

Appendix 6: Guideline for Professorial Nomination Letter

NOTE: The greatest value of this letter is to 1) provide an interpretation of the impact and importance of the accomplishments provided in the CV, and 2) provide information about accomplishments not listed in the CV.

ABSTRACT

1. The individual's current rank, positions and titles
2. The proposed rank, specifying for both whether full or part time. If there is a secondary department, is promotion in that Department being proposed simultaneously? If so, either a joint letter or a separate letter from the Director of the secondary department should be used.
3. A brief statement of why the promotion is proposed at this time and the impact of the individual in his/her field
4. Primary areas of scholarly achievement

INTRODUCTION

1. Outline of career history to date (education, institutions)
2. How or why the candidate came to Hopkins with a summary of his/her positions here

RESEARCH SCHOLARSHIP

Description of major accomplishments, listing for each:

1. Key communications (papers, textbooks, electronic publications, etc.)
2. Is there a clear fingerprint of the individual's role and responsibility for the work of greatest impact? If key studies are collaborative, what was the individual's role?
3. What is the impact of the key work? For example, has it changed the practice of medicine in a specific field, changed the conceptual basis for viewing specific problems, or altered the methods available to ask questions?
4. What was the mechanism of support (grants, contracts, etc.)?

TEACHING SCHOLARSHIP

1. Summarize any teaching responsibilities within or outside the institution. Identify the students or mentees (for example, medical student lectures,

CME courses, graduate students). Comment on recognition and how the candidate contributed to the success of students/mentees

2. Provide evidence of effectiveness, if available

- A. Teaching awards
- B. Progress of Mentees

CLINICAL SCHOLARSHIP

1. Summarize the clinical responsibilities

- A. What are his/her referral patterns?
- B. Clinical role/status in the department. Does the individual play a unique role or have a unique area of expertise, or is he/she one among others?

2. What has been the impact of the individual's acumen or innovation? Has there been a novel, incremental contribution in patient care? How is this documented?

3. Is there evidence of clinical effectiveness, such as the effect on local, regional, national, international practice, or other indices?

ORGANIZATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES/PROGRAM BUILDING

1. Description of major responsibilities

- A. Within the institution
- B. Outside the institution

2. Major accomplishments in the area of effort

3. Provide evidence of impact or effectiveness, if available

CITIZENSHIP/COMMITMENT TO JOHNS HOPKINS

Evidence or examples (especially for part-time appointments)

NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION

Scope and breadth of recognition: Evidence

- 1. Awards
- 2. Grants
- 3. Study Sections

4. Chapters
5. Invited Lectures/Symposia/Key Note addresses
6. Congressional testimony
7. Competitiveness of fellowship or other program
8. Desirability as a recruitment prospect to other institutions (Do not indicate ongoing attempts to recruit candidate to other institutions)

ANTICIPATED FUTURE PROGRESSION

What do you anticipate the individual's future role in the department or Institution may be?

ADDRESS ANTICIPATED ISSUES FOR PPC, or POSSIBLE SHORTCOMINGS

It is helpful to look at the individual as he/she appears on "paper," and if there are obvious questions, address those. For example, a laboratory-based investigator with relatively few papers may be working in a field where each study requires years, and the output of his/her peers is comparably small in number. A clinical investigator may have spent a decade organizing a study from which the results only begin to appear, but for which the impact is seminal. A clinician-teacher may have established a major teaching program that is not reflected in other measures of accomplishment.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

GUIDELINES FOR SUGGESTED REFEREES

1. The number is limited to a total of 15, with no more than 3 internal
2. Full professors only, with only rare exceptions for specific information
3. Identify all referees who have previously been contacted in the departmental review process