College of Natural Science

Guidelines for Tenure System Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT)

Contents

Revised: November 2025

Introduction

As a research-intensive, land-grant university, Michigan State University (MSU) is committed to advancing scholarship, delivering exceptional education, and continually strengthening its academic excellence. Faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) represent some of the most consequential decisions the university makes towards this mission.

This document outlines the guidelines for RPT of tenure-system faculty in the College of Natural Science (NatSci). These processes align with university policies and incorporate college-specific elements designed to enhance transparency and provide stronger support for faculty candidates.

The following sections define the standards and criteria used to assess performance in assigned duties (typically research, teaching, and service/leadership) and recommend changes in rank or status. Consistently with the university's commitment to continuous academic advancement, NatSci follows a multi-level, multi-factorial evaluation process to review faculty progress since the last appointment action (reporting period) and assess potential for sustained scholarly growth and impact.

The dean, upon consultation with the college's RPT committee, makes the final RPT recommendation considering the university's best interests. This determination is made based on a comprehensive and compelling record demonstrating consistently high performance across assigned duties.

NatSci RPT Committee Policies and Procedures

Committee Membership

As outlined in the NatSci Bylaws, the college's RPT committee comprises tenured full professors representing each tenure-granting unit in the college (currently 11 departments). Unit representatives are selected using internally approved processes (typically by the department faculty or advisory committee). NatSci RPT Committee members are selected based on:
- their scholarly record,
- their disciplinary knowledge and experience, and
- their commitment to serving the college in this important role.

Service and Responsibilities

NatSci RPT committee members serve two-year terms, from January 1st to December 31st. College bylaws exclude service in two consecutive terms, unless justified and approved by the college's Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Development.

Committee members receive onboarding training in December, prior to the term's start, and commit to attending several meetings during the RPT season (January-February) and monthly meetings scheduled during the rest of the academic year. Duties include the review of RPT dossiers, requests for new hires with tenure, formative review of mid-career faculty, and consultations on other tenure system matters (e.g., extensions, delays), if needed.

Faculty serving in the college's RPT committee are charged with the objective evaluation of candidates according to university standards. They understand that they:
- represent the **college interest** (not department interest),
- are a **consulting** body to the dean, who makes the final recommendation, and
- must maintain the **confidentiality** of the cases discussed.

Meeting Logistics

Committee members are expected to attend all scheduled meetings. Special accommodations may be made to submit review via email, when approved by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Development. Meeting schedules, agendas, and process vary but typically include:
- Onboarding training in December before the start of the term on January 1st.
- Assignment of dossiers to review proportionally based on the number of applications and deadlines.
- Presentation, discussion, and vote on standard RPT cases in January and February, delayed actions early in the Fall, and new hires with tenure throughout the year.
- Recusal from the review of candidates sharing the same department affiliation or to address conflicts of interest.
- Chairs and/or directors may be called to meet with the committee to provide clarification on a particular case.
- Formative review of mid-career associate professors (members with shared affiliations as the candidates participate in this review).
- Five-year review of endowed professors and named chairs.
- Advice on other RPT matters, as requested by the college.

University-Level Standards

The college follows the Provost's recommendations for the evaluation of RPT cases. Updated information on these requirements, as outlined in the most recent Provost's RPT memorandum and the Faculty Handbook, can be found on the NatSci RPT website. The college applies these standards, criteria and expectations for the review of tenure system faculty in research, teaching, service/outreach, and conduct.

1) <u>Reappointment</u>:
   Record of progress toward becoming an expert of national and/or international stature, a solid teacher, and a contributing member of the unit, college, University and/or discipline.

2) <u>Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure</u>:
   A reasonably long period of sustained, outstanding achievements in scholarship, teaching and service across the mission, consistent with performance levels at peer universities.

   Sufficiently long record for predicting capacity to grow as an expert of national or international stature and sustain long-term, high-quality professional achievement and University service.

3) <u>Promotion to Full Professor</u>:
   A record of sustained disciplinary excellence and outstanding achievements in scholarship and education across the mission, consistent with performance levels at peer universities.

   Leadership within the department, college, and institution, and evidence of contributions to a flourishing intellectual life for those in the broader discipline, unit, college and Institution.

   Sufficiently long record for predicting capacity to continue to grow as an expert of national or international stature and sustain long-term, high-quality professional achievement and University service.

4) <u>All ranks</u>:
   Commitment to the highest standards of professional behavior, and the enablement of a culture and climate that is respectful of all individuals, consistent with University's core values.

College-level Standards

The tenure track at MSU consists of two consecutive probationary appointments, each with mandatory reviews for reappointment and for promotion to associate professor with tenure at the department/college/institution levels. Tenured associate professors undergo a similar review for promotion to the full professor rank but without a mandatory timeline. Criteria and standards for each review step vary and reflect the expected growth of the candidate's scholarly impact and leadership roles at each rank.

Regardless of the review stage, **all candidates are expected to uphold MSU's core values of integrity, conduct, and inclusive excellence.** Thus, the RPT review will evaluate evidence in the dossier that demonstrates the candidate's commitment to:
- the highest standards of professional behavior, and
- contributions to the enablement of a culture and climate that is respectful of all individuals and promotes access, opportunity, and excellence.

Reappointment to a second probationary appointment

Each reappointment recommendation should be based on clear evidence that a record is being established of progress toward becoming a scholar of national and/or international stature, a solid teacher, and a contributing member of the unit, college, university, and/or discipline.

Research

Successful candidates for reappointment will demonstrate excellent progress toward establishing a productive, sustainable, high-quality program of research at MSU.The candidate's laboratory or other needed research facilities and infrastructure should be established and functioning. If this has been delayed by circumstances beyond the candidate's control, the department should document the delay. If the delay is substantial, the candidate should request an extension of the tenure clock as soon as the duration of the delay is known.

The candidate's research program should be established with well-defined research directions. In most fields, Ph.D. students, post-doctoral fellows, and/or other research staff should be working with the candidate. In fields in which supervision of Ph.D. students by assistant professors is not the disciplinary norm, the candidate should demonstrate successful research interaction with graduate students in other ways.

