

Michigan State University Neuroscience Program Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies

Policies for Tenure Track Faculty

Renewal of Appointment of Tenure Track Faculty

Overview of Reappointment Process for Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty member and Neuroscience Director submit to the Neuroscience Program a completed MSU 'Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action' form (Form D) by September 30 in year 3 (or year 4 if the tenure clock has been extended). stockmey@msu.edu

1. This, and any additional supporting documentation, is reviewed by the Neuroscience Program and tenure home department Promotion and Tenure Committee.
2. The Neuroscience Program Promotion and Tenure Committee is composed of all tenured faculty with a >25% Neuroscience Program appointment.
3. The Neuroscience Program Reappointment and Tenure Committee is advisory to the Director, but the Director is responsible for final evaluation of the performance of each faculty consistent with the expectations for the position and policies of the Program, College and University.
4. The Neuroscience Program Reappointment and Tenure Committee and the Program Director will meet to discuss and evaluate the candidate's reappointment materials. The committee will conduct a secret ballot on the reappointment recommendation. The Program Director does not vote but will be aware of the individual votes of the committee members. This will ensure alignment of each committee member's evaluation and vote.
5. If a member of the Reappointment and Tenure committee is also a member of the candidate's mentoring committee, the mentor can recuse him/herself from the meeting if they choose.
6. The Director assesses each significant area of the individual's responsibilities, and accomplishments in light of the Reappointment and Tenure Committee's recommendations and provides an overall written evaluation that becomes part of the candidate's Form D package.
7. The candidate is encouraged to share their Draft Form D package with their mentoring committee to receive advice and feedback for strengthening their portfolio.
8. The Director shall schedule a time to discuss the written evaluation with the faculty member.

9. The Director forwards his/her recommendation to the Dean of the College, and from there the process follows that outlined by the 'Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Review'. (<http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm>)

Performance Expectations in Areas of Evaluation

Research

Successful candidates for renewal will demonstrate excellent progress toward establishing a productive, sustainable, high-quality program of research at MSU.

The candidate's laboratory or other needed research facilities and infrastructure should be established and functioning. If this has been delayed by circumstances beyond the candidate's control, the department should document the delay. If the delay is substantial, the candidate should request an extension of the tenure clock (see below) as soon as the duration of the delay is known.

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

Competitive, external research funding is necessary to support a research program of the quality and impact expected at Michigan State University. External research funding at a level appropriate for the candidate's discipline should be in place. The candidate should have submitted proposals for competitive, external research funding within the first two years, and have continued to aggressively pursue such funding. If such funding is not in place at the time of reappointment, proposals for funding beginning with the 3rd year should have been submitted. In such cases, the department should submit a funding update to the college in January of the candidate's 4th year. If funding is awarded to the candidate as part of a large research collaboration (for example, multi-PI R01s, program project grants, etc.), these cases must be clarified and understood by the candidate, Program, and college.

A substantial proportion of papers from Michigan State University 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. The candidate should include bibliometric data supporting the impact of his/her publications on the field of research (H-Index, for example).

Evaluation will 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 the collaborative projects.

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 conference presentations based on research done at MSU.

Teaching/Student Engagement

The candidate should demonstrate success at classroom and/or online teaching at the undergraduate, graduate, or professional level. To document this, the candidate should develop and maintain a teaching 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 a syllabus and a representative assessment tool (e.g. quiz or homework assignments) from three separate courses (fewer, if less than three courses have been taught), up to three one-page summaries of examples of teaching excellence, and a summary list of contributions to the teaching culture. Contributions to teaching culture should include evidence of efforts at enhancement of classroom and/or online teaching and demonstration of effective engagement with undergraduate, graduate, or professional students on an individual basis, such as undergraduate advising, supervision of research, advising of student organizations, and participation on graduate dissertation committees.

Faculty teaching will be evaluated annually via a peer-review mechanism. Faculty can request a specific NEU faculty member to visit the classroom during a selected lecture. The faculty reviewer will also evaluate relevant teaching materials associated with that lecture. The reviewer will provide a written assessment of the lecture and associated materials.

Faculty can request additional teaching evaluations by NEU faculty or by faculty from outside the Neuroscience Program.

The Department should keep records of SIRS scores (or equivalent) for all courses, and of peer evaluation by members of the candidate's unit.

Service/Leadership

Beginning assistant professors should not be overly burdened with internal service activities, but there should be demonstrated and growing contributions to departmental, college or university committees.

There should be evidence of developing disciplinary leadership and service as demonstrated by, for instance, reviewing of papers and research proposals, significant roles in professional societies, meeting organization or other professional service and leadership activities.

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

For faculty appointed in the tenure stream, promotion to Associate Professor is normally accompanied by the award of tenure.

Overview of the Promotion Process

1. The faculty member will meet with the Program Director (and tenure home Department Chair for jointly appointed faculty) to discuss plans for assembling and submitting promotion materials.
2. Faculty member submits to the Program Director (and Chair of the tenure home department for jointly appointed faculty) a completed MSU 'Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action' form (Form D). For tenure track faculty this must be done by September 30 in year 6 (year 7 if the tenure clock has been extended). There is no specific deadline for submission of promotion materials by fixed term faculty. However, it is recommended that the faculty member be in rank at Assistant Professor for a minimum of 6 years in order to establish a substantial record of productivity and accomplishments that justify consideration for promotion to Associate Professor.
3. For tenure stream faculty, the Director schedules a meeting for discussion of the candidate's Form D and other materials with the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The meeting will be scheduled in November.
4. For fixed term faculty, the Director will schedule a meeting of the Promotion Committee that will consist of both tenure stream faculty holding the rank of Associate or full Professor and fixed term faculty holding the rank of Associate or full Professor. The candidate may request addition of a fixed term faculty member from another unit if there is insufficient representation of fixed term faculty on the Promotion Committee.
5. The Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Committees are advisory to the Director, but the Director is responsible for final evaluation of the performance of each faculty consistent with the expectations for the position and policies of the Program and College.
6. The candidate is encouraged to share their Draft Form D package with their mentoring committee to receive advice and feedback for strengthening their portfolio.
7. The Director assesses each significant area of the individual's responsibilities, and provides an overall written evaluation.
8. The Director schedules a time to discuss the written evaluation with the faculty member.

9. The Director forwards his/her recommendation in collaboration with the Chair of the tenure home department to the Dean of the College, and from there the process follows that outlined by the 'Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review'.
(<http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm>)

Review for promotion to associate professor normally takes place in the 6th year as an Assistant Professor at Michigan State or in rank in a comparable position at another university. It is important that the university has as complete a picture of a candidate's record as possible at the time of promotion review. Thus, reviews prior to the 6th year will be undertaken only when compelling reasons exist. The Neuroscience Program Director will consult with the College of Natural Science Dean before beginning a review prior to the 6th year.

The standard for promotion to Associate Professor is demonstrated excellence in research, teaching, and leadership/service, and convincing evidence that a comparable level of performance will continue after promotion. Accomplishment in each category is weighted according to the percent effort as stipulated in the candidate's appointment.

Performance Expectations in Areas of Evaluation

Research

An essential criterion for promotion to associate professor with tenure at MSU is demonstrated stature as one of the leading researchers nationally and internationally in the candidate's field and career cohort. This stature must be demonstrated by outstanding research publications, on-going competitive external research funding, and strong letters of review from leading senior researchers who are independent of the candidate.

The record of publication must constitute a body of research of the highest quality and of sufficient quantity to demonstrate a leading and highly productive research program with strong and growing national/international impact. These publications should be based on work at Michigan State University. They should be published or accepted for publication in leading peer-reviewed scientific journals. The candidate should include bibliometric data supporting the impact of his/her publications on the field of research (H-Index, for example).

Demonstrated independence from previous mentors such as Ph.D. and post-doctoral advisors is essential, and independent scientific leadership must be demonstrated. In cases of large collaborative teams, candidate must demonstrate leadership in the publication by being a first author, senior author, or a co- corresponding author.

Competitive, external research funding must be at a level sufficient to support an on-going research program and in keeping with disciplinary norms for excellent research programs in the candidate's field. Funding should be in place to support continuing research after promotion. Independent scientific

leadership is expected, and the candidate should have obtained on-going funding as principal investigator.

Collaborative research is also highly valued. Each candidate should clearly identify their role in any collaborative projects, provide evidence of a substantial role in each major collaboration and describe their unique contribution to it (such as technical expertise or intellectual leadership). If collaborative funded research is a substantial component of the justification for promotion, the candidate's role in obtaining the funding and undertaking the research should be described.

The candidate must show a clearly defined direction for leading research after promotion as demonstrated by, for instance, on-going research projects, publications in preparation, on-going external funding, statements in letters of evaluation, and discussion in the candidate's research narrative in the promotion documents.

