External Evaluation Letters—Refer also to University policy (copy attached; see also http://hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/refLetters.htm)

Criteria for external evaluators

| Scholars at rank being sought or higher; consult with Deans’ Offices re: non-academic scholars. External letters of reference should be from leading scholars in the relevant discipline at peer institutions. As a general rule, an external reviewer must at least hold the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered, i.e., an associate professor cannot review one being considered for professor. |
| Scholars at peer institutions or higher; consult with Deans’ Offices re: peer institution status if uncertain. While there can be no definitive list of peer institutions, research-intensive universities of international scope such as the CIC institutions normally constitute our peers. It is incumbent on candidates and administrators to provide an explanation when external reviewers are selected from institutions that are not of the same stature as CIC institutions. |
| External referees must be professionally capable to evaluate the candidate’s scholarly work objectively and to comment on its significance in the discipline. |
| No one with whom the candidate has collaborated (author or co-investigator) in past five (5) years. |
| In no case may those who served as primary dissertation chair or major advisor for post doctoral research be chosen as an external referee. |

Selection of external evaluators

| Unit head and/or FAC must select a minimum of four and a maximum of six evaluators. |
| Unit head and/or FAC shall form a list of external referees. Unit head and/or FAC will specify the number of potential evaluators to be suggested by the candidate, to which the unit head and/or FAC will add names. In accordance with college/department/school procedures, the chairperson/director/dean will determine which of the potential external referees will be asked to provide letters of reference. College/department/school procedures will specify a proportion or number of external letters of reference to be solicited from persons suggested by the candidate. |

---

1 University of Chicago; University of Illinois; Indiana University; University of Iowa; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota; University of Nebraska/Lincoln; Northwestern University; Ohio State University; Pennsylvania State University; Purdue University; University of Wisconsin-Madison.
Candidate may vet unit/FAC list (make it a big list) and strike one or two, or, as an alternative, candidate may provide a list of individuals that should not be used.

Indicate whether unit head and/or FAC selection, candidate selection, or both, on *External Evaluator Bios Summary* form.

Provide a statement explaining why each evaluator was selected.\(^2\)

### Additional requirements re: external letters of reference

External letters of reference should be submitted on institutional letterhead and carry the evaluator signature. It is acceptable for reviewers to submit reviews via their e-mail accounts; their reviews must be imbedded in their institution’s digital letterhead with their digital signature inserted.

All external letters of reference solicited and received must be included in the review materials. Unsolicited letters will not be included in the review materials.

If an external letter of reference is solicited and the referee fails to or declines to submit a letter of evaluation, this information shall become part of the candidate’s review materials. If a reason is provided in writing, it shall become part of the candidate’s review materials unless precluded by an agreement on confidentiality.

Any additional letters are extra and must be presented separately.

Candidates must not discuss their case with prospective or actual external evaluators at any stage of the review process, except as provided by department/school/college procedures. Soliciting external letters of reference and providing materials to the referees is solely the responsibility of the chair/director.

### Required materials to be provided to external evaluators (minimally)

- Candidate’s CV.
- Candidate’s five-page reflective essay.
- Representative sample of the candidate’s scholarly work.

### Required content in chair/director request to external evaluators

- The unit’s statement on confidentiality, which must be consistent with the University’s statement as contained in the policy “Confidentiality of Letters of Reference for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Recommendations.”
- A request to disclose any potential conflicts of interest.
- A description of the candidate’s assignment, including, for example, the percentage of the appointment devoted to research/creative activities, teaching, service, etc.\(^3\)
- A request to assess the candidate in comparison to others in her/his cohort nationally.
- A request to assess the extent and quality of the scholarship of the candidate, including its contribution to the discipline.
- A request to assess whether the candidates would receive promotion and/or tenure at their institution (if the external evaluator is at a peer institution).

---

\(^2\) This statement may appear in the unit head’s letter.

