

Department of Physiology Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure of Regular Faculty



Department of Physiology Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure of Regular Faculty

Table of Contents

Renewal of Appointment after 3 rd Year Review	2
Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure	4
Promotion from Associate to Full Professor	8
External Evaluators	10
Promotion Package Checklist.....	12
Funded Grant Worksheet.....	16
SIRS Summary Worksheet	17
Guidelines for Extending or Delaying Assistant Professor RPT Review	18
RPT Teaching Portfolio Assessment Tool	21

The Michigan State University Faculty Handbook reaffirms the right of faculty to full freedom in research, freedom in the classroom to discuss subjects responsibly, and the right to express oneself as a citizen without institutional censorship or discipline. Michigan State University also has rights and responsibilities. These include the right to select, retain and support those faculty members who effectively utilize their freedoms and accept the responsibilities that academic freedom requires. The following procedures will be utilized by the Department of Physiology to evaluate faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Members of the faculty shall be responsible for providing in a departmental file those materials that are pertinent and relevant to their university and professional activities. It shall be the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain the file on a current status.

The members of the elected Advisory Committee shall serve as a consulting body to the Chairperson for matters of evaluation of individual faculty members. Each year the Advisory Committee will review and evaluate the progress of every faculty member. A written summary of this evaluation and any recommendations concerning possible promotion, tenure or reappointment of every faculty member below the rank of Professor will be conveyed to the Chairperson. The Chairperson, with additional consultation with the Advisory Committee, will make the decisions on reappointment, tenure, promotion and merit raises and will inform each faculty member of his/her status in writing.

Annually, by June 15th, the Chairperson will discuss with each faculty member his/her plans for development in teaching, research and other scholarly activities. The intent of this dialogue is to assist the faculty in the development of their professional careers as physiologists, to assist them in working within the university's structure and programs, to evaluate their contributions to departmental, college, and university programs, and to apportion departmental resources on the basis of that evaluation.

Renewal of Appointment after 3rd Year Review

Overview of Reappointment Process

1. Faculty member and Department Chairperson submit to the Department a completed MSU 'Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action' form (Form D). This, and any additional supporting documentation, is reviewed by the Faculty Advisory Committee.
2. The Faculty Advisory Committee is advisory to the Department Chair, but the Chair is responsible for final evaluation of the performance of each faculty consistent with the expectations for the position and policies of the Department and College.
3. The Department Chair assesses each significant area of the individual's responsibilities, and provides an overall written evaluation.
4. The Department Chair shall schedule a time to discuss the written evaluation with the faculty member.
5. The Department Chair forwards his/her recommendation to the Dean of the College, and from there the process follows that outlined by the 'Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review'. (<http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm>)

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 (see below) as soon as the duration of the delay is known.

The candidate's research program should be established with well-defined research directions. There should be Ph.D. students, post-doctoral fellows, and/or other research staff working with the faculty.

Competitive, external research funding is 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. 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 with the 4th year should have been submitted. In such cases, the department should submit a funding update to the college in January of the candidate's 4th year. If funding is awarded to the candidate as part of a large research collaboration (for example, multi-PI R01s, program project grants, etc.), these cases must be clarified and understood by the candidate, department, and college.

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. 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.

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 and/or online teaching at the undergraduate, graduate, or professional level. To document this, the candidate should develop and maintain a teaching portfolio¹, 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 include 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 and/or online teaching and demonstration of effective engagement with undergraduate, graduate, or professional students on an individual basis, such as undergraduate advising, supervision of research, advising of student organizations, and participation on graduate dissertation committees.