National visibility is critical, and the candidate should have a growing number of invitations to speak at professional meetings or leading universities and research organizations and also a growing number of submitted conference presentations based on research done at MSU.

The candidate is required to present a seminar focused on their research program to the faculty. The seminar should be scheduled during the 5th year (or 6th year if the tenure clock has been extended by 1 year) of the faculty member's appointment. This presentation should provide a clear background of the research, its importance to the field of study, and how future studies will advance current knowledge in the field. The seminar can be presented in either in the Neuroscience Program seminar series or the faculty member's home department seminar series.

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

Recognition of excellence as an investigator:

- Regular publication of original research in rigorously refereed journals
- Strong record of sustained national grant and/or contract support awarded by a mechanism involving peer review, consistent with the area of scholarship
- Documented national (and eventually international) recognition by peers outside the university as an independent, original and substantive investigator
- Invited papers and lectures pertaining to research, particularly at national and international meetings

Contributions to the field:

- Evidence of seminal work
- Participation on journal editorial boards and as an Editor
- Participation and membership in national study sections and advisory groups

- Leadership roles in national or international research societies or meetings
- Participation as consultant in regional or national research program reviews

Contributions to the Institution

- Strong record of departmental and institutional research training participation (undergraduate student, graduate student and postdoctoral) and development of training program and activities
- Participation/leadership in research program development
- Research-related administrative or committee activities
- Activity/leadership in training grant, undergraduate, graduate or postdoctoral research training programs

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

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

Teaching/Student Engagement

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

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

The program will promote development and improvement of the candidate's teaching skills through evaluation of the teaching portfolio and annual review by the tenure home department chair or Neuroscience Program director.

Faculty will have their teaching evaluated once per year via a classroom visit by a peer NEU faculty member. The faculty member can also request an additional evaluation by an additional non-NEU

faculty member. Evaluator(s) will be chosen by the Director after consulting with the faculty member to be evaluated.

Faculty also may request an optional evaluation by a faculty member not associated with the Neuroscience Program or tenure home department. Typically, this optional evaluation will be provided by an individual whose scholarship is linked to pedagogy and best practices in teaching and evaluation of student learning. The outcome of this evaluation will not be a part of the faculty teaching review.

Teaching evaluation will also be based on SIRS scores and any additional student evaluations that the faculty member would like to use to assess teaching.

The teaching portfolio, peer evaluations and SIRS scores and the results of additional student evaluations should provide evidence that effective action was taken to improve teaching, including correcting any significant deficiencies noted in departmental evaluations during the first years of a candidate's appointment.

In most cases, the candidate should show effective mentoring of graduate students as demonstrated by supervision of students who have completed a Ph.D. or are well advanced toward completion of their dissertation. Comparable supervision and placement of post-doctoral fellows is equivalent.

There also should be additional evidence of successful student engagement. These may include but are not limited to undergraduate advising and research mentoring, supervision of a research project, advising of student organizations, and participation on graduate student dissertation advisory committees.

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

1. Engages in multiple forms of instruction:
 - a. Lectures – classroom or online
 - b. Course director and/or primary course instructor
 - c. Teaching a laboratory course or recitation sessions
 - d. Advises undergraduate and/or graduate students/post-doctoral fellows/residents
 - e. Organizes seminars, journal clubs, or continuing education programs
 - f. Formative evaluation of student performance with feedback
2. Develops or revises teaching material effectively. Products reflect high-level knowledge of subject area, coherent organizational structure, and appropriate evaluation tools.
3. Invited to lecture outside one's own course (e.g. seminars/lectures on campus, in the community, and at other institutions)
4. Leadership in college instruction, course/curriculum design and/or evaluation efforts

5. Consistently receives very good evaluations from learners. Evaluation data from peers and the department chair are encouraged. Creates and sustains a positive learning environment, delivers material with enthusiasm, stimulates students to think creatively, and is responsive to student's concerns.
6. Materials commonly used to assess quality of teaching/student engagement
 - a. Teaching portfolio (syllabi, handouts, electronic presentations, online courseware, examinations)
 - b. textbook: generation, contributions, editorial position
 - c. reference material generation
 - d. educational software or web sites developed or implemented to enhance instruction
 - e. student, peer and administrative evaluations
 - f. external presentations related to pedagogy
 - g. invitations to serve on outside curriculum or evaluation committees
 - h. grants and contracts received in support of instruction or education
 - i. interest in and regard for quality of the instructional materials by individuals and/or institutions external to MSU

Service/Leadership

All tenured faculty members must be able to effectively support the internal academic functions of the university and significantly impact the national/international scientific environment. Candidates for this promotion must demonstrate leadership abilities in these areas.

Assistant professors should not be overly burdened by internal service responsibilities, but candidates should demonstrate effectiveness in this area by an increasing level of successful service at the department level over the probationary period. The candidate must be demonstrably prepared to effectively take on the service and leadership responsibilities of a tenured faculty member.

Candidates should be demonstrably prepared to take on disciplinary leadership as shown, for instance, by leadership in scientific societies and other organizations, substantial engagement with funding organizations (proposal reviewing and panel participation), reviewing of research papers, and organization of meetings.

Examples of Criteria Considered to Demonstrate Excellence in Professional Service

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

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

Extension of the Tenure Clock

Extensions of the tenure clock may be granted under the procedures and criteria of the university. Extensions should be requested as soon as the triggering reason is known (for instance, birth of a child, family emergency, or delay in preparation of adequate laboratory space). Extensions will not be granted within two years of the promotion review unless the triggering event occurs within that time period.

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

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

Overview of Promotion Process

1. The faculty member will meet with the Program Director (and tenure home Department Chair for jointly appointed faculty) to discuss plans for assembling and submitting promotion materials.
2. The faculty member submits to the Program Director the Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action' form (Form D). This should be done by the end of September so that there is sufficient time to collect external letters evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion to Professor.
3. For tenure track faculty, the completed Form D and external letters are made available for review by the Neuroscience Program Promotion and Tenure Committee. In this case, the committee would be composed of all NEU faculty (with a >25% NEU appointment) who hold the rank of tenured Professor.
4. For fixed term faculty, the Director will schedule a meeting of the Promotion Committee that will consist of both tenure stream faculty holding the rank of Professor and fixed term faculty holding the rank of Professor. The candidate may request addition of a fixed term faculty member from another unit if there is insufficient representation of fixed term faculty on the Promotion Committee.

5. The Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Committees are advisory to the Director, but the Director is responsible for final evaluation of the performance of each faculty consistent with the expectations for the position and policies of the Program and College.
6. The Program Director assesses each significant area of the individual's responsibilities, and provides an overall written evaluation. The letter is written in collaboration with the Chair of the tenure home department for faculty who are jointly appointed.
7. The Program Director schedules a time to discuss the written evaluation with the faculty member.
8. The Program Director forwards his/her recommendation to the Dean of the College. This is done in collaboration with the Chair of the tenure home department for jointly appointed faculty. The remaining process follows that outlined by the 'Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review'.
<http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm>

The timing of the review for promotion to full professor is less well defined than that for promotion to associate professor. Under normal circumstances, several years are needed to develop the necessary record. Promotions soon after promotion to Associate Professor require compelling justification. Evaluations undertaken prior to the end of the candidate's fifth year as tenured associate professor should be discussed with the college prior to being initiated.

Promotion to 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.

The faculty member's performance in each of the areas listed below is weighted based on the percent effort specified in the appointment letter.

Performance Expectations in Areas of Evaluation

Research

An essential criterion for this promotion is demonstrated stature as one of the leading researchers, nationally and internationally, in the candidate's field. This must be demonstrated by continuing publication of outstanding research in leading peer reviewed scientific journals and other high-impact outlets, on-going competitive external research funding sufficient to support a leading research program, and strong letters of review from leading researchers.

Since the previous promotion, the candidate should have published a body of high-impact research of sufficient quality and quantity to demonstrate national/international scientific leadership.

The candidate should have obtained continuing, competitive external funding at a level sufficient to support a strong, on-going research program at a level commensurate with disciplinary norms for leading research programs. Funding should be in place to support continuing research after promotion

Collaborative research also is valued highly. Candidates should clearly identify their role in any collaborative project, and evidence of a substantial role or leadership in each major collaboration and the candidate's unique contribution to it (such as technical expertise or intellectual leadership) should be clearly described and recognizable. If collaborative funded research is a substantial component of the justification for promotion, the candidate should have demonstrated strong leadership in obtaining the funding.

The candidate must show a clearly defined direction for leading research after promotion as demonstrated by, for instance, on-going research projects, publications in preparation, ongoing external funding, statements in letters of evaluation, and discussion in the candidate's narrative in the promotion documents.

There should be a continuing and substantial number of invitations to speak at national and international conferences and leading universities and research organizations, as well as contributed contributions to meetings and other venues.