Competitive, external research funding is available in most of the disciplines in the College of Natural Science and is usually necessary to support a research program of the quality and impact expected at MSU. External research funding at a level appropriate for the candidate's discipline should be in place. In most fields the candidate should have submitted proposals for competitive, external research funding within the first two years and have continued to aggressively pursue such funding. If such funding is not in place at the time of reappointment, proposals for funding beginning the 4th year should have been submitted. In these cases, the department should submit a funding update to the college in January of the candidate's 4th year. In a few fields, obtaining independent external funding is not expected of assistant professors, either because funding is not available or is awarded to large research collaborations. In these cases, this must be clarified and understood by the candidate, department, and college at the time the candidate is hired and should be documented in the reappointment materials.

New publications from work completed in previous positions, including graduate school and post-doctoral positions, that are published or in press should be reported.

Strong papers based on research done at MSU should have been published or submitted to leading journals. Development of a leading, independent research program is a very important criterion for reappointment. Demonstrated independence from previous mentors, such as Ph.D. and post-doctoral advisors, is essential, although collaborations can continue. In most fields, a substantial proportion of the publications originating from MSU should be based on research for which the candidate is the intellectual leader. In fields in which research is done primarily in large national and international teams, the department must document the candidate's leadership in the collaboration and the significance and impact of the candidate's contributions.

Collaborative research is highly valued at MSU. If results from collaborative projects of any type are a substantial component of the case for reappointment, the candidate and department should document the candidate's leadership role in them.

National visibility is critical, and the candidate should have a growing number of invitations to speak at professional meetings or leading universities and research organizations as well as contributed conference presentations based on research done at MSU.

Teaching/Student Engagement

The candidate should demonstrate success in classroom teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The candidate should maintain a teaching portfolio, and the department or program should effectively advance the candidate's teaching skills through evaluation of the teaching portfolio, classroom visits by peer evaluators, assignment of a teaching mentor, and annual review by the chair or director.

The candidate's teaching portfolio should include[1] a syllabus and a representative assessment tool (e.g. quiz or homework assignment) from three separate courses (fewer, if less than three courses have been taught), up to three one-page summaries of examples of teaching excellence, and a summary list of contributions to the teaching culture. Contributions to teaching culture should include evidence of efforts at enhancement of classroom teaching (such as attendance at college and university programs related to instruction and results of mentoring interactions), and demonstration of effective engagement with undergraduate or graduate students on an individual basis such as undergraduate advising, supervision of undergraduate research, advising of student organizations, or participation on graduate committees.

Departments should keep records of SIRS or SPLS scores (or equivalent) for all courses, and of peer evaluation by members of the candidate's unit.

Service/Leadership

Beginning assistant professors should not be overly burdened with internal service activities, but should demonstrate growing contributions to departmental, college or university committees.

The candidate should provide evidence of developing disciplinary leadership and service as demonstrated by, for instance, reviewing of papers and research proposals, significant roles in professional societies, session or conference organization, or other professional service and leadership activities.

Timing of Review for Reappointment to a second probationary appointment

Review for reappointment normally takes place in the candidate's third year as a tenure track assistant professor at MSU or in rank in a comparable position at another university. It is important that the University have as complete a picture of a candidate's record as possible at

---

[1] See **NatSci Teaching Evaluation Guidelines** in the [NatSci RPT website](#).

the time of reappointment review, and therefore reappointment review prior to the third year in rank is discouraged. If a candidate does want to be reviewed for reappointment prior to their third year in rank, they must abide by the decision that is made (i.e., they cannot be reviewed again the next year if reappointment is not successful).

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The standard for promotion to associate professor is demonstrated excellence in research, teaching, and leadership/service and convincing evidence that a comparable level of performance will continue after promotion.

Research

An essential criterion for promotion to associate professor with tenure in the college is demonstrated stature as one of the leading researchers nationally and internationally in the candidate's field and career cohort. This stature must be demonstrated by outstanding research publications, on-going competitive external research funding, and strong letters of review from leading senior researchers who are independent of the candidate.

The record of publication must constitute a body of research of high quality and of sufficient quantity to demonstrate a leading and highly productive research program with strong and growing national/international impact. These publications should be based on work at Michigan State University or at other institutions where the candidate previously held a comparable position. They should be published or accepted for publication in leading peer-reviewed scientific journals and comparable outlets. Demonstrated independence from previous mentors such as Ph.D. and post-doctoral advisors is essential, and independent scientific leadership must be demonstrated. In most fields a substantial majority of the publications based on work done after appointment at MSU or at other institutions where the candidate previously held a position of comparable rank, should be from the candidate's research program with the candidate as the intellectual leader. Exceptions to these criteria, such as in fields where very large teams are needed for important progress to be made, must be agreed to at the time the candidate is hired and documented in the promotion materials.

Competitive, external research funding is available in most of the disciplines in the College of Natural Science and is usually necessary to support a research program of the quality and impact expected at MSU. External funding must be at a level sufficient to support an on-going research program and in keeping with disciplinary norms for excellent research programs in the candidate's field. Funding should be in place to support continuing research after promotion, or the candidate should have a track record of significant external funding, with applications pending at the time of review. Independent scientific leadership is expected, and in most fields the candidate should have obtained on-going funding as principal investigator. In a few fields, obtaining independent external funding is not the disciplinary norm. In these cases, this must be clarified and understood by the candidate, department, and college at the time the candidate is hired and documented in the promotion materials.

Collaborative research is also highly valued. Each candidate should clearly identify their role in any collaborative projects, provide evidence of a substantial role in each major collaboration and describe their unique contribution to it, such as technical expertise or intellectual leadership. If collaborative funded research is a substantial component of the justification for promotion, the candidate's role in obtaining the funding and undertaking the research should be described. Explanatory letters (up to two) can help clarify the intellectual role of the candidate in the collaboration.

The candidate must show a clearly defined direction for leading research after promotion as demonstrated by, for instance, on-going research projects, funding sustainability, publications in preparation, on-going external funding, statements in letters of evaluation, and discussion in the candidate's research narrative in the promotion documents.

National visibility is critical. The candidate should have a substantial number of invitations to speak at professional meetings or leading universities and research organizations and a growing number of submitted conference presentations based on research done at MSU.

Teaching/Student Engagement

An essential criterion for promotion with tenure is demonstrated effectiveness at successfully engaging undergraduate and graduate students in the classroom, through individual research supervision, or in less formal settings.

Generally, the candidate should demonstrate success at classroom teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The candidate should maintain a teaching portfolio (see footnote 1 above), and the teaching portfolio should include evidence of efforts at enhancement of classroom teaching such as attendance at college and university programs related to instruction and results of mentoring interactions, and demonstration of success in engaging undergraduate and graduate students on an individual basis.