\(^3\) For candidates with assignments, or from units, that are non-traditional among peer institutions, it is also important to provide contextual information about the mission, roles, and structure of the unit, e.g., residential colleges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research and Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s CV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s five-page personal research statement (reflective essay).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A copy of each refereed publication since last promotion must be submitted with dossier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed and non-refereed publications must be distinguished (on CV and on Publication Summary form).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A complete citation must be provided for each publication, to include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All authors included in the order list on the publication (on CV).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page numbers for publication (on CV).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations by other scholars (not self) should be indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews of candidate’s books should be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The candidate should annotate the CV with a code to distinguish refereed publications, first authorships, and other roles performed on multi-authored publications (on CV).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All SIRS forms must be available at unit, if requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRS data should be summarized to compare candidate to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student comments should be summarized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional evidentiary data is highly desirable, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student mentoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of teaching improvement or innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching prizes or awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications on teaching/learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants and Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only include projects for which funds were provided to MSU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate whether the proposal was competitively peer reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency, amount, project title, duration of award must be indicated (on CV).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not list projects where funds went entirely to another institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not list consulting projects as grants or contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not list projects for which no funds were received (i.e., pro bono).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List proposals submitted and proposals awarded, and distinguish them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If multiple investigators, indicate candidate’s role (e.g., PI or co-PI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The candidate should annotate the CV with a code describing the candidate’s role on projects with multiple investigators (on CV).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement, Outreach, and Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidentiary data is strongly encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters from clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications on engagement, outreach, or service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes, awards, or honors in Extension work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Candidates for RPT should retain all copies of SIRS forms. If for any reason these copies have been lost, the unit is responsible for providing a summary of SIRS information.

5 Such projects could be listed as service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Professional Service</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide evidence of candidate’s contributions to the discipline or profession, and/or value-added contributions to relevant communities.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Chair/Director Cover Letter of Support</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide information on quality/appropriateness of journals in CV.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate whether grants/contracts are available in candidate’s area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate workload standards in the unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe unit expectations regarding candidate’s distribution of effort across research, teaching, and outreach/engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarize SIRS and discuss faculty member’s overall teaching performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include paragraph explicitly addressing issues of external research funding:

- Is there external funding available in the candidate’s area of scholarly expertise?
- Would/Did external funding enhance the candidate’s scholarship?
- Did the candidate make an effort to secure external funding, if appropriate?
- If the candidate submitted applications but was unsuccessful in securing external support, did he or she seek assistance which may include mentoring to revise and resubmit?

Be prepared to meet with College PTR Council on **Monday, February 9, 2015, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.** to answer questions. Please provide a phone number where you can be reached during the College PTR Council’s deliberations.
Checklist for Materials Required for Submission of Review File (i.e., Dossier) for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

Revised: December 2, 2014

(This checklist is a fill-in form and is to be completed electronically by the unit and returned with the electronic RPT packet to the Deans’ Offices. Please include materials electronically in order listed below, noting that one (1) paper copy of all materials included in the basic packet is still required (in addition to the electronic copy).)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate’s Name (Last, First):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Dean’s Office Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x=Yes</td>
<td>x=Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASIC PACKET**

**Chair/Director Letter of Support** *(electronic copy in PDF format containing signature and 1 paper copy with original signature)*

1. Provides information on quality/appropriateness of journals in CV
2. Indicates availability of grants/contracts in candidate’s area
3. Indicates workload standards in the unit
4. Describes unit expectations regarding candidate’s distribution of effort across research, teaching and outreach/engagement
5. Summarizes SIRS and discusses faculty member’s overall teaching performance
6. Includes paragraph explicitly addressing issues of external research funding:
   - Is there external funding available in the candidate’s area of scholarly expertise?
   - Would/Did external funding enhance the candidate’s scholarship?
   - Did the candidate make an effort to secure external funding, if appropriate?
   - If the candidate submitted applications but was unsuccessful in securing external support, did he or she seek assistance which may include mentoring to revise and resubmit?

**Form D**—Must include all pages even if no information is added *(completed electronic copy and 1 paper copy with original signature)*

**Candidate’s personal research statement** *(reflective essay); note 5-page maximum *(electronic copy and 1 paper copy)*

**Candidate’s CV** *(electronic copy and 1 paper copy)*

**External Evaluator Bios Summary** *(completed electronic copy and 1 hard copy)*

**External Evaluation Letters** *(electronic copies in PDF format, each containing evaluator signature, and 1 paper copy with original signatures)*

A minimum of four and maximum of six selected. **Organize letters in same order listed on External Evaluator Bios Summary.**
Candidate’s Name *(Last, First)*:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Dean’s Office Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x=Yes</td>
<td>x=Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publication Summary** *(completed electronic copy and 1 paper copy)*

