Promotion Package Checklist

For the College of Natural Science, the promotion package consists of Form on Progress and Excellence plus additional items described below. It should consist of the following items in the order specified. The RPT candidate is responsible for providing the Department/Unit with PDF files for part IV of the Form on Progress and Excellence (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 the Form on Progress and Excellence – 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. Complete the External Review Letters summary table. List all referees from whom letters were requested, whether or not they provided an evaluation. Include a brief assessment of relationship to candidate, including potential conflicts of interest. If the reviewer did not provide a letter, describe the reasons if known. Do not include full vitas, web pages, or other bulky information about the referees.

☐ 3. Form D-II, Summary Information: For the summary ratings, the comparison group is faculty at AAU Research 1 universities at the same career stage. Assignment of time should accurately reflect the candidate’s situation. The letter from the chair or director (see #4) and the letter from the dean substitute for the summary statements in this section. Type “See attached letter” in D-II, part 1.

☐ 4. A 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 explaining 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 of research should not contain quotes from the external letters. The letter should include an addendum that reports the vote of the faculty on the issue of the candidate’s reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure (in addition to being reported on Form D-Ia, see #2). The addendum should describe the composition and size of the faculty body which voted on this issue and specify the number of faculty who voted for, against, abstained, or were absent in this vote. In addition, if some faculty members voted against or abstained in this vote, the addendum should explain the concerns raised during the discussion. For candidates with joint appointments, this letter should be prepared and signed by the chairs and directors of all units in which the candidate holds a more than 0% time appointment, and the addendum should report the votes of all relevant faculty committees.

☐ 5. 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 1-2 page evaluation of the candidate’s teaching documentation, including

a. An evaluation of the SIRS scores (or equivalent), including an analysis of student comments, and a comparison to scores submitted for (the same or comparable) courses taught by others. This comparative information should be included in the summary worksheet described in item 9 below.

b. A summary analysis of peer classroom observations.

c. An evaluation of the candidate’s Teaching Portfolio. 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”.

☐ 6. 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.

☐ 7. Form D-IIIC, Evaluation of Service: This should address all aspects of service and leadership described in the criteria above.

☐ 8. Form D-IIID, Additional Reporting: (If any)

☐ 9. In Section IV of the Form on Progress and Excellence, candidates should include evidence of their activities and accomplishments in DEI, as appropriate, when detailing information on relevant research/creative activities, teaching, and service. Candidates should describe how these efforts are interwoven with and enhance all other areas of faculty accomplishment. Whenever applicable, the candidate’s commitment to learning and engaging in DEI efforts will be recognized and considered in the RPT process. Significant involvement in DEI efforts can be viewed as a metric for advancement.

☐ 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 that meets 3 hours per week and for which 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.

4 See the section on “Summarizing Teaching Accomplishments” in the “Teaching Evaluation Guidelines”.
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”.

☐ 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 the candidate’s PhD or postdoctoral advisors by placing the title in italics. Highlight in boldface the titles of those publications arising from “the reporting period”, i.e., work conducted at MSU since the last RPT action (or, in the case of reappointment cases, since hire at MSU).

Members of the NatSci RPT committee represent the full range of disciplines within the college, and because disciplinary norms for order of authorship on publications can vary, to the candidate should briefly describe the disciplinary norms at the beginning of the list of publications (e.g., lead PI typically last author, authors are in alphabetical order, conference proceedings are peer reviewed, etc). In addition, the candidate is encouraged to highlight 3-5 significant publications and provide a brief narrative describing their significance or contributions to the field, either as an annotation in the list of publications or in the research reflective essay. It is also important to note publications with MSU undergraduate, graduate, or postdoctoral trainees. This can be done as an annotation in the list of publications, in a table describing presentations, publications, and awards received by the candidate’s trainees, or any other format that clearly indicates publications with MSU trainees.

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 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 five-page maximum reflective essay about accomplishments over the reporting period. This essay should highlight how accomplishments in research/creative activities, teaching, and service are significant and impactful and have contributed to the mission of MSU. The Reflective Essay should not be a narrative of the individual’s CV, but rather provide information on how previous and current accomplishments represent excellence.

☐ 18. *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.

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

☐ 20. Copies of recent chair’s/director’s annual performance evaluations of the candidate. Specifically:
   • For assistant professors in their first appointment or associate professors appointed without tenure, include evaluations since the initial tenure system appointment.
   • For assistant professors being considered for tenure, include evaluations since reappointment.
   • For associate professors being considered for promotion to (full) professor, include evaluations for the previous five years.

☐ 21. Teaching Portfolio and Evaluation: The teaching portfolio (as described in footnote 1 of this document) should be retained with the departmental RPT evaluation materials and be made available upon request by the NatSci RPT committee. With the Form on Progress and Excellence, include only the department’s evaluation/analysis of the
candidate’s teaching 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.

☐ 22. The package should not contain copies of papers, abstracts, grant proposals, course descriptions, or other lengthy items not explicitly requested.

________________

Approved: College of Natural Science Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee, March 15, 2013. Changes made to reflect revisions to Form D by the Office of the Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources, November 21, 2013. Changes to require a copy of the teaching portfolio and evaluation, April 11, 2014. Changes to the number of external letters required discussed at the Chairs and Directors meeting, April 2018 and formally approved by the Faculty Advisory Council on May 10, 2018. Updates on RPT committee and instructions for annotating publications made in June, 2019. Revisions on number of required external letters, reporting DEI engagement, and single reflective essay made in July, 2022.