• **Public relations**: Undertaking activities intended to enhance the public’s awareness of the university’s mission, programs, and achievements; marketing the university’s products and services through open houses, special showings, radio and television appearances, newspaper and magazine articles, and so on.

• **Other institutional service activities**: Undertaking other activities in support of institutional service which are not included above.

**Evaluation Standards for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion**

**Guidelines for time in rank**

A faculty candidate for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion actions shall be reviewed and evaluated with respect to teaching, research and scholarship, and public and institutional service. The time in the rank first hired is as specified in the initial appointment letter. The list of basic actions and typical timings includes the following:

- appointment as an assistant professor in the first probationary period;
- reappointment as an assistant professor in the second probationary period (time as specified in appointment letter);
- promotion to associate professor with tenure (typically six years total and after reappointment in the second probationary period);
- appointment as an associate professor;
- reappointment as an associate professor with tenure;
- appointment as an associate professor with tenure; and
- promotion to professor with tenure (typically not less than five years after receiving tenure at the associate level).

A few other unusual paths are permitted by the policies set forth in Section IV.I2. (Academic Personnel Policies. Tenure System.) of the MSU Faculty Handbook. Actions taking less than the nominal times on the conventional paths, such as actions on the unusual paths, are possible, but exceptional. With respect to time in rank, the MSU Faculty Handbook specifically states: “The reasons for a reasonably long period of time in rank prior to promotion are:

- “To provide a firm basis in actual performance for predicting long-term, high quality professional effectiveness, and”
- “To provide a firm basis in actual performance under Michigan State University standards to permit endorsement of the individual as an expert of national stature.”

The procedures that shall be followed in making an initial appointment will be set forth in affirmative action plans filed when a search is initiated. The criteria for evaluating teaching and education, research and scholarship, and public and institutional service are set forth in the later section of this Handbook entitled Faculty Evaluation Criteria. Also, the procedures that shall be followed in conducting a review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion are set forth elsewhere in the College of Engineering Faculty Handbook.

The judgments rendered against the standards set forth in this document shall reflect a faculty member’s educational background and performance as they serve to increase the quality of the departmental faculty with respect to the mission of the college and university and enhance the national stature of the department.
Terminology

The following terminology shall be used in evaluating faculty candidates for appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion:

• **Research, public and institutional service**, and **teaching and education** as defined in the previous section.

• **Scholarship associated with public service** emphasizes the scholarship of the application of knowledge, as well as the methodology and pedagogy for delivering public service activities.

• **Education** includes the scholarship of the teaching of knowledge. Also, as previously mentioned, teaching is a component in the larger domain of education.

• **Appropriate** is a qualifier for institutional service which implies that there is evidence that the indicated performance is consistent with that expected for a faculty member at that rank – e.g., for an assistant professor, membership and participation in department committees would be appropriate; for an associate professor, active leadership roles in some committees would be appropriate; and for a full professor leadership should be the norm.

The intent of these definitions is that each action should result in a higher quality faculty and a department with greater national stature.

Standards

The **basic standard** for all actions is the determination that the candidate’s achievements have increased the quality of the candidate’s department and raised its stature, are comparable to those of the candidate’s peers, and are consistent with the expectations of the candidate’s department and the College of Engineering. How standards vary by rank is outlined below.

• **Appointments and actions for assistant professors** require that the candidates demonstrate reasonable expectation that the basic standards will be met and that current performance is likely to result in timely promotion and awarding of tenure. The primary objective at this level is the development of a viable program in research and related scholarly activity. The foundation of good teaching and appropriate service must also be evident.

• **Promotion to, or appointment as, associate professor and/or tenure** requires the determination that the basic standards have been achieved and that it is likely that such achievements will continue over the course of the candidate’s academic career. The primary objective to be considered at this level is professional distinction in research and scholarly activity. Contribution to and effectiveness in teaching as well as appropriate public and institutional service are also necessary.

• **Promotion to professor** (and appointment at that rank) requires the determination that the basic standards have been achieved over an extended period of time and that this performance is likely to continue. The primary objectives include sustained professional distinction in research and scholarly activity, clear evidence of ongoing contribution to and effectiveness in teaching, and appropriate public and institutional service. It is further expected that candidates show leadership in each of these areas. In some instances, exemplary contributions to teaching and/or service and the scholarship associated with these domains can be the basis for the promotion.

Exceptions to typical appointments or promotions shall be based on similar standards and as stated in initial appointment letters.
Faculty Evaluation Criteria

A faculty candidate for appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and/or a merit salary increase shall be evaluated according to the following lists of criteria, titled points considered by raters and significant types of evidence. The lists are not necessarily comprehensive – other points and evidence may be relevant in some cases. The term “raters” refers to those faculty at the department and college levels who are involved in evaluating candidates for the aforementioned actions.

