COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

>

For the College of Natural Science, the promotion package consists of <u>Form on Progress and Excellence</u> (form PE, formerly form D) plus additional items described below in the order of assembly.

- The RPT candidate is responsible for providing the Department/Unit with PDF files for part IV of the Form PE (as indicated by the asterisks* and highlighted in red shade below) and their <u>CV</u>. (Candidate's are also expected to submit a <u>teaching portfolio</u> for review by the Chair but this portfolio is NOT to be inincluded in the promotion dossier see section #5)
- The Department/Unit is responsible for reviewing the information provided by the candidate, and for combining this file with those for parts I-III of the Form PE (highlighted in green shade below) thereby creating a *single, searchable* PDF file.
- \Box 1. Form PE-I: The completed cover sheet.
- □ 2. <u>Form PE-Ia</u>: Additional Information.
 - Summary of committee votes.
 - Complete External Review Letters summary table.
 - List of <u>all</u> referees from whom letters were solicited, whether or not they provided an evaluation.
 - 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. <u>Form PE-II</u>: 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/director (see #4) and the letter from the dean substitute for the summary statements in this section.**

- □ 4. Letter from the chair/director: Description and detailed analysis of the candidate's case.
 - **Reasoned discussion** of why the candidate meets the criteria for promotion or reappointment and why it is in the best interests of the university to make the reappointment or promotion.
 - It should fully address all significant **strengths and weaknesses** in the case, and should not be a reprise of the material in other sections.
 - The letter will be **shared with the candidate** at the same time the dossier is submitted to the college (by December 1).
 - Use a **one-page addendum** to report sensitive and potentially identifiable information about external letters (including quotes from the letters) and faculty votes (for, against, abstained; also who was absent). The addendum may also explain the process used for the internal review and vote (e.g., composition and size of the voting faculty body) and concerns raised during the discussion that may have led some faculty members to vote against or abstain in this vote.
 - 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.
- □ 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?
 - o 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 <u>NatSci guidelines for teaching evaluation</u> 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.
 - o Evidence of excellence.
 - o Contributions to teaching culture
- The evaluation of the **SIRS or 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 ratings should be compiled by the Unit/Department and appended to:
 - The candidate's contribution in Form PE-IVA, "Instructional Data" (section #11 below).
 - The NatSci tables for reporting SIRS and/or SPLS scores and comparable data (*COMP data is optional starting in 2025*)
- 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. <u>Form PE-IIIB</u>: Evaluation of Research and Creative Activities.
 - Both describe and evaluate the **impact** of the candidate's research.
 - Address all aspects of research evaluated and cite evidence to justify the evaluation.
 - It should not contain quotes from the external letters.
- □ 7. Form PE-IIIC: Evaluation of Service.
 - Address all aspects of **service and leadership**.
- □ 8. <u>Form PE-IIID</u>: Additional Reporting ("special foci", if any).
- □ 9. <u>Form PE-IVA</u>: Instructional Data Table.

Separate sections for reporting (under)graduate credit and non-credit instruction, academic advising, list of instructional works, and other evidence of instructional activity.

 (Under)graduate credit instruction
 "Number of Sections Taught" – number of lectures, recitations, and/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, whereas if responsibility was shared equally with two other colleagues, list 15, etc.
- Exclude hours taught independently by teaching assistants, even if the candidate is the class coordinator.

"Number of Students" – 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.
- 2) <u>Non-credit instruction</u> Guest lectures and other non-credit instruction
- 3) Academic Advising

Reading or research course supervision should be included here.

- List of Instructional Works: Publications, presentations, papers, grants received, and other works that are primarily in support of or emanating from instructional activity.
- 5) <u>Other Evidence of Instructional Activity</u> Other evidence of instructional productivity such as works/grants in progress or under review, innovative methods or curricular development, etc. Also instructional awards and peer recognition (within and outside the university).

□ 10. <u>NatSci tables for reporting numerical student evaluations</u>

- Numerical SIRS/SPLS data should be compiled in these tables by the Unit/Department and appended here.
 - o COMP data is **optional**
- Copies of the SIRS/SPLS reports for individual courses should be kept on file in the Department and should *not* be included in this packet.

