

Revised 4/14/17

Academic Appointments, Promotions and Titles at

Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth

(Promotion Information for Individuals in the Tenure-track/Tenure Line)

The full document may be found at

http://geiselmed.dartmouth.edu/faculty/pdf/geisel_faculty_appt.pdf



GEISEL
— SCHOOL OF —
MEDICINE
AT DARTMOUTH

Part I: Introduction

Mission of Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth

The mission of Geisel School of Medicine (Geisel), as part of Dartmouth College and Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center (DHMC)¹, is to improve the lives of the people we serve—our students, faculty and staff, patients, residents, alumni, and our community. Our vision is to be the Medical School that sets the standard for educating physician/providers, scientists, and teachers to be leaders of change in creating a healthier, better world. We advance our mission by providing an inclusive forum that supports the expression, consideration, and evaluation of diverse ideas, and that empowers each member of our community to reach his or her full potential. Geisel is committed to an environment where there are no barriers between research and education or between innovation and implementation. We strive to disseminate our discoveries readily and to translate our accomplishments into better health for those we serve. Our goals are advanced by a community of scholars whose success is intertwined with the success of our academic and clinical partners and that is guided by the principles of integrity, service, and compassion.

Our mission rests on our ability to appoint and advance faculty members who excel in teaching, research, scholarship, engagement, and patient care. Geisel grants faculty appointments to qualified health science professionals in recognition of the diverse contributions they make to the mission of the school as educators of students of many types, as scientists who create an environment of discovery, as clinicians who excel in patient care, and as professionals who implement change that advances academic medicine and biomedical research. Faculty titles are awarded on the basis of qualifications, experience, and achievement. Promotion in rank is given to those faculty members who achieve distinction for themselves and for the school, as determined by criteria that are consistent with specific titles and professional responsibilities. Without exception, appointments, titles, and promotions are granted by Geisel to those who have shown they merit such recognition or advancement.

The expectations for how each faculty member will commit his/her time and the criteria he/she will need to fulfill for academic advancement will depend on the faculty line, the track, and the rank of each faculty member. However, scholarship in its broadest definition to “think, communicate and learn”² is fundamental to the endeavors of all faculty members of our Medical School, and both appointments and promotions are granted in recognition of excellence in scholarship.

The specific criteria for excellence may vary, but key elements relate to intellectual productivity; to the development and dissemination of new knowledge; and to advances in one’s field or discipline leading to recognition by peers, students, patients, and the broader community. The appointments and promotions process also recognizes excellence in other areas essential to the academic medical system mission, such as leadership roles at Geisel, its clinical partners, Dartmouth College, and the society they serve.

¹ DHMC comprises Geisel School of Medicine (Dartmouth College), Dartmouth-Hitchcock Clinic (D-HC), Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital (MHMH), and Veterans’ Affairs Hospital in White River Junction (WRJ VAMC).

² Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Part II: Structure and Organization of the Faculty at Geisel School of Medicine

A. Faculty Definitions and Titles

All faculty titles at Geisel School of Medicine are provided by Dartmouth College for the express purpose of supporting the academic missions of the Medical School. Faculty titles shall not be granted for purposes outside of those that support the educational, service, and research missions of the Medical School.

1. Full Voting Members of the Professoriate:

a. Tenure-track/Tenure Line:

Tracks:

- Investigator-Scholar Track
- Educator-Scholar Track

Ranks:

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

Faculty Members in the Tenure-track/Tenure Line shall include members of the Professoriate who are employees of Dartmouth College at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor in either the Investigator-Scholar or the Educator-Scholar Track. All faculty members appointed to the Tenure-track/Tenure Line and only faculty members within this line shall be considered eligible for tenure (Appendix 1: Faculty Tenure at The Geisel School of Medicine).

b. Non-tenure Line:

Ranks:

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

Faculty Members in the Non-tenure Line include members of the Professoriate who are employees of Dartmouth College at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor.

2. Limited Voting Members of the Professoriate:

a. Academic Medical System (AMS) Faculty Line:

Tracks:

- Clinician-Investigator Track
- Clinician-Educator Track

- Investigator Track

Ranks:

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

Faculty Members in the AMS Faculty Line include members of the Professoriate at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor in the Clinician-Educator, Clinician-Investigator, or Investigator Track. Faculty members in the AMS Line may be employees of Dartmouth-Hitchcock (D-H; Dartmouth-Hitchcock Clinic, and Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital), White River Junction Veterans Affairs Medical Center (VAMC), or California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC).

3. Restricted-/Non-voting Members of the Professoriate:

- a. Instructors
- b. Lecturers
- c. Clinical Faculty Line
- d. Adjunct Faculty Line
- e. Emeritus
- f. Honorary Faculty (and special case of Post-“FRO” faculty)
- g. Visiting Faculty

The titles of Instructor, Lecturer, and such modified faculty titles as Clinical, Adjunct, Emeritus, Honorary, or Visiting, may be provided to individuals who are:

- employees of Dartmouth College who hold primary appointments in non-Geisel Schools;
or
- employees of D-H, WRJ VAMC, CPMC or other institutions who make contributions to the educational and/or research missions of the Medical School;
or
- individuals who are not employees of Dartmouth College or its primary clinical affiliates. Such appointments will be rare.

In all but a limited number of cases, these appointments are non-voting. In a small number of cases, when approved by the Dean or his/her designee, individuals who hold these titles may be given limited voting privileges (e.g., if they serve on the Faculty Council or the Medical Education Committee). Individuals in these lines are not voting members of the General Faculty of Dartmouth College.

Clinical Faculty Line:

Ranks:

- Clinical Instructor
- Clinical Assistant Professor
- Clinical Associate Professor
- Clinical Professor

To help fulfill its academic mission to train the next generation of physicians, scientists, and health care providers, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth depends on the committed participation of community-based physicians and other advanced clinicians who may be employed by the entities that comprise DHMC (Geisel, D-H, or WRJ VAMC) or by other clinical practices. In particular, as inter-professional education assumes an increasing prominence in medical training, health care professionals who do not hold a terminal degree (and therefore will usually not qualify for advancement beyond Instructor in the AMS Faculty Line) play increasingly important roles in the academic missions of the Medical School and as such, should be recognized by academic titles and paths of academic advancement.

In addition, clinicians, including physicians, employed by one of Geisel's major affiliates (D-H, VAMC, CPMC) who fulfill important administrative and clinical functions at these sites, but who do not meet the expectations for appointments/promotion in the AMS Line, may be appointed and advance in the Clinical Faculty Line.

Adjunct Faculty Line:

Ranks:

- Adjunct Instructor
- Adjunct Assistant Professor
- Adjunct Associate Professor
- Adjunct Professor

To help fulfill its academic mission to train the next generation of scientists, educators, and health care providers, Geisel School of Medicine depends on the committed participation of investigators and teachers who may be members of other schools at Dartmouth (A&S, Thayer, or Tuck) or who are not salaried by Dartmouth College or by any entity that employs voting and non-voting members of the Regular Faculty.

B. Oversight and Responsibility for Academic Appointments and Appointment Terms

Individuals who comprise the Faculty of Geisel School of Medicine may be employed by Dartmouth College or other entities; however, all faculty titles are granted solely by Dartmouth College.

We recognize that diversity and inclusion are at the very core of our educational mission and are catalysts for institutional and educational excellence. We are committed to building an excellent academic environment, which includes efforts to build a diverse and inclusive faculty. With this goal in mind, departments and programs are asked to develop strategies that incorporate diversity and inclusion as key parameters in their efforts to recruit and retain faculty.

All appointments to any faculty rank must be put forward to the Dean by the Chair (or Institute Director; hereafter referred to as Chair) of the hiring academic department and must be approved by the Dean of Geisel (or his/her designee: e.g., the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel), the Dean's Academic Board (DAB), and the Provost of Dartmouth College.

Under all but exceptional circumstances, individuals proposed for appointment (or promotion, see Part III) to senior faculty titles will have served at Dartmouth or an equivalent academic institution for at least 5 years at the prior academic rank. Irrespective of faculty line, appointments and promotions to senior ranks are based on an explicit recognition of excellence, both qualitatively and quantitatively, with advancement from Associate Professor to Professor being reserved for our most distinguished faculty. Continued service and performance at the rank of Assistant Professor shall not, in and of itself, constitute grounds for promotion to Associate Professor, nor time in rank at Associate Professor alone qualify for promotion to Professor.

Early appointments or promotions will be rare and, when granted, will signify *exceptional* potential and particularly noteworthy accomplishments. All appointments and promotions to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor must be recommended by the APT Committee of Geisel, and approved by the Dean, the Dean's Academic Board, and the Provost of Dartmouth College.

Initial Appointments:

Tenure-track/Tenure and Non-tenure Faculty Lines (Dartmouth College employees)

Individuals appointed in the Tenure-track/Tenure and Non-tenure Faculty Lines are expected to hold a terminal degree (e.g., MD, PhD, DVM, or DO). In rare cases, individuals who hold non-terminal degrees appropriate for a specific position (e.g., an MBA or M.Ed.) may, upon approval by the Dean or her/his proxy, the DAB and the Provost, be approved for appointment to the Tenure-track/Tenure or Non-tenure Faculty Lines.

