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: 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 Geisel School of Medicine (Dartmouth College), Dartmouth-Hitchcock Clinic (D-HC), Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital (MHH), 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:

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).

Faculty members employed at >0.5 FTE in the Tenure-track/Tenure Line have voting rights as members of the Faculty of the Geisel School of Medicine and of the General Faculty of Dartmouth College.

The qualifier Tenure-track/Tenure Line will be defined in all offer letters and reappointment letters, and in all Geisel databases. Individuals appointed in the Tenure-track/Tenure Line shall identify their positions on all external documents (e.g., grant applications) as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor of [Department] (tenured/tenured-track). The qualifier Tenure-track/Tenure Line does not need to be used on internal documents (e.g., letterhead) or personal business cards (e.g., John Doe, Assistant Professor of The Dartmouth Institute).

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.

Appointments made at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor in the Tenure-track/Tenure, Non-tenure, or AMS Faculty Lines must be reviewed by the Appointments, Promotions and Titles (APT) Committee and the appointment must be recommended to the Dean prior to subsequent review by the DAB and the Provost.

For faculty members in the Tenure-track/Tenure and Non-tenure Lines (i.e., employees of Dartmouth College), the decision to offer employment and a faculty appointment must be put forward to the Dean by the Chair of the hiring department. The Dean, in consultation with the Chair, 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 will construct the terms of the offer and the offer letter to the candidate. The Provost must review and approve portfolios of all hires accepted for Tenure-track/Tenure and Non-tenure Line faculty (see Appendix 6).

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 Faculty Lines (Dartmouth College employees)

Individuals appointed in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line 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 Faculty Line require evidence of demonstrated scholarly accomplishments (in all but exceptional cases, peer-reviewed). Advancement in rank (to Associate Professor/Professor) may be based on substantive contributions to the academic mission that do not necessarily conform to conventional peer-reviewed scholarship, however, initial appointment will require evidence of meeting this basic metric (evidence of peer-reviewed publication or peer-reviewed presentations) for appointment as Assistant Professor in any faculty line. In addition, for appointment and promotion, publications must meet the standard of being indexed in appropriate databases (e.g., Medline and other indexed databases within the Web of Science/The Social Sciences Citation Index). Any faculty member with questions about a particular journal or publisher should be encouraged to reach out to a reference librarian in the Biomedical Libraries, at Biomedical.Libraries.Reference@Dartmouth.edu.

All appointments in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line will in most cases also require a minimum of two years of postdoctoral training. In a limited number of cases, other advanced degrees (e.g., MD/PhD, MD/MBA or relevant MS/MPH degrees) may substitute for time spent in postdoctoral training.

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 overseen by Dartmouth College and follow best hiring practices (Appendix 2: Protocols for Faculty Hiring and for Search Committees).

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 (Tenure-track/Tenure Line): 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.

Reappointments: Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Lines (Dartmouth College employees)

a. Assistant Professor:

Individuals appointed to the Tenure-track Faculty Line will be appointed for a three (3)-year term that may be renewed (vide infra), with the expectation that such faculty members will be brought before the APT Committee before end of their sixth year (second term) for consideration for advancement to Associate Professor. Normal advancement timing would have the candidate’s portfolio be assembled and reviewed during his/her fifth year. Review of a candidate prior to 5 years would be considered an accelerated promotion and will occur rarely and only for exceptional candidates.

Beginning with the second 3-year term appointment, the Chair(s) of the Department(s) should annually 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.

It is the expectation that, with rare exceptions, each Assistant Professor in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line will be put forward no sooner than five (5) years in rank but before six (6) years in rank for review by the APT Committee (see Part III), for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor. Promotion earlier than five years is allowable, but such promotions will be viewed as exceptional.

b. Associate Professors:

The Chair(s) of the Department(s) should review the progress of each Associate Professor with her/his senior faculty (or Promotions Committee).

It is the expectation that, with rare exceptions, each Associate Professor in the Tenure-track/Tenure Faculty Line will be put forward for review by the APT Committee for consideration for promotion to Professor after no more than six (6) years in rank as Associate Professor (Part III). As with accelerated
consideration for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor \textit{(vide supra)}, review and consideration of promotion earlier than five years is allowable, but such promotions will be viewed as exceptional.

**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.

B. 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.

C. 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).

  o 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. 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.

- 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: 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 5: 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 rank\(^5\) 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, clinical 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 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, clinical 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:

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

Recommendations to extend an appointment, and the length of term of that reappointment, shall take into account both professional considerations and considerations outside of professional criteria (see Appendix 7: Faculty Review Process for Provisional Reappointments for Non-tenured Individuals in the Tenure-track/Tenured and Non-tenure Faculty Lines). Moreover, if the Dean and the Chair do not agree as to the duration of the variable appointment provided, the Chair and/or the Dean may request that the APT Committee convene a special session for review and recommendation for the term of the appointment, as described above.

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 5 (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.
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).
  - 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.).
- 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.*