# Section I: Recommendation Page

* Verify appointment system and ensure correct form for system is submitted (check for latest form on the [CHM website](https://humanmedicine.msu.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-affairs/promotion/index.html)).
* Check for completed date field – use date materials were submitted by applicant.
* Verify current rank is correct, time in rank as of date on application is correct, and listed appointment systems and ranks (e.g., in the CV) are aligned with each other and historical records. Discuss discrepancies with the applicant and make corrections as needed.
* Verify all appointing units listed in EBS are included.
* Ensure review period aligns with time in rank at MSU, or discrepancies have a rationale. Rationale should be provided by the candidate in Section IV in the final question under “Other Awards/Evidence.” The department chairperson should also affirm the rationale in the statement in section II.
* Ensure all chair/director signatures are applied. Additional chair/director signoffs should be addressed before forwarding to FAD. FAD will address approvals by multiple colleges/deans, but you should ask if you have questions about this stage.

## Vote

* Include outcome of vote for all tracks. For HP faculty, insert a copy of the tenure system FPE p. 2 to capture votes and external reviewer information.
	+ Abstentions in all votes should be restricted to conflicts of interest. An existing professional relationship is not a conflict of interest. See [MSU’s Conflict of Interest in Employment policy](https://hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/university-wide/conflict_of_interest.html) for additional details.
	+ Written report/letter from unit peer review committee should include the outcome of the vote to support recommendation.

## External Review Letters

* Include brief summaries of qualifications of letter writers (or CVs, but watch overall page count), as well as an assessment of the evaluator relationship to the candidate, per [MSU policy](https://hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/external_ref-letters.html). Include explanations for irregularities in the list, as suggested below the table on the FPE. Insert this information following the list of reviewers.
	+ Make efforts to collect the letters from a range of institutions. The provost’s office is asking for an explanation if, for example, half of the letters are from the same institution.
	+ Confirm the candidate’s primary dissertation chair and major advisor for any post-doctoral position are not among the invited letter writers.
* There must be at least two letters in the dossier that are not recommended by the applicant. You may need to solicit a third letter if one of the chair’s first two nominees does not respond.

Section II: Summary Information

## Assignment of Time and Ratings

* Assigned time must total exactly 100%. If “<1%” is used somewhere, make sure you also include a fractional amount in another category so that it adds up to 100%.
* Include a rating for each row that has effort allocated, including Overall Rating.

## Comments by chair and/or chair letter

* Include RPT committee letter (strongly recommended) and chair letter (optional, focus on quality text in the form).

# Section III

* Chair must address each prompt; do not say “see letter.”

# Section IV

* Section IV-Instruction: may include printout from CHM Educational Assignment System for any Shared Discovery Curriculum teaching-related assignments.
* Section IV-Additional reporting: ensure faculty member has addressed each prompt or written “this prompt intentionally left blank.”
* Section IV-Grants: printout from EBS is fine where applicable; write “see attached” in the appropriate sections of the table.

# Annual Review Letters

* Annual Review letters must be signed by the administrator and faculty member.
	+ Use **Print to .pdf** if digitally signed, before adding to the dossier. You should also do this with any .pdf in the dossier that is a filled form (whether it includes a signature or not).
* Dossiers will be sent back by U-FASA for correction/clarification if any annual review letters are missing without comment. If there is a missing letter, include an explanation, and/or provide other information about how expectations for the faculty member and feedback on progress were communicated in that year, such as:
	+ Appointment letter
	+ Developmental letter at time of reappointment
	+ Letter explaining why a promotion case was previously denied

# Academic Portfolio

* Ensure all documents are clear and legible. Avoid low-quality scans and photographs of print materials.
* For each artifact, use the document’s title when bookmarking. These should have been provided by the applicant and ideally already appear on the first page of each artifact. Use text boxes in Adobe to add as needed.
* Organize artifacts by mission area. Order should be provided by the applicant. Ideally, the portfolio is organized within each mission area by the promotion criteria.
* Applicants may have documents to present in Additional Reporting, such as evidence for quality of DEI efforts.

# Overall

* Dossiers submitted to the college must be no more than 500 pages including faculty and departmental contributions.