

## **Recap of 2012 Academic Review Files for 3-8-12 ORUBA Meeting**

- **Project Scientists Referee Letters** – Project Scientists are collaborative by nature. However, a few independent referee letters would be good to demonstrate how a referee from outside would evaluate the person. This is especially important if the ORU believes that at some point in the future the person will be proposed for a Change In Series to the Research Scientist series. If this is the case, CAP will review previous merit/promotion files and base their decision in part on the previous referee letters to determine the probability for independence.
- **Accelerated Merits** – The criteria for acceleration that the ORU utilized should be included in the review file. Proposed accelerations should meet the criteria and should be explicitly spelled out in the Director's Letter.
- **Research Statement** – Please emphasize to the people being reviewed that the research statement is a critical component of their file. This is where they can explain in detail their research and the role that they played in each publication. The bio/bib cannot fully explain the impact of research publications or their role on contracts and grants. The research statement is the place for them to stand out and shine and give the committee a reason to promote them rather than question the ambiguity of the file.
- **Director's Letters** – April has a sample Director's Letter on her website and this format should be followed. One of the primary areas of concern is that the requested action is explicitly stated in the first paragraph. Both CAP and PSSRP review hundreds of files a year and they don't like to search throughout the letter for the proposed action.

Also, if the academic is proposed for the BE&E (Engineering) pay scale, there should be at least a paragraph in the letter that justifies this action (please reference the BE&E matrix handout).

- **Academic Affairs Workshops** – There will be an Academic Affairs Workshop in May for ORU Director's and MSO's. There will be another workshop in June for academics that are being proposed for review in 2013. The exact dates and times are still being decided and a notice will go out with these dates. April will add the date for the workshops to both the Director Letter and the letter that is sent to the academic.

Factors to Consider When Appointing Project/Research Scientist on B/E/E Scale

FACTORS	CONSIDERATIONS
1 Degree	Is Ph.D. in an engineering discipline?
2 Training	Did the individual receive additional training in an engineering discipline?
3 Research	Is the individual using engineering principles, techniques, or answering questions of engineering nature?
4 Publication/Journals	Are publications in engineering journals? If so, how many? Or has the research shifted such that the individual is starting to publish in engineering journals?
5 Recognition by Engineering Societies/Profession/Membership	Does the individual participate in engineering groups, conferences, or professional societies and review for engineering journals and grant study sections?
6 PI Status	Is the individual a PI or co-PI on an engineering or related grant, subaward, or contract?
7 Collaborators	Are the collaborators engineers and the individual is contributing as an engineer or as a different subject matter expert?
8 Competitiveness	Does the market condition support appointment on BEE scale?
9 Equity	Are there others in the ORU with similar background that is appointed on the BEE scale?
10 Appointment	Does the individual have the qualifications to be considered for appointment in an engineering department?
11 Research Trajectory	If not, is the individual's research trajectory such that, s/he would be considered for an engineering appointment in the future?