



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-III A: 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 explanations¹.
- **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.

¹ 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.

- 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.

□ 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 **how 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.

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 updates, and single reflective essay made in July, 2022. Updated to clarify the process and simplify the instructions in November, 2023. Updated to align document with institutional policies and recommendations in November, 2025.