The Department 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 See Attached Teaching Portfolio Assessment Tool

Promotion From Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure

Overview of Promotion and Tenure Process

1. Faculty member and Department Chairperson submit to the Department a completed MSU 'Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action' form (Form D). This, and any additional supporting documentation, is made available for review by the Faculty Advisory Committee and tenured faculty within the Department.
2. Following a recommendation by the Faculty Advisory Committee, the Chair schedules an open discussion of the candidate with the tenured faculty of the Department.
3. The Faculty Advisory Committee and tenured faculty are advisory to the Department Chair, but the Chair is responsible for final evaluation of the performance of each faculty consistent with the expectations for the position and policies of the Department and College.
4. The Department Chair assesses each significant area of the individual's responsibilities, and provides an overall written evaluation.
5. The Department Chair schedules a time to discuss the written evaluation with the faculty member.
6. The Department Chair forwards his/her recommendation to the Dean of the College, and from there the process follows that outlined by the 'Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review'. (<http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm>)

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.

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 at MSU 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. They should be published or accepted for publication in leading peer-reviewed scientific journals. Demonstrated independence from previous mentors such as Ph.D. and post-doctoral advisors is essential, and independent scientific leadership must be demonstrated. In cases of large collaborative teams,

candidate must demonstrate leadership in the publication by being a first author, senior author, or a co-corresponding author.

Competitive, external research 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 the candidate should have obtained on-going funding as principal investigator.

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.

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.

While not required, it is highly recommended that the candidate provide a seminar presentation of their research program to the faculty. This presentation should provide a clear background of the research, its importance to the field of study, and how future studies will advance current knowledge in the field.

Examples of Criteria Considered to Demonstrate Excellence in Research and Scholarly Activity

1. Recognition of excellence as an investigator
 - a. Regular publication of original research in rigorously refereed journals
 - b. Strong record of sustained national grant and/or contract support awarded by a mechanism involving peer review, consistent with the area of scholarship
 - c. Documented national (and eventually international) recognition by peers outside the university as an independent, original and substantive investigator
 - d. Invited papers and lectures pertaining to research, particularly at national and international meetings
2. Contributions to the field
 - a. Evidence of seminal work
 - b. Participation on editorial boards and as editors
 - c. Participation and membership in national study sections and advisory groups
 - d. Leadership roles in national or international research societies or meetings
 - e. Participation as consultant in regional or national research program reviews
3. Contributions to the Institution
 - a. Strong record of departmental and institutional research training program offerings

- b. Participation/leadership in research program development
- c. Research-related administrative or committee activities
- d. Activity/leadership in training grant, graduate or postdoctoral research training programs

In summary, the candidate should consider the following questions as they develop their research program:

1. What are my major contributions to the field?
2. How does my work fit into the current and future direction of the field?
3. What is the future direction of my research program?
4. What impact has or will my work have on the field that justifies promotion?
5. How will my reappointment, promotion, or tenure enhance the department and its stature
6. How does my research program compare with others in my field at comparable research-based institutions?

Teaching/Student Engagement

An essential criterion for this promotion is demonstrated effectiveness at successfully engaging undergraduate, graduate, or professional students academically, through formal classroom or online instruction, individual research supervision, and in less formal settings.

In general, the candidate should demonstrate success teaching at the undergraduate, graduate, or professional levels. The candidate should develop and maintain a teaching portfolio, and the teaching portfolio should include evidence of enhancement of classroom and/or online teaching, with demonstrated success in engaging students on an individual basis.

The department should effectively promote the candidate's teaching skills through evaluation of the teaching portfolio, classroom visits, assessment of online materials and presentations, 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 cases, 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 also should be evidence of successful student engagement in less formal ways. These may include but are not limited to undergraduate advising, supervision of a research project, advising of student organizations, and participation on graduate dissertation committees.

Examples of Criteria Considered to Demonstrate Excellence in Teaching/Student Engagement

1. Engages in multiple forms of instruction
 - a. Lectures (min. of 3 courses) – classroom or online
 - b. Course director and/or primary course instructor