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION** *(electronic copies if available; otherwise, provide paper copy along with a separate electronic list of materials that are being submitted in paper form)*

### Research and Scholarship
1. Copy of each refereed publication since last promotion included
2. Refereed and non-refereed publications distinguished (on CV)
3. Complete citation for each publication included (on CV)
4. Citations by other scholars included
5. Review of candidate’s book(s) included
6. Candidate’s CV annotated to distinguish refereed publications, first authorships, and other roles performed on multi-authored publications (on CV)

### Teaching and Learning
1. All SIRS forms are available at unit, if requested
2. SIRS data summarized to compare candidate to others
3. Student comments summarized
4. Additional evidentiary data included, if available

### Grants and Contracts
1. Includes only projects for which funds were provided to MSU
2. Indicates whether proposal competitively peer reviewed
3. Agency, amount, project title, duration of award indicated (on CV)
4. Does not list projects where funding went entirely to another university or for which no funds were received
5. Does not list consulting projects as grants or contracts
6. Does not list projects for which no funds were received (i.e., pro bono)
7. Lists and distinguishes proposals submitted from proposals awarded
8. If multiple investigators, candidate’s role indicated (e.g., PI or co-investigator)
9. Candidate has annotated the CV with a code describing the candidate’s role on projects with multiple investigators (on CV)

### Engagement, Outreach, and Service
Provides evidentiary data, if available

### Professional Service
Evidence provided of candidate’s contributions to the discipline or profession and/or value-added contributions to relevant communities
Anthropology

4.2. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure
4.2.1. Recommendations about reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure shall be made by the Chairperson of the Department after consultation with the candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the appropriate Department faculty (specified in 4.2.6). In advising the Chairperson on these matters, the Department will give high priority to considering evidence that a candidate has contributed positively to the professional life of the Department, the College, and the University; is likely to continue to do so; and is nationally recognized as an authority in the relevant field of specialization.

4.3. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria
4.3.1. In the Department of Anthropology, “faculty are expected to be both active scholars and student-focused, demonstrating substantial scholarship and ability to promote learning through on-campus and off-campus education and research programs. The essence of scholarship is the thoughtful discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge, including creative activities, that is based in the ideas and methods of recognized disciplines, professions, and interdisciplinary fields. What qualifies an activity as scholarship is that it be deeply informed by the most recent knowledge in the field, that the knowledge is skillfully interpreted and deployed, and that the activity is carried out with intelligent openness to new information, debate, and criticism…” (MSU Faculty Handbook, part IV, Academic Human Resources Policies, 11/07) (p. 11)

4.3.2. The criteria used in evaluating a candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure in the Department of Anthropology will conform to the recommendations outlined in the MSU Faculty Handbook, Chapter IV: Academic Human Resources Policy, “Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Recommendations.” Criteria for evaluation include assessments of the quality and quantity of the candidate’s accomplishments in research, teaching, and service and outreach.

4.3.2.1. Research: Evaluation of research performance may derive from several sources, but the most important of these is effective dissemination of knowledge to our peers and society. The Department expects faculty members to publish regularly in peer-reviewed professional contexts. Publications may include books and monographs, articles in refereed journals, and/or chapters in edited volumes. Success in obtaining research funding is also an important consideration. Additional indicators of scholarly activity may include, for example, presentation of research results at professional meetings, and evidence of peer recognition of the quality of work such as awards, honors, and invited lectures or papers.

5. Annual Review and Salary Adjustment
5.2.1. In making salary adjustment recommendations, the Advisory Committee should give foremost attention to the following areas of faculty performance: (a) research and scholarly publication; (b) teaching load and teaching effectiveness; (c) University, public, and professional service; and outreach; (d) accomplishment of individual work goals established in consultation with the Chairperson; and (e) adherence to codes of professional responsibility, including the Michigan State University Code of Teaching Responsibility and other relevant ethical codes and principles of professional responsibility.

Economics

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion
(Approved May 1, 1987, Amended September, 2013)
2. There are three criteria to be considered in promotion decisions: (a) research and publications, (b) teaching, and (c) public service and professionalism. The nature of the department and the preferences of the faculty concerning its future growth and development in the profession require that research and publication to be the
primary concern. Accordingly, research and publication will be the major consideration for each promotion decision; quality teaching is expected for promotion at each level of advancement; and public service and professionalism will be given increasing weight at each level of promotion.

