



Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures
of the

Department of Research Centers

(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: July 1, 2019

APPROVALS	SIGNATURE	DATE
Kent McVay Department Faculty	 Chair, Primary Review Committee	5/24/2019 10:07 AM MDT
Darrin Boss Primary Administrative Reviewer	 Department Head/Director	5/29/19
Intermediate Review Committee	Chair, Intermediate Review Committee	
 Intermediate Administrative Reviewer	 College Dean	6/14/19
 College Review Committee	 Chair, College Review Committee	6/14/19
 University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	 Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	7/10/19
 Provost	 Provost	7-10-19

Role and Scope Document for The Department of Research Centers

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

The Department of Research Centers (DRC) is comprised of the faculty, staff, and administrators associated with the seven (7) Agricultural Research Centers administered by the Montana Agricultural Experiment Station (MAES) and the College of Agriculture. All personnel in the DRC support the fulfillment of the University's teaching, scholarship, and service mission in the area(s) of irrigated and dryland agriculture, animal husbandry and physiology, and resource management. Research areas include breeding and genetics, plant and livestock nutrition, field crop and livestock production systems, livestock reproduction, pest control for conventional and alternative crops such as horticultural crops, beef cattle, and value enhancement of agricultural commodities produced in Montana.

The seven individual research centers are: Southern Agricultural Research Center near Huntley; Eastern Agricultural Research Center in Sidney; Central Agricultural Research Center near Moccasin; Northern Agricultural Research Center near Havre; Western Triangle Agricultural Research Center near Conrad; Western Agricultural Research Center near Corvallis; and Northwestern Agricultural Research Center near Kalispell. Each research center is located in a unique environment to serve the specific needs of clientele directly involved in agricultural production and the broader needs of Montana agriculture in general. DRC faculty perform field and laboratory research at on- and off-station sites. Each research center is administered by a resident Superintendent. As faculty members of the DRC, superintendents serve as the primary representative and advocate for their respective research center, provide leadership toward the research center's mission, empower and enable research center staff and faculty to fulfill their roles, and are responsible for developing policies and procedures for the operation and function of the research center within the mission of the DRC. The DRC is administered by a Department Head (DH), who is tenured in the DRC and serves in the Primary Review Administrator role in the Promotion and Tenure process for all tenurable DRC faculty. The DH conducts annual reviews for all faculty, recommends salary adjustments for all faculty based on annual review, and serves as hiring authority for all tenure-track faculty positions. The DH represents the DRC faculty at College of Agriculture Department Heads meetings and in administrative relations with the Dean and Director.

New knowledge generated by Agricultural Research Center programs benefit Montana agriculture and the scientific community at local, state, national, and international levels. This knowledge is disseminated to the agricultural industry in Montana through publications and teaching to improve the economic status and quality of life of its citizens. Faculty members use their expertise to lead and contribute within professional societies, by publishing in peer-reviewed journals, presenting at professional meetings, and by serving as editors and organizers within those societies. Faculty appointments are predominantly research-oriented, with limited opportunities for traditional academic teaching activities. The DRC offers its faculty

unique academic opportunities to conduct research in distinct environments and cropping areas, to interact with agricultural clientele in identifying pertinent production problems, and in developing research programs of topical relevance to Montana's diverse agriculture.

Teaching

There are no formal teaching assignments within the DRC so there are no degree programs offered through the DRC. But education through outreach and Extension activities is expected. Activities include presentation and demonstration at agricultural field days, professional training programs (e.g. continuing education for certified crop consultants (CCA), county agricultural agents, agricultural producers etc.), county or regional Extension schools, educational events at commodity group conferences, online education for Federal agencies like the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) or Farm Services Agency (FSA), and others. Graduate student mentoring and advising is encouraged through collaborations with campus-based Departments within the College of Agriculture or with other Universities.

Scholarship

Faculty in the Department conduct basic and applied research across research specialties, resulting in national and international journal publications and leading to applications in grant-funded projects, consulting efforts, and outreach.