\Box 11. Form PE-IVB: Research and creative activities¹.

- For all publications and presentations, the **complete authorship** in published order, the title, journal or venue of publication, date, and pages should be included.
 - Identify peer-reviewed outputs with an <u>asterisk</u> (*)
 - Underline the lead author in multi-authored work.
 - <u>Italicize</u> work done in collaboration with the candidate's PhD or postdoctoral advisors by placing the title in *italics*.
 - Highlight in <u>boldface</u> the titles of those publications arising from "the reporting period", i.e., work conducted at MSU since the last RPT action (or, in the case of reappointment cases, since hire at MSU).
- 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 typically 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.
- It is also important to highlight **publications with MSU undergraduate**, **graduate**, **or postdoctoral trainees**. This can be done as an annotation in the list of publications, in a

¹ In NatSci, Research/Creative works (part 1 of section IVB of Form PE) would normally include only the following: 1) Books, articles (all journal publications reporting original research), 2) book chapters (any published contributions to edited volumes, other than conference proceedings), 3) reviews (reviews, commentary, or perspective articles appearing in a serial publication – Note that peer reviews provided for journals or other publications are not to be listed here but should be included in section IVC about service), and 4) papers and presentations from learned professional organizations and societies, including published conference proceedings.

table describing presentations, publications, and awards received by the candidate's trainees, or any other format that clearly indicates publications with MSU trainees.

- 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 under "*Other Evidence of Research/Creative Activity*" (part 4 of Form PE-IVB). Any work reported that does not clearly fit one of the categories described above should be identified, and the nature of the scholarship and the extent of peer review explained.
- □ 12. <u>NatSci Funded grants table [NatSci specific]</u>
 - List all the candidate's funded grants.
 - 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 P.I.*
- □ 13. Form PE-IVC: Service.
 - Include information related to disciplinary and institutional leadership and service.
- □ 14. Form PE-IVD: Additional Reporting (if any).
- □ 15. <u>Form PE-IVE</u>: Grant Proposals.
 - List ALL grant proposals submitted during the reporting period, whether they were funded, not funded or are pending.
- □ 16. <u>Reflective essay</u>: A five-page maximum essay on accomplishments over the reporting period.
 - Summary your work and impact in a way that a multi-disciplinary committee can understand and appreciate.
 - Highlight how **accomplishments** in research/creative activities, teaching, and service are significant and impactful and have contributed to the mission of MSU.
 - The essay must also describe how **DEI was interwoven** in their scholarly work (e.g., research, teaching and/or service).
 - It should not be a narrative of the individual's CV, but rather provide information on how previous and current accomplishments represent excellence and how the candidate will build on the achievement to further develop their scholarship and contribute to the mission of Michigan State University.
- □ 17. <u>Curriculum Vitae</u>: A CV containing a full record of scholarship.
 - List educational background, employment history, and honors; funded grants (with total \$\$ amounts and those awarded to the candidate); publications; contributed and invited presentations; DEI, service and leadership activities; (under)graduate students and post-docs supervised including placement, and external funding; etc.
- □ 18. <u>External review letters</u> (must be on letterhead and signed).
- □ 19. <u>Annual performance reviews</u>:
 - Copies of the candidate's annual performance evaluations during reporting period.
 - 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 professor.

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

Approved: College of Natural Science Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee, March 15, 2013. Changes made to reflect revisions to Form D by the Office of the Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources, November 21, 2013. Changes to require a copy of the teaching portfolio and evaluation, April 11, 2014. Changes to the number of external letters required discussed at the Chairs and Directors meeting, April 2018 and formally approved by the Faculty Advisory Council on May 10, 2018. Updates on RPT committee and instructions for annotating publications made in June, 2019. Revisions on number of required external letters, reporting DEI engagement, and single reflective essay made in July, 2022. Updates to clarify the process and simplify the instructions made in November, 2023 and 2024.

Last revised: November 2024