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Make the job of the Departmental, College, and University Review committees easy!

Seek the advice of your mentors and Chair!

Start now…
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  – Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor
  – Promotion to Full Professor

• Paperwork
  – Teaching Portfolio
  – External Letters
  – Form D

• Discussion
Timing and Process
Summary of the tenure timeline for Assistant Professors

**First appointment:**
tenure clock starts: Aug. 16

**Fall of third year:**
reappointment review begins*: due in Dean’s office by ~1/15

**Spring of third year:**
reappointment results announced by about May

**Fall of sixth year:**
reappointment review begins*: due in Dean’s office by ~1/15

**Spring of sixth year:**
tenure results announced by about May

Starting year:

**Termination date if not reappointed:**
- 2014: 18
- 2011: 15

**Termination date if not awarded tenure:**
- 2011: 16 CNS Workshop [17] RPT

**RPT Due:**
- 2014: 20
- 2011: 18

Note: The tenure clock starts on Aug. 16 of the calendar year in which the tenure-stream appointment is effective.

*Departmental deadlines for receipt of RPT documents vary!
RPT Timing

• Reappointment
  – process begins after 2(!) yrs. complete
  – results in renewal or terminal year

• 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
RPT Process

• Ongoing
  – Annual reviews
  – Mentoring
  – Collect Documents & Keep CV up to date

• Departmental Process: fall (Timing Varies!)
  – From YOU: CV, candidate “Form D” material, Teaching Portfolio (electronic!)
  – External Letters (tenure)
  – Committee and/or Departmental Votes
  – Chair Recommendation
  – Department combines their material and the candidate’s material in “Form D”
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
Updates During RPT Process

You will get feedback three times during the process:

• From your Department chair informing you of his/her recommendation and the outcome of the Departmental process.

• CNS will report (again, through your chair) on the outcome of the College process in April, after meeting with the Provost’s committee.

• From the University, via Chair, once the process is complete.
Reappointment Letter and Meeting

• (Successful) Reappointment candidates will receive a letter in the summer following the conclusion of the reappointment process.

• The letter will detail the CNS RPT committee’s analysis of your case, AND provide feedback on what will need to be accomplished to be promoted and receive tenure.

• Individual meeting to discuss this in the fall.
Cindy’s advice (note: college deadline for form D-Jan 15)

- talk to you Chair about the RPT process during this year’s annual evaluation meeting
  - Get some solid advice on when to start preparing
  - Develop a time line with your own due dates for completion of various pieces of form D
    - *these dates should be well before the departmental due date*
      - *Why? Because you plan on getting feedback on your parts of form D*

- What to ask the Chair/Director?
  - Basically, what will the process look like in your unit?
    - When should I complete a first draft of my parts of form D?
    - Who should I expect to get feedback from on drafts of my parts?
    - Is there a role for my assigned mentors in this process?
    - Is there a faculty review committee that will review my case?
      - If so, when will this happen next fall?
      - Who is on the review committee?
      - Do I get any say in who will be on my review committee?
    - When is my case presented in a faculty meeting for discussion and vote?
      - Who presents my case to the faculty and leads the discussion?
Expectations
Expectations: Reappointment

- Excellent progress toward establishing a productive, sustainable, high-quality research program at MSU.
  - Publications and grants as lead author/PI
  - Laboratory/Infrastructure at MSU productive

- 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 Assoc. Prof.

• Leading an established, productive, sustainable, world-class research program at MSU.
  – Publications and grants as lead author/PI
  – Impact confirmed by external letters
• Excellent UG/Grad Teaching Program.
  – Teaching Portfolio, SIRS, peer evaluation
  – Successful mentor of students and postdocs
• Effective disciplinary leadership and university service.
Expectations: Promotion to Professor

• Acknowledged national & international scientific leader, with a productive, sustainable research program at MSU.
  – Publications and grants as lead author/PI
  – Impact confirmed by external letters

• Continued Excellence in Teaching.
  – Teaching Portfolio, SIRS, peer evaluation
  – Successful mentor of students and postdocs

• Record of strong disciplinary leadership and university service.
Ideal Career Trajectory

Professional Impact in Research, Teaching, and Leadership

Time

- Reappointment
- Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor
- MidCareer Mentoring Feedback
- Promotion to Professor
Paperwork
Teaching Portfolio

• 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 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
External Evaluator Materials

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

11. Numerical SIRS data should be compiled by the Unit/Department, and the CNS RPT Numerical Student Evaluation Summary worksheet should be appended here. Copies of the SIRS summary forms for individual courses should be kept in file in the Department, and should not be included in this packet.

12. *Form D-IVB, Research and Creative Activities: For all publications and presentations, the complete authorship in published order, the title, journal or venue of publication, date, and pages should be included. Note that an asterisk should be used to indicate peer-reviewed activity, and the lead author of a multi-authored work should be underlined. Indicate work done in collaboration with PhD or postdoctoral advisors by placing the title in italics. Highlight in boldface the titles of those publications arising from "the reporting period", that is work at MSU since the last RPT action (or, in case of reappointment cases, since hire at MSU).

