

DARTMOUTH MEDICAL SCHOOL GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY PROMOTION PROCEDURES

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

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

I. Procedures for Promotion Consideration Prior to the APT Committee Review.

All faculty members should receive ongoing mentoring from the time of their initial appointment from his/her respective Chair or Director¹ and from members of the Department's/Institute's¹ Promotions Committee. These individuals are responsible, in conjunction with the faculty member, for guiding him/her along the appropriate trajectory for academic advancement.

The department has the initial responsibility for determining whether or not to recommend a faculty member in the department for promotion based on a thorough and objective review. Considerations about faculty promotions at the departmental level are lead by the Departmental Chair with the involvement of the Department Promotions Committee.

Departmental Review:

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

Extramural Reviewers

Number of reviewers: During the departmental review process, the Departmental Chair will solicit and receive a minimum of three letters from outside (non-peer) reviewers who are qualified to assess the candidate's academic performance. Outside reviewers must not have an

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

appointment at any institution where the faculty member holds an active appointment (e.g. if the candidate has an adjunct appointment at another institution) and must not have a personal or financial conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g., shared intellectual property).

For letters solicited both at the level of review by the Department and for those sent forward to the APT Committee, the outside reviewers must hold academic rank at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered.

Selection of reviewers: The candidate may provide the Chair with a list of up to 5 suggested outside reviewers, together with information about the professional relationship of the suggested reviewers to the candidate, if any, and the basis for their selection as individuals qualified to evaluate the candidate. In selecting the outside reviewers from whom letters will be requested, at least one of the minimum of 3 letters must be from the list provided by the candidate.

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

Solicitation of Letters; Departmental Assessment

To ensure consistency among departments and consistency between the departmental review and review by the APT Committee, the Chair's letters to outside reviewers should use the template letter provided as Attachment A in this document. Each potential reviewer should receive the solicitation to review (template) letter, a copy of the Chair's draft letter to the Dean about the candidate, and a copy of the Appointments Promotions and Titles Document for DMS in which the appropriate criteria for the title for which the candidate is being recommended are *highlighted*. The candidate should not be informed of the names of the outside reviewers who are selected by the Chair, and the Chair is responsible for informing the candidate that the candidate should not personally communicate with any of the candidate's suggested outside reviewers about the fact that their opinions may be solicited or the substance of the review.

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

Intramural Reviewers

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

Recommendations

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

Transmittal of Recommendation for Promotion

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

1. A letter from the Chair to the Dean of the Medical School, in his or her capacity as Chair of the Department's promotions committee, recommending promotion (original and 11 copies). The letter will include the following information and assessments:
 - a. The first paragraph of the letter should contain the candidate's proposed rank (primary department listed first if joint appointment. If the promotion is to the rank of Professor, the first paragraph should also specify whether this is a request for tenure or non-tenure.
 - b. The effective date of the proposed appointment
 - c. Identification of the candidate's faculty line (see Faculty Appointments, Promotions and Titles at Dartmouth Medical School document)
 - d. A breakdown of the percentage of effort the candidate spends in clinical activities, research or other forms of scholarship, teaching, and engagement
 - e. A precise description of the candidate's field of specialty
 - f. A detailed explanation of the basis for the promotion recommendation, including:

- i. The professional and personal qualities of the candidate that merit consideration
 - ii. The candidate's academic role in teaching and research
 - iii. The candidate's contribution to the department and the Medical School
 - iv. Evidence of regional, national or international recognition, as appropriate for the level of promotion and the portfolio
2. A letter of approval from the Chairs of the non-primary departments in the cases of joint appointments [original and 11 copies].
3. A current Curriculum Vitae of the candidate in the DMS Format: See Attachment B (original plus 11 copies)
4. Data supporting the Chair's assertion that the candidate has achieved the criteria for promotion, including:
 - a. Letters from inside reviewers, including, where relevant, letters from colleagues attesting to quality of teaching and, as appropriate, clinical accomplishments
 - b. Teaching evaluations: course reviews, eVal and other metrics
 - c. For faculty new to DMS a letter outlining the candidates teaching accomplishments/history/expertise, from the candidate's current institution
 - d. Letters solicited from the outside reviewers, letters sent to the reviewers framing the request, information indicating whether the reviewers were selected by the Chair or the candidate, the professional relationship of the reviewers to the candidate, if any, and the basis for their selection as individuals qualified to evaluate the candidate