Service

The faculty supports the University through service to the community and on committees at the Department, College, and University level. Faculty members in each disciplinary group support the professional community as editors, reviewers, referees, and conference organizers. In support of the University's land grant mission, faculty provide expertise to researchers across campus and to off-campus organizations as well as extensive professional service to the State of Montana, educational entities, and national organizations. Service and outreach activities broadly include:

- Serving on Department, College, and University committees.
- Participating in and contributing to national organizations; organizing professional conferences; editing professional journals and other products; reviewing or refereeing publications and grant proposals, organizing conferences or disciplinary sessions at professional meetings.
- Collaborating with state agencies to improve education and resource management.
- Providing agricultural consulting and collaboration to research scientists within Montana State University, and with other Universities, businesses, and government agencies throughout the U.S. and around the world.

Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Research faculty (professional appointed ranks of Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor) are not eligible for tenure, thus they are not

reviewed using the procedures for tenurable faculty. Promotion review includes review by the DRC P&T committee following a similar procedure as tenure-track faculty. The official departmental policy for advancement of non-tenure track Letter of Appointment faculty is described by the document entitled "DRC Research Professional Advancement Policy.pdf" adopted by a vote of the Department Faculty September 7, 2016.

Article III. Annual Review Process

Section 3.01 Purpose of Annual Review

An annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year, and is applicable to tenured and tenure track faculty, as well as non-tenurable faculty not part of the NTT Collective Bargaining Agreement. Faculty will submit materials relevant to their performance over the preceding calendar year (based on current assigned responsibilities and percentages of effort in teaching, scholarship, and service) by the deadline suggested by the Provost and established by the DH. The vehicle for submission will be Activity Insight, or whichever tool is designated by the Provost's Office. The DH will conduct annual reviews in accordance with the University Faculty Handbook and College of Agriculture policy.

Section 3.02 Faculty Role Statement

All DRC faculty are required to develop a faculty role statement defining their responsibilities and areas of scholarship within the first year of hire. This statement is to be approved by the DH and the dean/director. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to review her/his role statement annually and update it when appropriate. Role statements can also be updated by initiation of the DH or dean/director of MAES.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee – Composition and Appointment

Each year the Department Head will solicit candidates for the DRC Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee to evaluate all cases of retention, tenure, and promotion occurring within a given academic year.

- The RTP Committee will consist of three tenured faculty members, at least two at the rank of Full Professor if feasible. RTP Committee members serve one-year terms and may be reappointed. Deviations from this committee composition must be approved by the URTPC Chair (Faculty Handbook, Sec 2 of RTP Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights & Responsibilities).
- The RTP Committee membership selection process will promote inclusion of protected categories identified by MSU whenever possible, attending to the dual goals of valuing

diverse perspectives and promoting access to decision-making committees for individuals from protected categories.

- Before beginning their work, all RTP committee members will complete the required orientation and training sessions for the review cycle as described in the Faculty Handbook.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The Primary Review Administrator is the current DH of the DRC. Should the Primary Review Administrator have a conflict of interest with a candidate under review or cannot serve as the Primary Review Administrator for any reason, the College of Agriculture VP, Dean will identify an individual to serve as Primary Review Administrator for the case under review.

Section 4.03 Identification of responsible entities

- Establish the RTP by soliciting nominations which are then confirmed by a vote of DRC faculty each spring. Once the committee is formed the chair will be chosen by the committee.

Review Administrator

- Select external reviewers and solicit review letters.

Review Administrator in concert with the RTP

- If internal reviews are part of the unit's review process, solicit and select internal reviews.