All appointments to any rank in the Tenure-track/Tenure or Non-tenure Faculty Lines require evidence of demonstrated scholarly accomplishments (in all but exceptional cases, peer-reviewed).

Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line:

Appointment in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line will be reserved for the most distinguished academicians, and the criteria for this line of appointment are consistent with that expectation of excellence in scholarship. Appointment to The Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line and advancement in this line require a commitment to and excellence in research (broadly defined as original inquiry), teaching, service (institutional or engagement), and disseminated scholarship.

All appointments of individuals as faculty members in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line shall follow Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EO/AA) Guidelines, and individuals hired as members of the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line faculty will be counted in the census of faculty for the Dartmouth College Affirmative Action Plan (AAP). Recruitment/appointment of individuals to these faculty positions must occur through a national search or a waiver from a national search and follow best hiring practices.

Individuals may be appointed in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line in two tracks:

- a. **The Investigator-Scholar Track:** Individuals appointed in this Track are those for whom documentation (CV, letters of support) indicates the ability to establish and sustain (for Assistant Professor) or a proven record of having established and sustained (Associate Professor/Professor) a rigorous extramurally-supported research program and ongoing excellence in peer-reviewed scholarship. Individuals appointed in this Track will also be expected to teach (the venue of that teaching may be variable) and to excel in teaching and to provide exemplary service/engagement to the Medical School as well as to professional organizations related to their chosen field.

With rare exception and approved by the Dean, individuals appointed to the Investigator-Scholar Track in the Tenure-track/Tenured Line will be provided with central support for compensation (fractional FTE) in recognition of their contributions to all three missions (research, teaching, and service).

- b. **The Educator-Scholar Track:** Individuals appointed in this Track are expected to be fully dedicated to innovation and excellence in the delivery of undergraduate medical education (UME). As such, they are provided with central support (subvention) for compensation (fractional FTE) of 0.75. These individuals are expected not only to be excellent teachers, but also to play a key role in the evolution of the health care/Medical School curriculum both here at Geisel and on a national front. Although extramural funding is not required for advancement in this track, original inquiry (research) and scholarship is. Moreover, as with laboratory or data sciences, peer-reviewed extramural support for educational inquiry will be taken as validation of the faculty member's contributions to advancing her/his given field. Individuals in this track are expected to sustain a record of excellence for peer-reviewed work in either the specific scientific discipline or in medical pedagogy. Individuals appointed in this track will also be expected to provide exemplary service/engagement to the Medical School as well as to professional organizations related to their chosen field.

Tenure: Tenure imposes a long-term financial commitment by the Medical School and Dartmouth College. As such, the number of new hires to the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line positions at the Medical School at any one time shall be determined by the Dean in consultation with the Executive Dean for Administration and Finance and the Dean of Faculty Affairs, following input from the faculty and in a manner consistent with the financial well-being of the School.

Subvention: it is the expectation that new hires into the Tenure-track/Tenure Line faculty members will be provided with subvention (i.e., fractional coverage of compensation of the stated FTE). In nearly all cases, the level of subvention will be 50%, with exceptions noted for faculty members in the Educator Scholar Track in the Department of Medical Education and, in specific other cases where specified and agreed upon by the Dean, the Dean for Administration and Finance, the Dean for Faculty Affairs, and the Chair/Institute Director (e.g., TDI). Additional subvention may be provided for administrative responsibilities (e.g., Chairs may receive an additional 20%; directors of graduate programs may receive an additional 10%). Such additional subvention supplements are provided only during the term of the administrative duties.

Faculty members in the Tenure-track/Tenure Line may also be provided with different levels of resources for professional/program development. For each hire/appointment, the commitments, obligations, and expectations shall be agreed upon by the Department Chair and the Dean of Geisel, in consultation with the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel, the Executive Dean for Administration and Finance, and (where appropriate) the Senior Associate Dean for Research or the Senior Associate Dean for Medical Education, and delineated in the candidate's offer letter.

Part III: Academic Progression and Promotion

It is the responsibility of the faculty member and the departmental Chair to establish a clear understanding of the faculty member's goals and the Medical School's expectations to achieve those goals in order to develop plans to advance his or her academic career. This process leads to the generation of an academic portfolio that is consistent with the mission of Geisel, tailored to the particular talents, interests, and responsibilities of the individual faculty member, and guided by criteria that define accomplishment along specific career paths. The portfolio is a framework for academic development.

A. Departmental Oversight

The Chair (or his/her designee as academic advisor) shall meet with each faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor on a regular basis (which, at a minimum is annually, but which is expected to be more than once per year) in order to assure that each faculty member below the rank of Professor is meeting expectations for teaching, research, and service to Dartmouth. For faculty members in the Tenure-track/tenure, Non-tenure and AMS Lines, the Chair should insure that there is an academic plan that will be consistent with promotion within the expected timeframe of six (6) years in rank (except when circumstances support either an accelerated or prolonged timeframe). The Chair (and/or his/her designee) shall meet with Professors at least annually to ascertain that they are meeting expectations for teaching, research, and service to Dartmouth. Moreover, faculty members should convey to Chairs at these meetings information related not only on their status with respect to their teaching, research and service, but also information as to what resources are needed and, conversely what barrier they believe exist, towards maximizing their academic potential.

In these annual meetings, all faculty members shall also convey information to their Chairs as to efforts made in their research programs, in their teaching or in their service with respect to meeting institutional goals of enhancing diversity and inclusion. Such efforts may include their own efforts to hire more diverse staff, students, or faculty; to augment representation of diverse populations in their curricular materials, or to serve on committees (internally or externally) that work to meet these goals.

To this end, it is also the obligation of each department to designate a senior mentor or senior faculty mentoring committee to each faculty member below the rank of Professor to assure that she/he is provided ongoing and appropriate guidance to develop to the best of her or his ability including supporting opportunities for faculty development that will promote diversity and inclusion with the goal of advancement in rank within a period of six (6) years. Promotion criteria for faculty members will differ depending on the line, track, and rank; however, advances for all academic titles shall be predicated upon common elements of excellence in scholarship, reflecting contributions of each faculty member to her/his academic field of endeavor and to the community that includes Dartmouth but also extends beyond its borders.

Recommendations to advance a candidate to the APT Committee for consideration for promotion is to be made following review and recommendation by a committee of senior faculty at Geisel with expertise in the candidate's field of endeavor to the candidate's Chair(s). This committee may be composed of solely of members of the candidate's home department or, for departments

that have smaller numbers of senior faculty members, of members from the home department and other departments with appropriate expertise.

It is critical to note that time in rank alone is not sufficient to warrant promotion. To merit reappointment or promotion, the faculty member must provide strong evidence of achievement according to the criteria appropriate to a particular portfolio of academic activities.

B. Areas of Academic Endeavor

Scholarly activity within an academic medical system is recognized in the areas of teaching, investigation, and patient care. Each of these three areas has traditionally been an integral part of academic medicine, and what constitutes scholarship in these arenas is usually well defined. Contemporary academic communities also recognize the value and the contributions of a fourth component: engagement. To emphasize, we define scholarship as the *creation and dissemination* of *new* knowledge. Activities in all four areas (teaching, research, clinical care, and engagement) must meet this definition to be considered scholarly work.

The descriptions below provide professional models and related indicators of excellence for academic contributions within each arena. These criteria are neither completely inclusive nor absolute. Moreover, there is a rich interdependency among these areas, each informing aspects of the others. In particular the area of engagement is interwoven into each of the other three areas of investigation, teaching, and patient care. Appointments to specific titles and advancement along specific lines will depend on the ability of the faculty member to make substantive contributions in more than one of these domains of scholarly activity, but the weighting of each contribution may vary with each individual's professional record of accomplishment. Finally, because notable accomplishments may vary not only among individuals, but also with time as innovations shape the academic sphere, the following descriptions are intended to be suggestive of appropriate criteria, but do not provide a rigid checklist of items that must be met.

1. Teaching: Teaching is a core mission of Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth and a fundamental expectation of all members of the Geisel faculty. While Geisel has historically been primarily dedicated to the teaching of medical and graduate students, Geisel faculty now participate in the education of many other learners in our academic medical system, within our region, and beyond (e.g., residents and interns, students in the other professional schools and in Arts and Sciences at Dartmouth, students in summer courses, and students in Dartmouth Community Medical School). The goal of all scholarship is to inform those inside and outside our own sphere. An informed and diverse body of learners becomes a critical legacy of our faculty and institution, and we are committed to excellence in their education. Indeed, some members of the faculty may devote the majority of their professional energy to teaching and to the area of scholarship that is the development and dissemination of novel pedagogy.

We expect our faculty to be dedicated to our learners and to aspire to excellence in teaching. We recognize and reward our teachers for their ability to inspire these learners to achieve a sound mastery of the subject, a critical manner of thinking, a healthy skepticism of dogma, and a clear notion of what is both known and unknown in their field. In addition, we expect our faculty to instill in those they teach these same skills and values so that they, in turn, will excel in teaching

others. Our faculty members should teach rather than train, serve as role models rather than simply instruct, and inspire students to expand the horizons of knowledge.

