

Research Scientist Casebook Template

2021-2022

Name of Candidate
Employee ID
Name of Department
Name of College/School

For consideration of promotion

from
[Example 1: Assistant Research Scientist]
to
[Associate Research Scientist]

[Example 2: Associate Research Scientist
to
Research Scientist]

FORMAT OF RESEARCH SCIENTIST PROMOTION CASEBOOKS

- Length: Any casebook exceeding 20 pages (Sections A through F - not including CV, cover letters, internal or external letters of evaluation, appendix) will be returned.
- Margins: 1" top, bottom, left, right
- Font: Times New Roman or Times, size 11
- Sections: Separate each major section (A, B, C, D...) with a page break.
- Footer: Insert candidate name and the academic year of review in footer.

NOTE TO PREPARERS: Upon completing casebook please delete the formatting instructions before creating final PDF document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- A. Cover letter prepared by the Dean
 - B. Chair/Department/Unit Director Letters
 - C. Documentation of Research
 - C.1. Committee's Evaluation of Research and Impact
 - C.2. Ranking of Journals
 - C.2.1. Candidate's own ranking of journals/conferences
 - C.2.2. Committee's ranking of journals/conferences
 - D. Documentation of Service
 - D.1. Committee's Evaluation of Service
 - E. Documentation of Teaching (**Optional for Research Scientist Track**)
 - E.1. Committee's Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)
 - F. Brief Description of Credentials of External Reviewers and Relationship to Candidate
 - F.1. External reviewers (listed alphabetically by last name) who provided review letters
 - F.2. External Reviewers who did not provide review letters
 - G. Sample Letter Sent to External Reviewers
 - H. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers
 - I. Evaluation Letters by all Internal Reviewers (if required by unit policy, this is not mandatory for most units)
 - J. Curriculum Vitae
- Appendix – Records of Communications

A. Cover letter prepared by the Dean

- Summary letter must include Employee ID number for each individual being recommended for promotion.
- Insert copy of letter with electronic signature
- Maintain original signed letter with file.

Please note that for units reporting directly to UMOR, this letter comes from the Associate Vice President and will be provided by UMOR. Please leave this page blank (Title only) in the PDF submission.

B. Chair/Department/Unit Director Letters

(No direct quotes from reviewer letters should be included in any of these letters)

- Letter prepared by Department Chair/Group Leader.
 - Document the department decision-making process (i.e., vote by faculty at rank or higher, or department executive committee), the vote tally, and the chair's own recommendation. Insert scanned letter with signature by the Department Chair.
 - **Please note that for units reporting directly to UMOR, this letter comes from the Unit Director addressed to the relevant Associate Vice President**

- Letter from the Review Committee to the Department Chair/Group Leader presenting their conclusions and recommendation. (Insert copy of scanned letter into casebook and retain the signed original in the file. All members of the committee must sign this letter.)
 - The letter must include the vote tally of the committee's recommendation.
 - According to the Provost guidelines on promotion and tenure and consistent with UMOR principles, "The assessment should be written from an evaluative, not an advocacy, perspective and should present a balanced summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the case. Be sure to discuss any negative reports or reviews included in the casebook."

- Letter prepared by joint/additional Department Chair/Group Leader.
 - Required if candidate has an appointment in another school or department.

- Optional letters from Review Committee members, if they disagree with the Committee's recommendation or wish to modify the letter. Absence of these letters will imply agreement with the Committee's letter. Insert scanned copy of letter into casebook and retain the signed original in the file.

- Memorandum from the Review Committee to the candidate.
 - 1 page maximum
 - Written summary to the candidate including the salient aspects of the case, positive and negative, and a request for formal input from the candidate on the summary.
 - A recommendation of the Review Committee *should not* be included.
 - The original, signed assessment memorandum is submitted to the candidate simultaneously with submission of the casebook to the Department Chair/Group Leader.
 - Please insert a scanned copy of the memorandum into the casebook and retain a copy in the file.
 - Please see the sample letter found at the link at the end of this document.
 - **Please use this sample letter as guidance for the level and tone of the message, strict adherence to the language is not required.

