

**To the Advisory Board and the President:**

---

(Last Name)	(First Name)	(Middle Name)
<i>is hereby recommended for:</i>	Appointment	Reappointment    zz Promotion
<i>to the rank of:</i>	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor    Professor

*in the:*    UTL    NTLR    NTLT    MCL at \_\_\_\_\_ (Medical Center Affiliation MCL only)

For a term of years    Start: \_\_\_\_\_    End: \_\_\_\_\_

With tenure    Effective date: \_\_\_\_\_

For a continuing term    Effective date: \_\_\_\_\_

Primary department/school/policy institute: \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ % time

Secondary department/school/policy institute: \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ % time

Courtesy department/school/ policy institute: \_\_\_\_\_

*For an appointment coterminous with support or with an administrative assignment at Stanford or an affiliated institution, note, if applicable, the coterminous nature of the appointment:*

- Coterminous with continued salary and other research funding from sponsored projects
- Coterminous with continued salary and other support from \_\_\_\_\_
- Coterminous with \_\_\_\_\_

**Recommended by (as applicable):**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Chair of Primary Department/Director, Date)      (Dean of Primary School/Institute, Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Chair of Secondary Department/Director, Date)      (Dean of Secondary School/Institute, Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Chair of Secondary Department/Director, Date)      (Dean of Secondary School/Institute, Date)

**Approved for recommendation to Advisory Board (Academic Council) or President (MCL):**

---

(Provost) \_\_\_\_\_ (date)

**Approved for recommendation to the President by the Advisory Board (Academic Council):**

---

(Advisory Board Chair) \_\_\_\_\_ (date)

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**BIOGRAPHICAL/ DEMOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:**

***For new appointments only***

Please use the link below to visit the Stanford Secure Appointment Portal, enter candidate’s information, and submit it for secure processing. Faculty Affairs will use the candidate’s personal data only to complete candidate’s appointment record in our systems. The data will not be retained in this portal server once the employee record has been created.

Website: [Stanford Secure Appointment Portal](#)

**SEARCH AUTHORIZATION NUMBER**

***For new appointments only***

**BILLET INFORMATION:**

***For all appointments, reappointments or promotions***

Please complete the following form, adding additional rows as needed for additional secondary appointments.

Primary Department:			
Billet/Position Number:		FTE:	
Secondary Department:			
Billet/Position Number:		FTE:	

Note: If the School intends to seek support through the Faculty Incentive Fund, please contact Cristen Shinbashi in the Provost’s Office/Faculty Affairs: [cshinbashi@stanford.edu](mailto:cshinbashi@stanford.edu)

## Professoriate Long Form Transmittal Memos

The department chair's transmittal memo is intended to be a brief, substantive introduction to the candidate and the evidence for the action proposed. It should assert the department's support, discuss the candidate's qualifications, and clarify the department's position regarding any issues of possible concern in the file (strongly negative comments, negative votes in committee, very low evaluation scores, e.g.). One page will often be sufficient.

### Required for:

- All actions reviewed by the Advisory Board.
  - All UTL, NTLR, and NTLT new appointment and promotions
  - All actions conferring tenure or continuing term (UTL, NTLR, NTLT, MCL)
- Any action with issues of concern

### Guidelines for what to include:

- Candidate's name, degree(s) (for new appointments only), action, rank, line; candidate's current role at Stanford ("Acting Assistant Professor since August 2010", "joined Stanford in 2003 as Professor (R)"). For reappointments and promotions, may want to give brief faculty history ("promoted in 2007 to Associate Professor"). If the action would confer tenure or a continuing term, explicitly state this.
- If action could be considered an accelerated, "early," or mid-term promotion, provide a brief (one sentence) explanation of rationale for timing of review.
- Briefly summarize the candidate's performance in areas specified by applicable criteria - area of scholarly focus and impact, area of clinical expertise and level of performance, type(s) of teaching and mentorship and level of performance.
  - New junior appointments: may want to summarize training
  - Reappointments/promotions:
    - note recent accomplishments (during current term) that support the case
    - may omit pre-Stanford history unless relevant
- Short paragraph acknowledging any issues of concern in the file and a brief summary description of the steps the department is taking to manage them.
- Include all departmental and (if applicable) divisional votes. Split or negative votes may be discussed here or in the last section of the file – "Departmental and School Approval."
- For Medical Center Line faculty, include approximate FTE distribution between clinical duties, teaching, scholarship, and administrative service, as applicable. Brief explanation may be needed for unusual variations in FTE during the current term, or periods when protected time for scholarship was less than 20%.
- For Assistant Professors, include mentor's name.