Teaching/Student Engagement

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

The candidate should demonstrate success at classroom and/or online teaching at the undergraduate, graduate, or professional levels. The candidate should continue to maintain a teaching portfolio, and the teaching portfolio should include evidence of efforts at enhancement of teaching, as well as demonstration of success in engaging students on an individual basis.

The program should effectively promote the candidate's teaching skills through evaluation of the teaching portfolio, classroom visits, review of online materials and presentations, assignment of a teaching mentor, and annual review by the chair or director. The teaching portfolio, peer evaluations and SIRS scores should provide evidence of effective, continuous efforts to improve teaching, including correcting any deficiencies.

The candidate should show effective mentoring of graduate students as demonstrated by supervision and strong placement of students who have completed of a Ph.D. comparable supervision and placement of post-doctoral fellows is equivalent.

There also should be evidence of continuing successful student engagement in less formal ways. These may include, but are not limited to, curricular and pedagogical innovation or administration, undergraduate advising, supervision of undergraduate research, advising of student organizations, and participation on graduate dissertation committees.

Service/Leadership

This promotion requires demonstration of effective leadership within the academic sphere of the university and at the national/international level. Within the university, the candidate must show successful, continuing leadership and service contributions at the department level and the capacity to play a leadership role within the university. The candidate should show continuing national/international leadership through, for instance, significant roles in scientific societies and other organizations, substantial engagement with funding organizations (proposal reviewing and panel participation), and organization of scientific meetings.

External Evaluators

External evaluations by highly-qualified researchers are a critical component of the reviews for promotion to Professor.

The purpose of the external letters is to help evaluate the quality, significance and impact of candidate's research in regard to both the specific research area and the discipline overall, and to help the review committees in evaluation of the candidate's national/international stature.

Thus, letters should be obtained from a range of knowledgeable individuals with the objective of evaluating both the specifics of the candidate's research and its broader disciplinary impact – candidates should check with their respective college(s) as to the number of letters required. The letters should be from leading researchers at leading AAU Research I universities, or comparable research organizations, such as national laboratories or leading corporate research laboratories. They should be from individuals who are demonstrably disciplinary leaders, including people holding named faculty positions, fellows of major disciplinary societies, and members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences or a comparable organization.

Letters should not be obtained from individuals at the assistant professor level or equivalent. For promotions from assistant professor to associate professor, at most three letters may be from people holding the rank of associate professor, and these must be strongly justified. For promotion to professor, letters should not be solicited from individuals at the associate professor level.

Reviews from individuals who are independent of the candidate are essential and carry the most weight. Thus, letters from previous mentors (e.g., graduate or post-doctoral advisors) should not be solicited, and only a limited number of letters from research collaborators within the past three years should be solicited.

These should normally address specific questions about the candidate’s contributions to collaborative research projects. In a few fields that involve very large national or international collaborations, the best reviewers are often members of the collaboration team, and letters from such individuals are acceptable. The relationship of each reviewer to the candidate, if any, must be clearly described in the description of the referees’ credentials.

To solicit letters, the candidate should submit a list of six to eight potential referees, from which the department should obtain a minimum of three. All of the referees chosen from the candidate-recommended list must meet the criteria described above. The candidate should be told of the criteria for selection of referees prior to developing the recommendation list but should not contact the referees nor be aware of the identities of those chosen. Candidates may also designate a few referees they would prefer not review their case, indicating why. Additional referees chosen by the department to satisfy college requirements may not be from the list recommended by the candidate.

Policies for Fixed Term Faculty

Reappointment and Promotion Timeline

<u>Reappointment</u>	
February 1-15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Send fixed term faculty the annual self-appraisal form to be completed and returned to Shari Stockmeyer by March 15. 2. Consult individuals under review for suggestions of non-NEU members of the committee. Assemble annual review committees according to program RPT policies and procedures document. 3. Once members of the committee are identified, schedule meeting of the committee to review fixed term faculty annual review report. Meetings should be completed, and reports returned to Shari Stockmeyer by April 15. 4. Schedule 1-hour meeting of fixed term faculty with Program Director to review annual performance. Meetings scheduled during second half of April/first half of May.
April 15 – May 15	Annual review meeting with Neuroscience Program Director.

May 15 – May 30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual review evaluations distributed to fixed term faculty for comment and signatures. Return to Program Director. 2. Signed annual reviews filed in the Neuroscience Program Office.
<u>Promotion</u>	
Mid-January	For promotion, unit administrators must provide a recommendation to the College of Natural Science Dean by mid-January, submitting Form D and supporting materials
<u>Designation B</u>	
Sept. 30th or Jan. 31st	The candidate should submit Form B, a curriculum vitae, a reflective essay (no more than five pages), and a teaching portfolio to their unit administrator
Oct 20 th or Feb 28th	Unit administrators must provide a recommendation to the College of Natural Science Dean
Nov. 1st or Mar. 15th	The College of Natural Science Dean will review the case and make the recommendation to the Office of the Provost by the appropriate semester deadline
Nov. 30th or Apr. 15th	The Office of the Provost will make a final decision on Designation B status by the corresponding semester deadline

Annual Performance Review and Reappointment of Fixed Term Faculty

Principles

[HR Annual Review Principles](#)

The purposes of the annual performance evaluation of fixed term faculty are to:

- Ensure that each individual has a clear understanding of what is expected of her/him in his/her appointment;
- Assess individual performance against expectations;
- Provide an opportunity for fixed term faculty and academic staff to provide input to unit administrators about their performance;
- Provide a basis for making decisions on merit pay; and
- Provide input for decisions about future appointments.

Overview

- A. All Neuroscience Program fixed term faculty have their performance evaluated by the unit administrator on an annual basis, or within three months after the end of their appointment period.
- B. The evaluation of fixed term faculty is based on the duties and responsibilities specified in the position description and as stated in the accepted offer letter. Weight should be given to all duties consistent with the percent time listed for assigned duties in the “Fixed Term Faculty/Academic Staff Appointment/Reappointment Memorandum”.
- C. For fixed term faculty who are appointed in multiple units, Neuroscience Program will serve as the lead for performance evaluations if it is the lead unit for the appointment. This will include coordinating with the other unit(s) on performance planning, reporting, and evaluation to make things as seamless as possible for the faculty/staff member.

Evaluation Period

The annual evaluation period shall be January 1 to December 31.

Self-Review

Each fixed term faculty member must submit a written summary of activities using the Neuroscience Program Self Evaluation form (see [Appendix A](#)). The written summary of activities and supporting documentation provide evidence to be used by the peer review committee and Program Director in evaluating performance.

Unit Review by Colleagues

A unit review committee will be established to advise the Neuroscience Program Director about the reappointment or promotion of the fixed term faculty member. Every attempt should be made to ensure that the review committee is composed of individuals knowledgeable about the position under review.

The peer review committee will be composed of the Neuroscience Program Undergraduate Director, one NEU faculty (tenure-track or fixed term) or academic staff member, and one faculty (tenure-track or fixed term) or academic staff member from the College of Natural Science that is knowledgeable about the position under review. The fixed term faculty can request a fourth member if desired. The fourth member must meet the same guidelines as the other committee members. The candidate under review can suggest individuals to fill the roles of the committee members. Final decisions for all positions will be made by the Director of the Neuroscience Program.

The fixed term faculty member under review must be provided an opportunity to confer with the review committee before it provides advice to the unit administrator regarding reappointment or promotion.

If a Director position (Undergraduate or Graduate) is filled by a fixed term faculty member, that individual is exempt from the peer review committee process and should submit all documentation directly to the Program Director for evaluation.

Unit Review by Director

The Program Director shall review the performance of each fixed term faculty member and shall prepare a written evaluation using the "[College of Natural Science Fixed Term Faculty and Academic Staff Annual Performance Evaluation](#)" form.

The Program Director shall certify, through the Dean of the College of Natural Science, to the Office of the Provost that the evaluation has been completed.

Right to Review

The Program Director will discuss the evaluation with the fixed term faculty member. The Program Director shall provide a draft written evaluation prior to meeting with each individual to discuss the evaluation. A written summary of this evaluation shall be placed in the non-tenure track faculty's personnel file in the unit and given to the non-tenure track faculty within 30 calendar days of the evaluation. The fixed term faculty member may attach a written statement to the evaluation if desired, a copy of which will be kept in the candidate's personnel file in the unit.

Evaluation Criteria

The following categories will be included in any evaluation to the extent applicable:

- A. Teaching (undergraduate, graduate, non-credit)
- B. Research, creative activities, and other scholarly effort
- C. Advising, counseling, and other student services
- D. Outreach
- E. Curriculum development

- F. Service (unit, college, university, professional)
- G. Administration (i.e. duties related to a formal administrative assignment)
- H. Overall Evaluation, which considers performance in all of the required performance areas relative to their percent time and importance.

