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 1 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, including[2]

    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 From 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

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.