



Guidelines for Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure in the College of Natural Science at Michigan State University

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Renewal of Appointment after 3 rd Year Review	3
Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	5
Promotion to Professor.....	8
External Evaluators.....	10
Promotion Package Checklist.....	12
NatSci Funded Grant Worksheet.....	16
NatSci RPT SIRS Summary Worksheet	17
APPENDIX: Guidelines for Extending or Delaying Assistant Professor RPT Review	18

Introduction

Faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure are among the most important decisions made by the university. As described in the university policies concerning appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion, Michigan State University is a research intensive, land-grant university that is dedicated to the highest levels of scholarship and education and to continuous enhancement of its academic excellence. This document describes the criteria for reappointment, promotion and tenure in the College of Natural Science and guidelines for the evaluation process. It adds to and is consistent with university policies.

Promotion in the College of Natural Science is evaluated in the areas of research, teaching and student engagement, and leadership and service. The following describes the characteristics expected for reappointment and promotion for standard, tenure-track faculty positions. Following the university policy of continuous enhancement of academic stature, the expected level of performance for promotion and tenure in the college increases with time, and the characteristics of prior reappointments and promotions are not components of the evaluation. Characteristics for the more teaching intensive joint appointments in Lyman Briggs College are described in a separate document.

In all cases, a candidate will be recommended for renewal or promotion only when in the judgment of the dean of the college, in consultation with the college Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee, it is in the best interest of the university, when the totality of the record is consistent with renewal or promotion, and when there is a high level of performance in all three areas of evaluation.

Renewal of Appointment after 3rd Year Review

Research

Successful candidates for renewal 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, there should be Ph.D. students, post-doctoral fellows, and/or other research staff 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 Michigan State University. 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 documented in the reappointment materials.

In most cases, all publications from work completed in previous positions, including graduate school and post-doctoral positions, should be published or in press.

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 with whom collaborations continue, is essential. In most fields, a substantial proportion of the publications originating from Michigan State 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 Michigan State. 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.

Revised: October 8, 2015

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 at 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, assignment of a teaching mentor, and annual review by the chair or director.

The candidate's teaching portfolio should include¹ a syllabus and a representative assessment tool (e.g. quiz or homework assignments) 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, and participation on graduate dissertation committees.

Departments should keep records of SIRS 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 there should be demonstrated and growing contributions to departmental, college or university committees.

There should be evidence of developing disciplinary leadership and service as demonstrated by, for instance, reviewing of papers and research proposals, significant roles in professional societies, meeting organization or other professional service and leadership activities.

¹ A detailed description of the NatSci RPT Teaching Portfolio may be found in the "[Guidelines for Implementation of Teaching Evaluation in NatSci](#)".

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 the highest 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 Michigan State 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 documents.

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 Michigan State University. 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. 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 documents.

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.

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 research narrative in the promotion documents.

Revised: October 8, 2015

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 and also a growing number of submitted conference presentations based on research done at MSU.

Teaching/Student Engagement

An essential criterion for this promotion 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, 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, 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.

There should also be 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 dissertation 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 (proposal reviewing and panel participation), reviewing of research papers and organization of meetings.

Revised: October 8, 2015

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 Michigan State 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.

Promotion to 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 continuing 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 documents.

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.

Revised: October 8, 2015

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, assignment of a teaching mentor, and 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, including correcting any deficiencies.

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.

There should also be 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 dissertation 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 (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. 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 in regard to 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. There should be a set of at least eight letters from leading researchers at leading AAU Research I universities or comparable research organizations such as national laboratories or leading corporate research laboratories. These should be from individuals who are demonstrably disciplinary leaders, including people holding named faculty positions, fellows of major disciplinary societies, and members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences or a comparable organization. Letters should not be obtained from individuals at the assistant professor level or equivalent. For promotions from assistant professor to associate professor, at most three 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, and only a limited number of letters from research collaborators within the past three years should be solicited. These should normally address specific questions about the candidate's contributions to collaborative research projects. In a few fields that involve very large national or international collaborations, the best reviewers are often members of the collaboration team, and letters from such individuals are acceptable. The relationship of each reviewer to the candidate, if any, must be clearly described in the description of the referees' credentials.