The department or program should effectively promote the candidate's teaching skills through evaluation of the teaching portfolio, classroom visits by a peer evaluator, assignment of a teaching mentor, and annual review by the chair or director. The teaching portfolio, peer evaluations, and SIRS scores should provide evidence that effective action was taken to improve teaching, if warranted, including correcting any significant deficiencies noted in departmental evaluations during the first years of a candidate's appointment.

In most fields, the candidate should show effective mentoring of graduate students as demonstrated by supervision of students who have completed a Ph.D. or are well advanced toward completion of their dissertation. Comparable supervision and placement of post-doctoral fellows is equivalent.

The candidate should also provide evidence of successful student engagement in less formal ways. These may include but are not limited to undergraduate advising, supervision of undergraduate research, advising of student organizations, and participation on graduate committees.

Service/Leadership

All tenured faculty members must be able to effectively support the internal academic functions of the University and significantly impact the national/international scientific environment. Candidates for this promotion must demonstrate leadership abilities in these areas.

Assistant professors should not be overly burdened by internal service responsibilities, but candidates should demonstrate effectiveness in this area by an increasing level of successful service at the department level over the probationary period. The candidate must be demonstrably prepared to effectively take on the service and leadership responsibilities of a tenured faculty member.

Candidates should be demonstrably prepared to take on disciplinary leadership as shown, for instance, by leadership in scientific societies and other organizations, substantial engagement with funding organizations such as proposal reviewing and panel participation, reviewing of research papers, and organization of symposia or meetings.

Timing of Review for Promotion to Associate Professor

Review for promotion to associate professor with tenure normally takes place in the candidate's 6th year as a tenure track assistant professor at MSU or in rank in a comparable position at another university. It is important that the University have as complete a picture of a candidate's record as possible at the time of promotion review. Thus, reviews prior to the 6th year will be undertaken only for compelling reasons. Departments should contact the college before beginning a review prior to the 6th year.

Extension of the Tenure Clock

Extensions of the tenure clock may be granted under the procedures and criteria of the university. Extensions should be requested as soon as the triggering reason is known (for instance, birth of a child, family emergency, or delay in preparation of adequate laboratory space). Extensions will not be granted within two years of the promotion review unless the triggering event occurs within that time period. Information about automatic and non-automatic extensions and the process to submit such requests can be found in the NatSci webpage [Extending the Tenure Clock](#).

Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to the rank of professor requires the candidate to have demonstrated outstanding performance in research, teaching, and leadership/service and to be demonstrably prepared to take on the intellectual and organizational leadership expected at this rank.

Research

An essential criterion for this promotion is demonstrated stature as one of the leading researchers nationally and internationally in the candidate's field.

This must be demonstrated by continued publication of outstanding research in leading peer reviewed scientific journals and other high-impact outlets, on-going competitive external research funding sufficient to support a leading research program, and strong letters of review from leading researchers.

Since the previous promotion, the candidate should have published a body of high-impact research of sufficient quality and quantity to demonstrate national/international scientific leadership.

The candidate should have obtained continuing, competitive external funding at a level sufficient to support a strong, on-going research program at a level commensurate with disciplinary norms for leading research programs. Funding should be in place to support continuing research after promotion. In most disciplines, the candidate should have a demonstrated record of external competitive funding as principal investigator. In a few fields, obtaining independent external funding is not the disciplinary norm. In these cases, this must be clarified and understood by the candidate, department, and college early in the candidate's career and documented in the promotion materials.

Collaborative research is also highly valued. Candidates should clearly identify their role in any collaborative project, and evidence of a substantial role in each major collaboration and the candidate's unique contribution to it (such as technical expertise or intellectual leadership) should be clearly described and recognizable. If collaborative funded research is a substantial component of the justification for promotion, the candidate should have demonstrated strong leadership in obtaining the funding.

The candidate must show a clearly defined direction for leading research after promotion as demonstrated by, for instance, on-going research projects, publications in preparation, on-going external funding, statements in letters of evaluation, and discussion in the candidate's narrative in the promotion documents.

There should be a continuing and substantial number of invitations to speak at national and international conferences and leading universities and research organizations, as well as invited contributions to meetings and other venues.

Teaching/Student Engagement

An essential criterion for this promotion is demonstrated, continuing effectiveness in engaging undergraduate and graduate students in the classroom, through research supervision, and in less formal settings.

The candidate should demonstrate success at classroom teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The candidate should maintain a teaching portfolio (see footnote 1 above), and the teaching portfolio should include evidence of efforts at enhancement of classroom teaching (such as attendance at college and university programs related to instruction and results of mentoring interactions), and a demonstration of success in engaging undergraduate and graduate students on an individual basis.

The department or program should effectively promote the candidate's teaching skills through evaluation of the teaching portfolio, classroom visits by peer evaluators, assignment of a teaching mentor, and/or annual review by the chair or director. The teaching portfolio, peer evaluations, and SIRS scores should provide evidence of effective, continuous efforts to improve teaching.

The candidate should show effective mentoring of graduate students as demonstrated by supervision and strong placement of students who have completed a Ph.D. Comparable supervision and placement of post-doctoral fellows is equivalent. In some fields, Ph.D. supervision by associate professors is not the national norm. In these cases, this should be clarified and understood by the candidate, department, and college at the time the candidate is hired, documented in the promotion materials, and there should be strong evidence of effective engagement with undergraduate or graduate students on an individual basis.

The candidate should also provide evidence of continuing successful student engagement in less formal ways. These may include but are not limited to undergraduate advising, supervision of undergraduate research, advising of student organizations, and participation on graduate committees.

Service/Leadership

This promotion requires demonstration of effective leadership within the academic sphere of the university and at the national/international level. Within the university, the candidate must show successful, continuing leadership and service contributions at the department level and the capacity to play a leadership role within the university. The candidate should show continuing national/international leadership through, for instance, significant roles in scientific societies and other organizations, substantial engagement with funding organizations such as proposal reviewing and panel participation, and organization of scientific meetings.

Timing of Promotion to Professor

The timing of the review for promotion to professor is less well defined than that for promotion to associate professor. Under normal circumstances, several years are needed to develop the

necessary record and predict capacity for continued growth and impact. Promotions soon after promotion to associate professor require compelling justification. Evaluations undertaken prior to the end of the candidate's fifth year as tenured associate professor should be discussed with the college prior to being initiated.

