HOW TO WRITE AN EFFECTIVE PRIMARY COMMITTEE REPORT FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Guidelines for Department Primary Committees
Indiana University School of Medicine

The primary committee report is one of the most influential documents in a candidate's dossier. Please be familiar with the guidelines for determination of excellence or adequacy in research, service, and teaching described in the Indiana University School of Medicine Standards of Excellence. This document is available at: http://faculty.medicine.iu.edu/about-promotion-and-tenure/.

Below is a partial listing of critical items to discuss in each area of excellence. The Department Primary Promotion and Tenure Committee Review report should reflect the committee discussion and should include the following key elements:

1. Outline a brief biographical sketch of the candidate
2. Prepare a detailed written review of the candidate's primary area of excellence (research, service, or teaching for tenure track; teaching or service for clinical non-tenure track; research for scientist non-tenure track) by documenting the salient activities and outcomes used to determine excellence in the candidate’s area of expertise (see below).
3. Document the scholarly activities and scholarship of the candidate in his/her area of excellence, addressing any significant gaps in his/her scholarly body of work.
4. Document the activities of the candidate to determine adequacy in the remaining categories.
5. Evaluate the objectivity, stature and enthusiasm of the external reviewers' letters of recommendation. Specifically document what the external review letters say about the candidate’s contributions in their area of expertise. Provide exceptional comments from the external reviewers. Note whether or not the external reviewers are objective reviewers of the candidate’s research.
6. Assess and describe whether the documentation in the dossier supports the activities of the candidate as described in the personal statement and in the dossier.
7. Record the committee’s vote, accounting for and explaining negative votes based on committee discussions.

For Excellence in Research

1. Highlight the candidate's description of a continuing and coherent program of research while in the present rank.
2. Identify and discuss the candidate’s most significant publications that reflect the candidate’s major research accomplishments in rank. In collaborative publications, note how many papers the candidate has as first, senior, or middle author while in rank. Please comment on the individual contributions of the candidate to his/her chosen field of research. Document if there is evidence for independence from co-authors and/or evidence of independent contributions to team science.
3. Document the candidate’s extramural grant support including the size of awards, the duration of awards and the source of funding (NIH, AHCRI, VA Merit Review, CDC, Department of Defense, or other specialty society grants) and whether the funding source is local, regional, national or international. Document any intellectual property such as patents or royalties that the candidate may have developed.
4. Document the future plans of the candidate and his/her likelihood of continued success in research.
5. Document the local, regional, national, and/or international recognition of the candidate’s research contributions such as service on NIH, Department of Defense, VA Merit Review Study Sections, or Advisory Councils of the NIH or other major organizations.
6. Identify the candidate’s leadership roles in various local, regional, national, and/or international organizations.
For Excellence in Service

1. Document the candidate’s unique niche of excellence in service which is recognized by peers as well as by professionals outside of the medical center and document the significance, quality, and impact of the professional service.

2. Identify and discuss the candidate’s most significant publications that reflect the candidate's major service accomplishments in rank. In collaborative publications, note how many papers the candidate has as first, senior, or middle author while in rank. Please comment on the individual contributions of the candidate particularly if the work was collaborative in nature.

3. Document the program development of the candidate and the candidate’s unique contributions to his/her area of expertise. This may be documented by the establishment of new clinical programs and/or significant contributions to existing programs by the development of new or unique administrative contributions to health care delivery, education, or research activities in the department, by provision of an essential element of clinical care, clinical research, or administration within a program or department, or by provision of an essential element of a core service.

4. Document the future plans of the candidate and his/her likelihood of continued success in service.

5. Document the local, regional, national, and/or international recognition of the candidate’s service contributions.

6. Identify the candidate’s leadership roles in various local, regional, national, and/or international organizations.

For Excellence in Teaching

1. Document the teaching load of the candidate, the venue of the teaching activities, and discuss the evidence of outstanding teaching and/or mentoring as evaluated by peers and students.

2. Discuss the evidence of scholarly activities about teaching and document publications related to teaching activities. In collaborative publications, note how many papers the candidate has as first, senior, or middle author while in rank. Please comment on the individual contributions of the candidate particularly if the work was collaborative in nature.

3. Discuss the evidence of the nature and quality of course and curriculum development and how the candidate enhanced the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of teaching.

4. Document if the candidate has served on or chaired graduate committees and document the quality of results as documented by achievements of the students.

5. Document if there is evidence for local, regional, or national teaching, advising or mentoring awards and/or grants.

6. Document peer evaluation of teaching quality and discuss if there is evidence that the candidate has improved his/her teaching by active participation in such educational projects and programs sponsored by the medical school, campus or university or by the discipline, profession or other appropriate group.

7. Document the future plans of the candidate and his/her likelihood of continued success in teaching.

8. Document the local, regional, national, and/or international recognition of the candidate’s contributions and identify the candidate’s leadership roles in various local, regional, national, and/or international organizations.