This document is an abbreviated version of the document entitled Academic Appointments, Promotions and Titles at Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth related to the appointment and promotion of faculty in the Academic Medical System (AMS) Faculty Line. The full of the full set of guidelines may be found at https://geiselmed.dartmouth.edu/faculty/pdf/geisel_faculty_apt.pdf
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), 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 in the promotion of wellness of the population as well as excellence in clinical 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 clinical 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” 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 of 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).

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.

At the time of their hire, all faculty members shall receive information (e.g., through an offer letter or terms of appointment statement) that delineates the Line (and Track) to which they are being appointed and both the expectations and obligations of that Line/Track.

Full Voting Members of the Professoriate:

Academic Medical System (AMS) Faculty Line:

Tracks:
- Traditional Track
- Investigator-Scholar Track
- Clinician-Scholar 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 Traditional, Clinician-Scholar, or Investigator-Scholar Track. Faculty members in the AMS Line will, with few exceptions, be employees of Dartmouth-Hitchcock (D-H; Dartmouth-Hitchcock Clinic, and Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital), White River Junction Veterans Affairs Medical Center (WRJ VAMC), or California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC).

Faculty members in the AMS Line (≥ 0.5 FTE) are voting members of the faculty of the Geisel School of Medicine and may be voting members on College committees where they are selected by the Dean to serve as representatives of the Medical School (e.g., the Committee on Conflict of Interest or the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects), but are not voting members of the General Faculty of Dartmouth College.

The qualifier AMS Faculty Line will be defined in all offer letters (Terms of Appointment Statements), and reappointment letters, and in all Geisel databases, but does not need to be used on internal (e.g.,

---

3 Only faculty members who are employees of Dartmouth College are eligible for tenure; thus tenure, with rare exceptions, is not available for faculty members in the AMS Line
letterhead) or external (e.g., grant application) documents, or on personal business cards (e.g., Jane Doe, Assistant Professor of Pathology).

**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.

For faculty members in the AMS Faculty Line, employment rests with D-H, the WRJ VAMC, or CPMC. Appointment to a faculty rank for those offered employment by one of these clinical partners must be reviewed and approved by the Chair of the hiring department, the Dean or the Dean’s designee (the Dean of Faculty Affairs at Geisel), the 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.

**The AMS Faculty Line: Initial Appointments**

Individuals appointed in the AMS Faculty Line will, in all but rare exceptions, 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 designee, the DAB, and the Provost, be approved for appointment to the AMS Faculty Line.
Individuals appointed in the AMS Faculty Line are those who exemplify the clinical academic mission of the School and the Medical System. As such, academics are expected to be deeply imbued within their activities: not only in commitment to training learners, but in expectations that they themselves will be lifelong learners. For clinicians in the AMS Faculty Line, they will be expected to be practitioners who stay at the forefront of advances in their fields through participation in both local venues such as tumor boards, Grand Rounds, Morbidity and Mortality Rounds, and seminars, and also through active participation in professional societies. They will be practitioners who are expected to commit to knowing the research related to their fields and to contribute to that scholarship, most often through peer-reviewed and nationally recognized venues. As clinicians for whom these academic pursuits are integral to all that they do, including promotion of wellness and excellence in clinical care, those in the AMS Faculty Line will also be the members of the faculty who will be expected to make the most substantive contributions to the education of others, including medical students, residents, fellows, other health care professionals, and their own colleagues, either as separate activities or in concert with clinical care, and to advance their specific fields with colleagues across the country and the globe.

It is this commitment to the full scope of academic medicine that sets apart the AMS Faculty Line clinicians from members of the Clinical Faculty Line who may educate learners (e.g., precepting students), but whose primary responsibilities are to provide clinical care either within our affiliated community-based practices.

Although it is not necessary to explicitly delineate the Track (e.g., Traditional vs. Clinician-Scholar) at the time of hire into the AMS Faculty Line, the expectations for these practitioners with respect to expected contributions to clinical care, research, service, and teaching (and the resources provided for these activities) should be defined by their employers at that time.

Individuals hired in the Investigator-Scholar Track of the AMS Faculty Line will not be expected to have clinical responsibilities, but to be fully engaged in research and research-related teaching/engagement efforts.