Review Administrator in concert with the RTP

- Assure the following materials are included in the Dossier:
 - Internal and external reviewer letters, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer.
Review Administrator
 - Applicable Role and Scope Document.
Review Administrator
 - Letter of hire, Role Statement, any percentages of effort changes, all annual reviews, and all evaluation letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.
Review Administrator
 - Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period (See Section 6.03, last paragraph). If the evaluations are not in electronic format, the unit will provide evaluation summaries. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the unit will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review.
Review Administrator
- Maintain copies of all review committee evaluation letters and internal (if applicable) and external review letters after the review.

Review Administrator

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

The next review level after the reviews by the Primary Review Committee and the Primary Review Administrator is the College of Agriculture Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee.

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee Administrator

Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee – Composition and Appointment

The Intermediate Review Committee is the College of Agriculture Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee.

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator

The Intermediate Review Administrator is the Vice President and Dean, College of Agriculture.

Section 5.03 Level of Review Following Intermediate Review Administrator

The next level of review after the Intermediate Review Administrator is the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC).

Article VI. Review Materials

Review materials submitted by the candidate shall comply with the University Faculty Handbook document entitled “Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion,” subsection “RTP: Rights and Responsibilities,” and the DRC Role and Scope document (this document). Additionally, candidates in the DRC must follow the requirements below.

Section 6.01 Materials Submitted by Candidate

Materials for external review must include:

- a. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) documenting teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- b. A statement that identifies the candidate’s job assignment, distribution of job responsibilities, and identifies the candidate’s area of scholarship and achievement.
- c. Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period, selected by the candidate that best represents the candidate’s scholarship.

Materials for all dossiers must include:

- Cover sheet obtained from the Provost’s office.
- A comprehensive CV documenting teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- A personal statement that includes a description of the candidate’s job assignment, distribution of job responsibilities, and area of scholarship

- Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition, itemized by year over the relevant review period.
- For each scholarly activity or product that involves collaboration, the candidate will briefly specify their contribution to the activity or product. (See Section 6.02 for further details.)

If included in the CV, the candidate should separate the following categories:

- Refereed books or book chapters
- Refereed journal articles
- Invited book chapters or articles
- Invited conference presentations
- Contributed conference presentations
- Seminars and/or colloquia
- Grant proposals submitted and grants funded. If the grant was a collaborative effort, a total dollar amount should be specified including a subtotal amount specified for the candidate.
- Non-refereed publications, outreach materials, and media

The candidate may choose to include other categories as appropriate to the discipline and to the candidate's record. For publications, grants funded, and other scholarly products, full author lists must match the publication or grant award.

This list is a general requirement for all dossiers. For further details including evidence of teaching, scholarship, service, and integration activity, see Articles VIII-XI of this document.

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

Conventions for crediting collaborative work vary greatly among the different disciplines and journals represented in the Department. In particular, author order on published works should not be used to infer any information about the nature, quantity, or quality of the contribution of any particular author. Rather, the candidate will provide a single document briefly describing their contribution to each collaborative scholarly work over the relevant review period. The candidate may choose to use a single statement to describe any long-term collaboration that has resulted in multiple publications or grants.

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

The process and requirements for soliciting peer review materials are described in the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," Section 1.

Internal Reviews. The Review Administrator will solicit confidential reviews from at least three individuals with academic appointments in the College of Agriculture who are of academic rank higher than that of the candidate or of professor rank and with expertise in the candidate's area of study. An additional review shall be conducted by the candidate's superintendent provided the superintendent is tenured (and if the faculty member is not a superintendent). Reviewers will be provided with the appropriate DRC Role and Scope Document, the candidate's job description and self-statement, CV, and a selection of relevant publications along with other materials, as appropriate and selected by the candidate. Internal reviewers are asked to comment specifically on the quality of the candidate's scholarship and productivity, as well as the candidate's impact and recognition in the field.

External reviewers should be specialists in the candidate's field and familiar with the usual expectations for faculty performance. At least half of the external reviewers must be selected by the Review Administrator; the remainder may come from a list of names submitted by the candidate. The Review Administrator will solicit reviews from among those on the list provided by the candidate, but if those contacted are unable to serve then they will be replaced by other reviewers, not necessarily from the candidate's list. Candidates shall not be informed of the identity of outside evaluators to protect the confidentiality of the review process.