### In simple, straightforward cases, there is **NO** need for:

- Separate individual paragraphs on clinical, teaching, scholarly, and administrative work.
- Quotes from referees (these are discouraged)
- Details of teaching or clinical evaluation scores.
- Lengthy discussion of search.
- Details of candidate's training.
- Detailed evaluation of issues of concern.
- Mention of minor negative issues (minor outlying criticisms, individual negative scores)

## Summary of Votes

Yes	No	Recusals	Absences	Total: Eligible Voters	Total: Actual Voters
21	0	0	n/a	21	21

### Department Voting Practice:

The long form is circulated to the Department of Neurology senior faculty (i.e., Associate Professors and Professors including Clinician Educators) approximately one week in advance of the regular bi-monthly department senior faculty meeting. In addition, an email is sent to each senior faculty member to inform him/her that a vote will be taking place. Clinician Educators participate in the discussion, but have no voting rights on Professoriate files. After the discussion, the senior faculty votes by a show of hands.

Normal voting practices were employed for this recommendation.

The Department of Neurology vote took place on October 28, 2016. The vote was unanimous in favor (21 yes, 0 no) for Dr. Brown's appointment to Assistant Professor in the University Tenure Line.

**Updated: June 17, 2016**

**A. IDENTIFYING DATA**

Name

Hiram E. Tuesday, M.D., Ph.D.

**B. ACADEMIC HISTORY**

**Colleges and Universities Attended**

1989	B.S. with Honors (Moon Science), Lunar State University, The Moon
1993	M.D., The Very Gray and Dusty School of Medicine, Lunar State University, The Moon
1996	Ph.D., Physical Biochemistry, The Very Gray and Dusty School of Medicine, Lunar State University (laboratory of Dr. Wayne N. Wachs)

**Residency and Fellowship Training**

1996 – 1998	Postdoctoral Fellowship, Primate Mood Disorders in Macaque Colonies, Loma Luna University School of Medicine, The Moon (laboratory of Dr. Gibbous deMonet)
1998 – 1999	Internship, Internal Medicine, Loma Luna University School of Medicine, The Moon
1999 – 2001	Residency, Psychiatry, Loma Luna University School of Medicine, The Moon

**Scholarships and Honors**

**Board Certification**

2003	Lunar Board of Psychiatry
------	---------------------------

## Other Study and Research Opportunities

### Past:

2001 – 2002                      Funder: NIMH (R01)  
Title: Prevalence of Seasonal Affective Disorder in Green Monkeys  
Role: Co-Investigator (PI: J. Doolittle)

### Present/Pending:

2002 – 2005                      Funder: NIMH (R01)  
Title: Modified Dairy Products and the Treatment of Primate Mood Disorders  
Role: PI

2002 – 2005                      Funder: American Dairy Farmers' Association  
Title: A Randomized Clinical Trial of Modified Brie vs. Camembert in the Treatment of Primate Mood Disorders  
Role: PI

2003 – 2007                      Funder: Kraft Pharmaceuticals, Inc.  
Title: Grating vs. Slicing: Comparison of Vehicle Strategies for Psychoactive Dairy Intervention  
Role: Co-Investigator (Principal Investigator: J. Child)

2004 – 2008  
(submitted)                      Funder: NIMH (R01)  
Title: Dairy-Based Adjunctive Therapy for Social Anxiety Disorder in Adult Male Green Monkeys  
Role: PI

## C. Employment

### Academic Appointments:

September 1, 2001 to August 31, 2004                      Assistant Professor of Psychiatry  
Stanford University School of Medicine,  
Stanford, California

### Other Appointments:

2001 to present                      Medical Director, Stanford Clinic for the Nervous and Somewhat Lactose Intolerant

## D. Public and Professional Service

Ad Hoc Reviewer

1998 to 2001

*Proceedings of the Neuropsychiatric Dairy Association*

2001 to present

*Journal of Lunar Psychiatry*

2002 to present

*New Moon Journal of Medicine*

Editorial Positions

2001 to 2002

Editorial Consultant, *Proceedings of the Neuropsychiatric Dairy Association*

2003 to Present

Associate Editor, *Proceedings of the Neuropsychiatric Dairy Association*

## E. Post-Degree Honors and Awards, Including Memberships in Professional Societies

2001 – present

Member, Lunar Psychiatric Association

2002 – present

Member, American Neuropsychiatric Dairy Association

2003

Residents' Teaching Award, Department of Psychiatry, Stanford

## F. Bibliography

Peer-reviewed original research (14 total, 1 in press, 1 submitted)