With rare exception, appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor in the AMS Faculty Line require:

- Successful completion of a postgraduate training program and (for clinicians) certification or eligibility for certification by the American Board of Medical Specialties, American Osteopathic Board, equivalent foreign board, or the equivalent for non-M.D. or non-D.O. specialists;

- Evidence of demonstrated scholarly accomplishments (in all but exceptional cases, candidates must have evidence of peer-reviewed original research in journals that are recognized by being indexed in area-specific databases (e.g., Medline and other indexed databases within the Web of Science/The Social Sciences Citation Index);

- Commitment to excellence in clinical care with evidence of a high level of clinical competence, skill, or expertise, as demonstrated by recommendations from the program director and associated faculty; or
Commitment to excellence in clinical research with evidence of a high level of research competence, skill, or expertise, as demonstrated by recommendations from the candidate’s postdoctoral and/or thesis mentors, and by other faculty who know of the individual or who have the capability to assess her/his work.

Although not restricted by geography, Individuals appointed in the AMS Faculty Line will be expected to contribute >10% of their effort to academic pursuits related to the mission of the Geisel School of and to be an integral part of Geisel’s clinical academic community. Therefore, in all but rare cases, individuals appointed to this line will be members of the professional staff of Geisel’s three primary clinical affiliates: Dartmouth-Hitchcock, the WRJ VAMC, or, in some cases CPMC.

Appointment to the AMS Faculty Line requires approval by the Department Chair and subsequent review of the candidate’s CV, written delineation by the hiring department of the expected academic responsibilities and proposed academic title, and approval of the proposed title by the Dean (or the Dean’s designee).

**Senior Ranks in the Tenure-track/Tenure, Non-tenure and AMS Faculty Lines:**

Following initial appointment, portfolios of individuals hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor in the Tenure-track/Tenure, Non-tenure, or AMS Faculty Line must also be reviewed by the Appointments, Promotions and Titles (APT) Committee of Geisel and approved by the Dean, the DAB, and the Provost within one year of the candidate’s hire. Awarding of tenure (Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line only; employees of Dartmouth College) must also be approved by the Board of Trustees of Dartmouth College.

**AMS Line--Reappointments**

**a. Assistant Professor**

Individuals appointed to the AMS Line are encouraged and expected to meet academic criteria such that their portfolios will be brought before the APT Committee by the end of their sixth (6th) year (second term) for consideration for advancement to Associate Professor. However, the Dean or his designee (The Dean of Faculty Affairs) and the Chair may extend more than one reappointment term (each three (3) years) at the rank of Assistant Professor, if the faculty member is making expected contributions to the academic mission of the medical system, but would not be considered likely to move forward with promotion.

Reappointment terms may therefore be granted in the AMS Line at ranks of Assistant and Associate Professor with the understanding that:

- there should be adequate faculty development support from the department for them to reach consideration for promotion within a period that does not exceed two standard appointment terms;
- requests for reappointment will be made to the Dean’s Office with a documented assessment of the past contributions of the faculty member to the academic missions of the medical system and a plan for future efforts that will allow them to be considered for promotion within this time frame.
b. Senior ranks (Associate and Professor):

As above, individuals appointed to the AMS Line are both encouraged and expected to meet academic criteria such that their portfolios will be brought before the APT Committee by the end of their sixth (6th) year in rank as Associate Professor for consideration for advancement to Professor. However, the Dean or his designee (The Dean of Faculty Affairs) and the Chair may extend more than one reappointment term (6-year terms, except retired faculty; vide infra) at the rank of Associate Professor if the faculty member is making expected contributions to the academic mission of the medical system, but would not be considered likely to move forward with promotion.

Reappointment at the rank of Professor will be required for faculty members in the AMS Line (6-year terms, except retired faculty; vide infra).

For AMS Line faculty members, all reappointments must be reviewed, approved, and requested by the Chair of the primary department (not Service Line Leader or other administrative official).

Renewal of appointments for faculty members in the AMS Line at any rank is contingent upon demonstrated commitment to the academic missions of the Medical School and the medical system. Departments will be required to provide documentation of specific commitments (e.g., name of clerkship, hours committed) in which the faculty member has participated during the prior appointment term with accompanying requests for reappointment for such reappointments to be granted. Status at Dartmouth-Hitchcock alone (e.g., active hospital) is not a basis for renewed appointments of an academic title at Geisel (Dartmouth College).

