

COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE



For the College of Natural Science, the promotion package consists of [Form on Progress and Excellence](#) (form PE, formerly form D) 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 PE (as indicated by the asterisks* and highlighted in red shade below) and their CV. (*Candidate's are also expected to submit a teaching portfolio for review by the Chair but this portfolio is NOT to be included in the promotion dossier – see section #5*)
- 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 PE (highlighted in green shade below) – thereby creating a **single, searchable** PDF file.

1. Form PE-I: The completed cover sheet.

2. Form PE-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 PE-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 PE-II, part 1.*

4. Letter from the chair or director: Description and detailed analysis of the candidate's case.

- 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 letter will be shared with the candidate at the same time the dossier is submitted to the college. Hence, **the evaluation of research should not contain quotes from the external letters** nor report sensitive and potentially identifiable information about faculty votes.
- Use a **one-page addendum** to the letter to include confidential/sensitive information and report the vote of the faculty on the issue of the candidate's reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure (in addition to being reported on Form PE-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 PE-III A: Evaluation of Instruction.

- A 1-2 page narrative describing the **nature and quantity** of the candidate's formal teaching responsibilities and evaluating the **quality of instruction**.
- The description of teaching responsibilities needs to consider:
 - i. which courses did the candidate teach?
 - ii. at which time(s)?
 - iii. what was the nature of the course (e.g. lecture, seminar discussion, or lab)?
 - iv. and what was their level of responsibility (e.g. were they solely responsible or did they share responsibility with others)?
 - v. Include here an explanation of any *shared* teaching responsibilities.
- The [NatSci guidelines for teaching evaluation](#) explain that the summary evaluation must cover each of the following aspects of teaching quality, based on the department's review of 1) student evaluations, 2) peer evaluations, and 3) the candidate's teaching portfolio:
 - i. Clear and Appropriate Objectives.
 - ii. Competence in the Classroom.
 - iii. Evidence of Excellence.
 - iv. Contributions to Teaching Culture
- The evaluation of the SIRS scores (or equivalent) must include an analysis of student comments, and a comparison to scores submitted for (the same or comparable) courses taught by others. Numerical SIRS (or equivalent) data should be compiled by the Unit/Department and appended to the candidate's contribution in Form PE-IVA, "*Instructional Data*" (section #11 below).
- The evaluation must also include a summary analysis of peer classroom observations with a description of the process by which the teaching evaluation was performed, including who did the evaluations and when.
- The evaluation will also summarize the quality of the **candidate's *Teaching Portfolio**. There is no specific format for the teaching portfolio. However, all faculty are expected "to maintain a teaching portfolio consisting of three sets of materials provided by the faculty members themselves":
 - i. Syllabi & Representative Assessments (e.g. quiz or homework assignments) from 3 separate courses (fewer, if less than three courses have been taught).
 - ii. Examples of Excellence (up to 3 one-page summaries of examples of teaching excellence).
 - iii. Summary of Contributions to the Teaching Culture.
- The teaching portfolio is NOT to be included in the NatSci dossier. It should be retained by the department and be made available upon request by the NatSci RPT committee.

6. Form PE-III B: 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 PE-III C: Evaluation of Service.

- This should address all aspects of service and leadership described in the criteria above.

8. Form PE-III D: Additional Reporting (If any).

9. ***Form PE-IV**: Reporting of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) efforts.

- Candidates should include evidence of their activities and accomplishments in DEI, as appropriate, and describe how these efforts were 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 PE-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.
- 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. RPT Numerical Student Evaluation Summaries worksheet:

- Numerical SIRS data should be compiled in this worksheet by the Unit/Department and 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 PE-IVB: Research and Creative Activities¹.

- 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).

¹ In NatSci, Research/Creative works (part 1 of Form PE-IVB) would normally include only the following:

- "Books"
- "Articles", which includes all journal publications reporting original research.
- "Book Chapters", which includes any published contributions to edited volumes, other than conference proceedings (see "e" below).
- "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 PE-IVC).
- "Papers and Presentations from Learned Professional Organizations and Societies", which includes *published* conference proceedings.

- ****NOTE**** Members of the NatSci RPT committee represent the full range of disciplines within the college, and appreciate a brief explanation by the candidate about **disciplinary norms for order of authorship** on publications (e.g., lead PI typically last author, authors are in alphabetical order, conference proceedings are peer reviewed, etc). Candidates are also encouraged to highlight most (3-5) significant publications and their **contributions to the published work** and **significance to the field**. This can be done as an annotation in the list of publications and/or in the research reflective essay.
- It is also important to highlight 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.
- 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 PE-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. *NatSci Funded grants Only worksheet:

- A worksheet listing all the candidate's funded grants.
- Report 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 PE-IVC: Service.

- Include information related to disciplinary and institutional leadership and service.

15. *Form PE-IVD: Additional Reporting (if any).

16. *Form PE-IVE: Grant Proposals.

- List ALL grant proposals submitted during the reporting period, whether they were funded, not funded or are pending.

17. *Reflective essay: A five-page maximum essay on 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 essay must also describe how **DEI was interwoven** in their scholarly work (research, teaching and/or service).
- 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 and how the candidate will build on the achievement to further develop their scholarship.

18. *Curriculum Vitae: A CV containing a full record of scholarship.

- List educational background, employment history, and honors; funded grants (with total \$\$ amounts and those awarded to the candidate); publications; contributed and invited presentations; DEI, service and leadership activities; (under)graduate students and post-docs supervised including placement, and external funding; etc.

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

- 20. **Annual performance reviews:** Copies of the candidate's annual performance evaluations **since the last promotion.**
- 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 years since promoted to professor.

****NOTE**** 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. Updates to clarify the process and simplify the instructions made in November, 2023.