The majority of outside letters/reviewers have to come from individuals who have not trained, worked or collaborated with the candidate within the past 5 years of the date of solicitation of the review

 - e. Four (4) to ten (10) publications authored by the candidate that best reflect his/her academic endeavors (1 copy) or appropriate internet addresses for web-based materials

- f. Material from other academic/non-academic institutions indicating the candidate's accomplishments with respect to engagement where applicable (13 copies)
6. The list of outside reviewers suggested by the candidate, together with the information provided by the candidate about the suggested reviewers, described above
7. Evaluations from 10 individuals who have been taught by the candidate. These evaluations may include a combination of medical students, graduate students, residents and post-doctoral fellows, undergraduate students or other learners
8. The Departmental Chair's assessment of the candidate's institutional contributions, unique characteristics, and potential for leadership within the institution

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

II. Procedures for Promotion at the APT Committee Level

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

Committee Composition

The APT Committee consists of 11 members: the Dean of the Medical School or the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and 10 faculty members that reflect the diversity of faculty in DMS with regard to clinical care, teaching, and research. The Dean serves as Chair of the Committee. Members of the Committee, other than the Dean, are chosen by the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Department Chairs and the DMS Faculty Council. Appointments are subject to approval by the Dean. Initial appointments are made for one year with the ability to extend the term for an additional 3-4 years. No member of the Committee (other than the Dean) can serve more than two consecutive terms. For faculty members who rejoin the committee after a hiatus, they may sign up for a 3 or 4-year term without the initial one-year period. The Vice Chair of the APT Committee is appointed by the Dean or the Dean's designate (the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs) from among the members of the Committee. The Vice Chair serves as Vice Chair for two years. The Vice Chair is responsible for chairing the meetings, working with the Administrative Assistant to assure that the Committee stays on schedule, and working with the Senior

Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to make sure information regarding APT proceedings is conveyed to the Department Chairs in an accurate, helpful, and timely manner.

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

- a. Ensuring that all necessary documentation has been provided by the Departmental Chairs
- b. Maintaining correspondence with outside reviewers, inside reviewers, and students
- c. Keeping the APT member responsible for the file informed of the status of the file
- d. Maintaining all APT documentation (both hardcopies and electronic documents for the committees use that are posted on protected internet sites; e.g., Blackboard)
- e. Ensuring that the candidate's file contains at least 5 letters from outside reviewers in the case of promotions to Associate Professor and at least 7 letters from outside reviewers in the case of promotions to Professor. The majority of the letters in the file should be solicited from outside reviewers who are not drawn from the list of suggested reviewers provided by the candidate and must not have a conflict of interest with the candidate.
- f. Providing administrative support to the APT committee and taking minutes at the meetings
- g. Ensuring that copies of the letters to the Chairs from the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs/Vice Chair of the APT Committee that summarize the APT Committee's deliberations, as well as formal letters acknowledging appointments/promotions, are maintained in the candidates' files

Committee Meetings and Schedule

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

Committee Operations

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

1. The Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs assigns each candidate for promotion to one APT Committee member who will then be responsible for an in-depth review of the candidate's file. This individual must not have a conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g., same primary department, has written a letter for the candidate, has a familial relationship with the candidate, colleague with whom the candidate publishes, shares grant support or intellectual property, is a mentor for the candidate through mechanisms such as PPG, COBREs etc.).
2. While it is the responsibility of the Department administrators and DMS Administration to ensure portfolios are complete, APT reviewers should nonetheless double-check to make sure all required letters and other components are assembled. If any document is missing, the reviewer should alert the Administrative Coordinator for Recruitment and Faculty Affairs, and the review shall be rescheduled for a later date when the portfolio is complete.
3. The APT Committee member responsible for a candidate may also choose to seek additional reviews from inside reviewers selected by the Committee member.
4. The Committee member responsible for a candidate will make a presentation of the candidate's file to the APT Committee and will participate in the Committee's deliberations. This presentation must be written. The presenter may include in his/her draft letter the expected recommendation for or against advancement, but he/she should not make that recommendation known to the rest of the committee at the time he/she presents the portfolio. Following a discussion and a vote of the committee, the presenter should amend his/her letter to indicate the committee vote and submit the final letter to the Administrative Coordinator for Recruitment and Faculty Affairs (*vide infra*).
5. The Department Chair or his/her designate is invited to attend the presentation of the candidate and to answer questions from the committee. Other key individuals (e.g., the Director of the Cancer Center or a Chair from a joint department) may also be invited to attend.
6. Faculty members who hold the same primary appointment as the candidate or who have any other recognized conflict of interest shall leave the room during the presentation and subsequent voting. Such conflicts include, but are not limited to: co-author on papers or grants within the past 5 years; co-holder of intellectual property with the candidate, being a current or former mentor, having written a letter of support for the candidate for his/her current promotion; familial relationship). Individuals who hold secondary/tertiary appointments may