NOTE: The evaluation should be based only on assigned duties, not those activities that the faculty or staff member chooses to do on a voluntary basis

Annual Peer Teaching Evaluation

[College of Natural Science Teaching Evaluation Guidelines](#)

The fixed term faculty member with a primary teaching responsibility shall be evaluated annually. The guidelines document drafted by the College of Natural Science Promotion and Tenure Committee stipulates that the overall evaluation of a candidate for promotion, tenure, or reappointment will be based in part on peer evaluation of a candidate's teaching performed by the home department. The college expects that peer evaluation will include both classroom visits by faculty members from the department and reviews of syllabi and assessment tools used in courses. Faculty members who perform peer evaluations should be well informed about best practices.

The purpose of these peer evaluations is fourfold: (1) to place student evaluations in perspective, either corroborating them or providing an alternative viewpoint on the quality of teaching in the course, (2) to verify that the course goals outlined in the syllabus are clearly stated and appropriate and that the assessment tools are well aligned with those goals, (3) to review course content and exams to determine if these materials are appropriate for the course, and (4) to encourage an exchange of ideas among colleagues that enhances the quality of teaching throughout the department.

The candidate under review can suggest an individual to fill the roles peer evaluator. Evaluators should be knowledgeable about best practices for teaching. Evaluators can be NEU faculty, academic specialists, or from outside the Neuroscience Program if they a) have an expertise in teaching and learning or b) have an expertise in the method of instruction (e.g. lab courses or online courses). Final decisions for all positions will be made by the Director of the Neuroscience Program.

For in-person classes, the candidate will offer several dates that are most appropriate for the teaching evaluation to take place. The evaluator will attend class on one of those dates and provide advance notice of at least one week to the candidate.

For online classes, the candidate will offer a module for the evaluator to complete

The evaluator will complete the [CNS Peer Classroom Observation Tool](#) within one week of observation and provide a copy to the Neuroscience Program Director and the candidate. For online classes, items may be modified to suit an online environment as needed.

The teaching evaluation must be completed prior to the annual review committee meeting. The academic specialist may opt to have the teaching evaluation considered in the ratings of teaching provided by the committee to the Neuroscience Program Director.

Annual Peer Teaching Evaluation Forms

<https://natsci.msu.edu/faculty-staff/policies-procedures/evaluation-policy-resources/teaching-evaluation-guidelines/>

<https://natsci.msu.edu/natsci/assets/File/faculty-staff/peer-obs-tool.docx>

Guidelines for Promotion of Fixed Term Faculty from Assistant to Associate Professor or from Associate Professor to Professor

College of Natural Science Promotion Guidelines

Promotion of fixed term faculty is based solely on an evaluation of the duties and responsibilities specified in the candidate's position description. The procedures below follow the review process for the promotion of tenure system assistant and associate professors as closely as possible.

1. The promotion criteria for research and teaching excellence used by the Neuroscience Program are the same as those used in evaluating those duties for tenure system faculty as described in the "Guidelines for Faculty Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure in the College of Natural Science at Michigan State University", for the corresponding promotion (see Appendix B). As in the case of tenure system faculty, a successful promotion candidate is expected to have demonstrated an appropriate level of leadership in the areas of their assignment.
2. The procedures that the Neuroscience Program will use for reviewing the promotion of fixed term faculty are as follows.
 - a. Each year, during the required annual performance review (see "Annual Performance Review and Reappointment of Fixed Term Faculty" section above), unit administrators should discuss with eligible fixed term faculty the criteria for promotion in rank, the faculty member's progress toward promotion, and discuss whether he or she wishes to seek promotion in the coming academic year. The administrator shall provide a written copy of this review to the faculty member. While there is no fixed timeline associated with these promotions, successful candidates typically require 5-6 years in rank to acquire a suitable record of accomplishments.
 - b. If the individual elects to seek promotion, the unit administrator will prepare a description of the candidate's assignment including, for example, the percentage of the appointment devoted to research, teaching, and other duties. This description will form part of the review portfolio and will be distributed to all individuals who evaluate the portfolio.

- c. In preparing materials for the review portfolio, the candidate is required to provide information or documents related to the activities that are part of his or her assignment, using the Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action form (Form D, as implemented in the College of Natural Science RPT guidelines - https://natsci.msu.edu/_natsci/assets/File/Faculty%20%26%20Staff/rpt-faculty-form-unlocked.doc) as a guide. MSU guidelines specify that these materials must include:
 - i. A current curriculum vitae,
 - ii. A reflective essay about accomplishments during the reporting period (5 pages maximum), detailing the leadership activities undertaken,
 - iii. A representative sample of scholarly work, and
 - iv. Evidence of excellence in performing assigned duties, e.g., significance, impact, and innovation of research/creative activities, instructional activities, and service.
- d. If teaching is an assigned duty, the candidate must provide the Department with a “Teaching Portfolio”, as described in the “College of Natural Science Teaching Evaluation Guidelines.” (<https://natsci.msu.edu/faculty-staff/policies-procedures/evaluation-policy-resources/teaching-evaluation-guidelines/>) In addition, as per MSU policy5 for all teaching faculty, candidates must use unit-approved student instructional ratings forms (or online equivalent) in all classes (every course, every section, every semester), and make these forms available to the unit for collection and analysis.
- e. If research/creative work is an assigned duty, the Department must seek external review letters in accord with the College of Natural Science RPT guidelines; in other cases, the inclusion of external review letters is optional.
- f. Units should review the promotion material submitted by fixed term faculty candidates in the same manner in which they review tenure system promotion candidates, though focusing only the duties assigned to the fixed term candidate.
- g. Unit administrators must provide a recommendation to the College of Natural Science Dean by mid-January, submitting Form D and supporting materials (those relevant for the assigned duties as described in the College of Natural Science RPT guidelines), and must include copies of the annual evaluations of the candidate during the reporting period. This recommendation should provide an analysis of the candidate’s performance in their assigned duties, as well as the leadership activities in which they have been involved.
- h. The College of Natural Science Dean will consult with the College of Natural Science RPT committee and make a final recommendation to the Office of the Provost, according to the timetable for the academic year in question.

Guidelines for Consideration of UNTF Faculty for “Designation B” Status

[College of Natural Science Designation B Guidelines](#)

According to the terms of the contract between MSU and the Union of Nontenure-track Faculty (UNTF), fixed term faculty members who are members of the UNTF may apply to be considered for “Designation B” status during “the first month of the tenth or subsequent semester of teaching employment within six years of the first of these semesters in a given employing unit.”

A Designation B appointment is predicated on exemplary instructional performance in UNTF bargaining unit assigned teaching duties. If Designation B approval is granted, subsequent UNTF appointments would have a duration of at least three years. Details can be found in the [UNTF contract](#) and the relevant MSU policies and procedures can be found here: [Designation B MSU Policies & Procedures](#).

1. The criteria for teaching excellence used by the Neuroscience Program are the same as those used in evaluating the classroom teaching performance of tenure-system faculty as described in the “Guidelines for Faculty Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure in the College of Natural Science at Michigan State University”: [Evaluating Teaching Performance](#) (see also [Appendix B](#)).
 - a. The procedures that the Neuroscience Program will use for Designation B reviews are as follows. As per [MSU policy](#), for all faculty, candidates must use unit-approved student instructional ratings forms (or online equivalent) in all classes (every course, every section, every semester), and make these forms available to the unit for collection and analysis.
 - b. Candidates are expected to maintain a “Teaching Portfolio”, as described in the “[Guidelines for Implementation of Teaching Evaluation in College of Natural Science](#).”
 - c. The candidate should submit Form B, a curriculum vitae, a reflective essay (no more than five pages), and a teaching portfolio to their unit administrator by the designated semester (Sept. 30th or Jan. 31st) deadline.
 - d. Unit administrators must provide a recommendation to the College of Natural Science Dean by Oct. 20th (Fall) or Feb. 28th (spring).
 - i. As part of their recommendation, unit administrators must include:
 1. A summary of the results of the student evaluations (SIRS) for all unit courses the candidate has taught using the College of Natural Science RPT Numerical [Student Evaluation Summaries](#) worksheet.
 2. A summary of peer classroom observation of candidates, which are expected to have occurred at least once per year.
 3. An analysis of the teaching portfolio submitted by the candidate.
 - ii. Unit administrators can employ an appropriate review committee for advice in making a recommendation to the College of Natural Science Dean. In this case, the candidate must be

provided the opportunity to meet with the review committee prior to it making a recommendation. Recommendations of the review committee are forwarded to the unit administrator.

- iii. If no review committee is used, the candidate must be provided with an opportunity to meet with the unit administrator before a recommendation is provided to the College of Natural Science Dean.
- iv. The unit administrator should record their recommendation on the cover page of Form B, summarize their assessment of the teaching record of the candidate (including an analysis of the student evaluations and the candidate’s teaching portfolio) in Form B item 7, and forward Form B, associated material (the student evaluation summary and all material in item 2c except for the teaching portfolio), and copies of the all annual evaluations of the candidate from the employing unit to the College of Natural Science Dean.
- e. The College of Natural Science Dean will review the case and make the recommendation to the Office of the Provost by the appropriate semester deadline (Nov. 1st or Mar. 15th).