Criteria Related to Teaching

The candidate's contribution to teaching and its impact on learners should be documented through syllabi showing participation in didactic courses, evidence of membership on thesis and qualifying examination committees, and documentation of training of individual students, including both identification of mentees and service on student committees. The criteria for teaching excellence include:

- Recognition by peers and students as a key and/or outstanding individual in training, teaching, and advising of undergraduate, medical, and graduate students; residents, clinical, and postdoctoral research fellows; and allied medical personnel and peers. Such recognition of excellence is supported by:
 - Surveys, evaluations, and institutional ratings by students at all training levels;
 - Assessments of the candidate's teaching contribution from department Chairs or by other institutional officials (e.g., course directors) that provide a judgment based on a significant sample of the individual's teaching;
 - Documentation of the faculty member's mentoring of a substantial number of students and of the outcomes of teaching (e.g., the mentees who have gone on to obtain positions of their own in biomedical or academic institutions);
 - Formal acknowledgement of outstanding teaching (e.g., selection as Class Day speaker; Teacher of the Year award; membership in AOA, HHMI, and Teaching Professorships).
- Leadership and major participation in departmental or institutional courses or educational programs (e.g., clinical clerkship directorship), development of novel graduate curricula or novel programs that extend across the institution (e.g., development or substantive contributions to MD/MSE, MD/MBA, MS/MD, MD/PhD, or AB/MD curricula).
- Scholarship in the area of education and teaching methodologies, including textbooks, videotapes, and training manuals, as well as the development, dissemination, and effective implementation (documented) of new courses, curricular content, or novel teaching materials--syllabi, web-based and/or computer-assisted instruction, films, or videotapes. Developments that are peer-reviewed and/or exported on a national or international level shall be heavily weighted.

- Directorship or development of major courses or other curricular offerings and/or development of significant new teaching materials. Service in a major teaching responsibility (e.g., course director with major teaching responsibility) shall constitute a heavily weighted achievement when coupled with substantive effort commitment to other activities (e.g., clinical care or research).
- Measures of student achievement (e.g., scores on local or national board and in-service examinations, publication of students' work).
- Effective leadership or major participation in Continuing Medical Education (CME) at the local, regional, or national level; design of courses; and/or participation therein.
- Effective leadership or major participation in Graduate Medical Education (GME) at the local, regional, or national level; design of curricula; and/or participation therein.
- Frequent invitations to serve as a visiting Professor or outside speaker, especially in endowed visiting Professorships or lectureships.
- Letters of commendation for exceptional educational contributions to other institutions and organizations.
- Evaluations and ratings arising from participation in other teaching programs.
- Peer-reviewed research that involves the development or evaluation of teaching methods, material (e.g., national board questions), and/or new programs, or that defines important, innovative, and effective (documented) changes in medical education.
- Editorship or authorship of textbooks, reviews, or other scholarly contributions.
- Development of important curriculum offerings or teaching materials (including text books, web-based training modules, clinical handbooks) adopted by Geisel and/or other institutions.

2. Research: The mission of the investigator is research, encompassing the discovery, production, and dissemination of new knowledge. Productive scholarship at all levels, from the molecular basis of living systems and human disease to health services and public policy, is an essential characteristic of an academic medical system. The biomedical research of today informs and transforms clinical practice and the health care policies of tomorrow. Results of research can have exponential influence well beyond Geisel by enhancing our understanding of the fundamentals of biological processes, developing new drugs and devices, and advancing healthcare delivery. Accomplished, active investigators imbue their teaching with the rigor of the scientific method and the excitement of discoveries that transform their fields. Investigators nurture an atmosphere of inquiry that permeates all phases of biomedical training and, in turn,

promotes the development of researchers under their tutelage who have the ability to ask critical questions. This skill is at the heart of academic medicine, and individuals who understand the fundamental mechanisms of health, disease, and health care delivery will be those best equipped to advance the frontiers of biomedical knowledge and patient care.

The Geisel School of Medicine also recognizes that research may encompass a broad range of academic inquiry. Specifically, we recognize that as with laboratory or data sciences, peer-reviewed extramural support for educational inquiry and scholarship in this area of endeavor will be viewed as contributing to the research community and will be taken as validation of the faculty member's contributions to advancing her/his given field.

Criteria Relating to Research

The candidate should be recognized by peers as an investigator whose work has been instrumental in promoting significant advances in her/his field of inquiry, inclusive of basic research, clinical research, pedagogy, and health care delivery science. Hallmarks of recognition include both those made as an individual and those made as part of a larger, cooperative team. Recognition of excellence in investigation is made evident by:

- Documentation of the ability to create new knowledge or manners of thought, as made evident by continued publication of substantive, original studies (basic, clinical, pedagogical, or translational science) in peer-reviewed, high-quality journals. Assessment through publications and peers that one has had a substantive impact in driving advances in her/his chosen field of endeavor.
- Recognition by peers for independent and original investigation as shown by external funding of competitive peer-reviewed projects, in individual investigator awards, and/or in multi-investigator/institutional projects (biomedical or educational/pedagogical).
- Entrepreneurial advances. The transfer of knowledge and technology is integral to the educational mission. Research excellence may be recognized by intellectual property (patents, licenses, rights granted under copyright) and the transfer of technological advances to industries that provide for the improvement of society.
- Substantive, non-peer reviewed contributions to the biomedical literature (e.g., authorship or editorship of textbooks, monographs, reviews, or journals). Such contributions may also be relevant to a faculty member's contributions as an educator and/or clinician.
- National or international prizes or awards.
- Invitation to hold endowed lectureships.
- Invited lectures, particularly at major scientific meetings.

- Impact of scholarly output (through a variety of media, including opinion pieces and white papers) on scientific debate, policy, and health care practice.
- Participation on editorial boards, associate editorships, and editorships of journals.
- A strong record of departmental/institutional participation in scientific training.
- Leadership of or active participation in development of research programs (institutional, extramural, and those that link research efforts of Geisel with other organizations).
- Active participation in research-related administrative or committee activity.
- Leadership of or active participation in program projects, training grants, graduate programs, or postdoctoral training programs that advance scientific content in concert with the teaching of science.
- Substantive and significant contributions in biomedical research. These are often achieved by individuals as part of a complex and distributed team of investigators and clinicians. The scholarly importance of these team-science activities is recognized even when individuals are not accorded conventional indications, such as first or last authorship on collaborative projects. While team science is to be recognized and rewarded, to achieve academic advancement as part of collaborative efforts, individuals must provide intellectual input that is *critical* to the scholarship. Contributions must be substantive, not simply supportive, and essential to the efforts of the team to move forward the particular field of inquiry. Service participation (e.g., registering patients in a database), however useful to for the collaborative effort, does not meet the criteria for advancement if it is bereft of analysis and interpretation, which are the cornerstones of scholarship.
- Leadership roles in institutional activities that are critical for broad-based discovery and scholarship. While service work is expected of all faculty members, it is recognized that leadership roles associated with specific activities are fundamental to the scholarly output of large sectors of the institution, even if that individual is not identified by named investigator status on specific grants or published work arising from those efforts. Such efforts may include *leadership* roles with the Clinical Trials Office or in major initiatives such as establishment of institution-wide electronic health record (EHR), etc. Administrative support of such efforts in the absence of evidence of leadership capacity, while valued, is not a criterion for academic advancement.

3. Clinical Care: Excellence in clinical practice is an essential characteristic of an academic medical system. The scholarly clinician brings both superior performance and a clear academic dimension to the care of patients, evidenced by breadth and depth of knowledge, awareness of the fundamentals of basic science, pathophysiology and current clinical concepts, extensive use of the biomedical resources available to assist and improve clinical care, excellent judgment, humility, and an exemplary willingness to both teach and learn from professional colleagues. As embodied in the Oath of Hippocrates, the clinician demonstrates a consistent and deeply held dedication to human welfare, the promotion of good health, and the relief of human suffering.

Excellence in clinical practice can be assessed by a number of indicators, including recognition by peers and patients, clinical scholarship, practice of evidence-based medicine, quality of clinical service, whether as an individual or a team, and contributions to the profession and institution. In each instance, these are by-products of the individual's dedication to the highest principles of medical practice.

Criteria Relating to Clinical Care

Recognition by peers and patients--a reputation within and outside of DHMC for excellence in medical practice as made evident by:

- Development and maintenance of clinical skills and/or programs that have been demonstrated to significantly improve patient outcomes, clinical innovation, and elected or invited service to the profession, taking into account the impact of the program, based on regional health care need, patient volumes, program quality, and sustainability.
- Excellence in metrics of quality of care (e.g., patient satisfaction, peer and support team evaluations).
- Regional to national (for Associate Professor) or national/international (for Professor) recognition by peers and patients as an excellent clinician and consultant; evidence of unusual competence and accomplishment in clinical service.
- Invitation to lead, organize or participate as faculty in regional or national CME courses or other programs that disseminate medical knowledge.
- Evidence of a leadership role in local or regional clinical affairs by service (e.g., as Section Chief, Clerkship Director, Departmental Vice Chair, Departmental Chair, Center Director, or Service Line Director) and/or active and ongoing participation in committee, program, and/or governing boards.
- Design and/or participation in workshops that promote and improve patient care.
- Patient referrals or professional recommendations from other health care providers and patients, taking into account percentage of referrals/consultations that are requested by other peer providers rather than assigned and number and complexity of patients referred.
- Recognition by key partners of excellence in care that arises from the concerted efforts of a team of practitioners. It is recognized that referrals may not be common for certain disciplines (radiology, anesthesiology, emergency medicine, pathology). In these fields, the recommendations of colleagues who can attest to the importance of the skills and contributions of the candidate in promoting the well being of his/her patients will be weighed.