3. Definition of criteria:
   a. **Research and publication**: Research capability will be considered in the light of the quality of the candidate’s research and scholarly publications and the candidate’s commitment to a research-oriented professional career. Factors that will be strongly considered include whether the candidate has published in leading scholarly journals, demonstrated a strong prospect for continuing research productivity, and received external research grants.
   b. **Teaching**: Quality teaching, and the prospect of further quality teaching, is expected for promotion.
   c. **Public service/professionalism**: Consideration to include a candidate’s activities and/or participation with respect to university governance committees, government consultation, foundation committees, editorial assignments, positions in professional organizations, non-research professional publications and other professional activities.

4. Minimum normal criteria:
   a. Promotion from instructor to assistant professor:
      1) Upon receiving the Ph.D., an instructor in his or her initial appointment will normally be promoted to assistant professor, if he or she meets standards then in force for the appointment of new assistant professors.
   b. Promotion from untenured to tenured:
      1) The position of tenured assistant professor is not considered a normal position within the department. Consequently, the criteria for tenure are those for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor.
   c. Promotion from assistant to associate professor:
      3) The candidate’s record should demonstrate a commitment to research-oriented professional career, as evidenced by past publications which have advanced knowledge in their fields and by continued and serious research projects beyond achieved publications. There should be no doubt as to the candidate’s propensity to do high-quality research.
         a) No specific number of publications will guarantee promotion to associate professor, because the Committee’s assessment of a candidate’s commitment to research must involve an evaluation of quality as well as quantity. As a guideline, successful candidates should have from four (4) to eight (8) refereed articles published or accepted in scholarly journals (or the equivalent in books or book chapters). Candidates with publication records in (or below) the lower end of this range may meet the standard for promotion with publications of exceptional quality (due consideration being taken of the fact that normal rates of publication differ among subfields within economics). Candidates with publication records in the upper end of the range (or beyond) may not meet the standard for promotion if, in the judgment of the Committee, the quality of the publications is insufficient or shows little evidence of substantive research beyond the dissertation. In evaluating the extent to which the candidate’s research has advanced knowledge, the committee will consider the quality of the publication media (i.e., scholarly journal, academic press, conference volume; refereed or non-refereed publication), evidence of reception by the profession, and any other relevant information. Working papers and draft manuscripts will be evaluated for evidence of research projects beyond achieved publications.
         b) No specific factor of proportionality will convert jointly-authored publications to an “equivalent” number of singly-authored publications. In evaluating the quality of a candidate’s research, joint publications will (as will all publications) be evaluated for the information they convey as to the candidate’s commitment to a research-oriented professional career and propensity to do high-quality research. When evaluating joint work, the committee will consider whether or not the pattern and degree of co-authorship, the range of topics, and the candidate’s role in the underlying research...
projects supports the conclusion that there is no doubt of the candidate’s propensity to do high quality research.

d. Promotion from associate to full professor:

3) The candidate should have already produced an extensive bibliography in terms of articles in scholarly journals and/or books or equivalent publications; the prospect of continued high-quality research and scholarly activity should not be in the slightest question; research completed after promotion to or appointment as associate professor should demonstrate the candidate’s continued high quality research and scholarly activity.

a. No specific number of publications will guarantee promotion to full professor, because the Committee’s assessment of a candidate’s commitment to research must involve an evaluation of quality as well as quantity. As a guideline, successful candidates should have from ten (10) to sixteen (16) refereed articles published or accepted in scholarly journals (or the equivalent in books or book chapters). Candidates with publication records in (or below) the lower end of this range may meet the standard for promotion with publications of exceptional quality (due consideration being taken of the fact that normal rates of publication differ among subfields within economics). Candidates with publication records in the upper end of this range (or beyond) may not meet the standard for promotion if, in the judgment of the Committee, the quality of the publications is insufficient or shows little evidence of substantive research since promotion to or appointment as associate professor. In evaluating the extent to which the candidate’s research has advanced knowledge, the Committee will consider the quality of the publication media (i.e., scholarly journal, academic press, conference volume; refereed or non-refereed publication), evidence of reception by the profession, and any other relevant information.

b) No specific factor of proportionality will convert jointly-authored publications to an “equivalent” number of singly-authored publications. In evaluating the quality of a candidate’s research, joint publications will (as will all publications) be evaluated for the information they convey as to the candidate’s commitment to a research-oriented professional career and propensity to do high-quality research. When evaluating joint work, the Committee will consider whether or not the pattern and degree of co-authorship, the range of topics, and the candidate’s role in the underlying research projects supports the conclusion that there is no doubt of the candidate’s propensity to do high quality research.