1. **Tuesday HE**, Wachs WN. Mood Stabilizing Effect of Chinese Lunar Hamster Infant Formula Exposed to Extremes of Radiation and Temperature (Case Report). *Comparative Psych* 23:43-45, 1993.
2. **Tuesday HE**, Armstrong N, Wachs WN. Effects of Oscillatory Radiation and Temperature Exposure on Calcium Binding in the Formation of Casein Micelles. *Dairy Biochem* 204:1315-1321, 1996.
3. Aldrin B, **Tuesday HE**, Wachs WN. Effects of Apogee/Perigee on the stabilization of Casein Micelle formation in Chinese Lunar Hamster milk. *Dairy Astrophys Biochem* 205:27-31, 1997.
4. **Tuesday HE**, deMonet G. CACKLE Modification: Alteration of Calcium Binding in Casein Micelles in Green Lunar Monkey milk following Oscillatory Radiation and Temperature Exposure. *Dairy Biochem* 205:897-903, 1997.
5. **Tuesday HE**, deMonet G. Mood Stabilizing Effect of Green Lunar Monkey Milk Modified by Exposure to Temperature and Radiation Extremes. *J Lunar Psych* 15:1016-1019, 1998.
6. **Tuesday HE**, deMonet G. Mood Stabilizing Effect of Modified Yogurt in Marmosets. *Neuropsych Dairy* 72:324-329, 1998.

7. Doolittle J, **Tuesday HE**, deMonet G. CACKLE-Modified Soy Milk: Experience with Lactose-Intolerant Primates. *Dairy Biochem* 207:912-914, 1999.
8. **Tuesday HE**, Doolittle J. Development of a Primate Model of Depression for the Evaluation of Psychoactive Dairy Products. *Comparative Psych* 31:1153-1157, 2001.
9. Doolittle J, **Tuesday HE**. A Novel Strategy for Casein Kinetic Linkage Extension in Gruyere. *Dairy Biochem* 208: 212-217, 2001.
10. Stewart M, Child J, Pepin J, **Tuesday HE**. Efficacy of Grated vs. Sliced Delivery Vehicles for the Delivery of Psychotropic Dairy Products: A Meta Analysis. *Neuro Chees* 4:171-188, 2002.
11. **Tuesday HE**, Stevenson DK. Hyperbilirubinemia in Preterm Infants of Depressed Green Monkeys Receiving CACKLE-modified Dairy Supplements. *Pediatric Dairy Psych* 3:214-217, 2002.
12. **Tuesday HE**, Doolittle J, McLaughlin L, Layton JM, Volk-Brew J. A Randomized Placebo-Controlled Trial of CACKLE-modified Camembert for Treatment of Depression in Green Monkeys. *Proc Neuropsych Dairy Assoc*, 43:261-267, 2003.
13. **Tuesday HE**. Standard CACKLE Modification Techniques Require Adaptation for Rice Beverages. *Dairy Biochem* (in press, 2003).
14. Stewart M, Pepin J, **Tuesday HE**, Child J. Grated vs. Sliced CACKLE-Modified Brie in the Treatment of Major Depression in Baboons: Preliminary Results. *J Dairy Psych* (submitted, 2003).

Peer-reviewed publications (other – 2 total)

1. **Tuesday HE**, Wachs WN. Commentary on Mood Stabilizers in Dairy Supplements. *Comparative Psych* 23:43-44, 1998.
2. **Tuesday HE**. Are changes in dairy consumption effecting primate behavior? *Dairy Biochem* 204:184-185, 2001. (editorial)

Non-Peer-reviewed Articles (none)

Book Chapters (2 total)

1. **Tuesday HE**. Dairy-based Psychopharmacologic Treatments. In: Doolittle J. ed. Primate Mood Disorders. New York: Corporate Press, 2001. pp. 435 – 448.
2. Stewart M, **Tuesday HE**. Psychoactive Fondue. In: Stewart M ed. Foods for Happy Times. New York: Corporate Press, 2001. pp. 435 – 448.