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 (and/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. Each department should work to establish a template for gathering appropriate information such that the Chair (or Chair designee) should be able to assess the accomplishments and shortfalls of each faculty member with respect to the expectations in his/her academic line. Templates may vary from department to department, but each department is encouraged to use a similar template and
mechanism of assessment for all of its faculty members within a specific line. Chairs (or their designees) need to identify accomplishments, shortfalls and trajectory for advancement well in advance of an expected date for promotion review.

To this end, it is also the obligation of each department to designate a senior mentor or (ideally) a 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 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.

For faculty members in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line, 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). Moreover, faculty members should convey to Chairs at these meetings information related not only on their status with respect to their scholarship, teaching, research, engagement and service, but also information as to what resources are needed and, conversely what barriers they believe exist, towards maximizing their academic potential.

Recommendations to advance a candidate to the APT Committee for consideration for academic advancement are to be made following review and recommendation by a committee of active senior faculty at Geisel with expertise in the candidate’s field of endeavor to the candidate’s Chair(s). In some cases, inclusion of recently retired or emeritus/a members of the faculty may be appropriate, but inclusion must be reviewed and approved by the Dean of Faculty Affairs since retired faculty members are by definition, non-voting. 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.

Efforts to advance diversity and inclusion at Geisel:

The Geisel School of Medicine believes a diverse and inclusive community of students, residents, fellows, staff, and faculty enhances our mission of providing exceptional education, advances biomedical discovery, and fosters innovation to help tackle the most vexing challenges in health care. Building a diverse and inclusive community is an institutional goal to which the Geisel community as a whole must contribute. Therefore, it is also expected that during these annual meetings that Chairs will assess how their faculty members have advanced the school’s mission to build a diverse and inclusive organization. Such efforts may include, but are not limited to:

- Self-education or professional development opportunities that have increased your own awareness, empathy and ability to be inclusive.
- Committee membership, leadership or other service opportunities that have advanced institutional initiatives for diversity and inclusion.
• Mentoring, counseling or advising. This may be student organizations or individual students. It may include mentoring of students who are themselves members of under-represented groups or mentoring majority students in order to enhance their understanding of key issues in diversity and inclusion.

• Incorporation of material in courses, lectures etc. that enhances presentation/understanding of diverse groups. This may include (but not limited to) discussions of both biomedical/health issues that have impact on different under-represented groups, highlighting the accomplishments of non-majority clinicians/scientists who have historically contributed to our knowledge of a biomedical subject, inclusion of issues related to biomedical ethics/or subjects that would be included in medical humanities that encompass greater cultural competence).

• Presentations that you have made to groups within the academic/medical community or the community at large that have enhanced understanding of diversity and inclusion.

• Specific efforts in which you have been engaged that have led to enhanced recruitment or retention of under-represented faculty, staff or students (e.g., service on a search committee that hired a non-majority candidate; hiring a non-majority individual for your laboratory (staff or postdoc); service on admissions committees [med or grad] that augment recruitment of non-majority students; participation in summer programs that have as part of their mission enhancement of non-majority students in the biomedical community.

• Participation in pipeline programs or engagement in efforts to enhance recruitment at meetings (e.g., professional societies, AAMC) or in conjunction with other professional visits (e.g., when giving a seminar at other institutions).

• Participation/membership in local, regional, national, or international organizations whose missions are to enhance diversity and inclusion.

• Other efforts that you may want to report that would meet our diversity and inclusion goals.

In addition, specific programs developed and implemented that promote demonstrable enhancement of the recruitment, retention and advancement of a diverse and inclusive body of faculty, staff and students at Geisel may also fall under the areas of Academic Endeavor (Engagement) described below.

B. Areas of Academic Endeavor

For all faculty lines, 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.

Scholarly activity within an academic medical system is recognized in the areas of teaching, investigation, and promotion of wellness and excellence in clinical 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 promotion of wellness and excellence in clinical 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 documented outcomes of teaching (e.g., the mentees who have gone on to obtain positions of their own in biomedical or academic institutions);

Documentation of the success of specific educational programs implemented by a faculty member either singly or as a substantive member of a team that results in meeting specific set goals of the Department, the Medical School and/or the Medical School’s primary clinical partners, including (but not limited to):

- Record of placement of residents in well-recognized programs which can be attributed to a new or revised program;
- Record of hires of clinical trainees to the academic faculties and/or the professional staff of organizations with a reputation for excellence in academic medicine and/or health care delivery which can be attributed to a new or revised program;
- Record of training providers that meet a specific goal identified by the school and the health care system (e.g., trainees that increase the ranks of primary care providers in rural areas).
- Record of peer-reviewed publication and or extramural awards in areas of medical pedagogy;
- Record of non-traditional scholarship in areas of medical pedagogy;
- Record of student performance improvement (e.g., augmented scores on USMLE1).