C. Documentation of Research

C.1. Committee's Evaluation of Research and Impact

- Five-page maximum
- This section should summarize the key scholarly contributions of the candidate, based on input from a variety of sources such as the letters, and the candidate's publications. Specific examples should be given, ideally with reference to the most important papers. In particular, it should be noted that this is not a section in which to reproduce generic accolades copied from the external letters and citation indices.
- Candidate's research statement (optional)
- Expectations for promotion to **Research Scientist**:
 - A record of independent scholarship and funding.
 - Strong national and international scholarly reputation on the basis of sustained research productivity and contributions. Therefore, some letters from distinguished international scholars will be expected.
 - Substantial record of peer-reviewed publications.
 - Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.
 - In this section, the committee needs to emphasize the key intellectual and leadership contributions that the candidate has made to the field. For example, how would the field be different without the candidate's contributions?
 - No formal requirement for teaching
- Expectations for promotion to **Associate Research Scientist**:
 - Strong local and growing national scholarly reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years, possibly as part of a larger research program.
 - Record of peer-reviewed publications.
 - Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings. There needs to be evidence that at least a national reputation has been established, and that the candidate is on a trajectory for promotion to Research Scientist.
 - The specific intellectual areas in which the candidate is having an impact need to be identified, along with the evidence that the candidate is establishing an impactful reputation in these areas.
- Specific contributions to technology transfer, non-traditional involvement in public or non-profit sectors, and entrepreneurship should be included in this section, if applicable.
 - Examples include:
 - Creating a service learning opportunity for students
 - Engaging in community based research
 - Working to patent or license an invention
 - Engaging in creative performance

C.2. Ranking of Journals

C.2.1. Candidate's own ranking of journals/conferences

C.2.2. Committee's ranking of journals/conferences

- Committee's qualitative ranking of the journals, conferences, and proceedings in the candidate's list of publications, and implications of impact factors of journals if any.
- Comment on conventions of order of authors in the candidate's discipline (e.g., lead author last).
- If citations and the H-index are used, please verify the results with the candidate and include the source of this information, i.e. Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar.

D. Documentation of Service

D.1. Committee's Evaluation of Service

- One page maximum
- Overall assessment of candidate's contributions to service including diversity and climate activities.

E. Documentation of Teaching (OPTIONAL FOR RESEARCH SCIENTIST TRACK)

Please note: If the candidate has not been involved in teaching, please mark this section as N/A.

E.1. Committee's Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)

- Two-page maximum
- Overall assessment of candidate's teaching contributions including:
 - Classroom instruction; supervision of graduate student instructors in undergraduate courses
 - Conduct and supervision of laboratory instruction; mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students, as well as postdoctoral researchers and others in research
 - Advising students in the major; supervision of field work; and supervision of clinical and practicum experiences.
 - **REMINDER:** For faculty members with interdisciplinary appointments, please comment on his or her contributions to interdisciplinary activities with regards to teaching.

F. Brief Description of Credentials of External Reviewers and Relationship to Candidate

F.1. External reviewers (listed alphabetically by last name) who provided review letters

Reviewers are not to be contacted for any other reason other than to: 1. make the initial solicitation/request for the letter or a reminder that the letter is due; and 2. to request the reviewers' biographical data.

- Designate each reviewer as either “arm’s length” or “not arm’s length” and note whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate or by the department.
 - Please use template found at the end of this document as Attachment I as an example of format.
 - Arm’s length letters can be from persons who have been co-authors, major research collaborators, and former faculty colleagues with the candidate if the most recent association occurred over 10 years prior to the promotion.
 - Teachers, advisors, mentors, and current faculty colleagues (see exception above) **are not** "arm's length." We do not consider letters from persons who have served on a candidate’s thesis or dissertation committee to be “arm’s length.”
 - When both an outside reviewer and the candidate for promotion are members of the same large cooperative/research group that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an expanded number of co-authors, the outside reviewer can be considered an arm’s length reviewer if he/she and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort. In these cases, provide a statement with the bio noting the absence of a direct collaboration.
 - A minimum of five arm’s length external letters is required.
- If a non-academic external reviewer is identified as being “arm’s length”, provide justification that the title held by the reviewer equates to or is at a level above the academic rank to which the candidate is being considered for promotion.
 - Name and title(s)
 - Institution or corporation
 - Brief description of his or her credentials, including well understood measures of stature such as: fellows of societies, members of the NAE/NAS; editorships; endowed chairs; and leadership in professional society offices
 - His or her relationship to the candidate; e.g. classmate, personal friend, graduate instructor, dissertation committee member, co-author, or co-investigator. Dissertation/thesis advisors, major collaborators, if included, are not considered part of the minimum count for external letters

F.2. External Reviewers who did not provide review letters

- A listing of external reviewers, alphabetically by last name, who were asked to write a letter but declined to do so and the reason for declining. (See **Link at end of this document for format.**)