participate in the discussion and the vote as long as they, in good conscience, are not in conflict.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. Procedures for Promotion Following the APT Committee's Recommendation

Dean's Review

Upon receiving the APT Committee's recommendation, the Dean will review the recommendation. If the Dean so chooses, the Dean may add to the file his or her own views (positive or negative) on the candidate's promotion. The file of a candidate who has not been recommended for promotion by the APT Committee will receive no further consideration for promotion at that time.

If the Dean or his/her designate and the Chair of the Department feel that the candidate can address the deficiencies raised by the APT Committee that led the Committee to deny the recommendation to advance, the candidate may be reconsidered for advancement as soon as those deficiencies have been addressed. If, after consultation with the Chair by the Dean, the deficiencies are deemed to be too great for the candidate to be able to address (with regard to the *specific* criteria for appointment/advancement within his/her Faculty Line), the appointment of the faculty member shall not be renewed.

DAB Review

The Dean will inform the voting members of the Dean's Academic Board (DAB) of the names of candidates who have been recommended for appointment and/or promotion by the APT Committee and will request a vote by the DAB as part of the Personnel Agenda. Any member of the DAB who questions or has concerns about the recommendation may request that the promotion be tabled until further discussion with the Dean and/or the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.

A vote approving a recommendation to promote a candidate requires that the candidate receive at least 50 percent of the votes of all voting members of the DAB. The voting members of the DAB are the Dean and the Senior Associate Deans of DMS (The Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, The Senior Associate Dean for Medical Education, the Senior Associate Dean for Clinical Affairs, the Chief Operating Officer of DMS, the Director of Finance, the Associate Dean for Advancement, the Departmental Chairs and Major Center Directors of the Medical School, the co-Presidents of the Dartmouth Hitchcock-Clinic and the Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital, and the Chief of Staff of the Veterans Affairs Medical Center in White River Junction.

DAB members will hold the names of any candidates for promotion and any information they obtain about the candidates in strict confidence.

After all recommendations for promotion from the APT Committee have been voted on by the DAB, the Departmental Chairs have the option of informing the candidates within their departments who have not been recommended for promotion of their status.

Candidates who present just cause that their academic freedom has been violated have redress with respect to the actions of Department Promotions Committee, the APT Committee or the DAB through provisions set forth in the "Organization of the Faculty of Dartmouth College (pg 9): "If an academic appointee⁵ alleges that his or her academic freedom has been violated, he or she may request of the Dean of the appropriate faculty that the appropriate committee⁶ (hereafter, "the Committee"), and the Council on Academic Freedom and Responsibility in cases referred to the Council by the Committee, hear his or her complaint and consider his or her evidence pursuant to Sections 6(a)(iii) and 6(b)-(f)."

Provost's Review

The Administrative Coordinator for Recruitment and Faculty Affairs in the DMS Administration shall transmit the names, titles and departments of individuals whose promotions/senior appointments have been supported by the APT Committee, the Dean and the DAB to the Provost's Office. Recommendations for promotion to Professor with tenure will be accompanied by a detailed letter from the Dean that includes a description of the candidate's qualifications and accomplishments, the role of the candidate in the Medical School's academic activities, the reviewers' assessments of the candidate, the basis for the reviewers' credibility, and, if the Dean so chooses, the Dean's views of the candidate. The Dean will also provide the Provost, if requested, with the summary and vote from the APT Committee, the vote by the DAB, and all letters from reviewers (inside and outside) with respect to the candidate's consideration.