Geography

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Recommendations for promotion to associate professor with tenure in geography are made by the Chair in consultation with tenured faculty in that academic area. A favorable recommendation requires a sustained record of contributions to the professional and intellectual life of the Department and University and national recognition in the discipline. Evaluations are based on performance in research, teaching and service; research productivity and teaching performance are the primary criteria for evaluation. Merit salary profiles are not necessarily sufficient for assessing promotability. The Department does not recommend tenure without promotion to associate professor.

Research

A candidate is expected to provide evidence of a sustained record of research contributions. The research record consists of:

1. Publications in national refereed academic journals
2. Publications in other journals
3. Research grant activity
4. Presentations at national and regional meetings of professional societies
5. Other publications such as books, book chapters, technical reports or reviews
6. Other research activity involving disciplinary outreach to the public

Major emphasis is placed on publications in refereed journals, though a candidate is also expected to contribute in other research arenas. There should be evidence of individual or first authorship in publications. Coauthored works are legitimate components of a candidate's research record.

Promotion to Full Professor
The promotion recommendation to full professor is made by the Chair in consultation with the full professors in geography. Candidates are normally considered after five to seven years at the associate professor level. While consideration is given to the candidate's entire record, achievements since promotion to associate professor are emphasized. Evidence of a continuing record of achievement in research, teaching and service is required. The candidate is also expected to have provided leadership to the intellectual life of the department and university.

Research
A candidate is expected to provide evidence of a continuing record of nationally or internationally recognized research. These include:

1. National or international recognition as a significant contributor to an area of expertise
2. Significant publications in premier academic journals or authored research-oriented books (coauthored works are legitimate components of a candidate's research record but there should be evidence of individual or first authorship)
3. Other publications such as articles, book chapters, technical reports, and reviews
4. Research grant activity
5. Presentations at national or international meetings of professional societies
6. Other research activity involving disciplinary outreach to the public

At the appropriate time, the candidate initiates the promotion process in consultation with the Chair. At a convened meeting, full professors in the geography academic area review the candidate's record. Evaluations are requested from 4 to 6 outside reviewers. Other procedural steps are the same as for associate/tenure recommendations.

History

Article VI: Tenure and Promotion
B. Assistant professors who have not served previously at Michigan State University are appointed initially in the tenure system for a probationary period of four years and may be reappointed for an additional probationary period of three years. Although they may present themselves as candidates for tenure and promotion at any stage within the probationary period, the candidacy for tenure and promotion must be evaluated no later than the sixth year of the probationary appointments. Tenure may be recommended only for candidates who are also recommended for promotion to associate professor or who are already at that rank or above. In the case of a candidate already at the necessary rank, the purpose of evaluation for tenure will be to confirm that the candidate meets the promotion criteria established for that rank.

C. For promotion to associate professor, a candidate must present a record of achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. Candidates must demonstrate a maturing commitment to scholarship, normally evidenced by original contributions in the form of a significant book published or to be published by a rigorous university press or non-university press known for excellence in a field and by peer reviewed scholarly journal articles. Candidates should also provide evidence of a future significant book project and attempts to generate external funding through grant application. The emphasis in evaluation will be more on the quality than upon the quantity of the candidate's work.

For promotion to full professor, a candidate must present a record of achievements in scholarship, teaching, and service. Every candidate for full professor must have a record of substantial publication since promotion to associate professor, normally in the form of a significant book published or to be published by a rigorous university press or non-university press known for excellence in a field and by peer review scholarly journal articles. Candidates should also provide evidence of attempts to generate external funding through grant
application. The emphasis in evaluation will be more on the quality than upon the quantity of the candidate's work.

For promotion to associate and full professor, a book will be minimally defined as a completed manuscript, which has been reviewed by readers, and a contract stating a firm commitment by a press to the project with an expected publication date in the near future. The committee assessing a candidate's potential for future scholarly contributions and his/her position in the field will consider published books and journal articles, work in progress, presentations at professional meetings, the winning of grants and fellowships, the attracting of graduate students, chapters in books, edited collections of articles or sources, and/or the development of significant web-based or other forms of non-print resources. Evidence of effective teaching at all course levels is required for promotion.

