

**National Institute on Aging**

**Intramural Research Program**

**Board of Scientific Counselors  
Review Guide**



## **Contents**

Overview of BSC Review Process	1
Evaluation Criteria	2
Outline of BSC Review Process	3
Responsibilities of Laboratory/Branch Under Review	4
Guidelines for BSC Report	5
Appeals	6
Tenure-track Investigators and the BSC Process	7
Tentative Schedule of Proposed Meetings	8
BSC Members	9

## Overview of BSC Review Process

Each Laboratory within the Intramural Research Program will be subjected to a rigorous external scientific review at least once every four years. The review will include an evaluation of both the Laboratory leadership and the research of individual scientists who are independent investigators or staff scientists who conduct program-initiated research.

The BSC Peer Review evaluates Intramural scientists primarily on the basis of accomplishments since their last peer review, although careful consideration is also given to future plans.

The review will evaluate the research programs for their goals and long-term objectives, accomplishments, innovation, relevance to the NIA mission, and overall quality and impact.

The BSC Peer Review will evaluate candidates for tenure, as well as scientists occupying tenure-track positions at the midpoint of their appointments (see guidelines on Tenure-Track Investigators and the BSC Process).

The BSC will evaluate the Laboratory as a unit and provide the Scientific Director with advice on:

- overall scientific direction of the research program of the Laboratory/ Branch under review and new directions that could be considered
- interactions and synergism of research within the Laboratory and the Institute
- relevance of research to mission of NIA
- administration of the program
- allocation of resources
- tenure actions under consideration

BSC evaluations of individual investigators will address:

- quality of the research project(s), past accomplishments, productivity, and future directions
- significance of research and relevance to NIA mission
- research innovation
- collaborations/interactions with other NIA scientists
- level of resources (i.e., space, budget, and personnel) supplied to the investigator
- mentoring and training of fellows

## Evaluation Criteria

To address these issues in a systematic manner, the NIH has proposed the following evaluation criteria:

### *Significance*

Have the investigator's studies addressed important problems? Are the aims of the project(s) being achieved? Is scientific knowledge being advanced, and are the projects affecting the concepts or methods that drive this field?

### *Approach*

In general are the approaches well conceived? When problem areas arose, were reasonable alternative tactics used?

### *Innovation*

Do the projects use novel concepts, approaches, or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?

### *Environment*

Is the investigator taking advantage of the special features of the NIA/NIH Intramural scientific environment or employing useful collaborative arrangements?

### *Support*

Is the support the investigator received appropriate?

### *Investigator Training*

Is the investigator appropriately trained and well suited to carry out the projects being pursued? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other researchers (if any)?

### *Productivity*

Considering the investigator's other responsibilities (e.g., service or administrative), how would you rate his/her overall research productivity?

### *Mentoring*

Is the investigator providing appropriate training and mentoring for more junior investigators?

Recommendations about resources should be as explicit as possible, with a clear indication of which resources (budget, space, personnel) should remain the same, be increased, or be decreased.

## Outline of BSC Review Process

1. The Scientific Director determines the schedule of lab reviews that allows each lab to be reviewed at least every four years. The exact date of the review is set approximately 18 months in advance. Review dates are determined by the IRP Specialist based upon availability of the Chair of the BSC, board members, Scientific Director, and Director.
2. Four to six months in advance, the Intramural Specialist begins working with the Laboratory Chief to determine the review agenda (who will be reviewed) and requests suggested names for ad hoc reviewers. The ad hoc reviewers are asked by the Director NIA if they are available to participate in the review.
3. The BSC is provided the following information:
  - a. A Laboratory Review book that contains an overview of the Laboratory, research project summaries of the individuals under review, and their CVs. (Provided to the Board one month in advance.)
  - b. Confidential summaries of research resources.
  - c. Copies of last BSC review.
4. The BSC review consists of:
  - a. An evening session prior to the review with the BSC, ad hocs and the Scientific Director.
  - b. A formal presentation of an overview to the BSC by the Laboratory Chief.
  - c. A presentation by each independent investigator and appropriate staff scientist of his/her research.
  - d. A poster session where junior staff (fellows, IRTAs, students) can present their research. (optional)
  - e. A closed session with the BSC and the Scientific Director and the Director to give a preliminary summary of the BSC review and evaluation.
  - f. A written summary by the BSC, which is provided within two months after the review. The written summary gives an evaluation of the overall laboratory and of each investigator. (Each investigator receives a copy of the report dealing with the overall laboratory and their individual research.)
  - g. A written response by the Scientific Director to the recommendations in the BSC report. Any individual scientist may submit his/her own response to the Board's review directly to the Scientific Director. The Scientific Director may or may not include any submitted responses with the formal response to the Board.