External Evaluators

External evaluations by highly qualified researchers are a critical component of the reviews for promotion to associate professor and professor. They may be obtained but are not required for the 3rd year reappointment. The purpose of the external letters is to help evaluate the quality, significance, and impact of candidate's research regarding both the specific research area and the discipline overall, and to help the review committees in evaluation of the candidate's national/international stature. Thus, letters should be obtained from a range of knowledgeable individuals with the objective of evaluating both the specifics of the candidate's research and its broader disciplinary impact.

At least *four evaluative* letters should be obtained from individuals who are demonstrably disciplinary leaders at peer institutions or comparable research organizations such as national laboratories or leading corporate research laboratories. While there can be no definitive list of peer institutions, research-intensive universities of international scope such as the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA)[2] institutions normally constitute our peers. At most two letters may be from people holding the rank of associate professor, and these must be strongly justified. For promotion to professor, letters should not be solicited from individuals at the associate professor level.

Reviews from individuals who are independent of the candidate are essential and carry the most weight. Thus, **letters from previous mentors (e.g., graduate or post-doctoral advisors) should not be solicited**. In a few fields that involve very large national or international collaborations, the best reviewers are often members of the collaboration team, and evaluative letters from such individuals are acceptable. The relationship of each reviewer to the candidate, if any, must be clearly detailed in the description of the referees' credentials.

For individuals who work in smaller interdisciplinary research groups funded by shared external grants or in collaborative teams, *two explanatory* letters from colleagues who can describe the intellectual role and significance of the candidate's contribution to the program may also be included. Such letters are not meant to supplant evaluative letters from non-conflicted reviewers, but to clarify the contributions or independence of individuals working in highly collaborative programs. No more than two explanatory letters from research collaborators within the past three years should be solicited.

To solicit letters, the candidate should submit a list of at least six potential evaluative referees who meet the criteria outlined above; there is no limit to the number of names on the candidate's list. The candidate should be told of the criteria for selection of referees prior to developing the recommendation list but should not contact the referees nor be aware of the identities of those chosen. The candidate may also designate a few referees they would prefer not to review their case, indicating why. The department may solicit letters from individuals who are not on the candidate's list, provided they meet the criteria described above. *The department should obtain a minimum of two letters from the candidate's list* but all can be from the candidate's lists.

To the extent possible, strive for a diverse cohort of referees and expertise when obtaining external letters. If unable to secure some reviewers, state the reasons why in the External Letters Summary table from the Form on Excellence and Progress.

---

[2] University of Chicago; University of Illinois; Indiana University; University of Iowa; University of Maryland; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota; University of Nebraska/Lincoln; Northwestern University; Ohio State University; Pennsylvania State University; Purdue University; Rutgers University; University of Wisconsin-Madison.

To ensure that evaluations are as useful as possible, the letters requesting the evaluation must contain the following:

- **MSU confidentiality statement**: "Your letter of evaluation, as part of an official review file, will be held in confidence and will not be disclosed to the faculty member under consideration or to the public except as required by law or University policy. In all such instances, the information made available will be provided in a form that seeks to protect the identity, privacy, and confidentiality of evaluators."
- A request to disclose any potential **conflicts of interest**.
- A description of the **candidate's assignment**, including, for example, the percentage of the appointment devoted to research/creative activities, teaching, service, etc.
- Statement regarding **peer institutions**: "Your evaluation will be most helpful if it explains the candidate's contributions to advancing their discipline and evidence of leadership in their scholarly and professional endeavors, consistent with expectations for tenure and promotion at MSU and those of our peer institutions."
- The **candidate's evaluation materials**: CV, reflective essay[3], and a representative sample of the candidate's scholarly work.

External letters of reference must be submitted on institutional letterhead and carry the evaluator signature. Scanned letters with electronic signatures are acceptable. All letters solicited and received through all media must be included in the promotion materials. Unsolicited letters will not be included in the review materials.

Suggested template for invitations to letter writers in AY25-26

Dear Dr. **[X]**,
The **[department]** at Michigan State University is considering **[candidate]** for promotion to **[associate professor with tenure / full professor]**. We would like to obtain your candid and confidential evaluation of [candidate's] scholarship and contributions to the advancement of their discipline. **[Candidate's]** appointment is **[x]**% research, [**y**]% teaching, and **[z]**% service. [Unit/college expectations for promotion with tenure]

Attached are **[candidate's]** CV, reflective essay, and a sample of [the candidate's] scholarly work. Your evaluation will be most helpful if it explains the candidate's contributions to advancing their discipline and evidence of leadership in their scholarly and professional endeavors, consistent with expectations for tenure and promotion at MSU and those of our peer institutions, as outlined in the most recent RPT memorandum from the Provost **[enclose to guide the external reviewer]**. Please do not make any specific comparisons to peers; rather, highlight the candidate's accomplishments in research, teaching, and service/leadership. In addition, MSU will consider faculty engagement in efforts that advance strategic goals of access, opportunity, and excellence. Commitment to the highest standards of professional behavior, and the enablement of a culture and climate that is respectful of all individuals are also viewed as a metric for advancement.

To maintain the schedule of the review, it would be helpful to receive your letter by **[date],** and we will gladly accept a reply sent earlier if that is possible for you. We welcome electronic responses. If you plan to email your review, please send it on your letterhead, signed (PDF

---

[3] The candidate may submit either the 5-page reflective essay required in the Form on Progress and Excellence or a different reflective essay that is written for experts in the disciplinary field of research. The former allows referees to evaluate not only research, but also teaching and service, enhancing the review.

preferred but Word document also acceptable with electronic signature). Please address it to [person] and email it to [email address].

[MSU confidentiality statement]. Please also describe your prior interactions with the candidate and disclose any potential conflicts of interest.

I recognize the time and effort it takes to prepare recommendations for promotion and tenure, and on behalf of the University, I would like to express our deep appreciation for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Promotion Package Checklist

Instructions

NatSci RPT packages are a bookmarked PDF file consisting of [Form on Progress and Excellence](#) (form PE, formerly form D) plus additional items assembled within the form in the order specified below. The RPT candidate initiates the process, completing the necessary parts (**color-coded** below), before the internal review in the department/unit and, finally, the independent review by the supervisor.

