Outline of Topics

- Selection of referees, peers, and trainees
- Narrative section
- Evaluations (teaching, clinical)
- Counseling memo
- Requirements for transmittal memo
Selection of Referees for Associate and Full Professor Appointments

- Confidential letters from experts in the field are a major part of the evaluation process
- Their rank should be the same or higher than that of the candidate
- Candidate may recommend only 3 referees
- The overwhelming majority of the referees will be independent
- They should come from top-tier institutions with a broad geographic mix
Referees for Associate and Full Professor Appointments

- Distinction of the referees must be documented in the grid (awards, leadership positions, memberships in societies such as NAS, etc.)

- For tenured appointments, the referees must have tenure at an institution comparable to Stanford
Named Peers

- For tenure line, the peers must be leaders in the broad field, be at the same or higher rank as the candidate, and have tenure at a top-tier institution.

- Distinction of the peers must be documented in the grid.

- For NTL-R, the peers can be in a narrower field but must be leaders in that field.
Trainees

- For assistant professor reappointments and promotion to associate professor (or for untenured associate professor to tenure), all current and former research trainees should be asked to write; in addition, 3 to 5 clinical trainees may be selected by the long form lead.

- All trainees are given the option of a confidential conversation instead of a letter.

- For other A&P actions, the list of trainees can be selected at random by the long form lead from all trainees (current and former are required and a mix of research and clinical, if applicable).
Highlights of New Long Form

One narrative section (maximum of 5 pages but shorter is recommended) for both description and evaluation of

- 1. scholarship
- 2. teaching role
- 3. clinical role (if any)
- 4. leadership role (if any)
- List % effort for each mission area and note any changes (past or planned)
Narrative

- This section should be written by a senior faculty member; best practice is for the author to be independent of the candidate.
- Do not repeat information from the CV.
- The narrative is written by the long form lead of the evaluation committee or unit, and it may need to be updated after the discussion and vote of the full departmental faculty or the A&P committee.
New Long Form: Scholarship

- **Describe** scholarship: start with a brief description of the candidate’s scholarly program and then describe one published work from the current term (with full citation) and its significance and impact.

- **Evaluate** the candidate’s scholarship: consider the comments and peer rankings by the referees and trainees, the candidate’s trajectory, any issues needing to be addressed (negative comment by a referee about scholarship, etc.); do not include quotes from referees.

- One paragraph for each unless issues to address.
New Long Form: Teaching

- Describe the teaching role: classroom teaching, clinical teaching, mentoring, and/or pedagogical innovations

- Evaluate the candidate’s teaching: from trainee assessments and teaching evaluations; do not include quotes from trainees
New Long Form: Clinical Care

- **Describe** the clinical responsibilities: in-patient, clinic days, time in OR, etc.
- **Evaluate** the candidate’s clinical care: from clinical evaluations and comments on clinical performance by referees and trainees.
New Long Form: Leadership/Administrative

- **Describe** the leadership or administrative role: medical director, division chief, etc.; effort and responsibilities, any issues that are noted

- **Evaluate** the candidate’s leadership: from evaluations, letters; discuss future plans, and program for improvement if needed
Narrative Section

- In general, one paragraph for description of the role and one paragraph for evaluation of performance in each of the mission areas will be sufficient.

- University reviewers appreciate conciseness and brevity.
Narrative Section

- If there are issues that need to be addressed based on data in the file (letters, evaluations, etc.), this should be done in the narrative in the evaluation section

- There should be a clear plan for working with the candidate to improve and also a way to monitor performance for improvement
Teaching Evaluations/MedHubs/CES

- Make sure the scale is indicated: 1 to 6? 1 to 10?
- Make sure comments are not identifiable and all are about the candidate
- CES: See Qualtrics tutorial: how to create, distribute and report
- Voluminous teaching evaluations:

```
SAMPLE COURSE EVALUATION TABLE (if needed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter / Year</th>
<th>Course # Title</th>
<th>Course Units</th>
<th>Enrollment/Responses</th>
<th>Amount Learned Mean</th>
<th>Instruction Quality Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruction Quality Mean (All courses):

Amount Learned Mean (All courses):
```
Counseling Memo

- Required for all reappointments except for those conferring tenure (but may be helpful)
- Required for all promotions except for those conferring tenure
- In draft form until all levels of review are complete; changes may be requested
- Address the candidate’s performance
- Make recommendations for improvement
- Include the full text of criteria for future advancement
Counseling Memo

- If issues are identified in the file during the current term, a counseling memo should be included to alert the candidate to these issues and describe a plan for improvement.

- Be specific about the plan, and also be clear about how performance will be monitored going forward.
Transmittal Memo

- Required for all Ad Board files (UTL and NTL actions) and for MCL continuing term and for the appointment of any internal candidate

- Also required if there are issues to address in the file (negative referee comments, low clinical or teaching scores, concerns about scholarly productivity, etc.)

- Should address these and provide a plan

- Typical length is 0.5 to 1.5 pages
What is an Internal Candidate?

For the purposes of these guidelines, a “Stanford affiliated” faculty candidate is one who:

- Is currently a student, postdoc, resident, fellow, or employee at Stanford
- Was employed at Stanford in the past (e.g. Instructor, Clinician Educator, Senior Research Scientist)
- Completed MD, PhD, residency, fellowship, or post-doctoral studies at Stanford
- Is now or has been in the past affiliated with Stanford as, for example, a consulting or visiting faculty member.
Transmittal Memo

- The transmittal memo starts with the proposed action and a very brief summary of the role of the candidate.

- Negative comments and issues should be mentioned with a brief plan for how they will be remediated; this can be very brief with a reference to the full discussion in the narrative.

- Include a brief statement at the end that explains the reasoning for the proposed action.
Shorter Long Form

- Please make every effort to be as succinct as possible while conveying the information and evidence necessary for reviewers to make an informed evaluation.

- No need to quote from referee letters; all file reviewers will read the letters.

- To counter a negative referee comment, general statements and concepts from more positive referees may be referenced.
Questions?