The Provost and the President of the College, acting on behalf of the Board of Trustees, may accept the APT Committee's recommendation, reject the recommendation, or request the Dean, as Chair of the APT Committee, to provide additional information. The action by the Provost/President should be recorded in the form of a letter to the Dean and become a part of the candidate's confidential file.

Presentation to the Trustees of Dartmouth College

For those candidates whom the Provost and the President accept the recommendations for promotion or appointment to Professor with tenure, the Provost will present the candidates to the Trustees of Dartmouth College who are empowered to offer faculty promotion.

IV. Normal Schedule of Procedures

- The DAB meets monthly. All candidates recommended for promotion/appointment shall be included on the next DAB Personal agenda unless unusual circumstances prevent this action.
- For non-tenure decisions, the Provost's Office will typically approve appointments within 1-2 weeks of receiving the DAB Personal agenda. At this time, the Dean's Office will inform the candidates in writing of their promotion/appointment.
- For tenure decisions, material for consideration must be provided to the Provost's Office at least a month prior to the meetings of the Board of Trustees (February, June and November).
- The Dean's Office shall congratulate candidates, in writing, on their promotions, and a copy of each letter shall be retained in the faculty member's file.
- Annually at the end of the summer, the Dean's Office shall also announce to the Dartmouth Community through public forums (e.g., the DMS web site, email to the DMS community) those candidates who have been promoted or appointed to senior rank so that they may be acknowledged for their accomplishments.

ATTACHMENT A
Sample letter to outside reviewers

«today»

«name»
«address»

Dear «lttrname»:

The promotions process of Dartmouth Medical School involves review of each nominee's curriculum vitae and other selected material by acknowledged academic leaders outside of the Dartmouth community. I write to solicit your participation in this process. Our Promotions Committee has identified you as an authority in a field related to that of «promo_name» who is being considered for «appt/promo» «title» along the «faculty line» portfolio. Please note that it is not essential for you to know the candidate personally or even by reputation.

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

- 1) The Department Chair's letter requesting Dr. «last_name»'s promotion. This letter stipulates the specific faculty line and describes the candidate's portfolio.
- 2) Dr. «last_name»'s current curriculum vitae.
- 3) Dartmouth Medical School's Appointments, Promotions and Titles document, with the criteria for the relevant faculty line highlighted
- 4) Reprints of selected publications.

The Faculty Promotions Committee would be very grateful for your candid opinion regarding this candidate's suitability for the proposed rank in the faculty line highlighted in the enclosed Appointments, Promotions and Titles document. We would especially value your comments about the candidate's stature at a regional and/or national level for those being proposed for promotion to Associate Professor; at a national and/or international level for those being proposed for promotion to Professor; and whether or not the candidate would be likely to be promoted to the proposed rank in a comparable faculty line at your own institution. The decision to award tenure at Dartmouth Medical School, which is considered at the level of Professor, is a separate decision from that of promotion. If the candidate is also being considered for tenure, we would appreciate your comments on both the suitability of the candidate for the proposed rank and, separately, the suitability of the candidate for tenure.

The promotions process involves review by a 11-person committee composed of the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and senior faculty members from a range of disciplines and final review by the Provost and President of Dartmouth College. For that reason, it would be particularly useful if your assessment provided sufficient detail to inform individuals who may be unfamiliar with your field of scholarship. Against that background, I would ask you to

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

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

With many thanks for assisting us in this important process.

Sincerely,

Department Chair

CURRICULUM VITAE

Date prepared:

NAME:

ADDRESS:	<u>Home</u>	<u>Office</u>

Provide in chronological order or reverse chronological order, but please be consistent.

I. EDUCATION:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>DEGREE</u>

II. POSTDOCTORAL TRAINING

<u>DATE</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>SPECIALTY</u>

III. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

<u>DATE</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>TITLE</u>

IV. DARTMOUTH INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP ROLES:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>TITLE</u>

V. LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION (IF APPLICABLE):

<u>DATE</u>	<u>LICENSURE/CERTIFICATION</u>

VI. HOSPITAL APPOINTMENTS (IF APPLICABLE):

<u>DATES</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>POSITION/TITLE</u>

VII. OTHER PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS (NON-DARTMOUTH):

<u>DATES</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>POSITION/TITLE</u>

VIII. TEACHING ACTIVITIES:

Please append DMS/DC course reviews and eVal metrics with your CV.