- c. Teaches in a laboratory or small group session
 - d. Advises undergraduate and/or graduate students/post-doctoral fellows/residents
 - e. Organizes seminars, journal clubs, or continuing education programs
 - f. Formative evaluation of student performance with feedback
2. Develops or revises teaching material effectively. Products reflect high-level knowledge of subject area, coherent organizational structure, and appropriate evaluation tools.
 3. Invited to lecture outside one's own course (e.g. seminars/lectures on campus, in the community, and at other institutions)
 4. Leadership in college instruction, course/curriculum design and/or evaluation efforts
 5. Consistently receives very good evaluations from learners. Evaluation data from peers and the department chair are encouraged. Creates and sustains a positive learning environment, delivers material with enthusiasm, stimulates students to think creatively, and is responsive to student's concerns.
6. Materials commonly used to assess quality of teaching/student engagement
- a. teaching portfolio (syllabi, handouts, electronic presentations, online courseware, examinations)
 - b. textbook: generation, contributions, editorial position
 - c. reference material generation
 - d. educational software or web sites developed or implemented to enhance instruction
 - e. student, peer and administrative evaluations
 - f. external presentations related to pedagogy
 - g. invitations to serve on outside curriculum or evaluation committees
 - h. grants and contracts received in support of instruction or education
 - i. interest in and regard for quality of the instructional materials by individuals and/or institutions external to MSU

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.

Examples of Criteria Considered to Demonstrate Excellence in Professional Service

1. Active involvement and leadership roles in professional organizations
2. Editorships of major peer-reviewed journals or scholarly/professional organization publications

3. Member or chair of study sections, grant agencies or foundations, or national professional accreditation or certification agencies
4. Reviewer for peer-reviewed journals
5. Voluntary local or regional community service involvement, including health organizations (e.g., American Diabetes Association, American Heart Association, American Red Cross)
6. Involvement as a consultant or advisor to academic institutions, organizations or industry (e.g., other universities, student groups, pharmaceutical, biomedical)
7. Course director for a local, state, national or international professional meeting

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.

For full details see: <http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm>.

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

Overview of Promotion Process

1. Faculty member and Department Chairperson submit to the Department a completed MSU 'Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action' form (Form D). This, and any additional supporting documentation, is made available for review by the Faculty Advisory Committee and tenured Full Professor faculty within the Department.
2. Following a recommendation by the Faculty Advisory Committee, the Chair schedules an open discussion of the candidate with the tenured Full Professor faculty.
3. The Faculty Advisory Committee and tenured Full Professors are advisory to the Department Chair, but the Chair is responsible for final evaluation of the performance of each faculty consistent with the expectations for the position and policies of the Department and College.
4. The Department Chair assesses each significant area of the individual's responsibilities, and provides an overall written evaluation.
5. The Department Chair schedules a time to discuss the written evaluation with the faculty member.
6. The Department Chair forwards his/her recommendation to the Dean of the College, and from there the process follows that outlined by the 'Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review'. (<http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm>)

The timing of the review for promotion to full 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.

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

Collaborative research also is valued highly. Candidates should clearly identify their role in any collaborative project, and evidence of a substantial role or leadership 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, ongoing 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 contributed contributions to meetings and other venues.

Teaching/Student Engagement

An essential criterion for this promotion is continued demonstration of effectiveness in engaging undergraduate, graduate, or professional students academically, through formal classroom or online instruction, research supervision, and in less formal settings.

The candidate should demonstrate success at classroom and/or online teaching at the undergraduate, graduate, or professional levels. The candidate should continue to maintain a teaching portfolio, and the teaching portfolio should include evidence of efforts at enhancement of teaching, as well as

demonstration of success in engaging 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, review of online materials and presentations, 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 of a Ph.D. comparable supervision and placement of post-doctoral fellows is equivalent.

There also should be evidence of continuing successful student engagement in less formal ways. These may include, but are not limited to, curricular and pedagogical innovation/administration, 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.

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 – candidates should check with their respective college(s) as to the number of letters required. The letters should be from leading researchers at leading AAU Research I universities, or comparable research organizations, such as national laboratories or leading corporate research laboratories. They 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. Additional referees chosen by the department to satisfy college requirements may not be from the list recommended by the candidate.

Approved: Department of Physiology, January, 2015.

Promotion Package Checklist

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.

Form D: http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm

*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 should duplicate the information requested for external review letters.
- 3. A list and description of all referees from whom letters were requested, whether or not 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. 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
- 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 "Teaching Portfolio"
 - 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".
11. Numerical SIRS data should be compiled by the Unit/Department, and the *RPT Numerical Student Evaluation Summaries* worksheet (see below) 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).

