Rank & Status Suggestions

As you prepare your documents for final evaluation for continuing faculty status and rank advancement, the following suggestions may be helpful. In the final analysis, the preparation of your materials is your responsibility and the suggestions below are based on my observations while serving as a member of the College R&S committee.

1. External reviewers: I need to receive a list of 10 potential reviewers who are qualified to review your scholarship. These individuals should be full professors with whom you have no collaborative or established interactions. Previous mentors, collaborators, co-authors on papers or grants should be excluded. Please try to pick those who are considered experts in your field. You should NOT contact any of these individuals regarding the review at any time before or after the process is completed. This prohibition includes calling or other communication to see “if they would be willing to review your packet”. Any attempt to contact a potential reviewer about the review process, either before or after the review, would be interpreted as a breach of integrity and compromise the process. Please clearly define any relationship you have or have had with any of the reviewers you suggest and provide some rationales as to why you are suggesting them (e.g. Dr. Smith is a world expert in Applied Spectroscopy within my discipline).

2. Timeline: Peggy has a list of dates associated with CFS and Advancement review and these are posted on the Department website under “Faculty & Staff” and “Rank & Status” menus. Please follow the timetable closely as any deviation leads to delays in getting packets out to reviewers. A rule of thumb that I have found useful is that it ALWAYS takes longer than I think it will to complete.

3. Package Contents: Peggy also has a list of items to be included (these too are posted under “Rank & Status” on our website). Please be complete and review your submission thoroughly for omissions, typos and grammatical errors. You should be very honest in your appraisal of your accomplishments. False modesty or the addition of superfluous materials is not helpful and may be harmful to your review. An example of superfluous material would be statements along the lines of “I regularly attended and participated in faculty meetings”.

4. Publications: In the long run, works in preparation or progress will count little. Papers that are submitted are similar. Published or accepted works are the criteria that will be heavily weighted. Be very clear in indicating what your role was on each publication.

5. Grant proposals: You should clearly identify the proposals you have submitted and indicated whether they were funded. Be sure to list your contribution to the proposal (e.g. PI, Co-PI, investigator). You should make it very clear what your contribution was in any proposals on which you are not the sole or principal investigator. Just as with publications, grant proposals in preparation will not be helpful in the review.

6. Consult with your mentor: s/he should be very helpful to you as you prepare your materials. Don’t hesitate to ask them for input and/or suggestions.

7. Department and College Expectations documents: the review of your packet will use the most current expectations documents to assess your accomplishments in light of the expectations. It would be wise to keep these expectations in mind as you prepare your file.