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.

Scholarship in the area of innovation in curriculum design and teaching that enriches Dartmouth’s teacher/scholar model through the innovative use of institutional resources,
such as library resources and expertise, that has an objective and evidence-based impact on learners.

- Novel scholarship as made evident in Dartmouth’s Digital Library and Dartmouth Digital Learning Initiatives.

- Peer-reviewed extramural support for educational inquiry.

- 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.

Individuals for whom teaching and pedagogical research comprise a critical part of their academic endeavors may want to track their activities using an educator’s portfolio. While there is not a required template for these portfolios, we note that the AAMC provides helpful guidance for both planning and recording of these activities with respect to academic advancement.
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 promotion of wellness and excellence in clinical 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 peer-reviewed. Disseminated, original, and substantive 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).

- In the case of both disseminated, peer-reviewed scholarship and peer-reviewed funding, Geisel recognizes that such efforts more likely than not will occur in the context of collaborations with colleagues and often times as the combined efforts among individuals in research teams. In this context, Geisel recognizes the importance of substantive and original investigation whether
attributed to an individual who is the head of a research team or to members within such a team by the following standards:

*Substantive and original scientific contributions* represent content or methodological work that is substantive (associated with a major scientific contribution or impact) and original (novel and/or unable to be replaced or substituted with a generic or standard alternative). “Substantive and original” scientific contributions are critical to the impact, design, methods, findings and/or interpretation of research, and include ones that are specific to the faculty member offering the contribution. In the area of research methods, substantive and original contributions apply to, for example, developing novel techniques, methods, and/or analytic models that break new ground, establish novel paradigms, and are associated with original publications in peer-reviewed publications, and/or major invited presentations at national or international meetings, and/or attributable funding (as an independent investigator or as part of a team—with commensurate effort as noted above) to support development of those techniques.

While recognizing that the term substantive is subjective in nature, in the context of appointments or promotions to a faculty rank, unless otherwise indicated by documentation provided by the faculty member’s chair, it will be expected that substantive effort on sponsored projects will be reflected in greater than *de minimis* effort on such work. This designation of “substantive” does not mean that contributions to projects at *de minimis* effort are not without importance in evaluation of the faculty member’s portfolio, but that such efforts will be weighted accordingly in considering the overall the faculty member’s academic contributions. For promotion/appointment to Associate Professor or Professor, faculty members will be expected, in all but rare cases, to have a well-documented and consistent record of contributions on funded awards at this level of effort.

In contrast, to substantive contributions, a professional “service” or operational contribution is one that, while of noted value to the research project, can be readily replaced, substituted, contracted, or otherwise arranged or purchased and which is not unique to a faculty member. Examples of service or operational contribution include providing a research service, biological product (unless it is a novel reagent developed by the individual as part the academic program of discovery), tool, registering patients in a database, or routine component in a research study that are along the lines of standard practice in the field.

As noted above, research accomplishments 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, 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, 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. In this regard, as with effort on sponsored projects, Similarly, as with committed efforts on sponsored research, for a faculty member to hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with rare exception, it will be the expectation that they have a
well-documented and consistent record of peer-reviewed publication in indexed journals which includes first and/or last author status.

- 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.

- Development of programs that result in increased submission of awards and receipt of funded awards of learners/faculty engaged in research.

- Development of programs/methodologies that enhance and support new modes of scholarship, applied practice, and research innovation.

- 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.

Whether the research endeavor is characterized as team-based or not, faculty and their mentors are strongly encouraged to follow the precepts and guidelines of the ICMJE in terms of defining authorship (http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html).
In particular, faculty and those that mentor them should pay attention to 4 criteria recommended by the ICMJE:

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Both faculty members, and their senior mentors are also strongly encouraged to consult with the Biomedical Libraries on best publishing practices (https://researchguides.dartmouth.edu/PUBLISHARTICLE). The librarians provide an excellent resource in how to adhere to journal and funding organization requirements, open access considerations, the meaning of impact factors and how they are calculated, as well as how to assess whether a given journal meets a given scholar’s community norms or to be potentially wary of it (i.e., it may be a “predatory journal).