Books: (none)

Book Reviews: (none)



Abstracts (6 of 17 total)

1. **Tuesday HE**, Armstrong N, Wachs WN. Oscillatory Radiation and Temperature Exposure Affects Calcium Binding in Casein Micelles. *Dairy Biochem* 204:408, 1996.
2. **Tuesday HE**, deMonet G. CACKLE Modification: Alteration of Casein Calcium Binding in Milk Following Oscillatory Radiation and Temperature Exposure. *Dairy Biochem* 205:213, 1997.
3. **Tuesday HE**, deMonet G. Mood Stabilizing Effect of Modified Green Lunar Monkey Milk. *J Lunar Psych* 15:1357, 1997.
4. **Tuesday HE**, deMonet G. Mood Stabilizing Effect of Modified Yogurt in Marmosets. *Neuropsych Dairy* 72:324-329, 1998.
5. Doolittle J, **Tuesday HE**. Casein Kinetic Linkage Extension in Gruyere. *Dairy Biochem* 207: 1214, 2000.
6. **Tuesday HE**, Doolittle J, McLaughlin L, Layton JM, Volk-Brew J. A Randomized Placebo-Controlled Trial of CACKLE-modified Camembert for Treatment of Depression in Green Monkeys – Preliminary Results. *J Biol Chees* 67:864, 2003.

Invited Presentations (6 of 23 total)

- 2001 “Orbital Trajectory and Casein Micelle formation in Chinese Lunar Hamster milk.” Astrophysical Dairy Biochemistry Lecture Series, Iowa State University
- 2002 “Little; Yellow; Different: Hyperbilirubinemia in preterm infants of lactating depressed female Green Monkeys receiving CACKLE-modified dairy supplements.” Neonatology Grand Rounds, Stanford University
- 2002 “Lactose Intolerance in the Bipolar Marmoset: New Paradigms for Treatment”. Veterinary Grand Rounds, Texas A&M University
- 2003 “Grated vs. Sliced Delivery Vehicles for the Delivery of Psychotropic Dairy Products in Primates and Rodents.” Comparative Psychiatry Grand Rounds, Harvard University School of Medicine
- 2003 “When Green Monkeys become Blue Monkeys: A Primate Model of Depression.” 85<sup>th</sup> World Congress on Primate Mood Disorders. Schenectady, New York.
- 2004 “A Randomized Placebo-Controlled Trial of CACKLE-modified Camembert for Treatment of Depression in Green Monkeys.” Fromage et Psychologie Symposium, Paris, France.

# TRANSCRIPT

Required for beginning Assistant Professor appointments – transcript of the work that led to the highest degree.

## **Guidelines for the Candidate's Statement School of Medicine Long Forms**

The **three** page candidate's statement provides a faculty member, in the process of reappointment or promotion, the singular opportunity to have a "voice" in the long form and to explain their contributions, achievements, and future plans in the research, clinical and teaching arenas.

Medical Center Line faculty should focus on clinical activities, teaching, and scholarship, in order of proportional contribution.

University Tenure Line faculty should give the primary emphasis to scholarly activities; the secondary emphasis should be on teaching.

Non-Tenure Line Research faculty should focus on research activities, and Non-Tenure Line Teaching faculty on educational activities.

Have some discussion of all areas in which you contribute.

For reappointment and promotion, most of the information should center on achievements during the current appointment term, as well as future plans and goals. It is perfectly appropriate to explain previous achievements, training or background in that context, however.

### **Scholarship**

- Describe your investigative program – goals and accomplishments
- Major contributions and achievements
- Major publications and scientific discoveries and how they have impacted knowledge/further research in the field and/or patient care
- Major grants and awards
- Future goals - ongoing research projects, publications planned for submission, grant applications planned or in review

### **Teaching and Mentorship**

- Clinical "bedside" teaching and supervising, and student types (medical students, residents, fellows, community physicians)
- Lectures in clinical setting, in classroom, and/or continuing education
- Career mentoring and advising, and student types
- Research mentoring and direct supervision, and student types
- Prestigious positions obtained by former trainees
- Program development – course development and direction
- Awards received

**Clinical Care**

- General area of expertise, and description of clinical duties – for example, “75 percent of my time goes to clinical care and clinical teaching,” or “I attend three half-day clinics per week, two days per week in the operating room, and take inpatient call three months per year”
- Interaction with other services, and any outreach to other locations
- Periods of exceptionally demanding clinical workload during the current appointment term
- Development and/or implementation of new clinical protocols and the impact of such protocols
- Awards received

**Recognition in the Field**

- Study sections
- Grant review
- Editorial boards or peer reviewerships for journals
- Administrative service to academic organizations
- Major invited presentations and visiting professorships
- Conferences organized
- Honors and awards from professional societies