The four or more external review letters must be requested by the Review Administrator, and must not be solicited by the candidate. The Department RTP Committee report should state clearly how external reviewers were chosen and should include a brief statement of their status in the field. External reviewers should state knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, if either applies.

Reviewers will be provided with the appropriate DRC Role and Scope Document, the candidate's job description and distribution of job responsibilities, self-statement, CV, and a selection of relevant publications along with other materials, as appropriate and selected by the candidate. Reviewers are asked to comment specifically on the quality of the candidate's scholarship and productivity, as well as the candidate's impact and recognition in the field.

Teaching Evaluations. The candidate will nominate to the Review Administrator ten (10) agricultural producers and ten (10) representatives of agencies or industry who have attended presentations or trainings by the candidate. The Review Administrator, while not restricted to this list, will solicit confidential teaching evaluations from at least twenty (20) individuals, of which ten (10) will be producer clientele and ten (10) will be representatives from public agencies or private industry. The Review Administrator will provide a copy of the Department's evaluation document (Appendix B) to each reviewer to complete and return.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review

The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

Article VIII. Retention Reviews

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the University's Extending Tenure Review Period policy as found in the most recent edition of the Faculty Handbook.

Section 8.02 University Standard

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- Effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period.
- Integration of no fewer than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance indicators and associated weighting are defined in Section 9.03. The same indicators and weights that are used in tenure review are used in retention review.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge above all other measures of scholarship.

Effectiveness in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. *Effectiveness* includes, but is not limited to, establishing a research program that is in the candidate's discipline, is directly relevant to the responsibilities specified in the Letter of Hire or Role Statement, and is evidenced by the creation of scholarly products (see Section 9.03) throughout the review period.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a record of scholarly products at the

time of retention. Publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. The record must be substantive enough that it is reasonable to expect the candidate to achieve the standards for tenure at the time of tenure review.

Collaborative work is highly valued, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across groups, so no inferences about level of contribution should be made based on author order. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works (see Section 6.02).

Effectiveness in Teaching is as described in Section 9.04.

Effectiveness in Service is as described in Section 9.04, according to the candidate's job distribution, except that there is no requirement that service include assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU at the time of retention review.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of performance indicators are listed in Section 9.05. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

Scholarly products from work conducted at MSU that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the retention review period will be considered. Additionally scholarly products from work conducted prior to hire at MSU that are accepted or in press at the time that the candidate submits materials for review, or are published during the review period will be considered. All submissions within the dossier should be appropriately documented according to Section 9.05. It is not required that a candidate will have published from work conducted at Montana State since the date of hire.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the University's Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period.
- Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Accomplishment in scholarship.

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

The following performance indicators are considered in the review to determine if the standards in the previous section are satisfied. The faculty in the DRC represent a diverse cross-section of agriculture with differing expertise ranging from animal health to crop production. Not all indicators will be weighted the same and may vary across and within disciplines. Additional indicators will be considered if deemed appropriate and consistent with the definition of indicators stated in the Faculty Handbook.

Guidance for scholarship, teaching, service and integration for each faculty member in the DRC is framed by the responsibilities specified in their Letter of Hire and Role Statement. The program developed should be driven by identification of needed information in concert with peer researchers, advisory committees, and producers to the benefit of Montana agriculture. Evaluation of performance indicators will be conducted with this in mind.

Performance indicators in scholarship

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to scholarship. The indicators are considered the primary activities by which performance in scholarship is evaluated.