- The **RPT candidate** adds required content to the form and provides the department/unit with the completed sections and other required materials:
  - PDF files for part IV of the Form PE (as indicated by the asterisks* and highlighted in red shade below) and their CV.
  - A teaching portfolio for the Chair to review and complete the [Teaching Portfolio Assessment Tool](#) (the teaching portfolio is NOT to be included in the dossier – see section #5).
- The **chairperson/director** follows unit's process to evaluate the candidate's materials and provides an independent assessment of accomplishments in research, teaching, and service. The latter can be done as a separate letter and one-page addendum (#4) integrated into form PE after parts I-III.
- The *single, searchable* PDF file with each section bookmarked is sent to NatSci.RPT@msu.edu by December 1st. The chair's letter is simultaneously shared with the faculty candidate.

Sections and assembly order

☐ 1. [Form PE-I](#): Completed cover sheet

☐ 2. [Form PE-IA](#): Additional information
- A summary of *committee votes* must be recorded.
- Complete the *External Review Letters* summary table.
- List all referees from whom letters were requested, whether or not they provided an evaluation.
- Include a brief assessment of referee's relationship to candidate, including potential conflicts of interest.
- If the reviewer did not provide a letter, describe the reasons if known.
- Do not include full vitas, web pages, or other bulky information about the referees.

☐ 3. [Form PE-II](#): Summary information
- For the summary ratings, the comparison group is faculty at AAU Research 1 universities at the same career stage.
- Assignment of time should accurately reflect the candidate's situation.
- The letter from the chair or director (see #4) and the letter from the dean **substitute** for the summary statements in this section. Type "See attached letter" in PE-II, part 1.

☐ 4. [Letter from the chair/director and one-page Addendum](#)
Description and detailed analysis of the candidate's case and justification for the RPT decision.

- The chair's letter should provide a **reasoned discussion** of the candidate's accomplishments based on evidence in the dossier.
  - The letter should describe how the candidate's accomplishments meet the RPT criteria for the *rank and discipline* and why it is in the best interest of the university to make the reappointment or promotion. (See the letter templates provided by the college for each review type in Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) website.)
  - It should not be a reprise of the material in other sections but focused on addressing strengths and weaknesses in the case and justifying the RPT recommendation.
  - Do NOT include **confidential information** in the letter; use instead a **one-page Addendum**. The letter will be shared with the candidate at the same time the dossier is submitted to the college. Hence, *the evaluation of research should not contain quotes from the external letters* nor report sensitive and potentially identifiable information about faculty votes and referees.
  - For candidates with **joint appointments**, this letter should be prepared and signed by the chairs and directors of all units in which the candidate holds a more than 0% time appointment, and the addendum should report the votes of all relevant faculty committees.
- Use the **one-page Addendum** to include confidential/sensitive information about the referee's letters and unit's votes reported in Form PE-Ia (see #2).
  - The addendum should also describe the composition and size of the faculty body which voted on this issue and specify the number of faculty who voted for, against, abstained, or were absent in this vote.
  - In addition, if some faculty members voted against or abstained in this vote, the addendum should explain the concerns raised during the discussion.

☐ 5. Form PE-IIIA: Evaluation of instruction
- A 1-2 page narrative describing the **nature and quantity** of the candidate's formal teaching responsibilities and evaluating the **quality of instruction**.
- The description of teaching responsibilities needs to consider:
  - which courses did the candidate teach?
  - at which time(s)?
  - what was the nature of the course (e.g. lecture, seminar discussion, or lab)?
  - and what was their level of responsibility (e.g. were they solely responsible or did they share responsibility with others)?
  - Include here an explanation of any *shared* teaching responsibilities.
- The NatSci guidelines for teaching evaluation explain that the summary evaluation must cover each of the following aspects of teaching quality, based on the department's review of 1) student evaluations, 2) peer evaluations, and 3) the candidate's teaching portfolio:
  - Clear and appropriate objectives.
  - Competence in the classroom.
  - Evidence of excellence.
  - Contributions to teaching culture
- The evaluation of the SIRS and SPLS scores (or equivalent) must include an analysis of student comments, and a comparison to scores submitted for (the same or comparable) courses taught by others. Numerical SIRS (or equivalent) data should be compiled by the Unit/Department and appended to the candidate's contribution in Form PE-IVA, "*Instructional Data*" (section #11 below).

- The evaluation must also include a summary analysis of peer classroom observations with a description of the process by which the teaching evaluation was performed, including who did the evaluations and when.
- The evaluation will also summarize the quality of the **candidate's Teaching Portfolio**. There is no specific format for the teaching portfolio. However, all faculty are expected "to maintain a teaching portfolio consisting of three sets of materials provided by the faculty members themselves":
  - Syllabi & representative assessments (e.g. quiz or homework assignments) from 3 separate courses (fewer, if less than three courses have been taught).
  - Examples of excellence (up to 3 one-page summaries of examples of teaching excellence).
  - Summary of contributions to the teaching culture.
- The teaching portfolio is NOT to be included in the NatSci dossier. It should be retained by the department and be made available upon request by the NatSci RPT committee.

☐ 6. Form PE-IIIB: Evaluation of research and creative activities
- This section should both describe and evaluate the ***impact*** of the candidate's research on the discipline and scientific community at large.
- It should address all aspects of research and should ***cite evidence*** to justify the evaluation provided.
- It should not contain quotes from the external letters (use Addendum for this).

☐ 7. Form PE-IIIC: Evaluation of service
- This should address all aspects of service and leadership described in the criteria above.

☐ 8. Form PE-IIID: Evaluation of candidate's special foci (additional reporting, if any)

☐ 9. Form PE-IVA item 1: Undergraduate and graduate credit instruction (table)
- Under "Number of Sections Taught", list the number of classroom, discussion, or laboratory hours that the candidate was personally responsible for based on a standard 15-week semester.
  - For example, for a course that meets 3 hours per week and for which the candidate was solely responsible, list 45. If responsibility was shared equally with two other colleagues, list 15, etc.
  - *Do not* report classroom, discussion, or laboratory hours taught independently by teaching assistants, even if the candidate is the class coordinator.
- Under "*Number of Students*", list only the students registered in the classroom, discussion, or laboratory section(s) taught personally by the candidate.
- *Do not list reading or research, or guest lectures in courses in this table.* Reading or research course supervision should be included and described in item 3, "Academic Advising", and guest lectures should be listed in item 2, along with other "Non-Credit Instruction".

