



# COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

## **Guidelines for Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure in the College of Natural Science at Michigan State University**

### Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Renewal of Appointment after 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Review ..... | 2  |
| Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....              | 4  |
| Promotion to Professor.....                                    | 7  |
| External Evaluators .....                                      | 9  |
| Promotion Package Checklist.....                               | 10 |
| CNS Funded Grant Worksheet.....                                | 14 |
| CNS RPT SIRS Summary Worksheet .....                           | 15 |

---

Faculty reappointment, promotion and tenure are among the most important decisions made by the university. As described in the university policies concerning appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion, Michigan State University is a research intensive, land-grant university that is dedicated to the highest levels of scholarship and education and to continuous enhancement of its academic excellence. This document describes the criteria for promotion and tenure in the College of Natural Science and guidelines for the evaluation process. It adds to and is consistent with university policies.

Promotion in the College of Natural Science is evaluated in the areas of research, teaching and student engagement, and leadership and service. The following describes the characteristics expected for reappointment and promotion for standard, tenure-track faculty positions. Following the university policy of continuous enhancement of academic stature, the expected level of performance for promotion and tenure in the college increases with time, and the characteristics of prior reappointments and promotions are not components of the evaluation. Characteristics for the more teaching intensive joint appointments in Lyman Briggs College are described in a separate document.

In all cases, a candidate will be recommended for renewal or promotion only when in the judgment of the dean of the college, in consultation with the college promotion and tenure committee, it is in the best interest of the university, when the totality of the record is consistent with renewal or promotion, and when there is a high level of performance in all three areas of evaluation.

Revised: March 16, 2011

## **Renewal of Appointment after 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Review**

### 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 as soon as the duration of the delay is known.

The candidate's research program should be established with well-defined research directions. In most fields, there should be Ph.D. students, post-doctoral fellows, and/or other research staff working with the candidate. In fields in which supervision of Ph.D. students by assistant professors is not the disciplinary norm, the candidate should demonstrate successful research interaction with graduate students in other ways.

Competitive, external research funding is available in most of the disciplines in the College of Natural Science and is usually 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. In most fields 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 the 4<sup>th</sup> year should have been submitted. In these cases the department should submit a funding update to the college in January of the candidate's 4<sup>th</sup> year. In a few fields, obtaining independent external funding is not expected of assistant professors, either because funding is not available or is awarded to large research collaborations. In these cases, this must be clarified and understood by the candidate, department, and college at the time the candidate is hired and documented in the reappointment materials.

In most cases, all publications from work completed in previous positions, including graduate school and post-doctoral positions, should be published or in press.

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. In most fields, 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.

Revised: March 16, 2011

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 teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The candidate should maintain a teaching portfolio, 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<sup>1</sup> 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 teaching (such as attendance at college and university programs related to instruction and results of mentoring interactions), and demonstration of effective engagement with undergraduate or graduate students on an individual basis such as undergraduate advising, supervision of undergraduate research, advising of student organizations, and participation on graduate dissertation committees.

Departments 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> A detailed description of the CNS RPT Teaching Portfolio may be found in the "[Guidelines for Implementation of Teaching Evaluation in CNS](#)".

## **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

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 in the college 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 or at other institutions where the candidate previously held a comparable position. They should be published or accepted for publication in leading peer-reviewed scientific journals and comparable outlets. Demonstrated independence from previous mentors such as Ph.D. and post-doctoral advisors is essential, and independent scientific leadership must be demonstrated. In most fields a substantial majority of the publications based on work done after appointment at Michigan State or at other institutions where the candidate previously held a position of comparable rank, should be from the candidate's research program with the candidate as the intellectual leader. Exceptions to these criteria, such as in fields where very large teams are needed for important progress to be made, must be agreed to at the time the candidate is hired and documented in the promotion documents.

Competitive, external research funding is available in most of the disciplines in the College of Natural Science and is usually necessary to support a research program of the quality and impact expected at Michigan State University. External 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 in most fields the candidate should have obtained on-going funding as principal investigator. In a few fields, obtaining independent external funding is not the disciplinary norm. In these cases, this must be clarified and understood by the candidate, department, and college at the time the candidate is hired and documented in the promotion documents.