Human Development and Family Studies

0.2 Rules of Tenure

0.2.1 All procedures related to tenure will be those specified in the current Faculty Handbook, Michigan State University, plus any more specific procedures within these operating principles which may be adopted by the Department.

Political Science

XIII. Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases

B. Definitions of the Domains of Faculty Performance

1. Research: investigation aimed at the discovery of scientific knowledge, revision of accepted theories in light of new knowledge, or the practical application of knowledge.

C. Types of Faculty Evaluation

4. Review for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. Any individual holding a tenure-stream appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is eligible to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. By September 1 of each year, the Chair shall ask eligible faculty in writing whether they wish to be considered for promotion and tenure during that academic year. All faculty requesting such a review in writing by September 10 must be considered for promotion and tenure by the Department during that academic year.

However, every individual who has reached the penultimate year of the second probationary appointment as an Assistant Professor must be reviewed for promotion and tenure during that year. If that individual is not promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure by the end of the second year of that probationary appointment, the individual’s appointment at the university will be terminated at the end of the third year of that appointment.

Thus, the typical time in grade for promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor in the tenure stream to Associate Professor with tenure is 6 years.

5. Review for Promotion to Professor. Any individual holding an appointment as Associate Professor with tenure is eligible to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor. By September 1 of each year, the Chair shall ask eligible faculty in writing whether they wish to be considered for promotion to Professor during that academic year. All faculty requesting such a review in writing by September 10 must be reviewed by the Department during that academic year.

D. Evaluative Criteria

1. To assess each individual’s performance, the Department of Political Science asks the following general questions:
a. Is the individual, through production of a substantial body of published research, recognized professionally as an authority in his or her field?

b. Is the individual an effective teacher?

c. Has the individual effectively used his or her professional skills to serve (a) one’s academic discipline, (b) the department, college, and university, or (c) the public?

2. Answers to these three questions are applied in all types of faculty performance evaluation listed in Part C of this section.

3. Guidance as to the specific criteria to be used in performing faculty evaluations is given in Appendix II.

E. Further Evidence Used in Promotion and Reappointment Evaluations

1. When answering the three general questions enumerated in Section D above, the primary concern is to apply clear and convincing evidence of the quality of the individual’s performance in each area. No fixed measure of the quantity of output or effort in the three areas separately or combined can assure a favorable evaluation.

2. Any assessment of performance requires professional judgment and hence is subjective. There is no objective formula for evaluation applicable to every case. However, the Department establishes guidelines defining the types of evidence to be used in performance evaluation.

3. These Guidelines should not be construed to hold faculty in any field of specialization to a different standard of performance than faculty in any other field. Faculty in all fields are equally eligible for merit salary increases, tenure, and promotion.

4. Cases for promotion and/or tenure are compelling only when supported by convincing evidence of the quality, originality, scholarly repute, visibility, and impact of the faculty member’s research. In addition to the scholarly materials provided by the candidate, the Department shall include the following in its assessment:

   a. letters of assessment by leading scholars and practitioners in the field.
   b. evidence of the impact of the individual’s research as measured, for example, by citations in the work of other scholars or in changes in practice.
   c. evidence of the quality, influence, and ranking of the journals that have published the individual’s work, including, if possible, evidence of the acceptance rates and circulation figures of the journals.
   d. letters from the editor or publisher of book chapters discussing the selection criteria for chapters.
   e. the reputation and quality of the press that publishes a book.
   f. the individual’s self-assessment.

H. Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

1. Reappointment

   Faculty in the third year of their initial probationary appointment as Assistant Professor in the tenure stream must be reviewed for a renewal of their contract.

   The basic question asked in such a review is: Is the faculty member making substantial and normal progress toward the granting of promotion and tenure in three years?

   The review for renewal of a probationary appointment is to be based on the individual’s Career Plan, Annual Professional Activities Reports, the Chair’s Annual Performance Evaluation Reports, and evidence on research, teaching, service, and extension.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

   A decision on promotion to Associate Professor with tenure involves a retrospective judgment based on the criteria described in Section VIII.D. Along with the retrospective judgment, there is a prospective evaluation: a candidate must show a clear likelihood of sustained and substantial high-quality performance.