- Consulting activities, documented acknowledgement by peers as a premier consultant, and requested involvement in complex clinical problems.
- Introduction of novel and innovative skills or techniques locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally.
- Special competencies that improve or extend other clinical or training programs.
- Participation in clinical and translational research including questions relating basic biomedical science to patient care, clinical trials, comparative effectiveness research, and quality improvement and translating education research and innovation into standard teaching practice. In assessing such participation, prime consideration should be given to the role of the individual in concept, design, oversight, and conduct of the research activity, as well as membership on key project committees and authorship.

4. Engagement: Engagement has been defined as “a highly positive step towards reestablishing what higher education is intended to be: a community of scholars, serving both internal and external audiences in addition to the academic and the public good.”³ As such, engagement recognizes that service to both intra- and extramural communities fulfills not only an operational function, but is also fundamental to scholarship. Engagement is an alliance of university scholars, lay people, and individual knowledge-creating institutions in the local, regional, national and international community. Engagement promotes the public good and produces “projects that create knowledge and understanding that we cannot obtain anywhere else, while strengthening culture, community, and democracy.”⁴ While committee membership is recognized as a valuable contribution to the academic community and is considered in the evaluation for appointment or promotion, engagement goes beyond service work. Engagement is one of the key endpoints of scholarship: extending academic efforts beyond one's own clinical, laboratory or classroom responsibilities to have a broader impact on the biomedical community within the institution and on society and its environs at large.

Representative Criteria Related to Engagement

- Regional/national (Associate Professor) or national/international (Professor) recognition by peers for original teaching or investigative accomplishments as made evident by invited presentations, lectures, and symposia, requested publications; and formal awards. It is expected that national/international invitations will be more prevalent for those being considered at the rank of Professor than Associate Professor.
- Distinctive recognition through formal awards, invited and named lectures, and participation in symposia, professional society programs, and invitations to lead or participate in notable regional, national, or international courses. It is expected that named lectureships and national/international awards will be more prevalent for those being considered for the rank of Professor than Associate Professor.

³ Ward, K. *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*, 2003.

⁴ Ellison, J. and Eatman, T.K. *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University*, 2008

- Membership on editorial boards, study sections, and/or advisory groups.
- Leadership roles on editorial boards, study sections, and/or advisory groups.
- Appointed or elected membership/leadership roles in major societies; committee/program, national professional organizations; governing boards and organizations for major professional meetings. It is expected that such elections will be more prevalent for those being considered for the rank of Professor than Associate Professor.
- Membership (elected) and/or leadership roles in societies and/or governing boards related to the candidate's area of endeavor. Participation from local/regional to national/international level is expected to increase from Associate Professor to Professor. Progression from membership to leadership roles is also expected to increase from Associate Professor to Professor.
- Leadership roles in institutional activities that are critical for broad-based scholarship and/or transformative programs at Dartmouth. While service work is expected of all faculty members, it is recognized that leadership roles associated with specific activities are fundamental to the missions of large sectors of the institution, even when that individual may not be identified by named investigator status on specific grants or published work arising from those efforts. Such efforts may include leadership roles with major programs (e.g., Senior Administration, Dartmouth/Geisel Centers; NSF ADVANCE grants; COBRE or INBRE awards) or in major institutional initiatives. Administrative support of such efforts in the absence of evidence of leadership capacity, while valued, is not a criterion for academic advancement.
- Membership (elected) and leadership on state, national, and federal advisory committees.
- Involvement in activities such as position papers and reviews that shape the direction of medicine and science through local, state, and federal government agencies.
- Consultancy participation in or institutional reviews of major external programs.
- Appointed or elected service and leadership on Geisel/DH/Dartmouth College Advisory Committees.
- Contributions to entrepreneurial efforts that create new products or implement advances in product design and instrumentation relative to biomedical science and/or biomedical education.
- Contributions to non-conventional scholarship (e.g., opinion pieces, white papers) that can be shown (e.g., page view, citations) to have a substantive impact on scientific debate, policy, and health care practice.

- Contributions to advances in computation and computing infrastructure and to development and implementation of large databases and/or networks.
- Participation in community-based research organizations.
- Contributions to education communities of practice and/or education collaborations.
- Design and participation in workshops that advance key areas of academic medicine.
- Contributions with respect to departmental and institutional service related to the mission of the Medical School.
- Leadership of or major participation in community engagement venues (e.g., Geisel Community Medical School, HHMI-sponsored outreach programs).
- Development and implementation of curricula associated with regional K-12 outreach.
- Community science cafes and other initiatives that disseminate advances in science and healthcare through media for the general public.
- Community mentoring activities including efforts to enhance the skills of students entering STEM fields and efforts to enhance the diversity of student and faculty representation at Geisel.
- *Pro bono* service at organizations (regional, national, and international) that further health care and biomedical teaching/science (e.g., The Good Neighbor Clinic, Headrest, Listen, WISE, Second Growth, Dar-Dar, the WHO, After School Enrichment Programs).
- Involvement in initiatives that advance science and medical education at academic and non-academic institutions outside of Dartmouth.

C. Progression to Promotion

1. Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line:

As noted above, appointment to The Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line and advancement in this line require a commitment to and excellence in research (broadly defined as original inquiry), teaching, service (institutional or engagement), and disseminated scholarship. Excellence in these areas is predicated on recognition by both internal and external peers (*vide infra*). The APT Committee shall consider the following in their determining whether to recommend promotion (or initial appointment) to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line.

For those in the Investigator-Scholar versus the Educator-Scholar Tracks, the weighting of specific accomplishments may vary, but for promotion in either track, individuals must demonstrate excellence in teaching, investigation, scholarship, and a substantive commitment to

service/engagement, either at the level of the institution or more broadly within the professional community. In a limited number of cases, excellence in clinical care may also be a key part of the candidate's portfolio, but this is not expected for most faculty members in this line.

A commitment to and demonstrated excellence in teaching may be predominantly in either graduate education (PhD or Masters programs) or in medical education (e.g., small groups). Teaching in venues outside of Geisel (e.g., Dartmouth undergraduates or summer courses associated with other organizations) may also be considered when assessing a candidate's teaching accomplishments, but should not be the sole teaching activity.

All members of the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line are also expected to have substantive activities in service to the institution (e.g., serve on Geisel or Dartmouth College committees) and to have recognition from their external peers in areas of service/engagement (e.g., study section, editorial boards).

Criteria relevant to each of these areas are defined in Part 3B above.

a. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:

The Chair(s) of the Department(s) should review the progress of each Assistant Professor with her/his senior faculty (or Promotions Committee) according to policies outlined in Appendix 2: Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth Guidelines for Faculty Promotion Procedures, with the expectation that each Assistant Professor in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line will be put forward for review by the APT Committee for promotion to Associate Professor by six (6) years in rank⁵ as Assistant Professor.

Those being considered for promotion to Associate Professor in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line shall have garnered substantive extramural recognition at the regional level and a burgeoning reputation at the national level in areas of teaching, scholarship, investigation, engagement, and, if applicable, patient care. Note, as mentioned above, that the weighting of these individual components in contributing to a regional or national reputation may vary with each individual's professional record of accomplishment.

For example, with respect to research:

Individuals being considered for promotion to Associate Professor should have a regional to burgeoning national reputation in their area of research as made evident by the number and quality of peer-reviewed publications (especially those on which they have an identified key role, e.g., first or last author); their ability to secure peer-reviewed extramural funds as key personnel (e.g., PI, multiple-PI, or co-I/biostatistician at a substantive fractional effort); their recognition by those in their field as made evident by invited presentations; and their elected/invited membership on review panels, study sections, and societies.

⁵ *Subject to the review process and to the considerations that may provide faculty members with an additional one to three (1-3) year term; both outlined above under Section II: Reappointments.*

As with other faculty lines, the Geisel School of Medicine recognizes and values team-based as well as individual research efforts for Non-tenure Line faculty. However, advancement requires recognition and the development of a national/international reputation as leader in a field, even when work is performed in the context of a team, not simply acknowledgement that one is contributing member to a program.

If the candidate has not been approved for promotion at all levels (APT Committee, Dean, DAB, Provost), she/he may be reappointed for a variable non-renewable term, move to a Non-tenure Line faculty or Research Scientist position, or be provided with a one-year notice of the end of appointment/termination of employment as set forth in Section II on reappointments.

b. Associate Professor to Professor:

The Chair(s) of the Department(s) should review the progress of each Associate Professor with her/his senior faculty (or Promotions Committee), with the expectation that each Associate Professor in the Tenure-track/Tenure Line will be put forward for review by the APT Committee for promotion to Professor within six (6) years in rank as Associate Professor.⁶

Criteria for promotion (or initial appointment) to the rank of Professor in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line follow from those established for appointment/promotion to Associate Professor, with the expectation that both quantitative and qualitative advances in research, education, engagement, and, if applicable, patient care (Section 3B, above) will have been made in order for this rank to be bestowed. While accomplishments may vary with the individual, those promoted to Professor in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line must have a sustained record of excellence in teaching and will have garnered extramural recognition at the national and/or international level for their scholarship, research, engagement, and, if applicable, clinical care.