- Peer-reviewed or refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks in the candidate's discipline or more broadly focused as a result of multidisciplinary research
- Extension Bulletins, Montguides and other Extension outreach materials in the candidate's discipline
- Invited major talks (e.g., plenary or keynote)
- Invited papers or presentations given at professional meetings
- Invited high-profile seminars or colloquia (e.g., at prestigious venues)
- Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings
- Volunteered papers or presentations given at professional meetings
- Contributed papers or presentations given at professional meetings
- Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings and technical reports)
- External grants funded
- Grant proposals submitted (external and internal)
- Internal grants funded
- Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., software or curriculum materials)

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in scholarship, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter. For example, an invited major talk or keynote address at a prestigious venue would typically carry a greater weight than a volunteered presentation at a professional meeting.

Performance indicators in teaching

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to teaching. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in teaching is evaluated.

- Present as an invited speaker or guest lecturer at field days, agricultural educational meetings, or producer conferences
- Development of presentations and curriculum materials for workshops, or demonstrations for hands-on trainings or other education materials for outreach (note that publications resulting from such activities are performance indicators of scholarship)
- Outreach in the agricultural sciences to local, state, national, or international organizations within the appropriate discipline
- Development of news articles, podcasts or videos for outreach, or through online forums, and other non-peer reviewed media
- Interviews or guest appearances on public media such as radio, television, or digital media like Facebook live
- Impart knowledge through informal contact with individual growers, extension agents, agricultural professionals, and the general public
- Mentorship of graduate and/or undergraduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research)
- Speaker evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in teaching, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Performance indicators in service

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to service. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in service is evaluated.

- Membership and offices held on Department, College, University and professional committees
- Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in the agricultural sciences
- Reviewer or editor for a professional journal, monograph, or book
- Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication
- Community civic activities that extends expertise to the general public

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in service, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP committee will determine the weight of such indicators.

Performance Indicators in Integration

As indicated in Section 9.02, candidates are expected to demonstrate integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. The nature and extent of integrated activities will vary depending on the candidate's discipline and areas of specialization. The following list offers examples of potential indicators of integration, with the understanding that integration can take many forms. The candidate must clearly define and describe how integration is achieved in the dossier.

- Integration of scholarship and teaching: implementing a research activity within a training session or on-farm research and demonstration activity.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: offering seminars to introduce attendees to the process of conducting research.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: supervising and collaborating in research and/or publication with a student.
- Integrating of scholarship and service: lending research expertise through consulting.
- Integration of scholarship and service: implementing research results in a community setting.
- Integration of teaching and service: designing and/or delivering professional development for agricultural professionals or Extension agents.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Scholarship Expectations

The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge above all other measures of scholarship.

Accomplishment in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. With respect to publication quality, the Department RTP Committee will assess accomplishment based on the evidence provided by External Reviewers, and the citations and recognition of the publications (featured by the professional publication or award received). *Accomplishment* includes, but is not limited to, an ongoing record of independent research that has led to a sustained record of publication in refereed journals. It is expected that the results of these publications will be presented at conferences and professional meetings.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the tenure review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive and sustained record of peer-reviewed products at the time of tenure. The usual Departmental expectation for scholarly productivity is that tenure candidates' average and consistently produce between 1 and 2 scholarly products per year during the review period. Due to the diverse nature of scholarship within the Department, expectations will vary across disciplines.

Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as

documented by External Reviewers, citations, and recognition of the publications are of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process.

In some cases, a relatively small number of products with high impact may be acceptable for satisfying scholarship expectations, while in other cases a large number of products may not be sufficient. If the number of products is near the average of 1-2 scholarly products per year, and one or more of the products are documented by the External Reviewers as having little to no impact in the discipline, then scholarship expectations may not be satisfied. Also, if the candidate's contribution to one or more products is documented as minimal, then it is expected that the number of scholarly products would need to sufficiently exceed the average to offset the candidate's limited contributions.

A record of seeking extramural funds to support research activities is expected. As recognition of the intellectual work invested in the early phases of a grant, a candidate who is active as a PI or co-PI on an awarded external grant during the review period may be expected to not produce as many peer-reviewed papers. The scope of the grant work and the reputation of the granting agency are qualitative factors that will influence the quantitative expectation for number of peer-reviewed papers and other products associated with that grant.

