
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

SMHS COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

GUIDELINES FOR PRIMARY REVIEWERS

1. **Education:** Summarize undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate education. Account for any gaps during educational years.
2. **Academic/Professional History:** Summarize professional activities since the end of postgraduate education. Indicate academic ranks, when appropriate, giving the years when the candidate achieved each academic rank (instructor, asst. professor, etc.) Professional activities should include not only academic rank, but also *significant professional roles* played within the George Washington University School of Medicine and Health Sciences (or other institutions as appropriate), such as clinical leadership roles, director of training programs, lab director, etc.
3. **Awards:** Indicate any awards received by the applicant during his/her training or postgraduate years.
4. **Clinical Service (As Appropriate):** Summarize clinical activities, estimating, if possible, the clinical time commitment of the applicant. Note any evidence in CV, letters of support or awards suggesting *excellence of clinical care* delivered by the applicant.
5. **Research:** Summarize the applicant's area of research to set the stage for understanding the potential significance of the his/her work. Discuss the applicant's success in performing research. This should include a summary of the applicant's grants, including sources of funding, role of the applicant on the grant (PI, co-PI, consultant, etc.), yearly direct costs of the grants, and % effort applied to the applicant for each funded project. Discuss whether the applicant demonstrates a *continued pattern of research productivity* or whether much of the research was done during a single period (for example fellowship) during his/her professional career. Finally, discuss whether the applicant has published the results of his/her work in abstract and paper form.
6. **Teaching:** Attempt to summarize the applicant's teaching efforts; estimate percentage of time spent in active teaching and report any new and/or unique courses developed by the applicant, as well as mentorship of MS, Ph.D. students or post-graduate fellows. Look for evidence of *excellence in teaching*; e.g., awards, letters, statistical representation of students' evaluations, etc.
7. **Service:** Service to the school, hospital, university and community should be reported. Committee memberships should be noted; special attention should be paid to positions of leadership within these committees. *Significant administrative responsibilities*, such as chairing a department or major committee should be highlighted.
8. **Regional/National Reputation:** Evidence of *regional or national recognition of the*

applicant's expertise should be noted. Such evidence includes, but is not limited to: visiting professorships, invited lectures, presentations at national/international meetings, membership on national committees or review boards, membership on journal editorial boards, etc.

9. **Publications:** Publications should first be reviewed in the context of research performed by applicant. (See #5 above) The total number of publications in each category (refereed journals, non-refereed journals, invited chapters, abstracts) should be noted. Determine if the applicant has a *continued record of publication productivity* or whether the publications all are from a single period in the applicant's career. Only papers already published or accepted for publication should be considered.
10. **Letters of Support:** Letters of support should be written by individuals at or above the academic rank which is being presently sought. Summarize the letters by number of letters received, level of support expressed by the reviewers, quality of the reviewers, and whether any appropriate negative comments were made in the course of review.
11. **Summary:** At the end of the review, summarize your impressions and recommend approval, disapproval or deferment. If you suggest that the decision be deferred, provide specific reasons for your recommendation, as well as specific points of information needed to re-review the proposal.