The Office of the Provost will make a final decision on Designation B status by the corresponding semester deadline (Nov. 30th or Apr. 15th)

Policies for Academic Specialists

Reappointment and Promotion Timeline

<u>Reappointment</u>	
February 1-15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Send specialist the annual self-appraisal form to be completed and returned to Shari Stockmeyer by March 15. 2. Consult individuals under review for suggestions of non-NEU members of the committee. Assemble annual review committees according to program RPT policies and procedures document. 3. Once members of the committee are identified, schedule meeting of the committee to review specialist annual review report. Meetings should be completed, and reports returned to Shari Stockmeyer by April 15. 4. Schedule 1-hour meeting of academic specialist with Program Director to review annual performance. Meetings scheduled during second half of April/first half of May.
April 15 – May	Annual review meeting with Neuroscience Program Director.

15	
May 15 – May 30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual review evaluations distributed to academic specialists for comment and signatures. Return to Program Director. 2. Signed annual reviews filed in the Neuroscience Program Office.
<u>Designation B</u>	
Sept. 30th or Jan. 31st	The candidate should submit Form B, a curriculum vitae, a reflective essay (no more than five pages), and a teaching portfolio to their unit administrator
Oct 20 th or Feb 28th	Unit administrators must provide a recommendation to the College of Natural Science Dean
Nov. 1st or Mar. 15th	The College of Natural Science Dean will review the case and make the recommendation to the Office of the Provost by the appropriate semester deadline
Nov. 30th or Apr. 15th	The Office of the Provost will make a final decision on Designation B status by the corresponding semester deadline
<u>Promotion to Continuing System or Senior Specialist</u>	
January 1	Units inform College of Natural Science dean's office of candidates
January 15	Units forward external referee suggestions and rationale for 1) candidates for continuing status and 2) all candidates for senior specialist to College of Natural Science dean's office
March 1	Reappointment/promotion materials and recommendations due to College of Natural Science dean's office

April 1	Reappointment/promotion materials and recommendations due to Academic Human Resources
---------	---

Annual Review

[HR Annual Review](#)

The academic specialist shall be evaluated by the appropriate unit administrator before the end of the applicable annual duty period.

Principles

[HR Annual Review Principles](#)

The purposes of the annual performance evaluation of academic staff are to:

- Ensure that each individual has a clear understanding of what is expected of her/him in his/her appointment;
- Assess individual performance against expectations;
- Provide an opportunity for fixed term faculty and academic staff to provide input to unit administrators about their performance;
- Provide a basis for making decisions on merit pay; and
- Provide input for decisions about future appointments.

Evaluation Period

The annual evaluation period shall be January 1 to December 31.

Evaluation Basis

[HR Evaluation Basis](#)

The evaluation of an academic specialist's performance shall be based on the duties and responsibilities specified in the job description for the specific position, general merit guidelines and the provisions of the Academic Specialist Appointment System.

Annual Evaluation

[HR Annual Evaluation](#)

The academic specialist shall be evaluated annually to determine progress toward goals and/or the identification of goals. Units may also use the annual evaluation to assist in the assignment of merit and

other salary adjustments. Units may schedule such evaluations to meet the needs and concerns of the individual unit; however, the unit must follow the established procedures. The academic specialist appointed on a fixed term basis for six months or more shall be evaluated by the unit administrator no later than two months prior to the appointment ending date.

Notification of Evaluation

[HR Annual Evaluation](#)

The academic specialist shall be notified when the evaluation is to take place, what procedures are to be followed, and what criteria are to be used for the evaluation. This notification should be at the time of appointment and, subsequently, two months prior to the evaluation. Neuroscience Program Office Staff will provide reminders of due dates for submission of review materials and evaluation meeting dates.

Right to Review

A written summary of this evaluation shall be placed in the academic specialist's personnel file in the unit and given to the academic specialist within 30 calendar days of the evaluation. Unit administrators must review such evaluations personally with the academic specialist.

Self-Review

Each academic specialist must submit a written summary of activities using the Neuroscience Program Self Evaluation form (see Appendix A). The written summary of activities and supporting documentation provide evidence to be used by the peer review committee and Program Director in evaluating performance.

Unit Review by Colleagues

[HR Unit Review](#)

A unit review committee will be established to advise the Neuroscience Program Director about the reappointment, award of continuing appointment status, or promotion of the academic specialist. Every attempt should be made to ensure that the review committee is composed of individuals knowledgeable about the position under review and the Academic Specialist Appointment System. The composition of the review committee will be established every year. The review committee may be composed of members who have served on the academic specialist's committee in previous years.

The Academic Specialist - Teacher committee will consist of the Neuroscience Program Undergraduate Director, one NEU faculty (tenure-track or fixed term) or academic staff member, and one faculty (tenure-track or fixed term) or academic staff member from the College of Natural Science that is knowledgeable about the position under review. The Academic Specialist - Teacher can request a fourth member if desired. The fourth member must meet the same guidelines as the other committee members. Any committee member from outside the Neuroscience Program will have a voice but no

vote. The candidate under review can suggest individuals to fill the roles of the committee members. Final decisions for all positions will be made by the Director of the Neuroscience Program.

The Academic Specialist – Advisor committee will consist of the Undergraduate Director of the Neuroscience Program and one NEU faculty (tenure-track or fixed term) or academic staff member. The Academic Specialist – Advisor can choose to add one or two Academic Specialist – Advisor(s) from relevant units. The candidate under review can suggest individuals to fill the roles of the committee members. Final decisions for all positions will be made by the Director of the Neuroscience Program

The Academic Specialist under review must be provided an opportunity to confer with the review committee before it provides advice to the unit administrator regarding reappointment, promotion, or award of continuing appointment status.

Characteristics and Responsibilities

[HR Characteristics](#)

The principal activities of academic specialists are confined to three functional areas (academic advising/teaching/curriculum development, research, and service/outreach). Guidance for the assignment of academic specialists to one of the three functional areas and on whether a particular position should be placed within the Academic Specialist Appointment System is described in a document entitled “Guidelines for Specialist Placements”, which appears as Appendix B in the Academic Specialist Handbook. The characteristic duties and responsibilities included in Section A.5. are not intended to supersede the guidelines for specialist placements but only to provide examples of typical activities.

As noted, each academic specialist is classified as being in one functional area in which the individual expends a relevantly significant amount of effort in assigned duties. The academic specialist routinely will have duties which fall into more than one functional area plus other assignments. The specific description of assigned duties is contained in the job description for the individual position. Reappointment/continuing appointment status and promotion of an individual with responsibilities in multiple functional areas will depend on an appropriately weighted assessment of performance in each area. The following detailed descriptions provide a suggested array of duties that may be performed by academic specialists; they are not intended as listings of required job duties.

Detailed descriptions of responsibilities are found in [Appendix C](#). Criteria for reappointment are found in [Appendix D](#).

Annual Peer Teaching Evaluation

[College of Natural Science Teaching Evaluation Guidelines](#)

The academic specialist with a primary teaching responsibility shall be evaluated annually. The guidelines document drafted by the College of Natural Science Promotion and Tenure Committee stipulates that the overall evaluation of a candidate for promotion, tenure, or reappointment will be based in part on peer evaluation of a candidate's teaching performed by the home department. The college expects that peer evaluation will include both classroom visits by faculty members from the department and reviews of syllabi and assessment tools used in courses. Faculty members who perform peer evaluations should be well informed about best practices.

The purpose of these peer evaluations is fourfold: (1) to place student evaluations in perspective, either corroborating them or providing an alternative viewpoint on the quality of teaching in the course, (2) to verify that the course goals outlined in the syllabus are clearly stated and appropriate and that the assessment tools are well aligned with those goals, (3) to review course content and exams to determine if these materials are appropriate for the course, and (4) to encourage an exchange of ideas among colleagues that enhances the quality of teaching throughout the department.

The candidate under review can suggest an individual to fill the roles peer evaluator. Evaluators should be knowledgeable about best practices for teaching. Evaluators can be NEU faculty, academic specialists, or from outside the Neuroscience Program if they a) have an expertise in teaching and learning or b) have an expertise in the method of instruction (e.g. lab courses or online courses). Final decisions for all positions will be made by the Director of the Neuroscience Program.

For in-person classes, the candidate will offer several dates that are most appropriate for the teaching evaluation to take place. The evaluator will attend class on one of those dates and provide an advance notice of at least one week to the candidate.

For online classes, the candidate will offer a module for the evaluator to complete

The evaluator will complete the [CNS Peer Classroom Observation Tool](#) within one week of observation and provide a copy to the Neuroscience Program Director and the candidate. For online classes, items may be modified to suit an online environment as needed.