- 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. Promotion of Wellness and Advancement of Clinical Care: Academic Medicine has two primary directives: 1) to promote population health as made evident by programs and efforts that augment wellness and lessen the burden to society of our health care systems programs and 2) to provide for excellence in clinical care as made evident through advances in clinical research and in direct clinical practice. Both clinicians and non-clinicians may lessen the burden of disease through research and program development that advance health and wellness. For faculty members that are engaged in direct clinical care, we expect both superior performance and a clear academic dimension to these activities, 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 promoting wellness and advancement of clinical care 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 Promotion of Wellness and Excellence in 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. Impact of such programs may be
gauged through measures that include (but are not limited to):
  - Improved clinical effectiveness within the health care organization which can be
    attributed to a new or revised program;
  - Improved indices of wellness/professional satisfaction of professional staff in the health
care system which can be attributed to a new or revised program;
  - Improved patient and/or population outcomes which can be attributed to a new or
    revised program;
  - Improved interprofessional dynamics of a clinical service attributable which can be
    attributed to a new or revised program;
  - Increased patient referral base which can be attributed to a new or revised program.
  - Record of placement of medical students in high quality residency programs which can be
    attributed to a new or revised program;

- 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 clinical 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 clinical 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.”4 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.”5 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.

• 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.

• Involvement in initiatives that meet key departmental and/or institutional goals in attracting individuals from under-represented groups to residency and fellowship programs and to the professional staff of the health system; and/or developing mentorship and sponsorship programs
that act to enhance the representation of under-represented women and minorities in areas of health care.

C. Progression to Promotion

AMS Faculty Line

As an institution charged with educating health care providers and enhancing the knowledge of clinical science and clinical practices, Geisel relies on clinical institutions to provide educational, research, and leadership opportunities in the clinical setting that are essential to the mission of the Medical School. We recognize that the clinicians who provide access to patients and teaching for medical students, associate providers and house staff are foundational to our mission. We further recognize the contributions of scientists within our clinical departments who contribute to the advancement of translational research and whose studies advance wellness and provide new recourse to disease. We further recognize that, through engagement, program development, as well as research, teaching and/or clinical care, these faculty members prepare leading physicians/providers and biomedical scientists of tomorrow and promote programs that address the most critical needs in health care.

As noted above, individuals appointed in the AMS Faculty Line are those who exemplify the academic mission within the clinical environments of the School and the Medical System. As such, academic attributes are expected to be deeply embedded in all of their activities.

The majority of individuals in the AMS Faculty Line are expected to be individuals whose predominant effort are in improving population wellness and providing clinical care, but who also make substantive contributions to academic medicine and affiliate health fields through teaching, program development, and engagement that is associated with that care. Individuals who fulfill these roles will, in nearly all cases, be appointed and advanced along the Clinician-Scholar Track in the AMS Faculty Line. Their advancement will, by and large, be predicated on meeting expectations in a) promotion of wellness and excellence in clinical care; b) teaching, most often associated with delivery of care in the clinical setting; c) engagement in developing programs that advance population and patient health either directly or indirectly through training of learners; and d) original scholarship disseminated through both conventional and non-conventional mechanisms.

In addition to the primary cohort of faculty members in the Clinician-Scholar Track of AMS Line, active clinicians may also establish robust research programs, as made evident by peer-reviewed extramural support, presence in scientific bodies/organizations, and peer-reviewed and original, disseminated scholarship that has a substantive impact in their respective fields, in addition to the commitments outlined above. Individuals meeting these criteria will be considered for appointment/advancement in the Traditional Track.

Finally, faculty members in the AMS Line may establish robust research programs, as made evident by peer-reviewed extramural support, presence in scientific bodies/organizations, and peer-reviewed and original disseminated scholarship that has a substantive impact in their respective fields, but may not have any direct clinical care responsibilities (in many cases, individuals who hold PhDs). Individuals
meeting these criteria will be considered for appointment/advancement in the Investigator-Scholar Track.

Faculty members considered for advancement in any of the three tracks in the AMS Faculty Line will be expected to demonstrate engagement in academic activities (e.g., tumor boards, Grand Rounds, Morbidity and Mortality Rounds, seminars, and professional societies).

Appointment to senior ranks or advancement in any of the three tracks in the AMS Faculty Line is predicated on meeting criteria for excellence in endeavors central to that given track (teaching, engagement, research, and clinical care), and in all cases on meeting metrics for disseminated scholarship with documented and measurable impact. However, the weight of the components for advancement will vary with the different track and with individuals within each track.

**a. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:**

For all tracks in the AMS Line, the Chair(s) (and or his/her designee) 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 5: Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth Guidelines for Faculty Promotion Procedures, with the expectation that each Assistant Professor in the AMS Faculty Line will be put forward for review by the APT Committee for promotion to Associate Professor by six (6) years in rank as Assistant Professor. Although advancement to Associate Professor within six (6) years in rank is the expectation, multiple renewals of three (3)-year terms as Assistant Professor are allowable in the AMS Faculty Line.

It is the expectation that individuals promoted (or appointed on hire) as Associate Professor in any of the three tracks within the AMS Faculty Line will have developed a robust regional to burgeoning national presence in the emphasized areas of each specific track. This reputation may be evident in different ways for each specific individual; particularly balanced by the time that they have available in each area of endeavor. In all cases, however, individuals promoted to senior ranks will be expected to have a foundational record of peer-reviewed, original and disseminated scholarship. If such scholarship is in the form of original articles, such articles will be expected to be in journals recognized by an indexed database (e.g., Medline and other indexed databases within the Web of Science/The Social Sciences Citation Index) relative to the individual’s field of endeavor.

**b. Associate Professor to Professor:**

For all tracks in the AMS Line, 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.

Criteria for promotion (or initial appointment) to the rank of Professor follow from those established for appointment/promotion to Associate Professor, with the expectation that both quantitative and qualitative advances in research, education, engagement, and clinical care, as applicable, will have been made in order for this rank to be bestowed. While accomplishments may vary with the individual, those
promoted to Professor must have a sustained record of excellence and will have garnered extramural recognition at the national and/or international level for teaching, engagement, research, clinical care, and original scholarship, with their specific academic contributions in each area accordingly weighted for the track in the AMS Line and the effort available to each endeavor.

i. **Clinician-Scholar Track (AMS Faculty Line):**
The majority of faculty members in the AMS Line will be in the Clinician-Scholar Track. Promoting population wellness and excellence in clinical care, either directly through patient interactions, clinical administration, or indirectly through development of programs that augment the skills of learners who then, in turn, have measurable impact on the health of their patient populations.

All individuals being considered for promotion (or initial appointment) to Associate Professor in the Clinician-Scholar Track of the AMS Faculty Line must have demonstrated excellence in:

- teaching (may be at multiple levels: UME, GME, CME, associate providers, undergraduates); and
- engagement at the institutional (e.g., the entities that comprise DHMC: D-HC, MHMH, WRJ VAMC) and extramural (e.g., professional societies) levels; and
- a foundational level of original, peer-reviewed scholarship; and
- advancement of disseminated scholarship through either conventional and/or non-conventional mechanisms; and
- promotion of population wellness/clinical care either directly through patient contact or through the development of programs that have demonstrable and substantive impact on these endpoints. Such programs may include implementation (e.g., quality improvement) or novel educational paradigms.

and must have garnered a substantive extramural recognition at a regional level and a burgeoning reputation at the national level.

Geisel recognizes that fulfilling the academic missions of our medical center may occur through dissemination of new knowledge (scholarship) via conventional mechanisms (e.g., peer-reviewed publications) and also non-conventional scholarship that arises from the creation of programs that advance specific academic goals of a department or other unit within the school/medical center. As noted above (Areas of Academic Endeavor), the goals of such programs must be specifically defined and outcomes of such programs directly measurable for consideration for promotion or appointment at senior ranks.

Teaching, either in concert with promoting population wellness/clinical care or in association with research/service activities, is an important component for advancement in the Clinician-Scholar Track. While faculty members in all tracks of the AMS Faculty Line are expected to teach a defined set of learners to some extent, individuals within the Clinician-Scholar Track, more so than for the Traditional or Investigator-Scholar Tracks, may be recognized for innovation and excellence in the delivery of medical education (at multiple levels, e.g., UME, GME, CME), and in particular, for educational programs that advance defined pedagogical goals of the academic medical system.
It is also the case that a small cohort of faculty members in the Clinician-Scholar Track may not have appreciable or any direct interaction themselves with patients, but nonetheless have substantive impact on health outcomes and patient care through their development novel curricula for clinicians or development of clinical programs (e.g., PTSD Treatment Programs for Veterans) that have a direct impact on patient care both here at Geisel and on a national front and to produce original inquiry (research) and scholarship in this area.

While scholarship in the Clinician-Scholar Track in the AMS Line may take different forms, for advancement in rank, candidates must be able to show that pedagogical, curricular or program innovations have been adopted by other institutions and provide reviewable data that the adoption of new approaches (as designed and/or implemented by the candidate) have had a measurable impact on specific outcomes (e.g., but not limited to: learner scores on USMLE Step 1; enhanced residency or fellowship placement, improved patient outcomes, increased success of submitted grants).

Faculty members in the Clinician-Scholar Track of the AMS Faculty Line will be expected to be fully dedicated to innovation and excellence in the delivery of clinical education (may be at multiple levels, e.g., UME, GME, CME; associate providers) and are expected not only to be excellent teachers, but also to play a key role in the evolution of the health care curriculum both at Geisel and on a regional and national front. Although extramural funding is not required for advancement in this track, original inquiry (research) and disseminated scholarship (as defined below) is.

Moreover, as with laboratory or data sciences, while not required, 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 the Clinical-Scholar Track in the AMS Faculty may include:

- individuals who are engaged in research in association with their clinical activities and conventional peer-reviewed and original publications resulting from those activities; or
- faculty members recognized for the design, development, and implementation of programs that have a substantive, measurable, and multiplicative or even exponential impact on clinical education and clinical practice through the innovations they establish. In the parlance of geneticists, the impact of faculty members in manner will be expected to be measurable not only on those they directly instruct (F1 generation), but also in subsequent generations of learners (F2 generations and beyond).

In this regard, faculty members in the Clinician-Scholar Track of the AMS Line are expected to excel in mentorship, sponsorship and the development of others. They may do so through the establishment new programs and initiatives or innovative changes to existing programs that that broadly enhance the cadre of well-trained clinical providers and the delivery of clinical care. These accomplishments must meet a number of criteria:

1. The programs they develop/improve and the outcomes measured through these programs must meet missions/goals established and documented by the Department, Medical School, and/or Health System. For example, a faculty member may be recognized by creating and implementing educational programs that increase the proportion of trainees that practice in underserved areas, in
the development/implementation of novel telehealth programs that increase health outcomes through enhanced outreach and decreased costs, or through programs that enhance trainee or physician wellness. However, such goals need to be part of larger strategic planning established by the department or institution and recorded as such within the mission statements of the Department, Medical School or Health System.

2. The impact of such programs must be **measurable**. For example, if faculty members develop programs or novel pedagogical methods to advance learning within a specific population of learners, there must be a record that demonstrates the success of such measures in the professional development of the learners; in the impact on the quality of care; or in meeting goals that serve identified mandates of the school and its health system.

Such measures may include (but are not limited to):

   a. increased success of trainees on standardized exams (e.g., USMLE Step 1);
   b. enhanced success of trainees being accepted to targeted/identified residency or fellowship programs or in being hired to the professional staff of targeted/identified academic health systems;
   c. improvement of metrics on questionnaires such as the GQ that indicate measurable and **significant** improvement on identified and specific metrics;
   d. increased success of goals of the department/institutions(s) to enhance recruitment, retention and advancement of under-represented minorities in the trainee and faculty populations;
   e. increased success in research areas such as the numbers of externally funded grants
   f. increased success in patient outcomes and or in efforts that diminish cost while maintaining or augmenting patient outcomes.

For all such goals to be recognized by academic advancement, they need to be identified, assessed and reported within a rigorous and scientifically approved study design.

As with team science, it is expected that development of such programs is likely to occur through the collaborative efforts of more than a single individual, and individuals may be recognized by academic advancement for such collaborative efforts. However, as with team science, faculty members will be recognized for academic advancement for new or redesigned programs based on both their measurable impact and the ability to define “substantive and original” contributions that are unique to that faculty member in the design, methods, and/or implementation of the programs and their impact.

