

Peer Review

# Review of: "Strategic Career Planning for the Uninterrupted Growth of an Engineering Faculty Member Through "RAAT""

Azida Zainol<sup>1</sup>

1. School of Computing & Digital Technologies, Sheffield Hallam University, United Kingdom

## Peer Review of "Strategic Career Planning for the Uninterrupted Growth of an Engineering Faculty Member Through 'RAAT'"

**Overall Evaluation:** The paper presents an interesting approach to strategic career planning for engineering faculty members through the "RAAT" model. The topic is relevant to academia and provides a structured method for career growth. However, the paper would benefit from greater clarity in its methodology, a stronger theoretical foundation, and more concrete examples to support its claims.

### Strengths:

1. **Relevance:** The paper addresses an important aspect of academic career progression, which is valuable for early-career and mid-career faculty members.
2. **Structured Approach:** The "RAAT" model appears to provide a systematic framework, which is beneficial in guiding faculty members through career development.
3. **Practical Implications:** The paper suggests a structured method for career growth, which, if implemented correctly, could provide a roadmap for academic success.

### Areas for Improvement:

1. **Clarity and Organization:**
  - The paper should provide a clearer explanation of the "RAAT" model at the outset.

- A well-defined structure with subheadings for different sections (e.g., Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results, Discussion, Conclusion) would improve readability.
- Some sections appear dense and could be broken into shorter paragraphs for better comprehension.

## **2. Theoretical Foundation:**

- The paper lacks a robust literature review. Incorporating existing studies on faculty career development, mentorship, and academic success models would strengthen the argument.
- A comparison with similar models or frameworks used in academia could highlight the unique contributions of "RAAT."

## **3. Methodology:**

- The paper does not clearly outline how the "RAAT" model was developed. Was it derived from empirical data, expert opinions, or case studies?
- If the model is based on practical experience, including qualitative or quantitative data (such as surveys or interviews with faculty members) would add credibility.

## **4. Examples and Case Studies:**

- Providing real-world examples of faculty members who have successfully used the "RAAT" model would enhance its applicability.
- Case studies or testimonials from faculty members could offer insights into the effectiveness of the model.

## **5. Language and Grammar:**

- The writing could be refined for better clarity. Some sentences are overly complex and could be simplified.
- A professional proofread would help eliminate minor grammatical and typographical errors.

## **6. Discussion**

- The discussion section could be extended to further discuss the support of results of the research and literature.

## **7. Conclusion and Future Work:**

- The conclusion should summarize key findings and highlight the impact of the "RAAT" model.
- Future research directions should be suggested, such as testing the model in different academic institutions or refining it based on feedback from faculty members.

**Final Recommendation:** The paper presents a useful model but requires further refinement before publication. Strengthening the theoretical foundation, adding empirical support, and improving clarity would significantly enhance its impact. If these areas are addressed, the paper could make a meaningful contribution to the field of academic career development.

## **Declarations**

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.