**Administrative Duties**

- Description of administrative roles and responsibilities, and their impact (this may be local, regional or national in scope)
- Time commitment for administrative work
- Future goals and plans

## **II. NARRATIVE REPORT ON THE CANDIDATE**

**(not to exceed 5 pages)**

### Scholarship

- Describe one published work 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, and issues that need to be addressed (negative comment by a referee, etc.)
- One paragraph for each unless there are issues to address

### Teaching Role

- Describe the teaching role: classroom teaching, mentoring, and/or pedagogical innovations
- Evaluate the candidate's teaching: from trainee assessments and teaching evaluations

### Clinical Role (if any)

- 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

### Leadership Role (if any)

\*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

### III. Search Evaluation Process

For new appointments to the faculty at Stanford, both the distinction of the candidate of choice and the search process itself will receive close scrutiny during review at the department, the School of Medicine, and the University levels.

The various review bodies involved will seek reassurance that a department or institute has:

- made appropriate efforts to search broadly, such that the applicant pool includes the best possible candidates nationally for the position;
- made appropriate efforts to solicit applications from qualified female and underrepresented minority candidates;
- followed standard practices of the University, the School of Medicine, and department, including the management of any possible conflict-of-interest issues between members of the search committee and known candidates;
- included the solicitation of referee opinion before extension of an offer letter to the candidate;
- selected an outstanding candidate who will not only meet criteria for the rank and line as specified in the Medical Faculty Handbook, but who will enrich the Stanford community and bring distinction to the School and University.

It is important to keep careful records during the search process.

#### 1. Description of the Process (1 page)

In preparing the search report:

- Include the position/billet number(s) associated with the search.
- Include a description of the position, along with programmatic need. For example, *“We sought an MCL faculty member at the Assistant or Associate Professor level, board certified or board eligible in \_\_\_\_\_, with established research focus in \_\_\_\_\_. This candidate would play a critical clinical role as director of the new \_\_\_\_\_ clinic and support the \_\_\_\_\_ investigative initiative underway in the department”*)
- Include dates of significant meetings of the search committee.
- Include dates of advertisements and the names of the journals in which they appeared.
- Include dates that solicitation letters were mailed, and to whom. For example, *“On [date], letters were sent to Chairs of [number] of departments of [specialty] throughout the U.S. “*
- Describe the process that was used to establish the definitive pool (i.e., the people who were interviewed or invited for an interview). Include the date on which the definite pool was determined.

- Describe any unusual events (such as “starting over”, or redefining the position, or the identification of an additional candidate(s) from the search). Provide a clear explanation so that a reviewer with no prior knowledge of the search can easily understand what happened. One way to do this is to track the history of major events in chronological order; earlier waves of a multi-phase search may be summarized . For example: “In 2011-2012, we conducted a national search for \_\_\_\_\_. This search yielded a pool of 23 applicants and three finalists. Negotiations were pursued for the top two candidates, both of whom elected to stay at their home institutions. In 2013, we received permission to re-advertise, broadening the position to include the rank of full Professor....”.

## **2. Copy of the Search Authorization (email)**

## **3. Definitive Pool (1 page)**

- Include a list of the definitive pool (DP) candidates – the ones you invited for interview.
- List the DP candidates in order of preference, top candidate first.
- Following the name of each DP candidate, state the ethnicity and gender (if known) and the method by which the candidate was identified (Ad, Letter, other). For example, “Jane Doe, M.D. ([ethnicity], female, personal contact by search committee member).”
- Describe each DP candidate’s background and qualifications in a summary paragraph. Clearly indicate the rationale for each candidate’s ranking. For the top few candidates, this should be specific. For example, “It was the consensus of the committee that Dr. X is an outstanding clinician and teacher, with an exciting investigative program; however, his national recognition and record of published scholarship are not as established as those of Drs. Y and Z; thus, Dr. X was ranked third in the definitive pool.” For candidates lower in ranking in larger definitive pools, you may provide more concise descriptions and ranking explanations (a short paragraph is often acceptable, and it may make sense to describe these candidates as ranked “below the top candidates,” provided that the rationale is clearly explained.)

