



## **AOP 13.24: ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW PROCESS**

### **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.

### **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 provides the opportunity for the faculty member to detail achievements accomplished in the previous year and set goals and objectives. The annual faculty review is a way for the department head to inform the faculty member about departmental or unit goals and the faculty member's role in achieving those goals. When the faculty member holds the rank of assistant or associate professor, the annual review will also address progress towards tenure and/or promotion. Accordingly, the annual faculty review process should be reviewed 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. The form is published at <https://www.provost.msstate.edu/faculty-evaluation-form>.

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 or director.
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 head/supervisor 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 head/supervisor, 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 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.

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 from **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.

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 judgment 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/supervisor 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/supervisor should provide an evaluation, reflecting the faculty member's progress towards promotion, tenure, and/or career goals.

If the head/supervisor 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/supervisor 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 faculty member will be provided with a copy of the final review, including all signatures.

## **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 of the faculty member's performance is negative, 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 and/or review was unfair, not objective, and/or reflects personal bias.
5. The annual reviewer's performance expectations are inconsistent with the limitations of the respective FTE assignments.
6. The annual review does not reflect a correlation between performance expectations and availability of necessary resources.

To request an additional review, the faculty member shall make a request that the dean review the document within 10 working days of signing the annual review. Within 10 working days, the dean should meet separately with the department head/supervisor 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 evaluation. The dean, based on his/her findings, may request a new review of the faculty member by the department head/supervisor or tenured faculty in the department of equal or higher rank.

## **Promotion and Tenure**

Faculty members may elect to include annual reviews in the Promotion and Tenure Packages as outlined in the Faculty Handbook (see section V. Promotion and Tenure Procedures).

## **REVIEW**

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

**REVIEWED:**

/s/ Peter Ryan 7/24/2023  
Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and  
Dean of the Graduate School Date

/s/ David Shaw 7/24/2023  
Provost and Executive Vice President Date

/s/ Robert Banik 7/24/2023  
President, Robert Holland Faculty Senate Date

/s/ Tracey N. Baham 7/24/2023  
Associate Vice President, Institutional Strategy & Effectiveness Date

/s/ Joan Lucas 7/24/2023  
General Counsel Date

**APPROVED:**

/s/ Mark E. Keenum 7/24/2023  
President Date