

**CHECKLIST FOR
RESEARCH SCIENTIST PROMOTION CASEBOOKS**

Please upload a bookmarked PDF file of the following materials for each casebook to the designated **OVPR RESEARCH SCIENTIST PROMOTIONS** Dropbox folder by **Wednesday, February 8, 2023**.
Confirm submission with an email to OVPR.Faculty.Affairs@umich.edu

For further information, contact:
Wendi Mohl in the Office of the Vice President for Research, wendig@umich.edu (734) 763-1290.

1. Summary Memorandum from Dean/Director

- The Dean/Director should include a summary memorandum indicating the names of all individuals being recommended for promotion and the promotion action.
- For a Research Scientist track appointment, the summary memorandum from the Dean/Director should be addressed to the Vice President for Research.
- The summary memorandum must include an Employee ID number for each individual being recommended for promotion.
- For faculty holding joint appointments (including Instructional tenure track, Research Professor track, and Clinical Instructional track appointments), please include details of the recommendation from each unit in which they hold an appointment.
- Please upload to the OVPR Research Scientist Dropbox folder the signed summary memorandum as a separate PDF document.

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

2. Unit Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service

- No formal requirement for teaching at the Research Scientist level.
- Address how your school/college and the various promoting departments, programs, or other units define and evaluate teaching, research, and service in their areas. If there are material differences in the criteria used by different areas in your school/college to evaluate candidates for promotion, please describe these (e.g., external funding is an important criterion in some disciplines; in others, it is not).

3. Documentation for each Candidate:

- A. Chair/Department/Unit Director Letters
- B. Curriculum Vitae
- C. Documentation of Teaching (**Not Required for Research Scientist track**)
- D. Documentation of Research
- E. Documentation of Service
- F. Sample Letter Sent to External Reviewers
- G. Brief Description of Credentials of External Reviewers and Relationship to Candidate
- H. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers
- I. Evaluation Letters by all Internal Reviewers (**Not Required by OVPR.**)

Appendix: Records of Communications

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.

RESEARCH SCIENTIST CASEBOOK TEMPLATE TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Summary Memorandum prepared by the Dean.....	3
II.	Unit Criteria.....	4
III.	Documentation for each candidate	
	A. Cover Letter from Chair/Department/Unit Director.....	5
	B. Curriculum Vitae.....	6
	C. Documentation of Teaching (Optional for Research Scientist Track).....	7
	C1. Committee's Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)	
	D. Documentation of Research.....	8
	D1. Committee's Evaluation of Research Impact	
	D2. Ranking of Journals	
	D2a. Candidate's own ranking of journals/conferences	
	D2b. Committee's ranking of journals/conferences	
	E. Documentation of Service.....	9
	E1. Committee's Evaluation of Service	
	F. Sample Letter to External Reviewers.....	10
	G. Cover Sheet with Brief Description of Credentials of External Reviewers and their Relationship to the Candidate (Attachment 1).....	11
	G1. External Reviewers listed alphabetically by last name who provided letters	
	G2. External Reviewers who did not provide review letters	
	H. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers.....	12
	I. Evaluation Letters by all Internal Reviewers (Not Required by OVPR).....	13
	Appendix – Records of Communications	
	Attachment 1: External Letter Writers Information	
	Attachment 2: Solicitation Letter Template	
	Attachment 3: Memorandum from Committee to Candidate Template	

I. Summary Memorandum prepared by the Dean

- Summary letter must include Employee ID number for each individual being recommended for promotion.
- Summary letter should be addressed to the Vice President for Research
- For faculty holding joint appointments, please include details of the recommendation from each unit in which they hold an appointment.
- Insert copy of letter with electronic signature
- Maintain original signed letter with file.
- Upload the signed letter as a separate PDF document to the OVPR Research Scientist Promotions folder for your school.

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

II. Unit Criteria

Address how your school/college and the various promoting departments, programs, or other units define and evaluate teaching (optional for Scientist Track), research, and service in their areas. If there are material differences in the criteria used by different areas in your school/college to evaluate candidates for promotion, please describe these (e.g., external funding is an important criterion in some disciplines; in others it is not).

III. Documentation for Each Candidate

A. Cover Letter from Chair/Department/Unit Director

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

- A1.** Letter prepared by Department Chair/Group Leader.
- Provide a subject line with the candidate's name, all current titles, Employee ID number, and include the date of hire for current titles.
 - If the candidate holds a joint appointment, please indicate the fraction of effort for each title.
 - Indicate both the total years in rank for the current appointment and the years in rank at Michigan. Please note that to be consistent among all schools/colleges, the years in rank should include the year of the promotion review.
 - 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 OVPR, this letter comes from the Unit Director addressed to the relevant Associate Vice President

- A2.** 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 OVPR 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."
- A2a.** Letter prepared by joint/additional Department Chair/Group Leader. (Required **IF** candidate has an additional appointment in another school or department.)
- A2b.** 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.
- A3.** 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.

B. Curriculum Vitae

- Insert current CV here

C. 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.

C1. 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.

D. Documentation of Research

D1. Committee's Evaluation of Research and Impact

- Five-page maximum

Expectations for promotion to *Research Scientist*:

- 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?
- A record of independent scholarship and funding.
- 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.
 - Independence not required or planned for.
 - No formal requirement for teaching.
- 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

D2. Ranking of Journals

D2a. Candidate's own ranking of journals/conferences

D2b. 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.

E. Documentation of Service

E1. Committee's Evaluation of Service

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

F. Sample Letter Sent to External Reviewers to Solicit Recommendations

- 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. (Attachment 2)**

G. Cover Sheet with Brief Description of Credentials of External Reviewers and their Relationship to the Candidate

G1. 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 1** 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 external letters required, minimum of two of those five must be arm’s length.
- 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

G2. 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.)**

H. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers

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.

- Include letters from evaluators outside U-M (minimum of five (5) letters, two (2) must be “arm’s length”).
- 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:
 - 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 Provosts Office and OVPR 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 Provosts Office and OVPR 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 OVPR (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.
- 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

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)
- *Example Memorandum from Review Committee to Candidate of the Guidelines. (Attachment 3)*