## **4. Affirmative Action Aspects of Faculty Search (1/2 page plus FASI)**

- Describe efforts to identify qualified underrepresented minority and female candidates (for example, advertisement in publications of underrepresented minority or female professional or academic organizations, or letters sent to leaders at schools with large numbers of underrepresented minority students). If personal contacts were made either with potential candidates or with those who might be in a position to recommend

candidates, the outcome of those conversations should be described. For example, “members of the search committee contacted 14 colleagues to encourage application or solicit recommendations for potential applicants. These efforts yielded four additional applicants, two of whom were selected as finalists.”

- Describe specific efforts that were made to increase the size of the applicant pool beyond advertising and sending solicitation letters to institutions and individuals *as well as* the outcome of those efforts. Such efforts might include directly contacting potential candidates; communicating with colleagues at other institutions who may have special insight into the applicant pool, including those candidates in the pipeline; making personal contact with potential candidates at professional meetings and conferences and/or publicizing the job among meeting/conference attendees; direct outreach to discipline-based professional organizations, including phone calls to identify promising candidates. Again, the outcome of personal contacts should be described as above.
- Include the [Faculty Applicant Self-Identification](#) grid.
- Consider the proportion of women and underrepresented minority candidates in the definitive pool. If this proportion is appreciably lower than that in the total applicant pool, include an appropriate analytical comment in the search narrative report.

## 5. Advertisement/Solicitation Letter

Include a photocopy of a published journal page with your advertisement. Indicate the title and date of the journal and highlight the ad (for example, draw a box around it with a marker, or use a star in the margin). For a straightforward search, you need only include a copy of one ad. If different ads with changing content have been used during a lengthy or complex search, include one copy of each different ad, in chronological order.

Include a dated copy of the solicitation letter to institutions and individuals (e.g., department chairs or program directors). It is unnecessary to include a sample page of addresses; however, the distribution list should be maintained as part of the record for the search.



**SEARCH/EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Name	Position/Rank	School/Department	Relationship to Candidate

Above, list members of the search and/or evaluation committee (and if applicable, of any separate evaluation committee). Briefly disclose information regarding any negative votes, or recusals from final search/evaluation committee meeting, if applicable (**1/2 page**).

#### IV. REFEREE LETTERS

Number of external letters	Solicited	Received
	2	2
Number of internal letters	Solicited	Received
	1	1

Referee name & title/rank	Doug Howser, MD; Professor of Neurology		
Current Institution	Harvard University		
Brief description of stature and competence to serve as an evaluator	Reason selected: Research focuses on identifying diagnostic markers and disease pathways for dysthymic disorder  Academic Distinction: Former Director of the American Academy of Neurology; former associate editor for Movement Disorders; has served on the scientific advisory boards for the Michael J. Fox Foundation and Bachmann-Strauss Dystonia Research Foundation.		
Relationship to candidate	Expert	Co-Author	Mentor
	x		
Status of Letter	Received?	Did not respond	Declined (provide reason if known)
	9/7/16		

Referee name & title/rank	Lisa Cuddy, MD; Professor of Neurosurgery		
Current Institution	Stanford University		
Brief description of stature and competence to serve as an evaluator	Reason selected: Can speak to Dr. Brown as a departmental colleague.  Academic Distinction: Chief, Division of Epidemiology		
Relationship to candidate	Expert	Co-Author	Mentor
			x
Status of Letter	Received?	Did not respond	Declined (provide reason if known)
	9/2/16		

August 10, 2016

Dear Dr. Who:

The Department of Neurology is considering the appointment of Dr. Charlie Brown to the rank of Assistant Professor in the University Tenure Line (UTL). His duties include scholarship in the area of mood disorders, teaching, and mentorship.

This would not confer tenure.

One of the key sources of information for making such decisions is letters from experts in the field. We would be grateful if you would be willing to take the time to write such a letter of evaluation for us regarding Dr. Brown's professional standing. To assist you in your evaluation, I am enclosing his curriculum vitae and his candidate's statement.

The attached rank-specific criteria for this action, along with the School of Medicine's "Guidelines for Application of Criteria," should be used to inform your evaluation.

Your evaluation should concentrate on the area or areas in which you feel most qualified to render an opinion, keeping in mind the relevant criteria. The more specific and evaluative your letter can be, the more helpful it will be for us in our deliberations. In particular, we would appreciate your assessment of the quality and importance of Dr. Brown's contributions and their impact on his field, broadly defined. It would be helpful if you could open your letter by telling us how well and in what capacity you know Dr. Brown.

My colleagues and I value your counsel and appreciate your taking time to respond to this request. It would be most helpful to receive your letter by August 21, 2016. It is the policy and practice of Stanford University to treat your response as confidential in the faculty review process. Response by electronic mail or facsimile is acceptable.