For example, for research:

Individuals being considered for promotion to Professor will be expected to have a national to international reputation. These individuals will be programmatic leaders and have a sustained history of excellence in peer-reviewed scholarship and in their ability to secure peer-reviewed, extramural funding as PI/multiple-PI, as well as in roles as co-I/biostatistician at a substantive fractional effort. Those being considered for Professor should have national to international recognition as made evident by invited presentations, permanent membership on study sections and editorial boards, awards, and honors.

If, at the end of the six (6)-year term as Associate Professor, the APT Committee has not recommended promotion to Professor, the Dean, following consultation with the Chair of the Department, may recommend that the academic appointment be extended, and the faculty member may be reappointed for a term of one to six (1-6) years until that time when:

- i. She/he is promoted; or

⁶ *Subject to the review process and to the considerations that may provide faculty members with an additional one to three (1-3) year term; both outlined above under Section II: Reappointments.*

- ii. She/he moves to a different line (e.g., Non-tenure track or Research Scientist); or
- iii. Her/his employment and appointment at Geisel is terminated.

For faculty members in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line, it is expected that all individuals will demonstrate progress in their academic accomplishments consistent with their ability to attain promotion to the rank of Professor. That is, except in rare cases and only as approved by the Dean, indefinite and continued appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor for those in this line is neither consistent with the expectations for Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line nor with the mission of the Medical School.

It is also the expectation for individuals in the Tenure-track/Tenure Line that they will meet criteria that will be consistent with the awarding of tenure at the time that they are promoted to Professor. As elaborated in Appendix 2 (Guidelines for Faculty Promotion Procedures), the APT committee will make two separate recommendations to the Dean during review of a Tenure-track/Tenure Line candidate being considered for promotion to Professor: the first for advancement in rank and the second whether to recommend tenure. In a limited number of cases, the Dean may recommend promotion to Professor without tenure. If the faculty member is approved for promotion to Professor, but tenure is not approved, the Dean, in consultation with the Chair, may

1. approve a reappointment period of one to six (6) years until tenure is reassessed (such one- to six year (1-6 year) terms are renewable); or
2. recommend that the faculty member move to the Non-tenure Faculty Line.

c. Tenure:

Tenure at Geisel School of Medicine (Appendix 1) may be granted at the rank of Professor to those in either the Investigator-Scholar or the Educator-Scholar Tracks. For tenure to be awarded in either track, as stated in the Dartmouth College Faculty Handbook, tenure appointments will be made only when there is clear evidence of outstanding accomplishment and demonstrated potential for distinction in scholarship and teaching. Those individuals who are recommended for tenure need not only to meet criteria for advancement to Professor, but also to excel in those areas, such that the School is justified in making the long-term commitment to them that tenure provides. In brief, individuals who are recommended for tenure should demonstrate a sustained excellence in teaching and scholarship, a long-standing record of successful research endeavors (broadly defined as discovery supported through external mechanisms), and national and/or international prominence in their respective fields. With tenure, Geisel and Dartmouth College indicate that the individual's accomplishments and her/his future anticipated contributions warrant a continued, non-term commitment. Thus, only those individuals whose academic records fully support the assumption that their performance in teaching, research, scholarship, and service shall continue at a level of national/international excellence will be recommended to the Board of Trustees for granting of tenure.

Appendix 1: Faculty Tenure at Geisel School of Medicine

Pursuant to the proposal approved by the Dartmouth College Board of Trustees in April of 1993, the guidelines governing tenure for the faculty of Geisel School of Medicine shall be as follows:

1. All tenure commitments in existence prior to April 1993 will remain in force. There will be no change in the terms of the institution's obligation to those faculty members to whom tenure had been granted previous to the acceptance of this plan.
2. Eligibility for Geisel tenure will be limited to full-time faculty whose paymaster is Dartmouth College. For any individual deriving partial compensation from a DHMC entity other than Geisel, eligibility will depend on the willingness of Geisel to accept the potential responsibility of full support, or on the assurance of continued partial support from the other entity.
3. Tenure may also be awarded to eligible individuals with the rank of professor who join the Geisel faculty or are appointed as departmental chairs, named chairs, or Dean. In all cases the awarding of rank (professor) and the awarding of tenure are separable actions and require separate review and approval by the Appointments, Promotions and Titles (APT) Committee, the Dean, the Dean's Academic Board, the Provost of Dartmouth College and, for awarding of tenure, the Dartmouth College Board of Trustees. The Dean will include a status report on the tenure program in his/her annual report to the President, Vice-President and Treasurer, and the Provost.
4. Faculty with tenure will be entitled to retain their academic appointments until resignation, retirement, or death. They will not be subject to dismissal except for specific cause, as described in *Organization of the Faculty of Dartmouth College*.
5. The number of tenured positions granted will be determined by the rolling three (3)-year average of the sum of [(1) tuition paid by enrolled students (less internally funded scholarships), plus (2) the annual income from Geisel unrestricted endowment, plus (3) income from endowed chairs], divided by the average of potential tenure-derived compensation for all tenured senior faculty at that time.
6. Tenured faculty will ordinarily be expected to derive their compensation from a mixture of internal and external sources. To be fully compensated, a tenured faculty member is expected to derive at least 40% of compensation from extramural sources. External sources may include payments for research, teaching, consulting, clinical practice, or other sources designated as "extramural" (i.e., qualified) by the Dean. In the absence of external compensation support, tenured faculty members are guaranteed at least 60% of their previously determined full compensation from internal funds.
7. For a faculty member who does not derive at least 40% of full compensation from external sources, the Dean in consultation with the departmental Chair may provide up to 40% of additional compensation as an internal supplement to the 60% that is guaranteed, in recognition of continued effort in teaching, scholarly activity, and other valued institutional service.

8. In the event of loss of expected support from external sources adequate to assure full compensation, the downward transition from full compensation to a reduced level will not exceed 10% per year.
9. External support for faculty compensation in the aggregate is essential to the long-term health of the Medical School. To the extent possible, tenured faculty members are expected to derive compensation from external sources at a level determined at the time of hire (unless subsequently modified by policies of the school). The Dean may declare a moratorium on the awarding of tenure if external support of compensation as a percentage of full compensation for all tenured Geisel faculty falls by more than 20% in one year (compared to the rolling average of the three (3) previous years), or falls by that amount over a period of more than one year following the onset of a decline. If the number of tenured faculty meets or exceeds 95% of the institutional support available for those positions, the Dean may also declare a moratorium on the awarding of tenure.
10. In the event of a moratorium on the granting of new tenure/tenure-track positions, the awarding of tenure will be reinstated by the Dean once external support for faculty compensation again becomes adequate. Faculty members promoted to the rank of Professor during the period of the moratorium will be eligible for the award of tenure in order of the time of their promotion.
11. Revisions redefining the financial obligations to faculty members must be approved by the Board of Trustees of Dartmouth College. Other revisions that change the intent of the document must be reviewed by the Faculty Council of Geisel School of Medicine. Minor revisions and specific clarifications (e.g., re-naming of the Medical School) that do not alter the meaning of the document may be made by the Dean.

**Appendix 2: Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth
Guidelines for Faculty Promotion Procedures
(Tenure-track/Tenure, Non-tenure, and AMS Faculty Lines)**

The authority to award faculty titles at the Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth (Geisel) lies with the Trustees of Dartmouth College. The Trustees, however, act upon recommendations made by the Medical School and the administration of Dartmouth College. These guidelines outline the procedures for the consideration of appointment and/or promotion to senior rank (Associate Professor/Professor). Consideration for tenure at Geisel is made upon appointment or promotion to Professor for those individuals who are employees of Dartmouth College.

These guidelines focus on *procedures* for evaluation of appointments/promotions to senior ranks at Geisel. The *substantive* standards that govern all appointments, promotions and titles are found in the parent document entitled, "Academic Appointments, Promotions and Titles at Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth."

I. Procedures for Promotion Consideration Prior to the Appointments, Promotions and Titles (APT) Committee Review.

Annual reviews and appropriate mentoring of all faculty members is required by governing principles of the Medical School and by LCME standards for accreditation. Each member of the faculty will receive such reviews from his/her respective Chair or Director¹ (or the Chair's designated official) and mentoring from the Chair and members of the Department's/Institute's¹ Promotions Committee. These individuals are responsible, in conjunction with the faculty member, for guiding her/him along the appropriate trajectory for academic advancement.

The department has the initial responsibility for determining whether or not to recommend a faculty member in the department for promotion based on a thorough and objective review. Considerations about faculty promotions at the departmental level are led by the Departmental Chair with the involvement of the Department Promotions Committee. The Promotions Committee shall comprise all (or representative faculty members, depending on the size of the department) at the rank of Professor who hold voting rights (i.e., not emeritus, voluntary, visiting, adjunct, or clinical).