☐ 10. RPT Numerical student evaluation summaries (SIRS and SPLS tables)
- Unit compiles numerical SIRS and SPLS data in the corresponding tables (provided in this document and in the NatSci RPT promotion website) and appends them here.
- Comparable scores are OPTIONAL.
- Copies of the SIRS or SPLS summary forms for individual courses should ***not*** be included in this packet. They are to be kept on file in the unit and made available to the college, if requested.

☐ 11. Form PE-IVA item 2: Non-credit instruction

☐ 12. Form PE-IVA item 3: Advising and mentoring
- **Section a:** Academic advising
- **Section b:** Undergraduate advisees
- **Section c:** Graduate/professional advisees (e.g., masters, doctoral, and professional advisees

☐ 13. Form PE-IVA item 4: Instructional works

☐ 14. Form PE-IVA item 5: Other evidence of instructional activities

☐ 15. Form PE-IVB: Research and creative activities
- **Section 1:** Author contributions **during the reporting period** such as books, book chapters, articles, book chapters, reviews/commentaries/perspectives, and papers/presentations from learned professional organizations and societies (including *published* conference proceedings).
  - For each work, provide complete authorship in published order, the title, journal or venue of publication, date, and pages should be included.
  - Flag peer-reviewed works (*) and items with a significant outreach component (**).
  - Identify lead author in multi-authored work (e.g., underline) and candidate's PhD or postdoctoral advisors (*e.g., titles in italics*).
  - Highlight publications with MSU undergraduate, graduate, or postdoctoral trainees. This can be done as an annotation in the list of publications, in a table describing presentations, publications, and awards received by the candidate's trainees, or any other format that clearly indicates publications with MSU trainees.
  - Provide disciplinary context and/or explanations[4].

- **Section 2:** Table listing the number of research and creative works produced during the reporting period and during career.

- **Section 3:** Number of grants received during the reporting period and during career.

- **Other evidence of research/creative activity:** Any work reported that does not clearly fit one of the above categories should be identified here, indicating the nature of the scholarship and the extent of peer review.
  - Seminars, colloquia, invited papers; works/grants in progress or under review (refer to Form D-IVE).
  - Patents; formation of research-related partnerships with organizations, industries, or communities.
  - Curatorial and patient care activities, etc.
  - Evidence of peer recognition (within and outside the university; e.g., keynote talk, editor's article pick, journal's spotlight section).
  - All conference presentations (whether they correspond to a published contribution to proceedings or not), as well as seminars and colloquia presented at universities, should be included here.

---

[4] Members of the NatSci RPT committee represent the full range of disciplines within the college and appreciate a brief explanation by the candidate about **disciplinary norms for order of authorship** on publications (e.g., lead PI is the last author, authors are in alphabetical order, conference proceedings are peer reviewed, etc.). Candidates are also encouraged to highlight most (3-5) significant publications and their **contributions to the published work** and **significance to the field**. This can be done as an annotation in the list of publications and/or in the research reflective essay.

☐ 16. NatSci funded grants table

Use table template from this document or download it from the [NatSci RPT promotion](#) website to list all the candidate's funded grants (only those funded).

Report the following in order: title, principal investigator, all co-principal investigators (unless prohibitively many), awarding agency, effective dates, total amount awarded, total **amount awarded to the candidate**, whether these amounts include indirect costs or not, and the nature of the **candidate's participation** in the grant *if not PI*.

☐ 17. Form PE-IVC: Service

Include information related to disciplinary and institutional leadership and service.

☐ 18. Form PE-IVD: Additional reporting (if any).

☐ 19. Form PE-IVE: Grant proposals

List ALL grant proposals submitted during the reporting period, whether they were funded, not funded, or are pending.

☐ 20. Reflective essay

Five-page maximum essay on accomplishments during reporting period.

- Highlight <u>how</u> **accomplishments** in research/creative activities, teaching, and service are significant and impactful and have contributed to advancing MSU mission towards access, opportunity, and excellence.
- It should not be a narrative of the individual's CV but provide information on how previous and current accomplishments represent excellence and how the candidate will build on the achievement to further develop their scholarship.

☐ 21. Curriculum Vitae

A CV containing a full record of scholarship. List:

- Educational background, employment history, and honors.
- Research and creative works:
  - Funded grants (with total $$ amounts and those awarded to the candidate).
  - Publications; contributed and invited presentations.
- Instructional activities:
  - Research mentoring: Include (under)graduate students and post-docs supervised including placement, awards and external funding they have received, job placement.
  - Teaching assignment, student mentoring committees, and other instructional activities
- Service and leadership activities.

☐ 22. External review letters (on letterhead and signed).

☐ 23. Annual performance reviews

Copies of the candidate's annual performance evaluations **since the last personnel action** (hiring and/or promotion).

- For assistant professors in their first appointment or associate professors appointed without tenure, include evaluations since the initial tenure system appointment.
- For assistant professors being considered for tenure, include evaluations since reappointment.
- For associate professors being considered for promotion to (full) professor, include evaluations for the years since promoted to associate professor.

NOTE The package should **NOT** contain copies of papers, abstracts, grant proposals, course descriptions, or other lengthy items not explicitly requested.

_____

Appendix

This Appendix includes specific forms needed to assemble RPT dossiers for college review. It also provides guidelines for probationary faculty to request extensions of the tenure clock or delayed RPT decisions. This information as well as relevant forms and policies are also available on the NatSci [Promotion of Tenure System Faculty](#) website.

NatSci-specific forms

 I.   Funded grants table
 II.   SIRS scores table
 III.   SPLS table
 IV.   Teaching Portfolio Assessment Tool

Guidelines for Extending or Delaying Assistant Professor RPT Review

 I.   Extending the Tenure Clock
 II.   Delayed RPT actions

COLLEGE OF **NATURAL SCIENCE**

Funded Grants Only

List of all the candidate's **funded grants** and **relevant information**: Proposal title, PI, co-PIs (unless prohibitively many, then list number of co-PIs), funding agency, effective dates, total and candidate's $$ award (including indirect costs), IDC rate, and candidate's role and contributions to the effort.