In CNS, Research/creative works (part 1 of Form D-IVB) would normally include only the following:

a. "Books"  
b. "Articles", which includes all journal publications reporting original research.

c. "Book Chapters", which includes any published contributions to edited volumes, other than conference proceedings (see "e" below).

d. "Reviews", which include reviews, commentary, or perspective articles appearing in a serial publication.

e. "Papers and Presentations from Learned Professional Organizations and Societies", which includes published conference proceedings.

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 D-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.

13. *List of all the candidate’s funded grants (using the CNS Funded Grants Only worksheet) including the following in order: title, principal investigator, all co-investigator(s) (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.

14. *Form D-IVC, Service: Include factual information related to disciplinary and institutional leadership and service.

15. *Form D-IVD, Additional Reporting: (If any)

16. *Form D-IVE, Grant Proposals: List ALL grant proposals submitted during the reporting period.

17. A narrative (reflective essay) of no more than 4 pages in length (12 point type) written by the candidate describing the research program, including research directions and objectives and their significance, research contributions and their significance, contributions to collaborative research, future research directions and objectives and their significance, plans for maintaining external funding, and contributions to disciplinary leadership.

18. A narrative (reflective essay) of no more than 2 pages in length (12 point type) written by the candidate describing the candidate’s teaching philosophy, contributions to undergraduate and graduate instruction, activities in support of improving as a teacher, plans for the future, and other contributions to the instructional, advising, and other student-related missions.

19. The candidate’s Curriculum Vitae: The CV should contain a full record of educational background, employment history, honors, publications, contributed presentations, invited presentations, service and leadership activities, graduate students, and post-docs supervised including placement, and external funding.

20. External Review Letters (must be on letterhead and signed).

21. Copies of recent chair’s/director’s annual performance evaluations of the candidate, in particular be sure to include those since:

- the last P&T action for assistant professors being considered for tenure,
- the initial tenure system appointment for those who have a probationary end date (i.e. assistant professors in their first appointment or associate professors appointed without tenure), or
- the previous five years for associate professors being considered for promotion to (full) professor.

22. Third Year Review Letter: For third year reappointments of assistant professors, include a draft of the chair/director’s performance evaluation letter to the candidate including a description and evaluation of the performance in the areas of research, teaching/student engagement, and service/leadership. For candidates with joint appointments, these letters should be prepared and signed by the chairs and directors of all units in which the candidate holds a more than 0% time appointment. The CNS Promotion and Tenure Committee will review these and may request changes before the letter is given to the candidate.

23. Teaching Portfolio and Evaluation: Include an electronic copy of the CNS teaching portfolio, as described in footnote 1 of this document, and of the department’s evaluation/analysis of the candidate’s portfolio. (The teaching portfolio should be either the CNS teaching portfolio evaluation tool — link http://ms.msu.edu/dean/PortfolioTool.docx — or a letter addressing the issues raised in this document.)

24. 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.

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
Explain Collaborative Work!

• Goal: Demonstrable Scientific Leadership
  – Clearest evidence: independent/lead-author published work.

• 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.
Feedback

• RPT Action
  – Reappointment or
  – Tenure and Promotion

• Reappointment Letter(s)
  – Dean
  – Chair

• Seek feedback from mentors!
Make the job of the Departmental, College, and University Review committees easy!

Seek the advice of your mentors and Chair!

Start now...
Questions?
FAQs from faculty about RPT process/criteria:

- I was hired to teach graduate students only. Will that be a problem for RPT?
- What happens after the dept review?
- What happens when things go wrong and why?
- What is the impact of a minority of negative votes? What can the departmental Chair do?
- Some units have a strict “no service” policy (e.g., math) for jr. faculty; thus, there is an apparent discrepancy between department expectations/policies and assessment criteria of tenure. How is this handled/viewed by the college and university?
- What is the rubric for tenure success? (information in the unit is not specific and/or explicit)
- How much is too little or too much service?
  - What is most valued?
- The “bar” for tenure keeps increasing. Where will the standards be when I put together my tenure case? Who is my model for “tenure-worthiness”?

About grants

- Does the lack of external funds prevent tenure?
- Sustainability of my research does not depend on securing my own external grants. How is that seen by the college?
- Is it bad to be a PI on a much bigger multi-PI grant? (How is this viewed by the College? Unit?)
- Does the source of external funding matter (e.g., whether it is federal or private)?
Introduction

The Reflective Essay is an integral part of the reappointment, tenure and promotion process at virtually all universities. The reason for its universal importance is that "a capacity for reflection and self-evaluation ... is a critical ingredient in a professor's life" (McGovern, p. 96).

As such, the Reflective Essay holds a unique position in the candidate's dossier of supporting evidence. The CV (curriculum vitae) and Form D--no matter what the length--will be read and discussed by reviewers. Consequently, the Reflective Essay should not be a summary of evidence presented in those documents. Instead, the Reflective Essay is "an opportunity to weave a tapestry of understanding of [your] scholarly pursuits "(Smith, p. ii).