The teaching evaluation must be completed prior to the annual review committee meeting. The academic specialist may opt to have the teaching evaluation considered in the ratings of teaching provided by the committee to the Neuroscience Program Director.

Annual Peer Teaching Evaluation Forms

<https://natsci.msu.edu/faculty-staff/policies-procedures/evaluation-policy-resources/teaching-evaluation-guidelines/>

<https://natsci.msu.edu/natsci/assets/File/faculty-staff/peer-obs-tool.docx>

Administrative

An individual appointed in the Academic Specialist Appointment System, in accordance with the Guidelines for Specialist Placements, may also serve in administrative roles related to their functional assignments as an academic specialist. This may involve significant responsibilities in promoting and contributing to the efficient and effective management of the applicable unit or program with the related responsibility of attracting and managing resources, funding, material and/or people to achieve unit/program goals and to maintain administrative accountability. The individual with an appropriate assignment as an academic specialist in one or more of the three previously designated functional areas may be assigned such administrative duties with a relevant title in addition to designation as an academic specialist or senior academic specialist. Examples of such titles could be Assistant to the Dean/Chairperson/Director, Coordinator, plus other relevant academic administrative titles. As is the case for other academic unit administrators, as relevant, such administrative assignments may involve an annual appointment basis and the assignment of an administrative salary increment.

Other Contributions to Review Process

[HR Other Contributions](#)

In addition to the review committee's advice, the unit administrator may also consult with administrative staff, faculty, students, and/or other qualified individuals inside or outside the unit regarding the reappointment or promotion review. The academic specialist should be informed of those individuals from whom the unit administrator is requesting advice; the academic specialist is not informed of those individuals who provide letters of evaluation, unless stipulated by unit policy.

General Reappointment and Promotion Information

Reappointment Recommendation Schedule

[HR Reappointment Schedule](#)

For academic specialists in the continuing system, reappointment and promotion recommendations must be submitted to the Office of the Provost for review and final action in April of the calendar year prior to the end of the probationary appointment. The individual must be notified in writing by December 15 of the same year. Probationary appointment periods are calculated from August 16 of the calendar year in which the appointment is effective, irrespective of the actual date of appointment. In accordance with the Board of Trustees' delegation of academic personnel actions, the Office of the Provost approves all Academic Specialist Appointment System personnel actions; these actions are reported to the Michigan State University Board of Trustees as information items.

Merit as a basis for reappointment and promotion

[HR Merit](#)

Reappointment of the academic specialist, including the award of continuing appointment status and promotion to the rank of senior academic specialist, must be based on meritorious performance, not merely time spent in the position. General characteristics and responsibilities are included in later sections specific to the particular functional areas. However, the underlying premise is that individuals appointed as academic specialists are professionals dedicated to the performance of their responsibilities, the advancement of the University and maintaining Michigan State University as a premier land-grant, AAU University. The listing of criteria is not intended to be exhaustive. Nor would a single individual necessarily be measured by all the criteria related to a given functional group, even if the duties of that individual fell only within one functional area. Rather, the individual would be evaluated according to the subset of criteria from each functional area involved that is appropriate to the particular position.

General Process for Reappointment and Promotion

[HR General Process](#)

Reappointment, including the award of continuing appointment status and promotion to the rank of senior academic specialist, is predicated on the exemplary performance of assigned duties, professional development, excellence in scholarly activity, leadership and contributions to the institution.

- Consistent with the reappointment/promotion timetable, individuals who believe they have developed an appropriate record of activity and competence may assemble a compendium of scholarly achievements and submit such documentation to support consideration for reappointment or promotion. Such documentation may consist of evidence to substantiate excellence in relevant scholarly activities, i.e., course/curriculum development, teaching, publications, public service/outreach, academic advising, grants, creativity in program development and leadership in other areas related to assigned duties.
- It is to be recognized that no one individual is to be required to perform or excel in all three functional areas. The initial or subsequent appointment description defines the basic area(s) in which the individual should devote energy and attention in career progression.
- The unit review committee for academic specialist reappointment or promotion should be provided with guidelines and directed to determine objectively the level of accomplishment and excellence in the relevant academic specialist functional area(s) and specific duty assignments. Each academic specialist is to be evaluated based on individual merit.
- Recommendations of the review committee are forwarded to the appropriate academic unit administrator. The recommendation of the academic unit administrator is forwarded for subsequent review and action by the relevant major academic unit administrator (usually the dean) and by the Office of the Provost.
- Upon approval by the Provost, the academic specialist will be notified of the recommended action.

Fixed Term Specialist Reappointment

Upon satisfactory annual review(s), reappointment policies are detailed below.

See also: https://natsci.msu.edu/_natsci/assets/File/Faculty%20%26%20Staff/continuing-specialist-review-proc.pdf

<https://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/academicspecialist/fixedreview.htm>

An academic specialist with a fixed term appointment should be reviewed regardless of the probability of reappointment in order to assess progress toward goals and/or the identification of goals. The academic specialist appointed on a fixed term basis for six months or more shall be evaluated by the unit administrator no later than two months prior to the appointment ending date. A summary of this evaluation shall be placed in the personnel file in the unit and be given to the academic specialist.

Academic Specialist Reappointment Form

<https://www.hr.msu.edu/ua/hiring/documents/FixedTermAppt.pdf>

Continuing Specialist Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion

<https://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/academicspecialist/ReappContPromo.htm>

For academic specialists with continuing system appointments, evaluations are based on the specifics of the individual's assignment and on the effectiveness in the appropriate functional area(s): advising/teaching/ curriculum development, research, or service/outreach (see Appendix D). The kinds of evidence to be considered must be established at the time of appointment. The academic specialist should have the opportunity to submit evidence supporting the proposed reappointment, promotion or award of continuing appointment status. Reappointment, award of continuing appointment status, or promotion must promote the objectives of improving academic strength and quality (see HR Doc - Appendix A). <https://www.hr.msu.edu/ua/promotion/index.html>

Award of Designation B

Designation B guidelines are the same as fixed term faculty. See "Guidelines for Consideration of UNTF Faculty for "Designation B" Status" section above.

Award of Continuing Appointment Status or Senior Academic Specialist

Continuing Appointment

An academic specialist who has not served previously at the University is appointed initially in the Academic Specialist Appointment System for a probationary period of three years and may be

reappointed for an additional probationary period of three years. If an academic specialist is appointed beyond the two probationary periods, continuing appointment status is granted. If at any time during these two probationary periods an academic specialist is promoted to the rank of senior academic specialist, continuing appointment status is granted. Probationary appointment periods are calculated from August 16 of the calendar year in which the appointment is effective.

In the normal circumstances, continuing system academic specialists are reviewed for reappointment in their second year after initial appointment and for the granting of continuing status in their fifth year. Review for promotion to senior academic specialist has no fixed schedule.

Senior Academic Specialist

In addition to excellence in performance which warrants reappointment and/or continuing appointment status, a small number of academic specialists may achieve a level of distinction to justify promotion to the rank of senior academic specialist. Such a distinction is to be limited to a small number of individuals appointed in the academic specialist appointment system. The basis for such a promotion recommendation is to be derived from a significantly long and sustained period of excellence in the performance of assigned duties together with the recognition by peers and colleagues both within the University and regionally, nationally and internationally. Such recognition is to be based on external peer review involving evaluation of performance in one or more of the assigned functional areas: teaching/advising/curriculum development, research, public service/outreach. Only in unusual cases would an individual not previously appointed at Michigan State University be appointed at the rank of senior academic specialist. This rank designation is limited to individuals who either have continuing appointment status or would achieve such a status on positive recommendation for promotion to the rank of senior academic specialist. Academic specialists with fixed term appointments who have completed 60 FTE service months are eligible for promotion to senior academic specialist, subject to the same standards and criteria applicable to individuals in the continuing appointment system. (Specialists with fixed term appointments are not eligible for the rank of senior academic specialist upon appointment). A promotion recommendation requires endorsement not only by the immediate academic unit administrator but by intermediate administrators (usually the Dean) and the Provost.