To solicit letters, the candidate should submit a list of six to eight potential referees, from which the department should obtain a minimum of three. All of the referees chosen from the candidate-recommended list must meet the criteria described above. 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. Candidates may also designate a few referees they would prefer not review their case, indicating why.

Referees chosen by the department may not be from the list recommended by the candidate, and at least five of the letters received must be from the department's list. The ***External Letters of Recommendation Summary*** found on the NatSci website can be used to organize and track the collection of letters from external evaluators. A summary must be submitted with the Form D packet.

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

- "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

Revised: October 8, 2015

- A description of the candidate's assignment, including, for example, the percentage of the appointment devoted to research/creative activities, teaching, service, etc.
- "This review will be most helpful if you specifically compare Prof. XXX's stature and accomplishments to those of the leading researchers in her/his field and career cohort and the extent and quality of the scholarship of the candidate, including its contribution to the discipline."
- "The dean of our college requests that you also include a list of three other highly qualified potential referees that we could contact if we need additional reviews."

Referees must be provided the following information: CV, reflective essay(s), and a representative sample of the candidate's scholarly work (e.g. teaching/research fraction, etc.).

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.

Promotion Package Checklist

For the College of Natural Science, the promotion package consists of Form D plus additional items described below. It should consist of the following items in the order specified. RPT candidates are responsible for providing the Department/Unit with pdf files for part IV of Form D (as indicated by the asterisks below), and their CV. 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 Form D – thereby creating a *single, searchable*, pdf file.

*Items to be provided by candidate.

- 1. Form D-I: the completed cover sheet.
- 2. Form D-Ia, Additional Information: A summary of committee votes must be recorded. Units can either duplicate the information requested for external review letters– or simply indicate on the form that the information is provided on the *NatSci External Letters of Recommendation Summary*, which follows.
- 3. A list and description of all referees from whom letters were requested, whether they provided a review. Items to include: referee name, rank/title; institutional affiliation; brief summary of qualifications (a few lines) , assessment of relationship to candidate, including Potential Conflicts of Interest; and who the referee was recommended by. The *External Letters of Recommendation Summary* found on the NatSci website can be used. 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.
- 4. Form D-II, Summary Information: For the summary ratings, the comparison group is faculty at AAU Research I universities at the same career stage. Excellent ratings should be given in only truly exceptional cases. Assignment of time should accurately reflect the candidate’s situation. The cover letter from the chair or director (see #5) and the cover letter from the dean **substitute** for the summary statements in this section. Type “See attached letter” in D-II, part 1.
- 5. A cover letter from the chair or director describing the case and providing a detailed analysis of it. This letter should not simply list factual information but should provide a 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 weaknesses in the case as well as strengths and should not be a reprise of the material in other sections.* The evaluation should also position the candidate relative to a cohort of faculty at other AAU Research I universities at the same career stage and in the same field. The evaluation of research should not contain quotes from the external letters. In addition to being reported on Form D-Ia, the letter should also report the vote of the faculty on the issue of the candidate’s reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. The letter should carefully 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 voted against or abstained in this vote, the letter should explain the concerns raised by these faculty. 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 should report the votes of all relevant faculty committees.

6. Form D-IIIA, Evaluation of Instruction: This should both describe and evaluate the candidate's contributions to instruction and should fully address all aspects of teaching described in the criteria above. Include here an explanation of any *shared* teaching responsibilities. Be sure to precisely describe the nature and the quantity of the candidate's formal teaching responsibilities: 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)? The narrative should include a 1 to 2 page evaluation of the candidate's teaching documentation, including²
- a. an evaluation of the SIRS scores (or equivalent), including an analysis of student comments, and a comparative evaluation to (the same or comparable) courses taught by others,
 - b. a summary analysis of peer classroom observations,
 - c. an evaluation of the candidate's NatSci RPT "Teaching Portfolio", and
 - d. a description of the process by which the teaching evaluation was performed, including who did the evaluations and when.