Departmental Review:

The Department Review process should commence so that the candidate's completed portfolio will be presented to the APT Committee at a time when the candidate has been ~six (6) years in rank. Reviews that result in portfolios presented to the APT Committee before the candidate has been in rank at least five years will signify that the candidate is considered exceptionally

¹ Directors/Institutes which have Chair/Department standing hereafter are encompassed within the terms Chairs/Departments

qualified for advancement. Department Chairs and their Departmental Promotions Committees must provide candidates and their mentors a list of the material required for departmental review at least two months prior to this review, to allow the candidates adequate time to prepare this material.

Extramural Reviewers

Number of reviewers: During the *departmental* review process, the Departmental Chair will solicit and receive a minimum of three (3) letters from outside (non-peer) reviewers who are qualified to assess the candidate's academic performance. Outside reviewers must not have an appointment at any institution where the faculty member holds an active appointment (e.g., if the candidate has an adjunct appointment at another institution) and must not have a personal (e.g., is married to) or financial (e.g., shared intellectual property) conflict of interest with the candidate.

Letters solicited for the Departmental review, as well as those sent forward to the APT Committee, must come from outside reviewers who hold academic rank at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered.

Selection of reviewers: The candidate may provide the Chair with a list of up to five suggested outside reviewers, together with information about the professional relationship of the suggested reviewers to the candidate, if any, and the basis for their selection as individuals qualified to evaluate the candidate. In selecting the outside reviewers from whom letters will be requested, at least one of the minimum of three (3) letters must be from the list provided by the candidate.

The outside reviewers should be qualified to credibly assess the candidate's performance under the principles outlined in the document entitled, "Academic Appointments, Promotions and Titles at Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth". Because these principles vary depending upon the level of promotion under consideration and the nature of the candidate's portfolio, the credentials of the outside reviewers may vary depending on the particular situation. It is recognized that outside reviewers may not necessarily be *personally* familiar with specific aspects of a candidate's portfolio (e.g., teaching or clinical care). The major role of these reviewers is to assess the professional reputation and standing of the candidate in the non-Dartmouth academic community relevant to the candidate's proposed rank and faculty line.

Solicitation of Letters; Departmental Assessment

To ensure consistency among departments and consistency between the departmental review and review by the APT Committee, the Chair's letters to outside reviewers should use the template letter provided as Attachment A in this document. Each potential reviewer should receive the solicitation to review (template) letter, a copy of the Chair's draft letter to the Dean about the candidate, and a copy of the document "Academic Appointments, Promotions and Titles at Geisel School of Medicine," in which the appropriate criteria for the title for which the candidate is being recommended are *excerpted*. The candidate should not be informed of the names of the outside reviewers selected by the Chair, and the Chair is responsible for informing the candidate that the candidate should not personally communicate with any of the

candidate's suggested outside reviewers about the fact that their opinions may be solicited or the substance of the review.

As indicated below, *all* outside letters received shall be included in the candidate's portfolio that is provided to the Medical School's APT Committee. In assembling this portfolio, the Department will provide a list of a) the reviewers suggested by the candidate and b) the reviewers suggested by the Chair, and will indicate on both lists the reviewers from whom responses were obtained.

Intramural Reviewers

The Chair will also solicit letters from at least two (2) inside (Geisel) peer reviewers, selected by the Chair without consulting the candidate. The peer reviewers may have a stronger basis than outside reviewers to assess the candidate's teaching abilities, clinical skills, and contributions to the Dartmouth community.

Recommendations

After considering the candidate's file, including the letters solicited by the Chair, the Department's promotions committee will decide to recommend the candidate for promotion or decide not to forward the candidate's file for further consideration for promotion at the present time. Reviewers who are asked for additional letters for the APT review should not be informed of the deliberations or vote by the Department Committee (i.e., whether it was unanimous or not).

Transmittal of Recommendation for Promotion

The Departmental Chair will forward recommendations for promotion to the APT Committee, which will perform its own review. The Chair will transmit the following documents to the APT Committee:

1. A letter from the Chair to the Dean of the Medical School (Dean's Letter), in his or her capacity as Chair of the Department's promotions committee, recommending promotion. The letter will include the following information and assessments:
 - a. The first paragraph of the letter should contain the candidate's proposed rank (primary department listed first, if joint appointment). If the promotion is to the rank of Professor, the first paragraph should also specify whether this is a request for tenure or non-tenure;
 - b. The effective date of the proposed appointment;
 - c. Identification of the candidate's faculty line (see "Academic Appointments, Promotions and Titles at The Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth" document);

- d. A breakdown of the percentage of effort the candidate spends in clinical activities, research or other forms of scholarship, teaching, and engagement;
 - e. A precise description of the candidate's field of specialty;
 - f. A detailed explanation of the basis for the promotion recommendation, including:
 - i. The professional and personal qualities of the candidate that merit consideration;
 - ii. The candidate's academic role in teaching and research;
 - iii. The candidate's contribution to the department and the Medical School; and/or,
 - iv. Evidence of regional, national, or international recognition, as appropriate for the level of promotion and the portfolio.
2. A letter of approval from the Chairs of the non-primary departments in the cases of joint appointments. For faculty members in large departments who also report to a Section or Division Chief, a letter of approval from that Chief should also be included.
3. A current Curriculum Vitae of the candidate in the Geisel format: See [Faculty Handbook](#).
4. Data supporting the Chair's assertion that the candidate has achieved the criteria for promotion, including:
- a. Letters from inside reviewers, including, where relevant, letters from colleagues attesting to quality of teaching and, as appropriate, clinical accomplishments;
 - b. Teaching evaluations: course reviews, eVal and other metrics (required, for those who have teaching responsibilities in any Line);
 - c. For faculty new to Geisel, a letter outlining the candidate's teaching accomplishments/history/expertise, from the candidate's current institution;
 - d. Letters solicited from outside reviewers, letters sent to reviewers framing the request; information indicating whether the reviewers were selected by the Chair or by the candidate; explanation of the professional relationship of the reviewers to the candidate, if any; and the basis for their selection as individuals qualified to evaluate the candidate.

The majority of outside letters/reviewers should come from individuals who:

- have not trained or been trained by the candidate within five years of the date of solicitation of the review;
- have not received joint funding (grants, foundation awards, clinical trials etc.) as PI or co-I with the candidate within the past five years; and,

- have not published with the candidate in the past two years.

Letters should be received within no longer than 1 year prior to review of the candidate by the APT Committee.

It is recognized that under certain and limited conditions, departments may find it difficult to obtain the requisite number of letters from individuals who meet the criteria above (e.g., if the candidate is heavily active in large clinical trials that incorporate comparably large numbers of investigators, it may be difficult to obtain letters from those with sufficient expertise who are not in conflict). If Chairs believe that the inability to obtain outside letters is unduly impeding the review of the faculty member, she/he may petition the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel to see if either criterion 2 or 3, above, may be waived for a limited number of letters;

e. Four (4) to ten (10) publications authored by the candidate that best reflect her/his academic endeavors (one copy) or appropriate internet addresses for web-based materials; and,

f. Material from other academic/non-academic institutions indicating the candidate's accomplishments with respect to engagement where applicable.

5. The list of outside reviewers suggested by the candidate, together with the information provided by the candidate about the suggested reviewers, as described above;

6. Evaluations from 10 individuals who have been taught by the candidate. These evaluations may include a combination of medical students, graduate students, residents and post-doctoral fellows, and undergraduate students or other learners; and,

7. The Departmental Chair's assessment of the candidate's institutional contributions, unique characteristics, and potential for leadership within the institution.

The Departmental Chairs will forward their recommendations for promotion and all supporting material to the APT Committee when all materials required for the portfolio are received.

The complete portfolio (all materials) *must* be received in the Dean's Office no later than 3 weeks prior to the scheduled date for the APT Committee review.

The APT committee meets monthly during the academic year, with a hiatus in July and August.

II. Procedures for Promotion at the APT Committee Level

The APT Committee reviews candidates for promotion who have been recommended by their respective departments. The Committee represents the interests and perspectives of the Medical School as a whole.

Committee Composition

The APT Committee consists of 11 members: the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel and 10 faculty members that reflect the diversity of faculty in Geisel with regard to clinical care, teaching, and research. The Dean of Faculty Affairs serves as Chair of the Committee. Members of the Committee, other than the Dean of Faculty Affairs, are chosen by the Dean of Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Department Chairs and the Geisel Faculty Council. Appointments are subject to approval by the Dean. Initial appointments are made for one year, with the ability to extend the term for an additional three to four years. No member of the Committee (other than the Dean of Faculty Affairs) may serve more than two consecutive terms. Faculty members who rejoin the committee after a hiatus may sign up for a three- or four-year term without the initial one-year period. The Vice Chair of the APT Committee is appointed by the Dean or the Dean's designated official (the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel) from among the members of the Committee. The Vice Chair serves as Vice Chair for two years.

The Vice Chair is responsible for chairing the meetings, working with the Administrative Assistant to assure that the Committee stays on schedule, and working with the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel to make sure information regarding APT proceedings is conveyed to the Department Chairs in an accurate, helpful, and timely manner. The Dean for Faculty Affairs may also call on "reserves": former members of the APT Committee identified by the Dean for Faculty Affairs who may be asked to perform reviews when a quorum is in question without their participation.