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.

Revised: March 16, 2011

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.

### Teaching/Student Engagement

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

The candidate should demonstrate success at classroom teaching at the undergraduate level or graduate level. The candidate should maintain a teaching portfolio (see footnote 1 above), and the teaching portfolio should include evidence of efforts at enhancement of classroom teaching (such as attendance at college and university programs related to instruction and results of mentoring interactions), and demonstration of success in engaging undergraduate and graduate 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, 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 fields, 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 should also be evidence of successful student engagement in less formal ways. These may include but are not limited to undergraduate advising, supervision of undergraduate research, advising of student organizations, and participation on graduate dissertation committees.

### 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.

Revised: March 16, 2011

### Timing of Review for Promotion to Associate Professor

Review for promotion to associate professor with tenure normally takes place in the candidate's 6<sup>th</sup> 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 6<sup>th</sup> year will be undertaken only for compelling reasons. Departments should contact the college before beginning a review prior to the 6<sup>th</sup> year.

### 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.

## **Promotion to Professor**

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. In most disciplines, the candidate should have a demonstrated record of external competitive funding as principal investigator. In a few fields, obtaining independent external funding is not the disciplinary norm. In these cases, this must be clarified and understood by the candidate, department and college early in the candidate's career and documented in the promotion documents.

Collaborative research is also highly valued. Candidates should clearly identify their role in any collaborative project, and evidence of a substantial role 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, on-going 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.

Revised: March 16, 2011

### Teaching/Student Engagement

An essential criterion for this promotion is demonstrated, continuing effectiveness in engaging undergraduate and graduate students in the classroom, through research supervision and in less formal settings.

The candidate should demonstrate success at classroom teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The candidate should maintain a teaching portfolio (see footnote 1 above), and the teaching portfolio should include evidence of efforts at enhancement of classroom teaching (such as attendance at college and university programs related to instruction and results of mentoring interactions), and a demonstration of success in engaging undergraduate and graduate 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, 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 a Ph.D. Comparable supervision and placement of post-doctoral fellows is equivalent. In some fields, Ph.D. supervision by associate professors is not the national norm. In these cases, this should be clarified and understood by the candidate, department and college at the time the candidate is hired, documented in the promotion materials, and there should be strong evidence of effective engagement with undergraduate or graduate students on an individual basis.

There should also be evidence of continuing successful student engagement in less formal ways. These may include but are not limited to 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.

### Timing of Promotion to Professor

The timing of the review for promotion to 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.

Revised: March 16, 2011

## **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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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. There should be a set of at least eight letters from leading researchers at leading AAU Research I universities or comparable research organizations such as national laboratories or leading corporate research laboratories. These 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.

Referees chosen by the department may not be from the list recommended by the candidate, and at least five of the letters received must be from the department's list.

To insure that evaluations are as useful as possible, the letters requesting the evaluation must contain the following lines:

- "This review will be most help if you specifically compare Prof. XXX's stature and accomplishments to those of the leading researchers in her/his field and career cohort."
- "The dean of our college requests that you also include a list of three other highly qualified potential referees that we could contact if we need additional reviews."

All letters received through all media must be included in the promotion materials.

## Promotion Package Checklist

For the College of Natural Science, 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 of 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.

- 1. Form D-I: the completed cover sheet.
- 2. 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. 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.
- 3. Form D-II, Summary Information: For the summary ratings, the comparison group is faculty at AAU Research 1 universities at the same career stage. 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 and the cover letter from the dean substitute for the summary statements in this section.
- 4. 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 a explanation of any *shared* teaching responsibilities. The narrative should include a 1 to 2 page evaluation of the candidate's teaching documentation, including<sup>2</sup>
  - 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 CNS RPT "Teaching Portfolio", and
  - 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

---

<sup>2</sup> See the section on "Summarizing Teaching Accomplishments" in the "[Guidelines for Implementation of Teaching Evaluation in CNS](#)".

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.