Chair signature

Encl:  
Guidelines for Application of Criteria  
Candidate's CV  
Candidate's statement

## **Criteria for appointment to Assistant Professor without tenure in the University Tenure Line**

Individuals appointed as Assistant Professors in the UTL will have completed housestaff training (where applicable) and, additionally, one or two years of postdoctoral research experience. Their accomplishments during graduate and postgraduate training should already have stamped them as creative and promising investigators. If these individuals have not had formal teaching experience, they should have demonstrated during their postdoctoral training a commitment to develop the skills necessary for first-rate teaching. In short, the successful candidate must have demonstrated true distinction (or the promise of achieving true distinction) in research, and the capability of sustaining first-rate performance (or the promise of this) in teaching, and excellence in patient care (if applicable) appropriate to the programmatic need upon which the appointment is based.

### **Guidelines for Application of Criteria in the University Tenure Line**

#### Scholarship

In assessing whether a candidate has met the criteria of being one of the best scholars at his or her level of professional development in a broadly field, and of having achieved – or (in the case of Assistant Professors) having the promise to achieve – true distinction in scholarship, judgments should be informed by such considerations as whether the candidate is performing the kind of innovative, cutting-edge research on important questions in the field that breaks new ground, changes the way the field is viewed, broadens our understanding of the field, or opens up new methods or new areas of investigation, and thereby has (or is likely to have) the fundamental impact on the field that is expected from the very best scholars in the field.

Factors considered in assessing research performance or promise include (but are not limited to) the following: scholarly activity and productivity; impact, innovation and creativity; recognition in the field; ability to work effectively as part of a research team (if applicable); effective communication with colleagues, staff and students; and professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics.

Investigative independence (or, for Assistant Professors, the promise of investigative independence) is expected since it can be a useful marker of substantive scholarly contributions. It is anticipated that, in many cases, faculty members appointed or reappointed as or promoted to Associate Professor or Professor will have a record of external funding, which is often viewed as an indicator of how the work is regarded in the field and may likewise be relevant to an assessment of the ability of a faculty member to carry out an excellent program of scholarly activity.

Uniqueness of function is not, in and of itself, a primary criterion for an appointment, reappointment or promotion. The fact that a candidate is the only individual teaching in a specific area or doing scholarship on a certain subject, for example, is not relevant to the process of judging the quality of teaching and scholarship and is not determinative in the decision to appoint, reappoint or promote the candidate.

## Teaching

A UTL candidate should show promise – or have a record demonstrating -- that he or she is capable of sustaining a first-rate teaching program during his or her career at Stanford.

Teaching is broadly defined to include: the classroom, laboratory, or clinical setting; advising; mentoring; program building; and curricular innovation. Teaching may include undergraduates, graduate students, medical students, residents, postdoctoral fellows and in postgraduate and continuing medical education. It is recognized that many UTL faculty in clinical departments teach in small group sessions or with individual trainees.

Factors considered in assessing teaching performance or promise include (but are not limited to) the following: knowledge of the material; clarity of exposition; style of interaction with students; availability; professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics; effective communication skills; helpfulness in learning; and ability to stimulate further education; and ability to work effectively as part of the teaching team.

## Clinical Care

Excellence in clinical practice or clinical care is a requirement for those faculty members whose duties include such practice. Under normal circumstances, the proportion of time and effort dedicated to clinical care will be less than that devoted to scholarship and teaching. (For those faculty whose primary commitment is to clinical care, appointment in the Medical Center Line [MCL] is normally more appropriate.)

UTL faculty in the clinical departments may assume responsibilities for the care of patients to create the conditions necessary for medical research and for the teaching of medicine. Although the development and nurturing of the clinical skills necessary for patient care places demands on the time and the attention of the faculty who provide that care, appointments, reappointments and promotions will still be made primarily on the basis of scholarship and teaching.

Factors considered in assessing clinical performance may include (but are not limited to) the following:

General Clinical Proficiency: maintains up-to-date knowledge base appropriate to scope of practice; maintains current technical/procedural proficiency; applies sound diagnostic reasoning and judgment; applies sound therapeutic reasoning and judgment; applies evidence from relevant scientific studies; seeks consultation from other care providers when appropriate; maintains appropriate clinical productivity; and demonstrates reliability in meeting clinical commitments.