G. Sample Letter Sent to External Reviewers

- Include a sample letter sent to all the external reviewers.
- **The letter of request must be the same for all external reviewers and include the required text shown in the Sample Letter for External Recommendations, found at the end of this document.**

H. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers

- Include letters from evaluators outside the U of M (minimum of five (5) “arm’s length” letters).
- Dissertation/thesis advisors, major collaborators, if included, are not considered part of the minimum count for external letters
 - While letters from persons who have served as the candidate’s dissertation or thesis adviser or major collaborator can be especially helpful (because they can be presumed to have a good sense of both the person and the work), it is also true that their own reputations are involved in the work being evaluated. If such letters are included, they must be in addition to the minimum requirement of five.
- All letters received must be included and accepted through the following:
Reviewers are not to be contacted for any reason other than to: 1. make the initial solicitation/request for the letter or a reminder that the letter is due; and 2. to request the reviewers’ biographical data.
 - Original signed letters
 - Evaluation letters uploaded to a secure website
 - If the letter is unsigned, please note in the bio that the letter was uploaded to a secure website
 - Evaluation letters sent by email:
 - If the text is in the body of the email (needs to be a university or business email address, the Provost Office and UMOR will not accept personal email addresses); or
 - If the email attachment is accompanied by the original email within which it came (needs to be a university or business email address, the Provost Office and UMOR will not accept personal email addresses); or
 - If the person only has a personal email address, it will be accepted only if the email is followed by a hard copy of the letter
 - Evaluation letters sent by fax with the appearance of an original signature (obvious electronic signatures will be returned)
 - If a letter is received without a signature and is not delivered electronically, a letter or email message addressed to the Director or Department Chair from the casebook committee chair verifying the authenticity of the letter must be included in the casebook.

I. Evaluation Letters by all Internal Reviewers - NOT REQUIRED BY UMOR (if required by unit policy, this is not mandatory for most units)

- At least two letters of evaluation by internal reviewers at or above the proposed rank of the candidate. **Please use the template found at the end of this document.**
- Dissertation/thesis advisors, major collaborators, if included, are not considered part of the minimum count for internal letters IF REQUIRED BY UNIT AND THE FOLLOWING APPLY:
 - While letters from persons who have served as the candidate's dissertation or thesis adviser or major collaborator can be especially helpful (because they can be presumed to have a good sense of both the person and the work), it is also true that their own reputations are involved in the work being evaluated. If such letters are included, they must be in addition to the minimum requirement of two.
- If the candidate is involved in teaching, letters may be solicited from students, but are not required for research scientist track promotion.
 - Provide a list of all internal faculty reviewers contacted
 - List all students contacted (if applicable), and note whether the student was suggested by the candidate or the committee.
 - Sample letters to students are found at the link at the end of this document.
 - All letters received must be included in the casebook regardless of favorable or unfavorable comments

J. Curriculum Vitae

- Insert CV here

Appendix – Records of Communications

- Templates for all communications can be found at: <http://www.research.umich.edu/promotion-procedures-research-scientists>
- Only the text in the templates may be used.
 - Include a copy of the letter/email sent to all external reviewers.
 - Include a copy of the letter/email sent to all internal reviewers. (If applicable)
 - Insert a scanned copy of the signed RS-1 form.
 - Insert a scanned copy of the signed RS-2 form.
- *Example Memorandum from Review Committee to Candidate of the Guidelines.*

Attachment 1:

Sample - External Letter Writers Information

A. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FROM WHOM LETTERS WERE RECEIVED

Pamela A. Smith MD, Ph.D. (Reviewer A.)

Research Scientist, University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Smith is a Research Scientist, Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Sciences, University of Pittsburgh, Division of Urogynecology & Pelvic Reconstructive Surgery. Her research is in the general area of pelvic floor dysfunction. Specifically, she is interested in determining the biological basis for the increased incidence of pelvic organ prolapse following menopause. She knows Dr. CANDIDATE through her work and research. External Arm's Length, suggested by Committee

Ingrid Jones MD, Ph.D. (Reviewer B.)

Research Professor, University of Colorado.