Note: At no time prior to the review date or prior to the Board's completion of the written report, should the Investigators under review or anyone in their laboratory contact any member of the BSC or ad hoc reviewers. Questions about the review process should be addressed only to the Scientific Director.

## **Responsibilities of Laboratory/Branch Under Review**

Four to six months prior to a given review, the Chief of the Laboratory provides the Office of the Scientific Director with a list of each scientist who will be making a presentation at the review, and a draft review agenda indicating the order and title of staff presentations. This information is used to select ad hoc reviewers.

One and a half months prior to the review, the review book is compiled and sent to the Scientific Director for review. Once reviewed by the Scientific Director it will be returned to the laboratory for copying. One month prior to the review the Intramural Specialist will mail out the review book to all BSC members and ad hoc reviewers.

Approximately 20 copies of all slides being used are given to the Intramural Specialist in agenda order the night before the review.

## Guidelines for BSC Report

Review book consists of:

- Cover
- Roster of attending Board members and ad hoc reviewers (provided by IRP Specialist)
- Meeting agenda (provided by IRP Specialist)
- Summary of the organization of the lab being reviewed, including its various sections/units
- List of personnel, including their position, type of appointment and grade. They want to know specifically which positions are paid out of personnel budget and which positions are not paid for by NIA, i.e, Special Volunteers and Guest Researchers.
- Brief description of the laboratory/Branch, including its mission and focus, accomplishments since its last BSC review, and future directions
- Space usage
- Operating budgets and personnel budgets broken down by section
- Outside contracts, if any
- Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs), if any
- Copy of the most recent prior BSC report of the Laboratory
- Include an abstract for each poster that is being presented

For each scientist being reviewed:

- A current C.V. and bibliography (please use the format we have previously requested)
- Copies of up to three important recent manuscripts or publications
- Details of ongoing research, including general aims of the research projects, overall past accomplishments since the last review, and a discussion of future research plans
- A summary of the amount of support staff and space that the scientist uses, in addition to information about budget, contracts and CRADAs
- A listing of former fellows and their current positions

## **Appeals**

The BSC is advisory to the Scientific Director and action taken following the BSC review can be appealed only to the Scientific Director. A written appeal through the Laboratory Chief may be sent to the Scientific Director.

<http://www1.od.nih.gov/oir/sourcebook/sci-review/bsc-toc.htm>



## **Tenure-track Investigators and the BSC Process**

- A formal review of each tenure-track investigator is conducted by the BSC approximately three years after the investigator's original appointment.
- The BSC can recommend that the candidate be continued in the tenure-track, removed from the track, or considered for early evaluation for tenure.
- The BSC also identifies particular areas of strength and weakness of the candidate and suggests steps necessary to improve a candidate's research.
- Recent (no more than two years old) BSC reviews that include a specific recommendation on tenure are required as part of the package considered by the NIA Promotions and Tenure Committee at the time of tenure deliberations, as well as the Central Tenure Committee, NIH.

<http://www1.od.nih.gov/oir/sourcebook/irp-policy/tenure-track.htm>

## NIA BOARD OF SCIENTIFIC COUNSELORS

### TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED MEETINGS

***\*Please Note:*** Most reviews require both days and the first executive session will be held the night before the date listed below.

<i>May 13-14, 2003</i>	<i>Review of the Laboratory of Clinical Investigation &amp; Clinical Research Branch</i>
<i>October 29-30, 2003</i>	<i>Review of the Laboratory of Cardiovascular Science</i>
<i>June 9-10, 2004</i>	<i>Review of the Laboratory of Epidemiology, Demography &amp; Biometry</i>
<i>October 27-28, 2004</i>	<i>Review of the Laboratory of Personality &amp; Cognition Review of the Laboratory of Molecular Gerontology</i>
<i>May 18-19, 2005</i>	<i>Review of the Laboratory of Cellular and Molecular Biology</i>
<i>October 26-27, 2005</i>	<i>Review of the Laboratory of Genetics Review of the Laboratory of Immunology</i>
<i>May 17-18, 2006</i>	<i>Review of the Laboratory of Neurogenetics Review of the Laboratory of Experimental Gerontology</i>
<i>October 18-19, 2006</i>	<i>Review of the Laboratory of Neurosciences Review of the Molecular Dynamics Section Review of the Brain Physiology and Metabolism Section</i>