Materials for College-Level Evaluation

The materials provided by the unit to the college for reappointment, granting of continuing status, and promotion to senior specialist should include Form C as well as the additional materials requested below. As part of Form C, required information includes:

1. A summary statement by the department chair or program director justifying the change of status or promotion and describing the future trajectory of the candidate in Form C, item 1.
2. Copy of up-to-date Specialist Position Description for Form C, item 3

3. A deep analysis of the contributions of the candidate based on the job description and criteria above and undertaken by a knowledgeable individual or group. This analysis must include an evaluation of the position portfolio (see page 2) provided by the candidate and should appear in the appropriate section(s) of Form C: a
 - a. Academic advising in Form C, item 7
 - b. Teaching in Form C, item 12
 - c. Curriculum planning in Form C, item 14
 - d. Research in Form C, item 19
 - e. Outreach in Form C, item 21
 - f. Administration in Form C, item 23

In addition, the following materials are also required:

1. A statement by the candidate (no more than three pages) describing their contributions, future plans, and trajectory.
2. Letters of Review
 - a. For reappointment: no letters required.
 - b. For granting of continuing status: a minimum of three letters of evaluation from outside the unit with at least one being outside of the College of Natural Science.
 - c. For promotion to senior academic specialist: a minimum of four letters of evaluation with at least two of the letters to come from outside the university with at least one being peer review. No more than one letter can be from inside the unit.
 - d. All letters must be from appropriate individuals chosen by the unit and anonymous to the candidate. These individuals must be directly knowledgeable about and qualified to comment on the candidate's contributions.
 - e. In the case of research specialists being promoted to continuing status and for any specialist being promoted to senior status, the chair/director responsible for the promotion process will consult with the College of Natural Science Dean's Office regarding the letters that should be submitted with Form C. A list of suggested referees with a rationale (a couple of sentences) for why each are in a position to evaluate the candidate must be sent to College of Natural Science (natscidean@msu.edu) by January 15.
3. A description of the qualifications of the external and internal referees.
4. The candidate's curriculum vitae.
5. Copies of the three most recent annual evaluations of the candidate.

Appendix A

Academic Specialist & Fixed Term Faculty

Reporting and Self-Appraisal Form

Neuroscience Program, Michigan State University

The questions listed below are designed to help prepare for an effective performance evaluation by the Program Director and the Annual Review Committee.

Leave blank any activities that are not included in your appointment.

Please submit the completed form to Shari Stockmeyer (stockmey@msu.edu) by _____, **2018**.

Name:

Appointment:

Date of submission:

Please list your level of effort in each of the following disciplines for the previous calendar year. It must total 100%.

Activity	% Effort
Administration	
Advising	
Curriculum development	
Outreach/Public Services	
Research	
Teaching	
Total	

Administration

1. List any administrative appointments or contributions made to the Neuroscience Program, College, or University.
-

Advising

2. List advising activities:
3. Describe your advising philosophy:
4. List advising awards/recognition:
5. List other advising activity and advising-related workshops in which you have participated.
6. Provide a description of any educational contributions to the field of advising.
7. Attach any supporting evidence for excellence in advising (student evaluations, peer evaluations) you would like to have considered in your annual evaluation.
8. List names of students whom you supervised/mentored. Include their major or program of study. Please make note if they are paid employees. Insert more rows as needed.

Student position	Student name	Major/program	Year started	Paid (Y/N)

Curriculum Development

9. List any new courses developed or in development, modifications in existing courses that involve curricular innovations, workshops or other activities related to curricular innovations and improvements.
-

Outreach/Public Services

10. List relevant activities outside the university. This should include items not related to research; include work with professional societies, charitable organizations, community groups, preK-12 schools, health and welfare organizations, etc.
 11. List any outreach/Public Service related awards or recognitions.
-

Research

Publications

12. List manuscripts (with complete citations). List only publications published during the year in review or in press. Do not list abstracts.
13. List book chapters (with complete citations):
14. List books (with complete citations):

Scholarly and Research Activity

15. List the total number of manuscript reviews for the year in review:
16. List journals for which you reviewed manuscripts:
17. List service as a journal editor or editorial board member:
18. List membership in external advisory boards and scientific/professional society committees:
19. List participation in grant review panels:
20. List invited talks:
21. List consultantships:
22. List meetings/symposia organized:
23. List additional scholarly activities:

Grant Support

YOU MAY COPY AND PASTE FROM YOUR MOST RECENT AND UP-TO-DATE BIOSKETCH.

24. List current grant support. Include the grant number, duration of funding, current year funding, total funding, role (as PI, co-PI, co-investigator, etc.).

Extramural:

Intramural:

Total # of grants funded:

25. List pending grant applications

Extramural:

Intramural:

Total # of grants funded:

26. List any research related awards or honors received this year:

27. List names of students whom you advised or supervised (e.g. undergraduate, graduate, professional). Include their major or program of study. Please make note if they are paid employees. Insert more rows as needed.

Trainee Level	Trainee Name	Major/program	Year started	Paid (Y/N)
High School student				
Undergraduate students				
Graduate students in my lab				
Graduate student advisory committees				

Graduate student rotations				
Postdoctoral trainees				
Other professionals				
Mentored faculty				

28. List research awards that your trainees have received:

Teaching

29. Complete the items below. Add rows as needed.

FOR-CREDIT COURSE INSTRUCTION							
Semester	Course code + no.	Instructional method (Lab, lecture, online)	Total contact hours	No. credits	Course coordinator	Enrollment	Comments

30. List teaching awards/recognitions:

31. List other teaching activity (e.g., non-MSU affiliated lectures) and teaching related workshops in which you have participated:

32. Provide a description of any scholarly teaching or educational contributions:

33. Attach any supporting evidence for excellence in teaching (SIRS, other student evaluations, peer evaluations) you would like to have considered in your annual evaluation.

34. List names of students whom you supervised/mentored as graduate teaching assistants, post-graduate course assistants, undergraduate learning assistants, or other mentored teaching positions. Include their major or program of study. Please make note if they are paid employees. Insert more rows as needed.

Student position	Student name	Major/program	Year started	Paid (Y/N)
Graduate teaching assistants				
Post-grad course assistants				
Undergrad learning assistants				
Other mentored positions				

35. List teaching-related awards that those listed above have received:

MSU Service

36. List program, college, university committees and other activities.

37. List any MSU service related awards and recognitions.

Professional Development

38. List activities (not covered above) that you have participated in that are related to your professional development.

Appendix B

Promotion to Associate Professor

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.

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.

Generally, 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 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.

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 invited contributions to meetings and other venues.

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 of 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.

Appendix C

Description of Responsibilities

Advising / Teaching / Curriculum Development

The academic specialist in this category is actively involved in the instruction/curricular activities of the University. This category is divided into three sub groups: individuals primarily involved in advising students on curricular matters, individuals primarily involved in delivering instruction and individuals primarily involved in curriculum development.

Advising

The academic advising category includes individuals who provide advisement on course options and other academically related matters. These academic specialists have responsibilities in an academic department, school or college or in a unit that serves University-wide populations (e.g., Supportive Services, Undergraduate University Division, Honors College). These persons typically:

- provide advice on course and curriculum selection;
- monitor students' programs;
- recommend certification for graduation;
- maintain contact with advisors in other units;
- provide incidental information on the relationship between course selection and career options;
- refer students, when necessary, to other units in the University for assistance with educational, career and personal concerns;
- participate in activities devoted to the retention of students within University programs;
- provide assistance and guidance to students reentering programs;
- may be involved in instructional activities associated with classes, labs and seminars;
- participate, as required by the unit, in professional development activities, both on and off campus, including conferences, workshops and seminars to enhance the ability and knowledge to perform as an advisor;
- participate in department/school, college and University level committees;
- make a significant professional contribution by making scholarly presentations: present papers, lectures or workshops on campus or beyond related to academic advising or training;
- assume leadership roles involving the coordination, supervision and training of new academic advisors.

Teaching

The academic specialist in this category is involved significantly in providing instruction for credit in classes, labs, seminars, practical and clinical settings. In general, the goals of any teacher should include the following:

- to promote the intellectual maturation and honesty of the student;
- to promote the mastery of the material by the student;
- to provide appropriate testing and evaluation to allow the student to measure his or her mastery of the material;

- to promote the understanding by the student of how the material relates to the discipline, the profession, society, the world and the universe;
- to promote an appropriate climate for diversity in the classroom and other instructional settings;
- to increase the teacher's mastery of the subject material and the level, breadth and depth of topics taught.

Specifically, the academic specialist or teacher may perform one or more of the following duties:

- teach/assist in teaching credit courses involving classes, labs, seminars, lectures, demonstrations, etc.;
- supervise/train/evaluate students in a practicum or clinical setting;
 - supervise/train/evaluate teaching assistants and other instructional staff;
- provide continuity over time and assist in the resolution of inquiries and problems, especially in courses involving a large number of faculty and staff;
- participate actively and effectively in the development of curriculum and course content;
- consult with others within the University on matters such as advising and curricular development;
- provide cognitive area outreach to K-12 educational system;
- demonstrate leadership abilities, i.e.,
 - has influence on teaching programs and curriculum of the department, school or college;
 - may be the lead teacher in team teaching;
 - may supervise, train and evaluate other teachers.
- represent the academic unit in curriculum, instructional or governance issues;
- make scholarly contributions in relevant cognitive areas and/or in pedagogy;
- make significant contribution to the advancement of the profession and is so recognized by professional peers.