Ingrid Jones MD, MS (Epidemiology), is a tenured Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology at the University of Colorado. Jones is Past-President of the American Obstetrics Society, Vice-Chair of the University of Colorado Institutional Review Board, Principal Investigator for 2 NIH-sponsored R01 research projects, and is a Consultant Editor for Obstetrics and Gynecology, the primary general journal in this field. The primary focus of her research, conducted with investigators from Bioengineering, Exercise Science and Biostatistics, is to understand the association between physical activity and abdominal forces, and pelvic floor disorders in women. Knows Dr. CANDIDATE through professional meetings and conferences. External Arm's Length, suggested by Candidate

NOTE: Our goal is to achieve a balance of evaluative letters from external reviewers who have been suggested by the candidate and from reviewers who have been suggested only by the department. For the Research Professor track, the five required "arm's length" letters must include at least two from reviewers suggested only by the department. External reviewers should be contacted only by the school/college/department. The candidate should not have contact with the external reviewers.

If a non-academic external reviewer is included as one of the five required "arm's length" reviewers, provide justification that the title held by the reviewer equates to or is at a level above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered for promotion.

B. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FROM WHOM LETTERS WERE REQUESTED BUT WHO DECLINED AND THE REASONS FOR DECLINING

Gregory S. Alexander (Reviewer I.) Professor Alexander declined because of his limited knowledge of the candidate's work. He is Professor of Law at Cornell Law School, where he teaches real property, property theory, and estate and trust law. He recently wrote a book on property theory that received an award for best law book of 2014 from the American Publishers Association. (arm's length – suggested by the department)

Charles Donahue, Jr. (Reviewer J.) Professor Donahue declined because of a lack of time due to a family emergency. He is the Paul A. Freund Professor of Law at Harvard University, where he teaches property and legal history. He was previously a member of the University of Michigan Law School faculty. He is coauthor of a leading casebook on the law of real property and has written extensively about property and legal history. (arm's length – suggested by the candidate)

Carol M. Rose (Reviewer K.) Professor Rose declined because she is out of the country. She is the Gordon Bradford Tweedy Professor of Law and Organization at Yale Law School, where she teaches property, contracts, environmental law, land use planning, and natural resources law. She was previously on the faculties of Stanford Law School, University of California at Berkeley, Northwestern, and University of Chicago. She is co-author of a casebook on property law and is a leading scholar on property theory. (arm's length – suggested by the department)

Jeremy Waldron (Reviewer L.) Professor Waldron did not respond to numerous email requests. He is the Maurice and Hilda Friedman Professor Emeritus of Law at Columbia University where he taught courses in jurisprudence and legal theory. He was previously a member of faculty of the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. He is the author of a book on the theory of private property. Professor Waldron was the candidate's thesis advisor. (not arm's length – suggested by the candidate)

ATTACHMENT 2

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]

[Department]

[Institution]

[Street Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit(s)] at the University of Michigan [is/are] considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure] to the rank of [specify rank]. Faculty at the University of Michigan are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions; teaching ability; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name's] research accomplishments and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of [his/her] work or professional accomplishments, we would like your candid evaluation of [Candidate Name's] written and scholarly contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in [his/her] field. In particular, we would appreciate your comments on the following issues:

1. How do you know [Candidate Name]? (in what capacity and for how long?)
2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus and scholarly impact of [Candidate Name's] works?
3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?
4. How would you estimate [Candidate Name's] standing in relation to others in [his/her] peer group who are working in the same field?
5. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name's] service contributions to the discipline; that is, [his/her] work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. Might [his/her] work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion and, if applicable, tenure at your institution?

[The following paragraph (word-for-word) must be included in ALL letters soliciting an evaluation of the candidate.]

Questions sometimes arise about the confidentiality of external review letters, and we do want to advise you that your letter will be reviewed by senior faculty at the University of Michigan. Because the University is a public institution, legal considerations limit our ability to assure confidentiality but it is our practice not to release external review letters unless required to do so by law.

We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. Should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Title]

Enclosures

ATTACHMENT 3

MEMORANDUM FROM COMMITTEE TO CANDIDATE TEMPLATE

This serves only as guidance, you may add or delete any text as appropriate:

To: Candidate
From: Committee
Date:
Re: Promotion from RANK to RANK

The casebook committee has carefully evaluated the research, teaching, and service presented in the submitted casebook, as well as from the external and internal letters received.

The committee's overall assessment of your research is that.... Your publication record, citation numbers, and research funding show The committee members agree that your research record meets/exceeds/does not meet what is expected for promotion to the rank of _____.

Address any salient points related to research, service, etc...

Your casebook and the reference letters form the basis for the committee's evaluation of your contributions to teaching, research and service. You may respond in writing to this memo to correct any misunderstandings or to add missing information should you desire. If you choose to do so, your response should be delivered to NAME/S by DATE.