

SUMMARY GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF DUKE-NUS FACULTY DOSSIERS FOR REVIEW BY UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE (UPTC)

(A) Types of Faculty Appointment Reviewed by UPTC

S/N	Faculty Appointment Type	Proposed Faculty Academic Rank
1	Appointment + Award of Tenure	Associate Professor / Professor
2	Promotion + Award of Tenure	Associate Professor / Professor
3	Promotion of Tenured Faculty	Professor E.g. Promotion from tenured Associate Professor to tenured Professor
4	Award of Tenure	Associate Professor / Professor

(B) Dossier Requirements

The dossier must clearly identify how the candidate has distinguished himself / herself in research, education and service. It is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate the level of quality of his / her work and to provide evidence of achievements.

If a dossier has been through review by the Duke-NUS Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee and Dean but has yet to be submitted to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC), the candidate will be allowed to update his / her dossier only once by detailing such new material in an Addendum which would be submitted to the UPTC as a separate write-up to the dossier.

1. APT Cover Letter

This letter is from the Signature Research Programme (SRP) Director / Academic Clinical Programme (ACP) Chair / Head of Office (HOO) of Education to the Duke-NUS APT Committee.

The APT cover letter should also include:

- (i) The current Duke-NUS faculty appointment academic rank that the candidate is holding and the date that he / she was appointed at or promoted to this current academic rank.
- (ii) New / additional / expanded / major contributions and achievements made by the candidate from his / her last appointment / promotion till to-date that will warrant the proposed promotion or award of tenure.
- (iii) A summary of the discussion and recommendations by the SRP / ACP Nomination and Appointment Committee (NAC) on the candidate's proposed appointment / promotion, including the votes cast by the NAC members.

Please refer to [“Template – APT Cover Letter For Regular Rank Faculty Appointment / Promotion”](#)

2. Academic Council (AC) Cover Letter

The AC cover letter is required for:

- (i) Associate Professor and Professor level appointment / promotion; AND
- (ii) Candidates whose proposed appointment / promotion reside in an ACP.

3. CV

For new faculty appointments where the candidate has not joined Duke-NUS, please use [“Template – Duke-NUS / SingHealth CV”](#)

For promotion and / or tenure review of existing faculty members, CVs submitted must be in the Faculty Profile System (FPS) generated CV format. The online FPS can be accessed through: <https://inetapps.duke-nus.edu.sg/fps/home/#/>

- (i) For Associate Professor with Tenure and Full Professor with Tenure, CVs of candidates should include the following publication information:
 - (a) H-index
 - (b) Journal Impact Factor of every journal that the candidate had published in for the last 5 years (and further back if the candidate wishes)
 - (c) [Optional] Number of citations for every publication that the candidate had published
- (ii) For the **“Top 10 Publications”** section of the CV:
 - (a) Indicate the candidate’s role and contributions for each of the top 10 publications.
 - (b) Provide 3 - 5 sentences on the impact of the paper for each of the top 5 publications (e.g. how the findings in the publication had impacted the research field / medical practice / medical education / pedagogical approach, etc).

4. Intellectual Development Statement (IDS) [5 – 10 pages; no specific template]

- (i) The onus is on the candidate to present the case compellingly with evidence and how the different pieces of evidence converge to support the case for promotion and / or award of tenure.
- (ii) The IDS should not be just bare-bone facts regurgitated from information that is already provided in the CV.

- (iii) The IDS must start by identifying the body of work that has made significant impact on the candidate's standing and reputation in the field. The body of work must be described succinctly in concrete terms to demonstrate how impact has been recognized by the international peer community and / or industry, society, etc (if applicable).
- (iv) The description of specific contributions deemed impactful should be supported by multiple independent and convergent sources of evidence. The candidate is expected to provide the proper context to explain the significance of the evidence (e.g., funding support for an important invited talk/keynote, editorial board membership of the top journal in the field). The candidate is strongly advised to select the most significant evidence that would attract the attention of the referees, rather than providing a comprehensive list without emphasis and context to understand significance.
- (v) Below are **examples (what did you do, and why is it important and impactful)** of considerations that can guide the candidate to make a case for research impact and leadership:
 - Research productivity, activities, and accomplishments - besides describing your body of work, clearly demarcate which parts of your scholarly outputs and achievements are attributable to work conducted after your last appointment, promotion, and/or tenure
 - Research impact in academia (e.g., citations), industry (e.g., patents and licensing of technology, competitive start-up funding, entrepreneurship), society, public policy, economy, environment, culture or other impact domains as appropriate
 - International research leadership in the field including but not restricted to awards, invited talks, keynotes, editorial board membership, conference program committees
 - Research independence from the Masters, PhD, post-doctoral thesis advisors and / or regular senior co-authors. Please provide a list of their names. Note: independence in developing a core body of work is ideally demonstrated through convergence of multiple indicators in the form of authorship, grantsmanship, graduate supervision, etc. The overall intent is to demonstrate primary ownership spanning origin of the creative ideas to bringing resources (grants, students, equipment, etc.) and intellectual leadership to realize these ideas in a concrete way to achieve quality outcomes (e.g., papers in top journals). The entire body of work may consist of this core and a collaborative body of work. Evidence of collaboration that expands the reach and impact of this core body of work is an advantage.
 - Holistic and relevant comparison with relevant peers of comparable standing in leading research universities that is aligned to measures of excellence broadly accepted in a discipline.
 - Provide a citation analysis to demonstrate research impact
 - Sustained upward research trajectory with significant progression from previous appointment, promotion, tenure
 - Future plans: plans and evidences for continuing development and expected significant contributions in the future.
 - others