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 *Funded Grants Only* worksheet below) 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.
- 23. Teaching Portfolio and Evaluation: Include an electronic copy of the teaching portfolio, and of the department's evaluation/analysis of the candidate's portfolio.
- 24. The package should not contain copies of papers, abstracts, grant proposals, course descriptions, or other lengthy items not explicitly requested.

Record of 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.)

*A list of all the candidate's funded grants, 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.*

Student Evaluation Summaries

Semester and Year	Course Number	Course Enrollment	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							
	COMP							
	COMP							
	COMP							
	COMP							

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.**

MSU Guidelines for Extending or Delaying the Assistant Professor RPT Review Process

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 respective Dean's Office by mid-January 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 Clock* 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 members), 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 extension is automatic, the faculty member should make the request for an extension in writing as soon as possible. The request should be relayed by the department chair to the dean's office, which will forward it to the Office of the Provost.
- Extensions of the tenure clock for other reasons are rare, and are generally granted only if serious constraints *outside the control of the candidate* 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.

II. Delay 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:
 - 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.

RPT Teaching Portfolio Assessment Tool¹

Faculty _____ Rank _____
 Date _____ Assessment Performed by _____

RPT Teaching Portfolio Content: 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*; a *summary list of contributions to the teaching culture*.

Required Syllabus Elements²: (check if present in all syllabi)

- Statement of Course Goals/Objectives Activity/Assignment/Exam Calendar
- Instructor Contact Information/Office Hours Statement of Attendance Policy
- Grading Criteria Required/Recommended Course Materials
- Required Proctoring Arrangements (for online courses)

Instructional Design: *Alignment with course goals/objectives, progression of topics, content, pacing, frequency of feedback, and use of multiple modes of instruction to accommodate students with a diversity of strengths.*

<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory Course design inconsistent with learning objectives, little student feedback, or content, pacing, or instructional strategies inappropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement Course design poorly aligned with learning objectives, infrequent student feedback, or content, pacing, or instructional strategies inadequate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Good Course design well aligned with learning objectives, frequent student feedback, content and pacing appropriate, and a variety of effective instructional strategies employed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent All “Good” criteria, plus innovative course content or design promoting a high level of student performance, which fosters student learning, and enables student intellectual or skill development.
Comments: 			

Examples of Teaching Excellence: Assess instructional effectiveness of examples, e.g. ability to encourage creativity, higher-order thinking, or collaborative learning, and to require application of learning and skills in relevant or realistic ways, or use of methods informed by instructional scholarship.

Assessments: *Alignment with course goals/objectives, clarity of expectations and presentation, appropriateness of length and difficulty, opportunity for students to apply skills acquired in relevant ways, and encouragement of higher-order thinking.*

<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory Unaligned with learning objectives or curricular goals, does not demonstrate proficiency in skills taught, expectations or presentation unclear, inappropriate in length or difficulty, or requires no higher-order thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement Poorly aligned with learning objectives or curricular goals, inadequate examination of skills taught, expectations or presentation insufficiently clear, of questionable length or difficulty, or requires little higher-order thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/> Good Well aligned with learning objectives and curricular goals, thorough examination of skills taught, expectations and presentation clear, of appropriate length and difficulty, and requires higher-order thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent All "Good" criteria, plus innovative or particularly effective design or execution, assigned tasks support and require creative or synthetic work and foster student intellectual development.
Comments: 			

Contributions to the Teaching Culture: Assess contributions to teaching culture, e.g. participation, and effectiveness in improving the quality of teaching at MSU, including providing or receiving mentoring, curricular or instructional leadership, or contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Honors and Awards Indicative of Exceptional Teaching Merit

Summary and Recommendations:

1. Adapted from: CNS Teaching Portfolio Assessment Tool, College of Natural Science, Michigan State University
2. See the [MSU Code of Teaching Responsibility](#).