Collaborative work is highly valued, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across groups, so no inferences about level of contribution should be made based on author order. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works [see Section 6.02].

Teaching Expectations

Effectiveness in teaching is achieved through the candidate's positive contributions to the design, delivery, and instruction in local, county, and regional meetings. *Effectiveness* is judged primarily from multiple peer reviews and through the use of the DRC teaching evaluation document (Appendix B).

Graduate advising is encouraged in the Department. At the time of tenure review, if the candidate has been an advisor to graduate students, evidence of mentoring should be presented. Evidence may include chairing or serving on graduate committees, but can also be exhibited through other types of graduate student interactions.

Teaching evaluations are not required but are encouraged for use by the candidate to help understand and improve their performance in delivering information to an audience. These informal evaluations can be of their own making, or summaries produced by colleagues or organizers of events. Additionally, at Retention and at Tenure evaluation the Department's evaluation form (Appendix B) will be used to solicit independent evaluations for evaluation by the Department RTP Committee (See Section 6.03).

The Department expectation is that normally, for each set of evaluations, the overall mean score from the evaluation instrument is not less than the indicator for “Average.” For example, 3.0 is the “average” evaluation score for “Overall Effectiveness” on an instrument with 5 categories (1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, and 5 = Excellent). It is expected that any overall mean score below “Average” will be addressed by the candidate. Similarly, any issues related to teaching noted in the retention review should be addressed prior to tenure review.

Service Expectations

Effectiveness in service will be achieved if the candidate demonstrates active participation and competent execution of tasks in any of the areas of service described by the performance indicators. Service is expected to include at least one assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU. Service to a professional society of the candidate’s discipline is expected. Participation in other activities that contribute to the candidate’s discipline or profession (e.g., task forces or special programs) is valued, especially when such participation raises the stature and reputation of the Department or the University in the local community, region, state, the nation, or internationally. Participation in local activities that benefit from the candidate’s expertise are also valued and encouraged. Examples of local activities include membership on a regional board for organizations such as the Agricultural Chamber of Commerce, county Noxious Weed District, county Board of Planning, or other citizen—based groups.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate’s performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate’s dossier.

In addition to the listed evidence of performance indicators, properly documented nominations for and receptions of competitive awards for scholarship, teaching, or service will be considered as evidence of peer recognition.

Evidence of performance indicators in scholarship

The list of evidence presented in Table 1 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to the performance indicators for scholarship will be considered in the review.

Only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the tenure review period will be considered. For works published in a journal not readily available through University databases, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work in the dossier. For works accepted for publication but not yet published, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work accompanied by an official letter or email indicating acceptance.

Table 1. Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Approved MAES project	Project Number, Title, effective dates
Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, textbooks, Extension bulletins, Montguides, or other published materials	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Invited major talks (e.g., plenary or keynote):	Letter of invitation, copy of program, or full citation.
Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings:	Full citation for the proceedings, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Invited high-profile seminars or colloquia (e.g., at prestigious venues):	Full citation, including the title, venue, date, and level (Department, University, community, etc.).
Invited seminars, and/or colloquia, papers or presentations given at professional meetings:	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
External grants funded:	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency and level, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Contributed papers or presentations given at professional meetings:	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings and technical reports):	Full citation for the publication or report, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Grant proposals submitted (external and internal):	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency and level, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Internal grants funded:	Brief description (title, source of funding, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., software, websites, or	Brief description of the product including an overview of content and format, intended

curriculum materials):	use, potential audience, and location where it is publicly available.
------------------------	---

Evidence of performance indicators in teaching

The list of evidence in Table 2 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for teaching will be considered in the review.