Curriculum Development

The curriculum development category includes individuals who plan courses or curricula. Usually such responsibilities are undertaken by individuals appointed in colleges, departments, and schools. These persons typically:

- participate and, as relevant, provide leadership in the planning and development of curricula, academic programs, and individual courses;
- participate in the development of instructional materials;
- evaluate research relating to impact of various curricula and instructional techniques on student learning;

- undertake literature reviews, compilation of bibliographies, and assist in gathering up-to-date information and analysis for inclusion in courses and academic programs;
- gather and evaluate curricula and course materials from other institutions to assist in curricula planning and development efforts;
- participate in the development and evaluation of student testing and the evaluation techniques and procedures;
- participate, as required by the unit, in professional development activities, both on and off campus, including conferences, workshops, and seminars to enhance abilities and knowledge in the area of curriculum development;
- make a professional contribution by making scholarly presentations: present papers, lectures, or workshops on campus or beyond related to curriculum development and planning;
- assume, as relevant, leadership roles involving the coordination, supervision, and training of curriculum development specialists;
- represent the unit and college in curriculum planning/development deliberation;
- participate in departmental/school, college and university-level committees.

Research

The academic specialist appointed in this functional area facilitates scholarly research activity of a national and international stature appropriate for a premier land-grant, AAU university. These individuals must perform a lead role on research projects, including developing grant proposals and directing the research project with the designation as principal investigator and/or in performing position responsibilities which require a terminal degree. Individuals in this category typically:

- promote an appropriate climate for creativity/diversity in the research setting;
- promote and adhere to intellectual and scholarly honesty;
- conduct independent research as a principal investigator or is involved in joint research projects on a co-principal investigator basis;
- may participate in, manage, operate, and/or maintain instrumental facilities, laboratories, computer systems or bureaus conducting research and/or providing service to a wider audience of researchers within the unit, the University, external agencies, or the general research community;
- contribute significantly to the design and execution of experiments and research projects;
- analyze and interpret data;
- contribute directly and indirectly to the research goals and efforts of the unit and/or other University units, external agencies or other external clients;
- may consult with, collaborate with, supervise, train and otherwise support faculty, students, and other clients in the pursuit of research endeavors;

- attract and manage, both individually or in concert with others, resources, i.e., people, funding, materials, etc., necessary to the operation of the individual research project or the research support facility;
- author (or co-author) books, manuscripts, reports and other scholarly instruments reflecting the output of individual research projects and/or research service facilities;
- may serve on graduate student guidance committees;
- present seminars, lectures, papers, posters, etc.;
- may serve as reviewer, editor for journals or other publications;
- may serve as a consultant in the professional field;
- play a key role in securing funding for research activities and equipment;
- is well known and respected outside of Michigan State University and has established a sustained record of important contributions to research proposals, reports, papers, monographs, books or other publications.

Service / Outreach

The academic specialist appointed in this functional area facilitates service/outreach activities of state, regional, and national stature appropriate for a premier land-grant university. While the service/outreach mission of this University originated in the area of agriculture and the mechanic arts, this emphasis now has broadened to encompass fields such as health, human relations, business, communications, education and government, and extends to urban and international settings. The individual appointed in this category typically:

- effects and promotes the transfer of information, knowledge and expertise from the University to the general public;
- is committed to leadership and excellence in the delivery of technical and educational information and knowledge to off-campus clientele;
- promotes an appropriate climate for diversity in the service/outreach settings;
- develops independent projects/programs or is involved in projects directed by others;
- consults with, collaborates with, supervises, trains and otherwise supports faculty, students and other clientele in the development of service/outreach programs;
- may manage, consult, direct, operate or maintain diagnostic facilities, laboratories, computer systems or bureaus conducting research, and/or providing services to external agencies and the general public;
- authors resource materials, technical fact sheets, reports, manuals, computer programs, manuscripts, books and other educational publications on technology and/or applied research for distribution to the public;
- presents non-credit seminars, lectures, workshops, training, etc. for off-campus client groups;
- writes grants, individually and cooperatively, and manages resources, i.e., people, funding, materials, etc. necessary to carry out service/outreach programs and projects;

- may serve as reviewer for grants and publications and/or editor for newsletters and other publications;
- disseminates to students/professionals/clientele groups relevant research findings and technical information for practical application;
- conduct needs assessment studies and applied research with the ability to work out appropriate solutions for the people and groups involved;
- may be a liaison with, respond to requests from, and/or develop cooperative programs with other universities, agencies and organizations as well as the general public;
- provides program leadership and coordination in the development, execution, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of service/outreach programs;
- assumes significant roles in peer group organizations and professional societies;
- obtains recognition within the University, college, professional groups.

Appendix D

https://natsci.msu.edu/_natsci/assets/File/Faculty%20%26%20Staff/continuing-specialist-review-proc.pdf

The following are the specific criteria for different types of specialist positions.

Teaching

Reappointment

High-quality and improving teaching as demonstrated by student evaluations (teaching evaluations must be collected for every class taught), in-class peer evaluation, and evaluation of the teaching portfolio, including evidence of student learning. Successful professional development related to teaching and higher education. Engagement with teaching and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Granting of Continuing Status

Outstanding teaching as demonstrated by student evaluations (teaching evaluations must be collected for every class taught), in-class peer evaluation, and evaluation of the teaching portfolio, including evidence of student learning. Successful, growing engagement with and leadership related to broader teaching and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Promotion to Senior Specialist

Continued outstanding teaching as demonstrated by student evaluations (teaching evaluations must be collected for every class taught), in-class peer evaluation, and evaluation of the teaching portfolio, including evidence of student learning. Outstanding leadership and impact related to teaching and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Advising

Reappointment

High-quality and improving student advising as demonstrated by evaluation and feedback from students, faculty and staff served by the advisor. Demonstrated understanding of university policies, procedures and curriculum as it relates to advisor's responsibilities. Successful professional development related to advising and higher education. Engagement in advising and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Granting of Continuing Status

Outstanding student advising as demonstrated by evaluation and feedback from students, faculty and staff served by the advisor. Demonstrated understanding of university policies, procedures and

curriculum as it relates to the advisor's responsibilities. Successful and growing engagement and leadership related to broader advising and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Promotion to Senior Specialist

Continued outstanding student advising as demonstrated by evaluation and feedback from students, faculty and staff served by the advisor. Demonstrated contributions to the evaluation and revision of department policies, procedures and curriculum. Outstanding leadership and impact related to broader advising and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Curriculum Development

Reappointment

High-quality and improving development of curricula and curricular materials as demonstrated by evaluation of the written materials related to the curricula, implementation of the curricula, and evidence of student learning. Professional development related to curriculum development and higher education. Engagement with broader curriculum development and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Granting of Continuing Status

Outstanding development of curricula and curricular materials as demonstrated by evaluation of the written materials related to the curricula, implementation of the curricula, and evidence of student learning. Continuing engagement with professional development activities related to curriculum development and higher education. Successful and growing engagement and leadership related to broader curriculum development and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Promotion to Senior Specialist

Continued outstanding development of curricula and curricular materials as demonstrated by evaluation of the written materials related to the curricula, implementation of the curricula, and evidence of student learning. Outstanding leadership and impact related to broader curriculum development and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Service/Outreach

Reappointment

High-quality and improving engagement with and contributions to service and outreach activities as demonstrated by evaluation of the written materials related to the service or outreach activities assigned and impact on the clientele for the activities. Successful professional development related to service/outreach and higher education. Engagement with broader service/outreach and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Granting of Continuing Status

Outstanding engagement with and contributions to service and outreach activities as demonstrated by evaluation of the written materials related to the service or outreach activities assigned and impact on the clientele for the activities. Continuing engagement with professional development activities related to service/outreach and higher education. Successful and growing engagement and leadership related to broader service/outreach and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Promotion to Senior Specialist

Continued outstanding engagement with and contributions to service and outreach activities as demonstrated by evaluation of the written materials related to the service or outreach activities assigned and impact on the clientele for the activities. Outstanding leadership and impact related to engagement with broader service/outreach and educational issues within the university and beyond.

Research

Reappointment

High-quality and improving performance of the research activities assigned, as demonstrated by publications, research grants, or written evaluation from the clientele of research services, as appropriate. Successful professional development related to the research activities of the position. Engagement with broader research-related activities, programs, and issues within the university and beyond.

Granting of Continuing Status

Outstanding performance of the research activities assigned, as demonstrated by publications, research grants, or written evaluation from the clientele of research services, as appropriate. Continuing engagement with professional development related to the research activities of the position. Successful and growing engagement with broader research-related activities, programs, and issues within the university and beyond.

Promotion to Senior Specialist

Continued outstanding performance of the research activities assigned, as demonstrated by publications, research grants, or written evaluation from the clientele of research services, as appropriate. Outstanding leadership and impact related to engagement with broader research-related activities, programs, and issues within the university and beyond.