3. Promotion to Professor

   a. Criteria

   A decision on promotion to Professor involves both a retrospective and a prospective judgment. In addition to satisfying the criteria described in Section XIII.D, in accordance with the Faculty Handbook,
A recommendation for promotion from associate professor to professor in the tenure system should be based on several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in teaching, research, and/or public service as an associate professor.

The individual must also demonstrate a sustained and substantial high-quality performance and a substantial national reputation, and that this pattern of excellence and productivity is likely to continue throughout the career.

Psychology

9.3 Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion
9.3.3 Recommendations to reappoint or to promote will be based on evaluation of performance in three main areas: (1) teaching, mentoring and related professional activities, (2) research productivity, and (3) administration, service, and outreach. A candidate for retention or promotion should perform well in all three areas. Evidence of a high level of research productivity is essential.

Sociology

5.4 Promotion and Tenure Procedures
5.4.2 Candidates for reappointment will, during the fall semester of their third year, complete all needed college and university forms (Form D) and provide the Advisory Committee with these materials, along with a current CV and narrative discussing their research, teaching and learning, and service/outreach/engagement activities. The Advisory Committee will assign a member of the committee to the candidate’s materials to provide feedback to the candidate, the Advisory Committee, chair, and the department regarding the candidate’s work and case for reappointment. Specific dates for turning in materials, presentations to the Advisory Committee and votes on recommendations for the department will be determined during the semester the candidate is being considered. While every case will be determined on its own merit, a faculty member expecting to be reappointed as an assistant professor should show promise in being published in highly regarded peer review publications (journals and/or books in the discipline of sociology and/or area of expertise) and seeking external funding.
5.4.3 For candidates seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, the department will during the fall semester of their fifth year create a three-person committee of regular faculty members of appropriate rank and expertise to guide the candidate through the process of promotion and tenure (at least one of these members can be from the regular faculty subcommittee of the Advisory Committee). This will include having the candidate complete all needed college and university forms (Form D) along with a current CV and narrative discussing their research, teaching and learning, and service/outreach/engagement activities. This committee will present the candidate to the Advisory Committee to provide additional feedback to the candidate. The chair, in consultation with the candidate’s committee and Advisory Committee, will create a list of external reviewers for each case for promotion and tenure. Candidates will have an opportunity to review this list and make suggestions in accordance with college guidelines. Specific dates for turning in materials, presentations to the Advisory Committee and votes on recommendations for the department will be determined during the semester the candidate is being considered. While every case will be determined on its own merit, a faculty member expecting to be promoted to associate professor with tenure should be able to show that s/he has been active in seeking external funding and has developed and maintained a national reputation as a scholar.
5.4.4 For candidates seeking promotion to full professor, the department will during the fall semester of the year prior to the year in which they expect to be promoted create a three-person committee of regular faculty members of appropriate rank and expertise to guide the candidate through the process of promotion (at least one of these members can be from the regular faculty subcommittee of the
Advisory Committee). This will include having the candidate complete all needed college and university forms (Form D) along with a current CV and narrative discussing their research, teaching and learning, and service/outreach/engagement activities. This committee will present the candidate to the Advisory Committee to provide additional feedback to the candidate. The chair, in consultation with the candidate's committee and Advisory Committee, will create a list of external reviewers for each case for promotion. Candidates will have an opportunity to review this list and make suggestions in accordance with college guidelines. Specific dates for turning in materials, presentations to the Advisory Committee and votes on recommendations for the department will be determined during the semester the candidate is being considered. While every case will be determined on its own merit, a faculty member expecting to be promoted to full professor should be able to show that s/he has been successful in obtaining external funding and has developed and maintained an international reputation as a scholar.

Criminal Justice

2. Faculty Career Planning Documents

Each member of the faculty of the SCJ shall develop a career plan, a document that sets out the member’s plan for teaching, service and scholarly activities.

