

# Utah State University College of Science

## Supplemental Guidance for Faculty E-Dossier (Packet) Preparation for Promotion to Research Professor

### Packet Preparation – General Comments

- For promotion to research professor, the Faculty Code dictates that not only must performance in the major area of emphasis be judged to be “excellent” and your performance in the remaining area(s) of emphasis must be judged to be “effective”, promotion to the rank of professor shall require an outstanding reputation in at least the major emphasis as defined in the role statement. Excellence is measured by standards for professors within the national professional peer group.
- Emphasize your trajectory since promotion to research associate professor.
- Openly address any gaps, inconsistencies, or shortcomings, providing underlying perspectives as appropriate.
- Brevity and efficiency are appreciated by the reviewers. We encourage you to think about your packet (or the individual research and service sections) as being analogous to a well-written scientific paper, where data is condensed in charts, tables, and graphs along with clear explanations.

### Self-Assessment Letter (*maximum 6-8 pages*)

This should be very well thought out document that clearly articulates how you demonstrate excellence and effectiveness in the respective areas of your role statement. Overall, this is an executive summary of the outcomes that are further detailed in the packet. Be positive and promote your achievements. If you receive any sort of award or recognition related to one of your roles, make sure to highlight this. Openly address any weaknesses, but do not excessively focus on them. Tables and graphs should be incorporated to summarize data and demonstrate impact.

#### ***Define your research program***

- Use terminology that is understandable to a non-specialist.
- Describe the research philosophy that guides your independent research program.
- Describe how your efforts result in excellence in research.
- Provide evidence for the development of an outstanding professional national reputation.
- Explain the outcomes (support with data in the packet).
- Address previous (outstanding) difficulties and how you worked (are working) to overcome them.
- Demonstrate how your achievements to date position you for future successes.

### ***Define your approach to service and outcomes***

- This section can be brief and summarize key activities. Include service to the department, college/university, profession, and community as appropriate.

## **Research Documentation**

### ***List all publications and creative activities***

- List all refereed publications with official authorship list, publication year, doi, and page range.
- Use special font style to identify student or postdoctoral co-authors (e.g., italics, bold, or underline).
- Clearly differentiate publications/creative activities performed prior to being named a research assistant professor.
- Include a citation analysis and indicate relative range of h-index in your field.
  - Explicitly call out high-impact papers, including popular press coverage and/or altmetrics.
- Clearly explain authorship sequence and practice in your field.
- Use brief (1-2 sentence) annotations to:
  - Identify the outcomes and activities for which you are primarily responsible.
  - Explain your contribution to multi-authored papers.
  - Provide evidence for the quality of your research publications/creative activities, including:
    - Journal impact factor
    - Number of citations
    - Other evidence of impact
- List other technical reports or non-refereed publications with attention to detail described above.

### ***External funding***

- List all proposals submitted as a research assistant professor including title, agency/foundation, requested amount
  - Indicate funding status (i.e., awarded, declined, under review)
  - For funded proposals include award amount, start and end dates.
  - For declined proposals, the College of Science encourages the inclusion of information such as scores, reviewer comments, funding agency pay lines (if known), and strategy for resubmission.

### ***List scholarly presentations***

- Clearly list all presentations at professional meetings (include abstract citation or dates, organization, invited or contributed, and location of meeting).
- Clearly differentiate presentations performed since being named a research assistant professor
- Provide evidence of impact (i.e., describe venue, note if it was a major meeting in your field).
- Clearly differentiate who made the presentation (you, student, etc.) and distinguish between poster and oral presentations.

### ***Student Engagement in Research***

- Indicate research performed by undergraduates, graduate students (indicate degree level if still in the program and degrees completed under your advisement), and post-docs (provide dates).
- Note any unique accomplishments of these students (placement on graduation, awards received, contributions to your research, co-authorship, etc.).

### **Service Documentation**

- Clearly list all committee service (both external and internal to USU) with start/end dates.
- When listing service on thesis/dissertation committees, indicate student's name, college, department, degree, and dates.
- Professional service includes reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, chairing sessions at professional meetings, chairing symposia, organizing meetings/symposia, etc.

### **Other Comments**

- All acronyms should be defined when first used.

### **External Reviewers**

While the code indicates that external peer reviewers should be “of rank equivalent to or higher than that sought by the candidate,” candidates are encouraged to submit a strong list of senior scholars who can provide insightful comments on their record. External reviewers should be respected scholars in the candidate's discipline and should have sufficient rank, experience, and perspective to judge the candidate's record and compare it to others of equivalent experience in the field. Candidates are advised to recommend colleagues who can serve as objective evaluators; i.e., not a former mentor, former collaborator, close friend, or former classmate.

The ideal external reviewers are not invested in the career of the candidate but, rather, have sufficient distance to serve as objective external reviewers. Candidates should avoid any appearance of close personal relationships with suggested reviewers.