- (vi) Below are **examples** of considerations that can guide the candidate to make a case for teaching impact and leadership with a focus on:
- (a) *self*: evidence of a range of educational activities and accomplishments made as a result of continuing development as a teacher after your last appointment or promotion
 - (b) *others*: evidence of accomplishments beyond the classroom, i.e., educational leadership (e.g., curriculum review, mentorship, awards, keynote invitations, key membership of high level education committees)
 - (c) *scholarship*: educational scholarship independent from or in collaboration with senior co-authors (e.g., education-related articles and / or presentations, textbook, innovative pedagogy and / or educational material, conference program committees, funded education projects)
 - (d) *future plans*: plans for continuing development, with significant progression from previous appointment or promotion and expected significant contributions in the future

5. Referee Requirements

- (i) For the required number of reference letters and the definition of an arm's length referee for appointment / promotion with the award of tenure, please refer to ["Reference Letter Requirement Criteria for Duke-NUS \(A\) Faculty, \(B\) Principal Research Scientist / Senior Principal Research Scientist and \(C\) Faculty \(Named Donor\) / Distinguished / Emeritus Professor Appointments"](#)
- (ii) Evaluation by referees form an integral part of the evaluation process. Referees should be carefully selected, as they must be able to comment in a discriminating and objective way on the candidate's current research and / or other professional work. The candidate should be informed that their nominated referees must be at adequate arm's length and to submit a statement declaring their relationships with their referees. A one-page biography of each referee must be included. They should be from established reputable institutions, holding positions equivalent or higher in rank than that for which the candidate is being considered, and should be in active academic / professional service. Non-academic persons of comparable standing, such as senior research staff in reputable organizations or equivalent may also be selected as referees.
- (iii) Please refer to ["Template – Letter to Referee Requesting For Reference Letter for Candidate \(UPTC Review\)"](#)
- (iv) Letters should ordinarily be solicited from referees who are in peer institutions or better. A general guideline may be 4 to 5 letters from **peer institutions** and 1 to 2 from **aspirant institutions**. It should be specified as to which letters are from peer institutions and which are from aspirant institutions. There may be referees who are not from a peer or an aspirant institution, but have a very high international reputation and impact in a field relevant to the candidate. This is allowable. Those nominating referees should explain their choice.

As a guide, the top 20 universities listed in the latest Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings can be referenced as aspirant institutions,

while universities ranked from 21st to 100th can be referenced as peer institutions.

For tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the referees should at least be at the Associate Professorial level. If Associate Professors are called upon to be referees, they must themselves be tenured. For promotion from Associate Professor to full Professor, the referees should be at the full Professorial level.

- (v) It may also be beneficial to hear from collaborators and pre- and post-doctoral supervisors, e.g. about relative contributions to joint work: any such letters should be beyond the minimum of 6 required.

(vi) Appointment to Associate Professor or Professor with tenure

- (a) There must be 6 or more letters of evaluation from referees, whereby up to half of the letters can come from referees suggested by the candidate. The rest of the letters should be from referees suggested by the Search Committee, independent of the candidate.
- (b) Evaluations should not be obtained from referees with conflict of interest unless there are good reasons for doing so, such as to solicit inputs on the relative contributions in joint work. In such a case, the relationship between the candidate and the referee should be clearly disclosed, and any such letters should be beyond the minimum of six.
- (c) The candidate and the Search Committee shall each submit names of 6 possible referees to the SRP Director / ACP Chair. The Search Committee shall not duplicate the names from the candidate's list. The SRP Director / ACP Chair shall select an equal number of referees, minimum of 3, from each of the two lists submitted, and write to them for their evaluation of the candidate. The SRP Director / ACP Chair should avoid using more than one referee from each institution and referees who are no longer research-active. The SRP Director / ACP Chair may also request for additional names of referees from the Duke-NUS APT Committee and Dean to supplement the list from the Search Committee before he / she makes the selection. Additional referees may be added to the list in place of those who fail to respond or decline the task. The Duke-NUS APT Committee and the UPTC may also request additional letters of evaluation, if necessary.

(vii) Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor with tenure, or the award of tenure

- (a) There must be 6 or more letters of evaluation from referees, whereby up to half of the letters can come from referees suggested by the candidate. The rest of the letters should be from referees suggested by the SRP / ACP NAC, independent of the candidate.

