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Questions...comments... words of wisdom... are welcome at any time!
A lot of handouts!

• Let’s review…
Make the job of the Departmental, College, and University Review committees easy!

Start now...

✓ become informed
  • Know what you need to do
  • Seek the advice of your mentors and Chair

✓ make a plan  (*include a time table of discrete goals and target dates*)
RPT Timing

• **Reappointment**
  – *process typically begins after* 2(!) *yrs. complete*
    • results in renewal or terminal year
  
  *Note: tenure clock extension granted before reappointment also delays the time of reappointment (otherwise tenure extension is forfeited if reappointment review happens yr 3)*

• **Tenure and Promotion to Assoc. Professor**
  – *process begins after* 5(!) *yrs. complete*
    • results in tenure or terminal year

• **Promotion to Full Professor**
  – *timing flexible - driven by scholarly progress*
    • results in promotion (or not) following year
It all starts with your annual performance reviews...

Intent:
reappointment, tenure and promotion...
builds on and from your annual reviews
## NatSci Tenure-System Faculty Annual Evaluation Form

**Name** | **Department(s)** | **Review Year**
--- | --- | ---

### Workload Expectations
- **Research**
  - %
- **Teaching**
  - %
- **Service**
  - %

### Research
- Below Expectations
  - Insufficient scholarly or research activity, quality below expectations.
- Needs Improvement
  - Minimal amount of peer-reviewed scholarship and grant funding, research productivity below expectations.
- Good
  - Scholarly productivity relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.
- Excellent
  - Excellent scholarly achievement relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.
- Outstanding
  - Extremely significant and rigorous scholarly work, demonstrable disciplinary impact, published in prestigious venues.

### Research: Strengths/Weaknesses of Activities/Achievements, and Recommendations
- 
- 
- 

### Teaching/Student Engagement
- Below Expectations
  - Problematic classroom or other teaching performance.
- Needs Improvement
  - Fulfills all teaching responsibilities and meets minimal expectations in the classroom.
- Good
  - Fulfills all teaching responsibilities and meets expectations.
- Excellent
  - Fulfills all teaching responsibilities very well.
- Outstanding
  - Fulfills all teaching responsibilities very well; Evidence of overall excellence.

### Teaching: Strengths/Weaknesses of Activities/Achievements, and Recommendations
- 
- 
- 

### Engagement in Leadership/Service/Outreach
- Needs Improvement
  - A minimal level of service, especially in important ways.
- Good
  - Consistently effective and proactive in leadership.
- Outstanding
  - Uniformly excellent effort and results in important projects.

### Engagement: Strengths/Weaknesses of Activities/Achievements, and Recommendations
- 
- 
- 

### Allocation of MSU space and resources
- Space or resources should be reallocated.
- Space or resources appropriate.
- More space or resources required.

### Summary and Outlook: Progress, Plans, and Future Promotions
- Faculty Member Signature:
- Date:

Please refer any unresolved questions or concerns about this annual review to natsci.dean@msu.edu.
- I have a written response, and the response is attached.
- I have a written response and have sent it directly to natsci.dean@msu.edu
- I do not have a written response to this review.

### Department Chair(s)/Administrator(s) Signature
- Date:
RPT Process

Departmental Process: fall (Timing Varies!)

So ask your chair NOW about the expected time line

OVERVIEW

– From YOU:
  • CV, candidate “Form D” material, Teaching Portfolio (electronic!)
– External Letters (tenure, except Physics)
– Committee and/or Departmental Votes
– Chair Recommendation
– Department combines their material and the candidate’s material in “Form D”
Cindy’s advice (Material due to college Jan 15)

Leverage your annual evaluation meeting this spring to learn about how the RPT process will go in your unit next fall. This is your 1st step in preparing your case.

Ask:

• What is the unit deadline for submitting my materials?
• What is the process?
  • When should I complete a first draft of my parts of form D?
  • Is there a role for my assigned mentors in this process?
  • Who should I expect to get feedback from on drafts of my form?
  • Is there a faculty review committee who will review my case or is it made available to all above-rank faculty?
  • Is my case presented in a faculty meeting for discussion and vote? If so, when in the fall? And who presents my case to the faculty and leads the discussion?
• When should I start preparing?
  • Good first steps?
• Is there staff support to help complete form D? Who would that be?