Numerical SIRS (or equivalent) data should be compiled by the Unit/Department, and appended to the candidate's contribution in Form D-IVA, "Instructional Data". To facilitate the evaluation of this data, a comparison should be made to either student evaluation data from the same course or other courses of approximately the same level and student audience, but taught by other faculty members. This comparative information should be included in the summary worksheet described in item 9 below.

7. Form D-IIIB, Evaluation of Research and Creative Activities: This should both describe and evaluate the impact of the candidate's research. It should address all aspects of research described in the criteria above, and should cite evidence to justify the evaluation provided. It should not contain quotes from the external letters.
8. Form D-IIIC, Evaluation of Service: This should address all aspects of service and leadership described in the criteria above.
9. Form D-IIID, Additional Reporting: (If any.)
10. *Form D-IVA item 1, Instructional Data 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 which meets 3 hours per week and the candidate was solely responsible, list 45, whereas 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".

² See the section on "Summarizing Teaching Accomplishments" in the "[Teaching Evaluation Guidelines](#)".

- 11. Numerical SIRS data should be compiled by the Unit/Department, and the *NatSci RPT Numerical Student Evaluation Summaries* worksheet should be appended here. Copies of the SIRS summary forms for individual courses should be kept on 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 the case of reappointment cases, since hire at MSU).

In NatSci, 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. Note that peer reviews provided for journals or other publications are not to be listed here, but should be included in service (Form D-IVC).
- 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. *A list of all the candidate’s funded grants (using the *NatSci Funded Grants Only* worksheet) including 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.*
- 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

Revised: October 8, 2015

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's/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 NatSci 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 NatSci 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 evaluation should be either the [NatSci RPT Teaching Portfolio Assessment Tool](#) 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.

COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

Funded Grants Only

Title	Principal Investigator	Co-Principal Investigators	Awarding Agency	Effective Dates	Total Amount Awarded Including Indirect Costs	Total Amount Awarded to Candidate Including Indirect Costs	Indirect Cost Rate	Nature of Candidate's Participation (if not P.I.)

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

From the *NatSci P&T Guidelines* revised November 21, 2013:

*A list of all the candidate's funded grants (using the *NatSci Funded Grants Only* worksheet) including 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.*

COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

NatSci RPT Numerical Student Evaluation Summaries

Semester and Year	Course Number	Number of student responses	Instructor Involvement (average of SIRS items 1-4)	Student Interest (average of SIRS items 5-8)	Student-Instructor Interaction (average of SIRS items 9-12)	Course Demands (average of SIRS items 13-16)	Course Organization (average of SIRS items 17-20)
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						
	COMP						

From the NatSci P&T Guidelines adopted March 16, 2011:

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”, either same course taught by other instructors, or courses at same level and with a comparable audience) courses immediately below. **If department-specific evaluations are used, provide appropriate average scores corresponding to categories listed above and rescale to SIRS 1.0-5.0 scale.**



COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

Guidelines for Extending or Delaying Assistant Professor RPT Review

Under normal circumstances tenure system assistant professors must be reviewed for reappointment in year three and for tenure and promotion to associate professor in year six of their appointment. In each case, reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) review materials are due in the NatSci Dean's Office by mid-January¹ of the candidate's review year. There are two separate procedures by which the RPT review of a faculty member can be postponed with respect to this standard schedule: "Stopping the Tenure Clock" and a "Delay in Reappointment Decision".