Communication: communicates effectively with patients and their families, physician peers, trainees, and other members of the health care team (for example, nurses, nurse practitioners, therapists, pharmacists); and maintains appropriate medical documentation.

Professionalism: treats patients with compassion and respect; serves as patient advocate (puts the patient first); shows sensitivity to cultural issues; treats physician peers, trainees, and other members of the health care team (for example, nurses, nurse practitioners, therapists, pharmacists) with respect; is available to colleagues; responds in a timely manner; and respects patient confidentiality.

Systems-Based Practice: effectively coordinates patient care within the health care system; appropriately considers cost of care in medical decision-making; participates in quality improvement activities; and demonstrates leadership in clinical program development and administration.

The UTL may include faculty members who contribute indirectly to patient care in clinical environments that heavily emphasize technology and/or a multidisciplinary approach. For example, a radiation physicist may play an integral role in treatment planning for individual oncology patients or a biomedical engineer may work closely with a surgeon or interventional cardiologist to develop and implement new treatment strategies. In such cases, factors considered in assessing clinical performance may include (but are not limited to) the applicable factors described above.

(excerpted from Chapter 2.4 of the Stanford University School of Medicine Faculty Handbook)



**V. TRAINEE LETTERS**

Provide the following:

1. A description of the process used to select trainees for solicitation;
2. A dated copy of the solicitation letter sent to trainees; for nonrespondents, there should be a minimum of two follow up requests;
3. All letters received from trainees, plus declinations or other substantive correspondence from trainees who did not submit letters.

**TRAINEE LETTER GRID**

*Read only sample:*

Name, current position	Former or current trainee?	Letter <b>received</b> , request <b>declined</b> , or <b>did not respond</b> ?	Dates of follow-up requests (if applicable)



**VI. TEACHING AND CLINICAL EVALUATIONS**

Provide the following:

1. A *summary* page or pages, in table form, of all courses for which teaching evaluations were available. *For most schools, classroom evaluations in table form are available from the [Registrar's Office](#); for other evaluations, please provide a customized summary, in table format, of all evaluations received and/or a list of the types of evaluative materials being provided;*
2. A summary of *representative* written comments by trainees, if applicable; *detailed evaluations and comments may be included in an appendix at the end of the form;*
3. Clinical Evaluations, if applicable.
4. If required evaluations are not available, please provide an explanation.

**SAMPLE COURSE EVALUATION TABLE (if needed)**

Quarter / Year	Course # Title	Course Units	Enrollment/ Responses	Amount Learned Mean (formerly Course Overall Mean)	Instruction Quality Mean (formerly Instructor Overall Mean)
Instruction Quality Mean (All courses) (formerly Instruction Overall Mean):					
Amount Learned Mean (All courses) (formerly Course Overall Mean):					

## **Summary of Fellowship Performance Evaluation – Charlie Brown**

**Total Evaluations:** 19

**Dates of Evaluations:** 10/1/15-5/1-16

### **Q1. Availability – Adheres to rounds and consult schedules; spent enough time; was unhurried**

Outstanding: 12

Skilled: 6

Competent: 1

### **Q2. Teaching – Stated goals clearly and concisely. Emphasized problem-solving (thought processes leading to decisions). Stimulated team members to read, research, and review pertinent topics. Accommodated teaching to actively incorporate all members of team.**

Outstanding: 14

Skilled: 4

Competent: 1

### **Q3. Overall Comment(s): All**

-‘I already think he is one of the better educators on staff.’

-‘Overall excellent operative experience. Reinforced his operative routine well which made the case progress more efficiently. Expressed very useful nuances and teaching points throughout his cases.’

-‘Dr. Brown is an excellent teacher! Wished I could have worked with him more!’

**VII. COUNSELING** (if applicable)

Provide a *draft* counseling memorandum to be provided to the candidate following the President's approval of the proposed action.

Counseling memoranda are **REQUIRED** for:

- All reappointments except for those conferring tenure
- All promotions except for those conferring tenure

For reappointments or promotions conferring tenure, counseling memoranda are optional and at the discretion of the Department Chair and/or Dean.

The counseling memorandum should:

- Address the candidate's performance
- Make recommendations for improvement as applicable
- Include the full text of criteria for future advancement, if applicable.

**VIII. APPENDICES** (if applicable)

Items to include in an appendix may include:

- Additional copies of the search advertisement and/or solicitation letter;
- Lists of persons and organizations solicited during the search process;
- Limited additional back-up material for teaching evaluations;
- Other materials as may be relevant to sections of this form.