Putting together your reappointment case is excellent practice for putting together your tenure case (3 yr later) so the time invested is worth it!
RPT Process (cont’d)

• CNS Review: Begin mid-January
  – Faculty Committee Review
  – Dean’s Recommendation

• University Review: Late Spring
  – Provost’s Recommendation
  – President’s Approval

• Trustee Approval: Early Summer
  – Required for tenure, not reappointment

see “NatSci RPT cheat sheet…” for specific dates
You should expect **feedback** from your Chair 3 X’s during the process:

- **by Jan 15th** -- Chair informs you of his/her recommendation and the outcome of the Departmental process.
- **by late April** -- Chair informs you on the outcome of the College process, after Dean meets with the Provost’s committee.

**Final decisions:**
- On reappointment by late May
- On tenure by late June (after board meets and decides).
Reappointment Letter and Meeting

• Reappointed candidates receive a reappointment letter in the summer
  – Contents:
    • CNS RPT committee’s analysis of your case
      – Includes feedback on what is needed for successful promotion and tenure.

• Reappointed faculty meet individually with Assoc. Dean for Faculty Development in the fall to discuss the letter
Paperwork
External Evaluation Letters

“...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 eight letters from leading researchers at leading AAU Research I universities or comparable research organizations ... from individuals who are demonstrably disciplinary leaders...”

Letters are obtained by Department.

- Candidate should submit a list of six to eight potential referees, from which the department should obtain a minimum of three
- Dept. solicits from others; 6-10 total needed.
- Confidential: no communication with candidate
- College can request additional letters
Form D (IV = candidate contribution) taken from “Guidelines for faculty RPT…”

Asterisks: Candidate Responsible!
Form D: Explain Yourself!

• Describe (keep audience in mind)
  – **Teaching**
    • Your role in courses taught jointly
  – **Publications**
    • Refereed vs. un-Refereed
    • *Your role in joint work: describe your contributions and their importance, don’t just repeat factual information.*
  – **Grants** (PI vs. co-PI, $’s to your program & IDC)

• **Reflective essays** (research and teaching)
  – read by faculty outside your department
  – your chance to “frame” the RPT case
Teaching Portfolio

• **Contents:**
  - Syllabus and Representative Assessment Tool (e.g. quiz or test) from up to three separate courses.
  - Up to three one-page summaries of examples of teaching excellence.
  - Summary list of contributions to “teaching culture” (e.g. attendance at CNS workshops, etc.).

• **Reviewed by Department & CNS**
  - See assessment tool.

• Be kind to committee, keep length < 100p!
External Evaluator Materials

• Referees are to be provided with:
  – Updated CV
  – Reflective Essays on Research and Teaching
  – Representative sample of scholarly work
Expectations
Expectations: Reappointment

• Evidence of a good start as an independent scholar, teacher and leader
• Indices:
  – Publications as lead author
  – Grants as PI
  – Successful Teaching Program
    • Teaching Portfolio, SIRS, peer evaluation
  – Starting to mentor students and postdocs
  – Engagement with disciplinary leadership and university service.
Expectations: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

• **Strong evidence** that you are an *established* scholar, teacher and leader:

• **Indices:**
  – **Publications** as lead author
  – **Grants** as PI
  – Successful and effective teaching program
    • Teaching Portfolio, SIRS, peer evaluation
  – **Trained PhD students and postdocs**
  – Engagement with disciplinary leadership and university service.
Explain Collaborative Work!

**Goal:** Demonstrable Scientific Leadership

– Clearest evidence: independent/lead-author published work.

**HOWEVER...**

MSU & CNS understand that much modern scientific work is done in collaborative teams.

– Be sure to **explain your role** in collaborative work.
– Especially in cases involving senior authors or former mentors.
Make the job of the Departmental, College, and University Review committees easy!

Seek the advice of your Chair, mentors and trusted colleagues!

Start now...
Questions?