*Revised July, 2003*

**NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING  
BOARD OF SCIENTIFIC COUNSELORS**

**CHAIRPERSON**

Leslie J. Berg, Ph.D. (6/30/04)  
Associate Professor, Department of Pathology  
School of Medicine  
University of Massachusetts Medical School  
Worcester, MA 01655  
(508-856-8371/FAX: 508-856-8372)  
Email: [Leslie.Berg@umassmed.edu](mailto:Leslie.Berg@umassmed.edu)

Sangram Singh Sisodia, Ph.D. (6/30/04)  
Professor and Chairman Dept. of  
Pharmacology and Physiological Sciences  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, IL 60637  
(773-834-2900/FAX: 773-702-3774)  
Email: [ssisodia@drugs.bsd.uchicago.edu](mailto:ssisodia@drugs.bsd.uchicago.edu)

James S. Jackson, Ph.D. (6/30/04)  
Director Research Center for Group Dynamics  
Room 5006, Institute for Social Research  
426 Thompson Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248  
(734-763-2491/FAX: 734-763-0044)  
E-mail: [jamesj@umich.edu](mailto:jamesj@umich.edu)  
[dcjerome@umich.edu](mailto:dcjerome@umich.edu)

Leonard P. Guarente, Ph.D. (6/30/06)  
Professor, Department of Biology  
School of Sciences  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
(617-253-6965/FAX: 617-253-8699)  
Email: [leng@mit.edu](mailto:leng@mit.edu)

J. Larry Jameson, M.D., Ph.D. (6/30/06)  
Chairman, Department of Medicine  
NMH/NUMS  
251 East Huron Street, Galter 3-150  
Chicago, IL 60611  
(312-926-9436/FAX: 312-926-7260)  
E-mail: [ljameson@northwestern.edu](mailto:ljameson@northwestern.edu)  
[mcarsten@nmh.org](mailto:mcarsten@nmh.org)

Susan Swain, Ph.D. (8/10/07)  
Trudeau Institute  
100 Algonquin Avenue, Box 59  
Saranac Lake, NY 12983  
(518-891-3080/FAX: 518-891-5126)  
Email: [sswain@northnet.org](mailto:sswain@northnet.org)

Arlan Richardson, Ph.D. (8/10/07)  
Department of Physiology  
University of Texas Health Center  
MC 756  
7703 Floyd Curl Drive  
San Antonio, Texas 78229-3900  
(210-567-4397/FAX:  
Email: [richardson@uthscsa.edu](mailto:richardson@uthscsa.edu)

Douglas C. Wallace, Ph.D. (9/21/05)  
University of California  
2014 Hewitt Hall  
Irvine, CA 92697-3940  
(949-924-3490/FAX: 949-824-6388)  
Email: [dwallace@uci.edu](mailto:dwallace@uci.edu)

Rudolph E. Tanzi, Ph.D. (6/30/07)  
114 16<sup>th</sup> Street C 3009  
Charlestown, MA 02129-4404  
(617-726-6845/FAX:  
Email: [tanzi@helix.mgh.harvard.edu](mailto:tanzi@helix.mgh.harvard.edu)

Lisa Berkman, Ph.D. (6/30/08)  
Department of Health and Social Behavior  
Kresge Building  
Room 709  
677 Huntington Avenue  
Boston, MA 02115  
Phone: 617-432-3915  
Email: [lberkman@hsph.harvard.edu](mailto:lberkman@hsph.harvard.edu)

Barbara E. Bierer, M.D. (Not an official member yet)  
Dana 810  
Dana Farber Cancer Institute  
44 Binney Street  
Boston, MA 02115  
(617-632-6530/FAX: 617-632-1977)  
Email: [Barbara.Bierer@dfci.harvard.edu](mailto:Barbara.Bierer@dfci.harvard.edu)

Ron Petersen, M.D., Ph.D. (6/30/08)  
Department of Neurology  
Mayo Clinic  
200 First Street, S.W.  
Rochester, MN 55905  
(507-284-4006/FAX: 507-266-4752)  
Email: [Peter8@mayo.edu](mailto:Peter8@mayo.edu)