If you have also held a faculty position at another institution (or currently hold one at another institution), please list your teaching experience under A-F below (e.g., UME, CME etc.), but under a separate sub-heading that indicates the other institution.

A. DARTMOUTH UNDERGRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION (Inclusive of both classroom teaching and medical student instruction in clerkships):

<u>DATES</u>	<u>NAME OF COURSE/ACTIVITY</u>	<u>ROLE</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>HOURS</u>

B. DARTMOUTH GRADUATE EDUCATION (List classes taught for Ph.D. and Masters students):

<u>DATES</u>	<u>NAME OF COURSE/ACTIVITY</u>	<u>ROLE</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>HOURS</u>

C. DARTMOUTH GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION (Inclusive of instruction of residents and fellows during clinical practice):

<u>DATES</u>	<u>NAME OF COURSE/ACTIVITY</u>	<u>ROLE</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>HOURS</u>

D. DARTMOUTH COLLEGE:

<u>DATES</u>	<u>NAME OF COURSE/ACTIVITY</u>	<u>ROLE</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>HOURS</u>

E. CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION:

<u>DATES</u>	<u>NAME OF COURSE/ACTIVITY</u>	<u>ROLE</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>HOURS</u>

F. COMMUNITY EDUCATION:

<u>DATES</u>	<u>NAME OF COURSE/ACTIVITY</u>	<u>ROLE</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>HOURS</u>

IX. STUDENT/FELLOW ADVISING/MENTORING:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>NAME OF STUDENT</u>	<u>ROLE</u>	<u>PROGRAM</u>

--	--	--	--

X. RESEARCH FUNDING:

A. Current

<u>DATES</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE/NUMBER</u>	<u>ROLE/%EFFORT</u>	<u>SPONSOR</u>	<u>ANNUAL DIRECT COSTS</u>

B. Past

<u>DATES</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE/NUMBER</u>	<u>ROLE/%EFFORT</u>	<u>SPONSOR</u>	<u>ANNUAL DIRECT COSTS</u>

C. Pending

<u>DATES</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE/NUMBER</u>	<u>ROLE/%EFFORT</u>	<u>SPONSOR</u>	<u>ANNUAL DIRECT COSTS</u>

XI. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (List any educational, clinical or research entities at Dartmouth that were created or notably advanced by your efforts):

XII. ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITIES (List any patents, licenses or other entrepreneurial activities):

XII. MAJOR COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS:

National/international

<u>DATES</u>	<u>COMMITTEE</u>	<u>ROLE</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>

Regional

<u>DATES</u>	<u>COMMITTEE</u>	<u>ROLE</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>

Institutional

<u>DATES</u>	<u>COMMITTEE</u>	<u>ROLE</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>

XIV. MEMBERSHIPS, OFFICE AND COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS IN PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES:

<u>DATES</u>	<u>SOCIETY</u>	<u>ROLE</u>

XV. EDITORIAL BOARDS:

<u>DATES</u>	<u>SOCIETY</u>	<u>ROLE</u>

XVI. JOURNAL REFEREE ACTIVITY:

<u>DATES</u>	<u>JOURNAL NAME</u>

XVII. AWARDS AND HONORS:

<u>DATES</u>	<u>JOURNAL NAME</u>

XVIII. INVITED PRESENTATIONS:

International location:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TOPIC/TITLE</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>

National location:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TOPIC/TITLE</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>

Regional/local location:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TOPIC/TITLE</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>

XIX. BIBLIOGRAPHY:

A. Peer-reviewed publications in print or other media (*Use a standard format that includes list of ALL authors, date of publication, title of publication, journal/book name, volume (number) and inclusive pages or appropriate web address*).

Original articles:

1.

Reviews:

1.

Book chapters:

1.

Letters to the editor:

Abstracts:

B. Non-peer-reviewed publications in print or other media (*Use a standard format that includes list of ALL authors, date of publication, title of publication, journal/book name, volume (number) and inclusive pages or appropriate web address*).

Original articles:

1.

Reviews:

1.

Book chapters:

1.

Letters to the editor:

Abstracts:

1.

XX. Personal Statement:

Please highlight in ~1-3 pages those accomplishments that best define your contributions to the academic mission of DMS. Include your educational, clinical and research activities, as well as your goals. Use this space to describe activities that may benefit from a more substantive description than the entries listed in your CV.

Updated by: