

For SCORS Review, From Angel Kwolek-Folland

| College | Contact | Comments |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| College of the Arts | Lucinda Lavelli, Dean, 392-0207 | Per our review COTA has no issues with the materials you sent but if possible could the statement be more general about collaboration so it could include more that collaboration in the sciences. However, we understand “Team Science” is in itself a specific term. |
| College of Journalism and Communications | Diane McFarlin, Dean 392-0466 | We are enthusiastically in support. What is the next step? (9/26/16) |
| College of Pharmacy | Julie Johnson, Dean 273-6309 | <p>Overall this looks very good. I see that HSC deans were in the CC line, so perhaps you are not asking for our input, but this is the first I have seen this document.</p> <p>I only have a couple of minor concerns as it is presented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Up to three letters of evaluation should be solicited from collaborators (internal or external, at or above the rank being sought) who will describe the activities and impact of the individual faculty member on the project(s) and results produced by the research team(s). These letters would be in addition to the required letters of evaluation. ○ A faculty member may, as an option, include a network analysis of the extent and impact of their collaborations with investigator and investigative teams. <p>3 letters from people at or above the rank being sought would generally work, but one can imagine a group of highly collaborative Asst Professors. I don’t think we would want the guidelines to imply that Asst Profs shouldn’t collaborate with other Asst Profs. So maybe something that allows such letters when justified. Document no longer requires rank at or above that being sought.</p> <p>For the info below, which I know is only a suggestion, I am guessing that we would want external validation in some way (letters perhaps) about the moderate and minor contributions as my guess is people might tend to not choose “minor” when that is really the case.</p> <p>Otherwise looks great</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>Shall I share with my T&P committee or not yet? 9/25/16</p> |
| College of Dentistry | Isabel Garcia, Dean 273-5802 | <p>Thank you for this, it looks very nicely thought out. We will disseminate more broadly across the college and ask for input. Do you have a deadline for us to return comments? Thanks Isabel 9/10/16 (responded 1-2 months) Met with Shannon Wallet, Assoc Dean for Fac Affairs)</p> |
| Other | Mark Segal | Also encourage folks to indicate equal authorship on papers with (*) |
| | From Mentor Academy session 11/1/16 | <p>Consider recommending letter writings consider: if this person left would the program be able to continue? What would be the impact? How would contributions change the University Careful communication and education of the external reviewers about the rules – not a traditional dependence on establishing “independence” for promotion Spell out importance of co-1st author, co-PI, co-senior author Importance of mentoring – if good team science, rotate responsibilities and recognition. Independent thinking to be a successful collaborator.</p> |
| | From COM TT Committee | <p>Require PI/Team leader to provide one of the 3 collaborator letters Include collaborator letters in the packet that is sent to external reviewers Provide a new template for solicitation of external review letters Have faculty candidates indicate specifically in their packet (#2) that they are members of a scientific team Chair should also be explicit. Do not require establishment of major, moderate or minor criteria, rather: Emphasize the importance of (1) uniqueness and (2) innovation of the candidate’s contributions as they provide added value to the team and to the University. What is essential about candidate’s role in the team? In the proposal and guidelines, state that the unique and innovative contributions are what the University/College consider valuable and are what will be assessed in determining excellence for promotion and/or tenure Avoid the appearance that faculty can function as techs within the team to advance. They should not just be applying what they were trained to do, but contribute uniquely a body of expertise that advances the science forward and to new directions.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>In instructions to candidate and collaborators, describe what would be lost if candidate were not part of the team.</p> <p>E.g. team leader/PI would not be able to compete successfully for x,y,z grant, or would not have achieved what the team has achieved without this person.</p> |
|--|--|---|