- 5. 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.
- 6. Form D-IIIC, Evaluation of Service: This should address all aspects of service and leadership described in the criteria above.
- 7. Form D-IIID, Additional Reporting: (If any.)
- 8. \*Form D-IVA, Instructional Data, as required by the Form D instructions: The candidate's contributions to shared courses should be fully listed and also described in the written evaluation of teaching. Note that the number of "sections taught" refers to the number of separate course lecture, recitation, or laboratory sections taught directly by the candidate, and does not include recitation or laboratory sections taught by assistants, nor does it refer to the number of course meetings per week.
- 9. Numerical SIRS data should be compiled by the Unit/Department, and the CNS RPT numerical student evaluation summary worksheet should be appended here. Copies of the SIRS summary forms for individual courses should be kept on file in the Department, and should not be included in this packet.
- 10. \*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).

In CNS, 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.

- 11. \*A list of all the candidate’s funded grants (using the CNS funded grants worksheet) including the following in order: title, principal investigator, all co-principal investigators (unless prohibitively many), awarding agency, effective dates, total amount awarded, *total amount awarded to the candidate*, whether these amounts include indirect costs or not, and *the nature of the candidate’s participation in the grant if not P.I.* For promotion to professor, this list substitutes for Form D-IVB 3 and Form D-IVE. For reappointment or promotion to associate professor, Form D-IVE should contain all funded and non-funded grants and proposals.
- 12. \*Form D-IVC, Service: Include factual information related to disciplinary and institutional leadership and service.
- 13. \*Form D-IVD, Additional Reporting: (If any.)
- 14. \*Form D-IVE, Grant Proposals: Candidates requesting reappointments or promotions to associate professor need to complete this section. Not necessary for candidates requesting promotion to professor: see item 11.
- 15. \*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.
- 16. \*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.
- 17. A list and description of all referees from whom letters were requested, whether they provided a review, their current position, whether they are from the candidate’s list or selected by the department, a summary biography (a few lines) demonstrating their qualifications, and a description of any collaborations with the candidate or other potential conflicts of interest. If the reviewer did not provide a letter, describe the reasons if known. Do not include full vitas, web pages, or other bulky information about the referees.
- 18. Letters of recommendation.
- 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.

Revised: March 16, 2011

20. 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.
21. The package should not contain copies of papers, abstracts, grant proposals, course descriptions, the full teaching portfolio or other lengthy items not explicitly requested.

Approved: College of Natural Science Promotion and Tenure Committee, March 16, 2011.

# COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

## 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.) |
|-------|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|--|--------------------|---|
|       |                        |                            |                 |                 |   |  |                    |   |
|       |                        |                            |                 |                 |   |  |                    |   |
|       |                        |                            |                 |                 |   |  |                    |   |

[To add another row to the table, push the tab key in the very last cell.]

From the *CNS P&T Guidelines* adopted March 16, 2011:

11. A list of all the candidate's funded grants (using the CNS funded grants worksheet) including the following in order: title, principal investigator, all co-principal investigators (unless prohibitively many), awarding agency, effective dates, total amount awarded, *total amount awarded to the candidate*, whether these amounts include indirect costs or not, and *the nature of the candidate's participation in the grant if not P.I.* For promotion to professor, this list substitutes for Form D-IVB 3 and Form D-IVE. For reappointment or promotion to associate professor, Form D-IVE should contain all funded and non-funded grants and proposals.

# COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

## CNS RPT Numerical Student Evaluation Summaries

| Semester and Year | Course Number | Number of student responses | Instructor Involvement<br>(average of SIRS items 1-4) | Student Interest<br>(average of SIRS items 5-8) | Student-Instructor Interaction<br>(average of SIRS items 9-12) | Course Demands<br>(average of SIRS items 13-16) | Course Organization<br>(average of SIRS items 17-20) |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
|                   | COMP          |                             |   |   |  |   |  |
|                   | COMP          |                             |   |   |  |   |  |
|                   | COMP          |                             |   |   |  |   |  |
|                   | COMP          |                             |   |   |  |   |  |
|                   | COMP          |                             |   |   |  |   |  |
|                   | COMP          |                             |   |   |  |   |  |
|                   | COMP          |                             |   |   |  |   |  |
|                   | COMP          |                             |   |   |  |   |  |
|                   | COMP          |                             |   |   |  |   |  |
|                   | COMP          |                             |   |   |  |   |  |

**From the CNS P&T Guidelines adopted March 16, 2011:**

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.**