Intent and Use

The Reflective Essay serves as the "key orienting and organizing element of the [dossier]" (Froh, et. al. p. 108) with the purpose of "providing a frame of reference 01' context for the items submitted to the committee" (Diamond, p. 24). Consequently, the Reflective Essay is the primary opportunity the candidate will have to convey the nature and meaning of her/his scholarly work and philosophy to those reviewers from his/her and other disciplines (Millis, p. 69).

Above all, the Reflective Essay should (a) convey the candidate's vision of herself/himself as a maturing or mature scholar (including describing one's scholarly niche); (b) communicate the contributions made during the reporting period in advancing toward that vision; (e) provide an indication (evidence) of the impact of the candidate's scholarly efforts; and (d) show development-evolution of the candidate's scholarship.

The objective of the Reflective Essay "is to convey as much depth and richness as possible by [employing] selective evidence of [scholarly] accomplishments" (Froh, et. al., p. 106). Above all, candidates should remember that the Reflective Essay is "a reflection of the care [the candidate) take(s) in communicating scholarship" (Smith, p. il).

Preparation Guidelines

The preparation of the Reflective Essay should begin early in one's MSU--CANR career, and should be updated on a periodic basis throughout the reporting period (c. g., during the annual evaluation process). Approaching it this manner will enable the candidate to prepare a document that represents a more accurate and convincing expression of the evolution of one's scholarly development. With all of this in mind, here are 8 guidelines for the development of a Reflective Essay:
1. Because the Reflective Essay is just that--a personal reflection written in essay format--it is important that it be crafted as an intellectual piece, an academic contribution in its own right, rather than as a document that reports academic accomplishments. Most of all, the essay should “demonstrate a capacity to be reflective and self-critical; hence, capable of continued growth and change” as a scholar (Diamond, p. 24).

2. The Reflective Essay should convey the candidate's vision of himself/herself as a maturing or mature scholar. It is an opportunity to convey one's scholarly philosophy and vision; to describe how Scholarly priorities were established; to share the logic of one's program of scholarship (and its development); to make explicit the strategy (choice making) used over the years; and to be clear about one's future trajectory.

3. The Reflective Essay should be expressed in manner that is consistent with CANR's interpretation of scholarly activities and scholarship. Scholarly activities cut across the mission of teaching, research, and outreach / Extension / engagement. Activities are "things scholars do" (e.g., designing and offering an undergraduate class). While scholarship also applies to all mission dimensions, it is an outcome, not an activity. Scholarship involves creating something new; and it is designed to advance understanding by contributing something new to a body of knowledge. "Newness" is peer reviewed or validated; and products of scholarship are made available in publicly accessible forms and in publicly available locations. The worth of both scholarly activities and scholarship is evaluated in multiple ways: in terms of intellectual quality (substance-content); quality of expression (how the work is constructed and presented, particularly in terms of its relevance to intended audiences); and its impact on and/or use by intended audiences.

4. Because each candidate's mix of assigned duties is unique, the essay should address all aspects of the candidate's assigned duties---activities and scholarship---in a manner roughly proportionate to those duties-teaching, research, outreach / Extension/ engagement, and service to MSU and profession (Froh, et. al., p. 107). It is understood that scholarly activities and scholarship influence a wide range of audiences (e.g., disciplinary peers, scholars in other disciplines, students, public officials, industry members, members of nongovernmental organizations). Consequently, just as each candidate's assigned duties is unique, the impact of each candidate's activities and scholarship is also likely to be unique (at the very least distinctive in nature and contribution).
5. Because the hallmark of the scholarly life is integration and connections across the mission, the Reflective Essay should demonstrate the candidate's integration of work across her/his assigned duties (e.g., how research influences teaching; how Extension influences research).

6. The Reflective Essay "provides a vehicle for discussion of special circumstances that have affected your work to-date" (Diamond, p. 24). There are always critical times or points in an academic's life, when an academic decides to move in one way or another. Sometimes these times or points are products of one's own doing—an outcome of intent. At other times, they are either a result of opportunity ("being in the right place at the right time") or unexpected circumstance (e.g., departure of a senior collaborator from MSU).

7. The Reflective Essay also provides an opportunity for the candidate to explain "any contradictory or unclean materials in the [dossier]" (Seldin, p. 10). However, explanations should be reserved for unique events; and, when included in the essay, the description should not consume an undue portion of the essay.

8. A useful means of developing a Reflective Essay may be to periodically consider a series of "reflective prompts" that will induce reflection about "why we teach; why we work as we do; why we choose certain priorities in... scholarship; why we publish in this or that field or particular topic; ... [thereby leading to] meaningful inquiry into what we do and how we do it" (Zubizarreta, p. 208, italics in original; for additional useful prompts, see McGovern, pp. 103-08).

**Final Comments**

Remember..., the Reflective Essay is the candidate's opportunity to communicate the quality of thinking, vision and logic of the program, strategy and implementation—incorporating what has been achieved to date; the trajectory of the program; and the targets and milestones anticipated in the next 10 years. The Essay must emphasize the intellectual foundation of the work and plans for the future. The Essay must not be a reporting or listing of what has been done in the past; this is well covered in Form D and the CV.
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