Table 2. Performance Indicators in Teaching and Typical Evidence

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Delivering quality information in settings such as production schools, in-service training for agricultural professionals, field days, farm or regional tours, or as an invited speaker for college classes	Full citation, including the title, venue, date, and level (Department, University, community, etc.). Attendance numbers. Summary of evaluations by attendees.
Mentorship of graduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research):	Brief description including graduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or projects):	Brief description including undergraduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Teaching evaluation and summary	Summary of scores and comments from producers and agricultural professionals using The DRC Teaching Evaluation Form, Appendix B or other review instruments.

Evidence of performance indicators in service

The list of evidence presented in Table 3 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for service will be considered in the review.

Table 3. Performance Indicators in Service and Typical Evidence

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Membership and offices held on Department, College, and University committees:	Name and level of each committee and dates of service.
Professional service in local, state, national, or international organization:	Name of each organization (with description as needed), offices or roles held, dates of service, and notable accomplishments.
Outreach in the agricultural sciences to local, state, national, or international communities:	Brief description of outreach activities, audience, and outcomes.

Service as a reviewer or editor for a professional journal, monograph, or book:	Citations including name of journal, editorial role, dates of service, and workload.
Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication:	Brief description of consulting activities, audience, and outcomes.

Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01 University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01 Timing of Review

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service at the rank of Associate Professor, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.

Section 11.02 University Standard

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

- Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period
- Sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service
- Excellence in scholarship

Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

The performance indicators and weighting used for this review are the same as those defined in Section 9.03 of this document, with the following exception. In service expectations, an additional weight is placed on active contributions to Department committees and programs.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Scholarship expectations

The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge above all other measures of scholarship.

Excellence in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. With respect to

publication quality, the Department RTP Committee will assess excellence based on the evidence provided by External Reviewers, citations of publication and recognition of the publication by the professional society of the candidate's discipline (e.g. featured or awarded by the professional societies). *Excellence* includes, but is not limited to, receiving national or international recognition from peers and colleagues as having made important scholarly contributions to the candidate's discipline. The Department expects that scholarly results will be disseminated through both publications and presentations.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive and consistent record of peer-reviewed scholarly products that impact the field. Due to the diverse nature of scholarship within the Department, expectations will vary across disciplines. Although the candidate's complete body of work since the tenure review is important, the candidate's scholarship performance will be reviewed primarily on the most recent 5 years of appointment, regardless of the amount of time that has elapsed since the candidate's tenure review.

Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by number of citations and opinions of External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. In some cases, a relatively small number of products with high impact (quality of journals, number of citations, and recognition by societies) may be acceptable for satisfying scholarship expectations, while in other cases a large number of products may not be sufficient.

A record of seeking extramural funds to support research activities is expected. As recognition of the intellectual work invested in the early phases of a grant, a candidate who is active as a PI or co-PI on an awarded external grant during the review period may be expected to not produce as many peer-reviewed papers. The scope of the grant work and the reputation of the granting agency are qualitative factors that will influence the quantitative expectation for number of peer-reviewed papers and other products.

Collaborative work is highly valued and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate accomplishment in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across groups, so no inferences about level of contribution should be made based on author order. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works [see Section 6.02].

Teaching Expectations

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in teaching, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04.

Service Expectations

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in service, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review an additional weight is placed on

active contributions to Department committees and programs.

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier. The description of evidence of performance indicators is found in Section 9.05 of this document.

Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

Faculty members are entitled to propose changes to Role and Scope Documents of their academic unit. Review committee members or administrators who identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to the Department's Role and Scope may submit the request for changes to the chair of URTPC. The URTPC Chair will forward the recommendations to the unit. Submission to the URTPC chair should occur after the review committee or administrator completes all reviews for the year. Units will act on any proposed changes received from the URTPC Chair on an annual basis and will undertake a full review of their Document no less than every three years.

Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- Tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit
- Retention, Tenure, and Promotion review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges)
- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- Provost

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- Promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit
- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- Provost

Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document

- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- Faculty Senate
- Deans' Council
- Provost