In a small number of cases, faculty may meet the criteria for appointment/advancement in the Clinician-Scholar Track, even if they themselves are not directly engaged in patient care. Since these faculty members are not expected to have effort committed to clinical activities, the programs they develop, either pedagogical (which may be at multiple levels, e.g., UME, GME, CME) or clinical (e.g., the National Center for PTSD) are expected to have broad and measurable impact institutionally, regionally, and nationally. Original inquiry (research) and peer-reviewed scholarship is expected. Moreover, as with laboratory or data sciences, when applicable to their specific area, peer-reviewed extramural support will be taken as validation of the faculty member’s contributions to advancing her/his given field.
ii. **Traditional Track (AMS Faculty Line):**

Appointment to the Traditional Track of the AMS Faculty Line and advancement in this line requires a commitment to and excellence in research (broadly defined as original inquiry), teaching, either at the level of the institution and/or more broadly within the professional community, promotion of population wellness/clinical care, and original, disseminated scholarship (Section 3B).

A commitment to and demonstrated excellence in teaching may be at any clinical level (UME, GME, CME, associate providers) or in graduate education (PhD or Masters programs). 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.

As with the other tracks in the AMS Faculty Line, individuals in the Investigator-Scholar Track are expected to participate in activities of the medical system that are intrinsic to its academic mission (e.g., tumor boards, Grand Rounds, Morbidity and Mortality Rounds, seminars, and professional societies). They are also expected to demonstrate a level of professional engagement (e.g., membership/office in professional societies, study sections, invited speaker engagements) as well as institutional service (Medical School or Academic Medical System).

Individuals being considered for advancement in the Traditional Faculty Line shall also have a record of excellence in promotion wellness and/or improving clinical care as made evident by assessments by external and internal peers as well as measurable outcomes improving patient/population health.

Excellence in these areas is predicated on recognition by both internal and external peers and by documented demonstrable impact of work, whether conventional peer-reviewed or in the development/implementation of novel programs related to goals of the academic medical system.

iii. **Investigator-Scholar Track (AMS Line):**

Individuals in the Investigator-Scholar Track will, in most cases, be non-clinicians (e.g., PhDs) dedicated to research outside of the delivery of care. As with faculty in the Traditional Line, individuals in the Investigator-Scholar Track will be expected to achieve recognition with regard to research (including recognition by extramural funding agencies, teaching, and engagement/service, and to have documented peer-reviewed scholarship.

As with the other tracks in the AMS Faculty Line, individuals in the Investigator-Scholar Track are expected to participate in activities of the medical system that are intrinsic to its academic mission (e.g., tumor boards, Grand Rounds, Morbidity and Mortality Rounds, seminars, and professional societies). They are also expected to demonstrate a level of professional engagement (e.g., membership/office in professional societies, study sections, invited speaker engagements) as well as institutional service (Medical School or Academic Medical System). However, they are not expected to be engage in direct clinical care, and they are not required to teach outside of their research activities (i.e., teaching those in the research “team” may be considered part of their responsibilities).
While recognizing that not all of those in this line will have access to graduate students, postdoctoral scholars or other trainees and as such, formal teaching is not obligatory, faculty members in the Investigator-Scholar Track of the AMS Faculty Line may choose to be engaged in graduate/post-graduate level teaching and clinical teaching. If they do, (i.e., in the teaching of medical students, graduate students, research associates, residents, and/or fellows), their portfolios will be assessed in these area according to criteria also set out for graduate/post-graduate teaching by faculty members in the Traditional Track of the AMS Line and the Tenure-track/Tenure and Non-tenure Faculty Lines.

As with other faculty lines, the Geisel School of Medicine recognizes and values team-based as well as individual research efforts. However, advancement in the Traditional or Investigator-Scholar Tracks in the AMS Faculty Line 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.
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-Scholar), 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).
    o 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.
    o For grants, list past awards, current awards, and pending proposals, with the information requested. Do not provide information on unsuccessful proposals.
    o 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.).
  • Of the required five letters, three 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.

- Of the required five outside letters, three 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).
- Of the required five outside letters, three must come 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-Scholar), 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).
    o Secondary Chair letter, necessary only if there is a joint appointment.
    o 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.
    o For grants, list past awards, current awards and pending proposals, with the information requested. Do not provide information on unsuccessful proposals.
    o 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.).
  • Of the seven required letters, four 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.

- Of the seven required outside letters, four 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).
- Of the seven required outside letters, four must come 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.*