The Committee is assisted by the Administrative Coordinator for Recruitment and Faculty Affairs in the Geisel Administration, who maintains the promotion files. More specifically, the Administrative Assistant is responsible for:

- a. Ensuring that all necessary documentation has been provided by the Departmental Chairs;
- b. Maintaining correspondence with outside reviewers, inside reviewers, and students;
- c. Keeping the APT member responsible for the file informed of the status of the file;
- d. Maintaining all APT documentation (both hardcopies and electronic documents for the committee's use that are posted on protected internet sites; e.g., SharePoint);
- e. Ensuring that the candidate's file contains at least five letters from outside reviewers in the case of promotions to Associate Professor and at least seven letters from outside reviewers in the case of promotions to Professor. The majority of the letters in the file should be solicited from outside reviewers who are not drawn from the list of suggested reviewers provided by the candidate and must not have a conflict of interest with the candidate;
- f. Providing administrative support to the APT committee and taking minutes at the meetings;

g. Ensuring that copies of the letters to the Chairs from the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel/Vice Chair of the APT Committee that summarize the APT Committee's deliberations, as well as formal letters acknowledging appointments/promotions, are maintained in the candidates' files.

Committee Meetings and Schedule

The Provost of Dartmouth College approves appointments and promotions at Geisel on a rolling basis (with the exception that promotions/appointments with tenure must be voted upon by the Board of Trustees). The APT Committee, therefore, meets on a year-round basis. The number of portfolios ready for review, the availability of Department Chairs or their designated officials, and the availability of APT Committee members will set schedules. In general, the APT Committee meets once monthly, with fewer meetings in the summer months. Because portfolios are reviewed on a year-round basis, Geisel Administration will not accept portfolios from the Departments until they are complete.

Committee Operations

The Departments are responsible for obtaining all promotions materials. The Geisel Dean's Office is responsible for assembling materials into portfolios for review by the APT Committee. The APT Committee is responsible for reviewing information regarding the candidates' qualifications for promotion in rank, assuring the objective assessment of the candidates' academic and professional achievements, and putting forward recommendations for advancement.

1. The Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel assigns each candidate for promotion to one APT Committee member who will then be responsible for an in-depth review of the candidate's file. This individual must not have a conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g., is in the same primary department, has written a letter for the candidate, has a familial relationship with the candidate, is a colleague with whom the candidate publishes, shares grant support or intellectual property, or is a mentor for the candidate through mechanisms such as PPG, COBREs etc.).
2. While it is the responsibility of the department administrators and Geisel administration to ensure portfolios are complete, APT reviewers should nonetheless double-check to make sure all required letters and other components are assembled. If any document is missing, the reviewer should alert the Director of Faculty and Staff Recruitment and Retention or the Dean of Faculty Affairs, and the review shall be rescheduled for a later date when the portfolio is complete.
3. The APT Committee member responsible for a candidate may also choose to seek additional reviews from inside reviewers selected by the Committee member.
4. The Committee member responsible for a candidate will make a presentation of the candidate's file to the APT Committee and will participate in the Committee's deliberations. This presentation must be written. The presenter may include in her/his draft letter the expected recommendation for or against advancement, but she/he should not make that

recommendation known to the rest of the committee at the time she/he presents the portfolio. Following a discussion and a vote of the committee, the presenter should amend her/his letter to indicate the committee vote and submit the final letter to the Administrative Coordinator for Recruitment and Faculty Affairs (*vide infra*).

5. The Department Chair or her/his designated official is invited to attend the presentation of the candidate and to answer questions from the committee. Other key individuals (e.g., the Director of the Cancer Center or a Chair from a joint department) may also be invited to attend.

6. Faculty members who hold the same primary appointment as the candidate or who have any other recognized conflict of interest shall leave the room during the presentation and subsequent voting. Such conflicts include, but are not limited to: co-authoring papers or grants within the past five years for grants; within the past two years for papers, being a co-holder of intellectual property with the candidate, being a current or former mentor, having written a letter of support for the candidate for his/her current promotion, or familial relationship. Individuals who hold secondary/tertiary appointments may participate in the discussion and the vote as long as they, in good conscience, are not in conflict.

7. After this initial discussion, the Chairs and their designated officials shall be excused. A motion to recommend for promotion/appointment shall be made and seconded. After the motion has been proposed, the Committee shall then discuss and vote on the motion:

a. Candidates who receive a “yea” vote to advance from greater than 50 percent of the APT Committee members will be recommended for promotion/appointment. A quorum (six (6) members of the committee who do not have a conflict and can thus vote) must be present and vote for an action to be taken.

b. Candidates who receive a “yea” vote to advance from less than 50 percent of the APT Committee members will not be recommended for promotion.

c. A secret ballot can be called for by any member of the Committee at any time. Otherwise, voting will be performed by a show of hands.

In some cases, the APT Committee may find that more information is required before coming to a vote. In these cases, the motion shall be tabled, and the Department Chair shall be informed that no decision can be made until the portfolio can be re-reviewed with new information. The revised portfolio can be re-reviewed as soon as the requested information is in hand.

8. The Committee's vote and a brief written summary of the reasons for the vote will be prepared by the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel and the Vice Chair of the APT Committee. This summary shall be sent to the Department Chairs(s) as soon as possible following the APT's decision. Each note on the recommendation of the candidate should delineate the reasons why the recommendation carried or did not carry. If promotion/appointment was recommended, this note should also contain one of the following sentences:

As you know, our recommendation must be approved by the Dean of Geisel, the Dean's Academic Board (DAB), and the Provost of Dartmouth College. Therefore, we request that you not let Dr. XXX or others know of our decision until the promotion has been approved at all levels.

As you know, our recommendation and the award of tenure must be approved by the Dean of Geisel, the Dean's Academic Board (DAB), the Provost of Dartmouth College, and the Dartmouth College Board of Trustees. Therefore, we request that you not let Dr. XXX or others know of our decision until the promotion has been approved at all levels.

9. The Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel will submit to the Dean the recommendations for each candidate reviewed by the APT Committee, the written summaries of the Committee's review, and the vote tabulation for each candidate.

10. Throughout the review process, the APT Committee's procedures are confidential. Committee members shall not disclose any recommendation or any details of the process or discussion outside the APT meetings.

***Geisel or New Faculty Member Being Considered for Appointment/Promotion
to Associate Professor through the APT Committee***

This document should be used in conjunction with documents entitled, “Academic Appointments, Promotions and Titles at The Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth” and “APT Guidelines and Structure.”

All documents will be uploaded to a restricted site. Only one copy of each is therefore required.

Candidate’s Name: _____

- Chair’s Letter (to Dean):**
 - Original must be on letterhead and signed. An electronic version is acceptable, but the signature should not be electronic, copied or stamped (i.e., a scan of the original letter should be submitted).
 - The first paragraph should indicate the Faculty Line (Tenure-track/Tenure, AMS, or Non-tenure) and track (e.g., Investigator-Educator), if the promotion is being considered with tenure (Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line, DC paymaster only), and the fractional FTE committed to each relevant activity (teaching, research, service, administration).
 - Secondary Chair letter, necessary only if there is a joint appointment.
 - Section Chief and Tertiary Chair letters, when applicable (optional).
- Curriculum Vitae (CV):**
 - Must be in the Geisel format, current and dated.
- Career Overview:**
 - This is part of the CV. It must be written by the candidate.
- Research Funding:**
 - This is part of the CV.
 - For grants, list past awards, current awards, and pending proposals, with the information requested. *Do not* provide information on unsuccessful proposals.
 - If no information is provided in CV, it will be assumed that there is no research support.
- Publications:**
 - Provide pdfs of four to ten different publications
- Five (5) Letters from Outside Reviewers:** Departments must provide a list of the external reviewers identified as “Chosen by Chair” and “Chosen by Candidate.” List needs to identify name, institution and rank of reviewer (*vide infra*).
 - The letters must be on letterhead, dated, with original signature and indicating the rank of the reviewer.
 - Unless otherwise approved, letters must be within 1 year of date of APT review.
 - Reviewer must be of the same or higher rank as the candidate’s proposed rank (Associate Professor or equivalent). Must not be a modified title.
 - Letters cannot be from individuals who have a conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g., close relative, business partner, etc.).
 - The majority of the required five letters must come from *individuals* who
 1. have not trained or been trained by the candidate within five years of the date of solicitation of the review;
 2. have not received joint funding (grants, foundation awards, clinical trials, etc.) as PI or co-I with the candidate within the past five years;
 3. have not published with the candidate in the past two years.

It is recognized that under certain and limited conditions departments may find it difficult to obtain the requisite number of letters from individuals who meet the criteria above (e.g., if the candidate is heavily active in large clinical trials that incorporate comparably large numbers of investigator), it may be difficult to obtain letters from those with sufficient expertise who are not in conflict). If Chairs believe that the inability to obtain outside letters is unduly impeding the review of the faculty member, he/she may petition the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel to see if either criterion 2 or 3, above, may be waived for a limited number of letters.

- The majority of the five required outside letters must not come from *institutions* where the candidate has trained in the past five years or holds an adjunct appointment (current or within the past 5 years).
- The majority of the five required outside letters must be from individuals selected by the Chair.
- More than five letters may be solicited; all letters (even if there are more than five) must be submitted with portfolio.

Lists of Outside Reviewers:

- For Reviewers selected by the Chair, provide a single page that indicates
 - Reviewers' names, ranks, institutional affiliations, and contact information.
- For Reviewers selected by the Candidate, provide a single page that indicates
 - Reviewers' names, ranks, institutional affiliations, and contact information.