Grant Proposal Title	Principal Investigator	Co-Principal Investigators	Funding Agency	Effective Dates	Total $$ Award (Including Indirect Costs)	$$ Award to Candidate (Including Indirect Costs)	Indirect Cost Rate	Candidate's Role/Contribution (if not PI)[1]

[To add another row to the table, push the tab key in the very last cell.]

[1]Add context to evaluate intellectual leadership and extent of candidate's contribution to the funded effort

COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

RPT Numerical Student Evaluation Summaries – SIRS

Semester & year	Course number	No. student responses	Instructor Involvement (average SIRS scores 1-4)	Student Interest (average SIRS scores 5-8)	Student-Instructor Interaction (average SIRS scores 9-12)	Course Demands (average SIRS scores 13-16)	Course Organization (average SIRS scores 17-20)
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						

For each course taught, list semester and year, course number, number of student responses, and average SIRS (or equivalent) scores (1.0-5.0, with **lower numbers better**) in each of the categories listed, along with corresponding average scores in comparable ("COMP") courses (either same course taught by other instructors, or courses at same level and with a comparable audience). **If department-specific evaluations are used, provide appropriate average scores corresponding to categories listed above and rescale to SIRS 1.0-5.0 scale.**

**NatSci policy:
COMP scores are OPTIONAL. The college encourages units to carefully consider what courses and instructor ratings are used for comparison to ensure objective and equitable determination of instructional performance.

COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

RPT Numerical Student Evaluation Summaries-SPLS

Semester & year	Course number	No. student responses	Atmosphere[1]	Demonstrate understanding[2]	Expanded understanding[3]	Expectations[4]	Interest increased[5]	Organization[6]
	COMP							
	COMP							
	COMP							
	COMP							
	COMP							
	COMP							
	COMP							

For each course taught, list semester and year, course number, number of student responses, and average **SPLS scores** for each category (1.0 – 5.0, with **higher numbers better**) and comparable (COMP) course (same course taught by other instructors, or courses at same level and with a comparable audience). SPLS categories rate the following:

[1] The instructor created an atmosphere that supported my learning
[2] Course assignments and/or tests provided opportunities for me to demonstrate an understanding of the course material
[3] The course expanded my understanding of the subject matter
[4] I understood what was expected of me in this course
[5] My interest in the subject has increased because of this course
[6] Overall, the course was well organized

**NatSci policy:
COMP scores are OPTIONAL. The college encourages units to carefully consider what courses and instructor ratings are used for comparison to ensure objective and equitable determination of instructional performance.

NatSci RPT Teaching Portfolio Assessment Tool

Faculty _____   Rank _____
Date _____   Assessment Performed by _____

Teaching Portfolio Content

As explained in the NatSci Teaching Evaluation Guidelines[5], the portfolio includes:
1. **Sample course materials:** Syllabus and representative assessment tool (e.g. quiz or homework assignments) from at least one course considered the faculty's main instructional assignment.
2. **Teaching statement:** Statement where they explain the teaching pedagogy and instructional design for the course (e.g., rationale for the selection of course goals/objectives; progression of topics/content/pacing; modes of instruction used; and frequency and implementation of peer/student feedback).
3. **Examples of teaching excellence:** Up to three one-page summaries of instructional activities exemplifying teaching excellence such as evidence of instructional effectiveness; ability to encourage creativity, higher-order thinking, or collaborative learning; integration of experiential learning components (e.g., instructional elements to build and apply skills in relevant or realistic ways); and/or use of methods informed by instructional scholarship.
4. **Contributions to the teaching culture:** A summary list of contributions to the teaching culture.

Chair/director's evaluation of Teaching Portfolio

Syllabus Elements

Check course syllabus for content completeness based on institutional requirements[6]:

☐ Statement of Course Goals/Objectives   ☐ Activity/Assignment/Exam Calendar

☐ Instructor Contact Information/Office Hours   ☐ Statement of Attendance Policy

☐ Grading Criteria   ☐ Required/Recommended Course Materials

☐ Required Proctoring Arrangements (for online courses)

Assessments

Alignment with learning objectives and curricular goals; clarity of expectations and presentation; appropriateness of length and difficulty; opportunity for students to apply skills acquired in relevant ways; and encouragement of higher-order thinking.

❏ Unsatisfactory	❏ Building (needs improvement in some areas)	❏ Satisfactory
Evaluation justification: **Evidence of excellence (beyond that required to meet expectations):** For faculty who meet expectations but also demonstrate exceeding performance in this area.		

---

[5] Per "NatSci Teaching Evaluation Guidelines".
[6] Per MSU Code of Teaching Responsibility policy (Faculty Handbook).

Instructional Design

Clearly stated course goals/objectives; adequate progression of topics, content, and pacing; use of multiple modes of instruction to accommodate students with a diversity of strengths; frequency and implementation of peer/student feedback is adequate to address instructional needs; and evidence of inclusive pedagogy[7] and positive contributions to the teaching culture.

❏ Unsatisfactory	❏ Building (needs improvement in some areas)	❏ Satisfactory
Evaluation justification: **Evidence of excellence (beyond that required to meet expectations):** For faculty who meet expectations but also demonstrate exceeding performance (e.g., effectiveness via innovative course content or design, promoting an exceptionally high level of student performance for comparable courses, outstanding efforts to foster student learning, and/or enabling student intellectual or skill development).		

Examples of Teaching Excellence

Assessment of instructional effectiveness based on faculty's examples based, e.g. ability to encourage creativity, higher-order thinking, or collaborative learning, and to require application of learning and skills in relevant or realistic ways, or use of methods informed by instructional scholarship.

❏ Unsatisfactory	❏ Building (needs improvement in some areas)	❏ Satisfactory
Evaluation justification: **Evidence of excellence (beyond that required to meet expectations):** For faculty who meet expectations but also demonstrate exceeding performance (e.g., innovative and highly effective methods for creative inquiry, critical thinking, experiential learning, and/or broader impacts to the discipline).		

Contributions to the Teaching Culture

Assessment of contributions to teaching culture, e.g. participation, and effectiveness in improving the quality of teaching at MSU, including providing or receiving mentoring, curricular or instructional leadership, or contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

❏ Unsatisfactory	❏ Building (needs improvement in some areas)	❏ Satisfactory
Evaluation justification: **Evidence of excellence (beyond that required to meet expectations):** For faculty who meet expectations but also demonstrate exceeding performance (e.g., leads teaching workshops within the unit, college, and institution; mentoring other instructors to improve the unit's teaching culture; authors scholarly articles for effective instruction within the discipline and beyond; etc.).		