2A. Contents of the Career Plan

2A.2.4 A discussion of strategies for extra-mural funding through grants, contracts, and fellowships; (p. 19)

V. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEWS AND MERIT/SALARY INCREASES

7. Research

Research shall be recognized as activities in a process that seeks to culminate in the generation of products that will ultimately be credited for Scholarly Publications, Outreach, Service, or Teaching. Pursuant to the mission of SCJ, faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in research. In evaluating performance in the Research category, FAC shall consider the following:

7.1 research grant applications
7.2 research grants successfully obtained, with greater credit for larger grants
7.3 annual narratives describing research-in-progress, including progress on multi-year research projects
7.4 conference papers and presentations
7.5 contributions to international research activities
7.6 other evidence of research activity

9. General Criteria for Merit Evaluation by Rank

9.1 Assistant professor

Evaluation of assistant professors is based on the expectation that their efforts are leading to the development of a national reputation and recognition for scholarly work in their major area of interest consistent with the mission of the SCJ. While assistant professors should be willing to contribute to and demonstrate activity in School and University Administration, Public Service, and Outreach, their efforts should emphasize Teaching and Advising, Research, and Scholarly Publications. Demonstrated success in these latter three categories are central to tenure and promotion considerations at MSU.

9.1.5 Research (Meeting Expectations): presentation of scholarly paper at one regional, national, or international conference; evidence of active research agenda. Assistant professors are encouraged to make plans to submit proposals for research grants.

9.1.11 Research (Exceeding Expectations): Writing grant proposals; gaining funding for research; presentation of multiple papers at scholarly conferences

9.2 Associate professor

Evaluation of associate professors is based on the expectation that they will make continuing progress toward solidifying and enhancing their national reputations and recognition. Faculty at this level are expected to broaden their involvement in School and University Administration, Service, and Outreach while continuing their productivity and achievements in Teaching and Advising, Research, and Scholarly Publications.
9.2.5 Research (Meeting Expectations): Present a scholarly paper at one regional, national, or international conference; provide evidence of an active research agenda. Grant-writing activity is encouraged.
9.2.11 Research (Exceeding Expectations): Writing grant proposals and gaining funding; multiple presentations at scholarly conferences.

9.3 Full professor
Evaluation of full professors is based on the expectation that they will make continuing efforts to maintain their national reputations and recognition. Faculty at this level are expected to broaden further their involvement in School and University Administration, Service, and Outreach while continuing their productivity and achievements in Teaching and Advising, Research, and Scholarly Publications. Such further involvement may include leadership roles in national associations, serving as editors of scholarly journals, and national recognition for the dissemination of knowledge to criminal justice practitioners and the public.

9.3.5 Research Grants (Meeting Expectations): Present one paper at a regional, national, or international conference; provide evidence of an active research agenda. Grant-writing activity is encouraged.
9.3.10 Research (Exceeding Expectations): Writing multiple grant proposals; gaining funding for research; multiple presentations at scholarly conferences.

Human Resources and Labor Relations

VII. Tenure System Appointments and Tenure System Promotions

D. Faculty members under the tenure system shall be evaluated on their contributions in teaching, scholarly research, and service as the basis for recommendations for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Time in rank, per se, shall not be a criterion for promotion.

F. The faculty constituencies for recommending appointments, reappointments, and promotions in the tenure system are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Appointment, Reappointment or Promotion Faculty Constituency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Assistant Professor (3rd year reappointment without tenure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning, Design and Construction

3. COMMITTEES
3.6. Promotion and Tenure Committee
3.6.5. Criteria by which faculty members will be evaluated for appointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

3.6.5.1. An updated curriculum vitae outlining activities in research, teaching, outreach and service, including international activities in these areas.

3.6.5.2. Completed draft of FORM D (RRPT0993) “Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion or Tenure Action”.

3.6.5.3. Reprints of publications, including up to five (5) peer-reviewed journal articles and/or proceedings.

3.6.5.4. Complete Set of Summary Sheets for classes taught during the review period (SIRs forms).

3.6.5.5. A Reflective Essay.
3.6.5.1.6. Letters of commendation, awards, etc.

3.6.5.1.7. Completed drafts of official promotion and tenure paperwork for the College and University, including the “Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion or Tenure Action Form D (RRPT0993)”.

3.6.5.2. Candidate’s evaluation shall be based on a variety of considerations including professional competence, based on the context of their appointment (e.g. proportion of time assigned to teaching, research, and service/outreach) and their performance in each of these areas. Activities in teaching, scholarly activities and service/outreach may be domestic and/or international to be considered important.

**Social Work**

6.3. Promotion. Tenure, Reappointment, and Annual Review

6.3.4. Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment

6.3.4.1. Evaluation of candidates for promotion, tenure, or reappointment is based on criteria of excellence and productivity in research/scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach.

6.3.4.2. Research and Scholarship

6.3.4.2.1. Sustained record of high quality refereed publications, including articles, books, book chapters, and reviews.