Two (2) Letters from Peers:

- Letters should be from current peers (i.e., at the same institution where the candidate holds a position; or for recent senior recruits, their immediately prior institution) and from individuals of comparable or higher rank.

***Narrative Evaluations from Learners (Students, Fellows, Residents):**

- Request at least 10 evaluations.

***Formal Teaching Evaluations:**

- Reviews and quantitative metrics for all formal (i.e., not individual mentoring) UME, GME, associate provider and graduate student teaching, and undergraduate teaching when applicable. Do not include information on faculty members other than candidate.

Completed DAB form:

- Please note, this does not indicate or guarantee recommendation to promote/appoint.

*Note: Some faculty members in the Non-tenure Faculty Line or the Investigator Track of the AMS Faculty Line may not have interactions with students. These requirements are optional for those who do not have these responsibilities.

**Geisel or New Faculty Member Being Considered for Appointment/Promotion
to Professor through the APT Committee**

This document should be used in conjunction with documents entitled, “Academic Appointments, Promotions and Titles at Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth” and “APT Guidelines and Structure.”

All documents will be uploaded to a restricted site. Only one copy of each is therefore required.

Candidate’s Name: _____

- Chair’s Letter (to Dean):**
 - Original must be on letterhead and signed. An electronic version is acceptable, but the signature should not be electronic, copied or stamped (i.e., a scan of the original letter should be submitted).
 - The first paragraph should indicate the Faculty Line (Tenure-track/Tenure, AMS, or Non-tenure) and track (e.g., Investigator-Educator), if the promotion is being considered with tenure (Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line, DC paymaster only), and the fractional FTE committed to each relevant activity (teaching, research, service, administration).
 - Secondary Chair letter, necessary only if there is a joint appointment.
 - Section Chief and Tertiary Chair letters, when applicable (optional).
- Curriculum Vitae (CV):**
 - Must be in the Geisel format, current and dated.
- Career Overview:**
 - This is part of the CV. It must be written by the candidate.
- Extramural Support:**
 - This is part of the CV.
 - For grants, list past awards, current awards and pending proposals, with the information requested. *Do not* provide information on unsuccessful proposals.
 - If no information is provided in CV, it will be assumed that there is no research support.
- Publications:**
 - Provide pdfs of four to ten different publications
- Seven (7) Letters from Outside Reviewers:** Departments must provide a list of the external reviewers identified as “Chosen by Chair” and “Chosen by Candidate.” List needs to identify name, institution and rank of reviewer (*vide infra*).
 - The letters must be on letterhead, dated, with original signature and indicating the rank of the reviewer.
 - Unless otherwise approved, letters must be within 1 year of date of APT review.
 - Reviewer must be of the same or higher rank as the candidate’s proposed rank (Professor or equivalent). Must not be a modified title.
 - Letters cannot be from individuals who have a conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g., close relative, business partner etc.).
 - The majority of the seven required letters must come from *individuals* who
 1. have not trained or been trained by the candidate within five years of the date of solicitation of the review;
 2. have not received joint funding (grants, foundation awards, clinical trials etc.) as PI or co-I with the candidate within the past five years;
 3. have not published with the candidate in the past two years.

It is recognized that under certain and limited conditions departments may find it difficult to obtain the requisite number of letters from individuals who meet the criteria above (e.g., if the candidate is

heavily active in large clinical trials that incorporate comparably large numbers of investigators, it may be difficult to obtain letters from those with sufficient expertise who are not in conflict). If Chairs believe that the inability to obtain outside letters is unduly impeding the review of the faculty member, he/she may petition the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel to see if either criterion 2 or 3, above, may be waived for a limited number of letters.

- The majority of the seven required outside letters must come from *institutions* other than those where the candidate has trained in the past five years or holds an adjunct appointment (currently or within the past five years).
- The majority of the seven required outside letters must be from individuals selected by the Chair.
- More than seven letters may be solicited; all letters (even if there are more than seven) must be submitted with portfolio.

Lists of Outside Reviewers:

- For Reviewers selected by the Chair, provide a single page that indicates
 - Reviewers' names, ranks, institutional affiliations, and contact information.
- For Reviewers selected by the Candidate, provide a single page that indicates
 - Reviewers' names, ranks, institutional affiliations, and contact information.

Two (2) Letters from Peers:

- Letters should be from current peers (i.e., at the same institution where the candidate holds a position; or for recent senior recruits, their immediately prior institution) and from individuals of comparable or higher rank.

***Narrative Evaluations from Learners (Students, Fellows, Residents):**

- Request at least 10 evaluations.

***Formal Teaching Evaluations:**

- Reviews and quantitative metrics for all formal (i.e., not individual mentoring) UME, GME, associate providers and graduate student teaching, and undergraduate teaching when applicable. Do not include information on faculty members other than candidate.

Completed DAB form:

Please note, this does not indicate or guarantee recommendation to promote/appoint.

*Note: Some faculty members in the Non-tenure Faculty Line or the Investigator Track of the AMS Faculty Line may not have interactions with students. These requirements are optional for those who do not have these responsibilities.

1. The Chair's letter included for reviewers (below) should only briefly and factually summarize the candidate's portfolio (e.g., to indicate their relative distribution of effort to teaching, clinical care or research, their area of expertise; whether they were hired mid-rank from another institution; or other pertinent factual information). This letter should not provide an assessment or other subjective measures of the candidate or indicate whether or not the candidate has (has not) been unanimously recommended by the departmental committee for promotion.

2. The Chair's letter to the APT Committee that accompanies the candidate's full portfolio (Chair's letter to Dean) should provide a full summary of the candidate's contributions, especially noting salient comments by the outside reviewers and aspects of the candidate's professional performance that may not be evident from her/his CV alone and should indicate whether or not the promotion was unanimously supported by the department committee.

ATTACHMENT A

Sample letter to outside reviewers

«today»

«name»

«address»

Dear «ltrname»:

The promotions process of the Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth involves review of each nominee's curriculum vitae and other selected material by acknowledged academic leaders outside of the Dartmouth community. Should you provide it, your letter of reference, along with those of other external and internal referees, learner evaluations, and my letter to the Dean in support of the candidate's promotion will be provided to Geisel's Appointments, Promotions and Titles (APT) Committee.

As part of this process, I write to solicit your participation so as to inform our departmental promotions committee. You have identified as an authority in a field related to that of «promo_name» who is being considered for «appt/promo» «title» along the «faculty line/track» portfolio. Please note that it is not essential for you to know the candidate personally or even by reputation.

What we seek is your opinion of the quality of this individual's accomplishments based upon the enclosed material listed below:

- 1) Dr. «last_name»'s current curriculum vitae.
- 2) Excerpts from the document entitled, "Academic Appointments Promotions and Titles at the Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth", that are relevant to the faculty line/track of the proposed candidate. The document in full may be found at:

http://geiselmed.dartmouth.edu/faculty/pdf/geisel_faculty_appt.pdf

3) Reprints of selected publications.

Both our departmental committee and the institutional APT Committee would be very grateful for your candid opinion regarding this candidate's suitability for the proposed rank in the indicated faculty line. We would especially value your comments about the candidate's stature at a regional and/or national level for those being proposed for promotion to Associate Professor and at a national and/or international level for those being proposed for promotion to Professor, as well as your evaluation as to whether or not the candidate would be likely to be promoted to the proposed rank in a comparable faculty line at your own institution.

The decision to award tenure at The Geisel School of Medicine is considered at the level of Professor. The decision to award tenure is also a separate decision from that of promotion. If the candidate is also being considered for tenure, we would appreciate your comments on both the suitability of the candidate for the proposed rank and, separately, the suitability of the candidate for tenure.

The APT Committee comprises the Dean of Faculty Affairs and ten faculty members at the rank of Professor whose expertise reflects the distribution of clinical, instructional and research departments at Geisel. Subsequent to APT Committee review, the recommendation to promote must be approved by the Dean, the senior leadership of the medical school (the Dean's Academic Board), the Provost of Dartmouth College, and, in the case of tenure, The Board of Trustees. For this reason, it would be particularly useful if your assessment provided sufficient detail to inform individuals who may be unfamiliar with your field of scholarship.

Against this background, I would ask you to emphasize your detailed assessment of the candidate's scholarly contributions to his/her field and, where you are able to do so, the candidate's clinical accomplishments and his/her pedagogical accomplishments. You have perhaps heard the candidate lecture to a regional or national audience, and you have perhaps observed them on a national panel or study section or the equivalent. Please use such observations where applicable. We encourage your comments about the candidate's teaching skills, but recognize that it would be unusual for an outside reviewer to have intimate exposure to this aspect of a candidate's portfolio. Finally, please comment if you know the applicant through work he or she has done with respect to engagement: those activities of the candidate that incorporate how we put into practice the results of our scholarly enterprise and extend our academic efforts beyond the university to have a direct impact on the way people live.

We would greatly appreciate it if we could receive your response by «date». Needless to say, your comments will be held in the strictest confidence. It would also be helpful if you could give us the names of others who might offer valuable opinions about this candidate.

With many thanks for assisting us in this important process.

Sincerely,

Department Chair