I. Stopping the Tenure Clock² entails an **extension** of the usual assistant professor probationary period, beyond the traditional six years. The extension postpones reappointment review or tenure and promotion review, as appropriate in the extended probationary period of the candidate.

- Stopping the tenure clock is automatic *if an extension is requested when a child under the age of six enters the household* (either through birth or through adoption, for either or both parents who are MSU tenure system faculty members³), or in cases in which a faculty member has taken a leave of absence with or without pay (for at least one semester), has a change of appointment to 50% time or less (for one year), has immigration/visa status that does not permit the award of tenure, or when an extension is recommended as an outcome of a hearing and/or appeal conducted pursuant to the Faculty Grievance Policy.
 - In cases where the request for an automatic one-year extension are related to the birth or adoption of a child, the request must be submitted within two years of the birth/adoption but no later than the due date for submission to the department/school of the dossier for the next reappointment/promotion/tenure review. The request should be relayed by the department chair to the dean's office, which will forward it to the Office of the Provost. [Template for memo is provided on *Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure Guidelines* webpage.]

¹ See [NatSci Guidelines for Tenure-system Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure](#).

² See [Implementation Practices \(Stopping the Tenure Clock\)](#).

³ See [Summary of MSU Parental and Health Leave Policies for Faculty and Academic Staff](#).

Appendix: Guidelines for Extending or Delaying Assistant Professor RPT Review

- Extensions of the tenure clock for other reasons are **rare**, and are generally granted only if serious constraints *outside the control of the candidate*¹ prevent a fair and appropriate tenure review on the usual schedule. It is also expected that the request for an extension will be made as soon as possible after the constraint arises and, unless there are extenuating circumstances, extensions requested after the January of the year **preceding** the tenure review year will not be approved.
 - In cases where the request is not automatic, the request needs to be made by the faculty member, reviewed by the appropriate departmental peer review committee, and endorsed by the department chair. If the request is endorsed by the chair, the material described in the policy [Implementation Practices \(Stopping the Tenure Clock\)](#) should be submitted to the dean's office. If the Dean endorses the request, it will be submitted to the Office of the Provost for review. [Templates for the Departmental Peer Review Committee Memo and Summary of Prior Assignments are provided on **Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure Guidelines** webpage.]

II. A Delay² postpones the reappointment, promotion, or tenure decision approximately 8 months, until the fall of year 4 (for reappointment) or of year 7 (in the case of tenure and promotion) ***without extending the probationary period***. A delay is intended for a situation in which extra information – e.g. publication of manuscripts or a decision on grant funding – would have an impact on the review decision. Note that while the delay allows for additional information to be considered by 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 would have only one semester left of MSU employment.

To request a delay, the candidate must submit a letter to the chair by Sept. 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 giving justification for it. The request should detail how the added time would allow for the inclusion of additional important evidence in the consideration of his/her case.

If the chair agrees with the request to delay, he/she must assemble by Sept. 15th (of the normally scheduled review year) a packet including the following components to be submitted to the Dean of the College of Natural Science:

1. A statement of 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:

¹ E.g., illness of the candidate or a family member.

² See appropriate section of [Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Review](#).

Appendix: Guidelines for Extending or Delaying Assistant Professor RPT Review

- a. How does the new work connect to the overall directions of the candidate's program?
- b. 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?
- c. Why is additional time required? Is there a fatal problem with the candidate's research direction, their ability to get work done, or lab management – conditions that would make it difficult to succeed in accomplishing the necessary work during the delay, or in the future?
- d. 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 he/she is likely to accomplish it.

2. A description and analysis of the importance of prior publications. In particular, 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. A description of the candidate's projected teaching contributions both during the delay and beyond.
5. The candidate's vitae.

If the Dean endorses the delay this material will be forwarded to the Office of the Provost, which makes the final decision. If a delay is granted, the department must submit Form D (and supporting documentation) to the dean's office by the following Sept. 1, at the beginning of the candidate's terminal probationary appointment year.

10/8/2015