---

[7] "Inclusive pedagogy is a student-centered approach to teaching that employs innovative course design and teaching methods to cultivate a classroom or remote learning environment that helps everyone feel respected and empowered to achieve their highest potential" ([source](#)).

Summary and Recommendations

_____

COLLEGE OF
NATURAL SCIENCE

Guidelines for Extending or Delaying RPT Actions

Pre-tenure faculty are required to undergo formal reviews in their third (for reappointment) and sixth (for promotion to associate professor with tenure) academic year of appointment. In each case, reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) dossiers are due in the NatSci Dean's Office (NatSci.RPT@msu.edu) by **December 1st** of the candidate's review year.

However, there are procedures for faculty candidates to request **extensions** of their probationary appointment and/or **delayed reviews** during the scheduled year.

I. Extending the Tenure Clock

The College assists pre-tenure faculty requiring extensions to the tenure clock during their first or second probationary appointment. Some extensions are **automatic** (e.g., childbirth/adoption); others are **non-automatic** (justifiable constraints) and require multi-level review and approval. Below is a summary of events and/or constraints eligible for extension requests. Faculty are encouraged to discuss with their supervisors an extension as soon as the event, constraint, and impact are known, keeping in mind that there are time restrictions for submitting such requests. This and additional information on policies and procedures can be found in the NatSci [Extending the Tenure Clock](#) webpage.

Automatic extensions

Pre-tenure faculty may request a one-year extension of their tenure clock due to:
- **Childbirth or adoption** of a child under six years of age
- Any of the **following other reasons**:
  - *Leaves of absence* with or without pay that are one semester to twelve months.
  - *Changes in appointment* to 50% time or less for one year.
  - *Immigration/visa status* that does not permit the award of tenure for candidates who have been recommended for tenure.
  - An extension recommended as an outcome of a *hearing and/or appeal* conducted pursuant to the Faculty Grievance Policy.
  - The *impact of COVID-19* for any probationary faculty member who: **a)** was in the tenure system at MSU as of Spring 2020 scheduled for a reappointment or tenure review, or **b)** has an employment start date in the tenure system from Summer 2020 through August 15, 2023.

Non-automatic extensions (multi-level review required)

Serious constraints to faculty progress may justify additional extensions to the probationary appointment. Examples:
- Constraints due to childbirth or adoption meriting extensions beyond the standard automatic period
- Care of an ill and/or disabled child, spouse, or parent
- Personal illness
- Receipt of prestigious awards, fellowships, and/or special assignment opportunities

Revised: November 2025

28

- Other such serious constraints (e.g., infrastructure delays, impacts of the federal transition)

Requests for such extensions require review and endorsement by the unit, college, Office of the Provost, and the University Committee on Faculty Tenure (UCFT), which makes the final decision. This multi-level review process will consider 1) whether the circumstances justify an extension of the probationary appointment as an **exception** to the standard procedures governing the tenure system, and 2) whether the proposed decisions are consistent with preservation of the **integrity of the tenure system**.

II. Delayed RPT actions

On an individual case basis, there may be justification to delay the final reappointment, promotion, or tenure decision of a faculty member until the fall. For example, information that would have a large impact on the review decision (e.g. decision on grant funding or publication of important manuscripts) may be delayed. Upon the request of or after consultation with the faculty member, the department/school chairperson/school director and dean may concur that another review will be held early in the fall for the purpose of reviewing additional information and making a final recommendation. The request for a delay **must be approved by the Vice Provost and Associate Vice President for Faculty and Academic Staff Affairs**.

While the delay allows for additional information to be considered at all levels of review (external referees, the department, and the college), *the final RPT decision by the University will not be made until December of the candidate's terminal appointment year, and the time of the termination of the appointment is not extended*. Therefore, if the decision is not favorable, the candidate will have only one semester left of MSU employment.

Process for requesting delayed actions

To request a delay, the candidate must submit a letter to the chair by **September 1** of their normally scheduled review year (*i.e.* typically year 3 in the case of reappointment and year 6 in the case of tenure and promotion), asking for the delay and providing a justification for it. The request should detail how the added time would allow for the inclusion of additional important evidence in the consideration of their case.

If the chair agrees with the request to delay, they must assemble by September 15th of the normally scheduled review year a packet including the following components to be submitted to NatSci.RPT@msu.edu and addressed to the Dean of the College of Natural Science:

1. A statement explaining why the additional published papers and/or funded grants would be sufficient for tenure, if the current record is not. The statement should address the following questions:
   - How does the new work connect to the overall directions of the candidate's program?
   - What are the scientific significance and the status of the additional publications or grants? Why do these additional items position the candidate among the leaders in his/her field and career cohort?

- Why is additional time required? How would the additional months solve the problem?
- Will the candidate succeed, scientifically, if tenure is granted?

The statement must also describe precisely what the candidate needs to accomplish during the delay to achieve tenure and promotion and explain why they are likely to accomplish it.

2. A description and analysis of the importance of prior publications. If there have been any publication gaps, the statement should address them.
3. A description and analysis of the candidate's external funding record, addressing any funding deficiencies that are present.
4. A description of the candidate's teaching assignments and performance while at MSU, including a description of the candidate's projected teaching contributions both during the delay and beyond.
5. A description of the candidate's service record and their contributions to upholding institutional core values of integrity, access, opportunity, and excellence.
6. The candidate's curriculum vitae.

If the Dean endorses the delay this material will be forwarded to the Office of the Provost, which makes the final decision.

Process for Reviewing Delayed RPT dossiers

If a delay is granted, the department must submit Form on Progress and Excellence (and supporting documentation) to the dean's office by the **following September 1**, at the beginning of the candidate's terminal probationary appointment year.

The delayed dossier will be reviewed and voted by the NatSci RPT committee at its standing monthly meeting in September (typically the second Friday of the month) to advise the Dean on whether the standards for reappointment or for promotion and tenure have been met. The dossier with the Dean's RPT recommendation will be sent to the Office of the Provost by October 15.

As with standard RPT reviews, the chair's and dean's letters are to be shared with the faculty candidate at the time of submission of the dossier. The faculty will have the option to submit a confidential response to NatSci.RPT@msu.edu with clarifications, corrections, and/or updates.

10/8/2015 – Revised on 11/11/2025