Long Form Best Practices

Linda M. Boxer, Vice Dean
Outline of Topics

• Selection of referees, peers, and trainees
• Narrative section
• 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
- The overwhelming majority of the referees will be independent
- They should come from top-tier institutions with a broad geographic mix
- Their rank should be the same or higher than that of the candidate
- Candidate may recommend only 3 referees
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

- **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
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-2

- 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
Counseling Memo

• In draft form until all levels of review are complete; changes may be requested
• Required for all reappointments except for those conferring tenure (but may be helpful)
• Required for all promotions except for those conferring tenure
• Address the candidate’s performance
• Make recommendations for improvement
• Include the full text of criteria for future advancement
Counseling Memo-2

• 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
Transmittal Memo-2

• 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?

• Questions on long form best practices?