The overarching concern in evaluating faculty is the extent and level of the candidate’s overall activity and reputation in the profession. For example, is there evidence of professional distinction and leadership in research/scholarship, teaching/education, and/or service; is there evidence of demonstrated progressiveness in the development and/or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems?

Teaching and education

Points considered by raters:

- Command of subjects taught
- Ability to create a learning climate within a class
- Ability to organize and present material
- Ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and stimulate advanced students to do creative work
- Capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationships between disciplines
- Spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate’s teaching
- The extent and skill of the candidate’s participation in the general guidance and advising of students
- Continuous growth in knowledge of the field
- Scholarly achievements and their impact in the field; national and international reputation
- Continued productivity of high quality and significant scholarly results

Significant types of evidence related to teaching and education:

- Courses taught, including lifelong education courses
- Summary and analysis of student opinions
- New courses developed and taught
- Extramural course and program development proposals and support
- Awards and honors received for teaching
- Development and implementation of new and effective techniques of education
- Overall evaluation in comparison with other faculty in the department
Peer evaluations of teaching through consideration of (a) reviews of course content, examinations, homework, and syllabi; (b) the candidate’s preparation of students in prerequisite courses; (c) class visitations; (d) attendance at public lectures given by the candidate

Number and caliber of students (a) guided in research by the candidate and (b) attracted to the campus by the repute of the candidate as a teacher (overlaps with research)

Opinions of graduates

Textbooks and other educational materials developed by the candidate

List of scholarly publications in journals and conference proceedings and copies of these publications

Intramural and extramural letters of support evaluating scholarly publications

Extramural funding and other support and proposals for scholarly activities

Awards and honors received for scholarly activities

Appraisals of publications and other work in the scholarly and critical literature

Evaluation of the candidate’s contribution to collaborative co-authored publications

Assessment of work in progress

Other significant types of evidence not otherwise listed above.

Research

Points considered by raters:

Impact of research achievements on the candidate’s field; national and international reputation; achievements in the field in comparison with others of the same academic rank and years of professional experience

Continued productivity of high quality and significant results

Originality and significance of contributions in research or, alternatively, originality, scope, richness, and depth of expression in creative achievements

Significant types of evidence related to research:

List of research publications and copies of these publications

Intramural and extramural letters of support evaluating research publications

Extramural funding and other support and proposals for research activities

Numbers of completed M.S. and Ph.D. theses supervised
• Number of completed M.S. projects supervised
• Involvement of undergraduates in research
• Involvement with post-doctoral fellows
• Awards and honors received for research
• Appraisals of publications and other work in the scholarly and critical literature
• Evaluation of the candidate’s contribution to collaborative co-authored publications
• Assessment of work in progress
• Number of citations/references to candidate’s work and publications
• Other significant types of evidence not otherwise listed above.

Public service

Points considered by the raters:

• Scope of involvement in learned professional organizations/societies
• Scope of (a) participation in technology transfer, such as through pro bono consulting and small business opportunities, and (b) advising to government bodies and in the private sector
• Participation in the design of continuing education activities/programs (but not in the delivery of any courses for credit or of any offerings for certificate or degree programs)
• Participation in extension service activities
• Impact of scholarly achievements on the candidate’s field; national and international reputation; achievements in the field in comparison with others of the same employment status and years of professional experience
• Continued productivity of high quality and significant scholarly results, as they impact external audiences

Significant types of evidence related to public service:

• Peer review and evaluation of specific public service activities
• Written testimonials supplied by the constituents served by the candidate’s activities
• Awards and honors received for public service
• Extramural public service support and proposals
• List of service-related scholarly publications in journals and conference proceedings and copies of these publications
• Intramural and extramural letters of support evaluating service-related scholarly publications
• Extramural support and proposals for scholarly activities related to public service
• Awards and honors received for scholarly activities related to public service

• Appraisals of service-related publications and other work in the scholarly and critical literature

• Evaluation of the candidate’s contribution to collaborative co-authored publications

• Assessment of work in progress

• Other significant types of evidence not otherwise listed above.

Institutional service

Points considered by the raters:

• Extent of actual participation

• Quality of service in terms of effective and imaginative contributions

• Candidate’s willingness to participate in academic governance in the formulation of department, college, and university policies

Significant types of evidence related to institutional service:

• Service as an administrator

• Service in the formal aspects of academic governance

• Service on administrative committees

• Awards and honors received for administration or academic governance

• Other significant types of evidence not otherwise listed above.