievements, other)
4. Other (including professional development)

**B. Research/Creative Activities** (See Faculty Handbook, Fall, '97, Section C.3, p. 53.)

1. Publications, performances or creative activities (note stage of development):  
(For books, indicate date of publication and publisher; for articles, indicate refereed journals; for art shows, indicate judged competition; for musical shows, attach copies of programs; for reports, indicate those done for in-house use.)
2. Professional papers read; indicate whether invited, refereed, or volunteered. Cite organization, date, and title:
3. Grants for research or study; submitted or awarded (cite source, title of project, role [PI, etc.], \$ amount, dates):
4. Other (including professional development):

**C. Service** (See Faculty Handbook, Fall, '97, Section C.4, p. 54.)

1. Public service, as lectures, short courses, workshops (dates, organizations and places):  
Off campus/on campus/extension projects
2. Professional association service (offices held, journals edited, etc.):  
(indicate only association in which you performed tasks)
3. University service (committees, administrative accomplishments, etc.):
4. School/departmental service/committees, etc.:
5. Other (including professional development):

**D. Relevant Activities and Accomplishments (not reported elsewhere)**

Cite title, organization, and brief description

1. Awards and distinctions
2. Memberships in learned and professional societies
3. Consulting activities
4. Other