- (b) Evaluations should not be obtained from referees with conflict of interest unless there are good reasons for doing so, such as to solicit inputs on the relative contributions in joint work. In such a case, the relationship between the candidate and the referee should be clearly disclosed, and any such letters should be beyond the minimum of six.
- (c) The candidate and the SRP / ACP NAC shall each submit names of 6 possible referees to their Duke-NUS HOO. The NAC shall not duplicate the names from the candidate's list. The HOO shall select an equal number of referees, minimum of 3, from each of the two lists submitted. The HOO should avoid selecting referees who were previously referees in the candidate's earlier application for promotion and / or tenure, and avoid using more than one referee from each institution and referees who are no longer research-active. The SRP Director / ACP Chair shall write to them for their evaluation of the candidate. The HOO may also request for additional names of referees from the SRP Director / ACP Chair and / or Duke-NUS APT Committee to supplement the list from NAC before making the selection. The letters of evaluation from referees will be forwarded to the NAC upon receipt. Additional referees may be added to the list in place of those who fail to respond or decline the task. The Duke-NUS APT Committee and the UPTC may also request additional letters of evaluation, if necessary.

(viii) Order of arrangement of Reference Letters in candidate's dossier

When compiling candidate's dossier, please note that the order of the reference letters in the candidate's dossier should be arranged in the same order as the list of names in the External Reviewer Summary table.

6. Peer Benchmarking Report

- (i) Once there are enough reference letters solicited, the Search Committee Chair or SRP / ACP NAC Chair should send an e-mail to RAD with the following names:
 - (a) Candidate
 - (b) NUS faculty members (in related research area) who were promoted to the same rank and track as the candidate in the past 5 years
 - (c) Peers identified by the candidate (3 to 5 pax; optional for appointments)
 - (d) Peers identified by the Search Committee or SRP / ACP NAC (3 to 5 pax)
 - (e) Peers identified by the referees in their letters
 - (f) Names and institutions of the referees

Search Committee / NAC Chair to fill out the benchmarking template and submit the completed benchmarking template to RAD for onward submission to Office of Data and Intelligence (ODI) at NUS Office of the Senior Deputy President & Provost (PVO), who will then generate the candidate's peer benchmarking report. Please refer to "[Template – Peer Benchmarking \(UPTC Review\)](#)"

Note: For the purpose of identifying names of NUS faculty members (in related research area) who were promoted to the same rank and track in the past 5 years for the peer benchmarking template, the UPTC Secretariat can assist with the provision of names of proposed NUS peers should the SRP/ ACP Search Committee / NAC require assistance. To do so, UPTC Secretariat:

1. Has provided a list of NUS Departments for Duke-NUS' reference.



NUS List of
Departments for Duke

2. Will require Duke-NUS to indicate the NUS Departments where the candidate's areas of research would be more compatible to those of peers in the NUS Departments.

SRP/ ACP Search Committee / NAC can indicate which NUS Departments are suitable for NUS peers to be identified from for the candidate's peer benchmarking report to RAD. RAD will then connect with the UPTC Secretariat for names of proposed NUS peers to be incorporated into the candidate's benchmarking report. This process will generally take about 3 weeks from the date of submission of the NUS departments to UPTC by RAD.

- (ii) The PVO ODI will conduct independent research benchmarking for all candidates for promotion and / or tenure and appointments through a systematic analytical process. The PVO ODI research benchmarking takes into consideration the comparable level of academic experience (e.g., rank, year of PhD, research community, etc.) of the candidate and peer comparators. It also makes more explicit reference to the peer and aspirant institutions identified in the endorsed department research benchmarking report, if any.
- (iii) ODI will only select additional comparators if less than 9 peer names were submitted or most of the peer names came from one source.

The criteria for ODI's selection are as follows:

- (a) Co-authors of the referees
- (b) Past doctoral students of the referees
- (c) Junior faculty members who work in the same university and department as the referees

Should ODI again fail to obtain enough peers, they will find additional peer researchers from the cognate departments of the following universities:

- (1) Peer and aspirant universities according to the Endorsed Department Research Benchmarking report
- (2) For departments that do not have endorsed department research benchmarking reports, ODI will identify peer and aspirant universities by

referring to the Times Higher Education (THE) ranking and QS Subject Ranking in the subject areas of the candidate

In all cases, the peers are selected only if they graduated around the same time as the candidate (+/- 5 years approximately) and currently hold the position to which the candidate is applying.

ODI will generate the benchmarking bibliometrics from Scopus, SciVal and NUS Elements and write a report with their analysis. ODI will send the benchmarking report that explains their methodology and analysis to RAD upon completion. The entire process will take 2 weeks from the date of submission of the peer names to ODI by RAD.

- (iv) After RAD receives the peer benchmarking report from ODI, RAD will forward it to the respective Search Committee Chair or SRP / ACP NAC Chair who had submitted the benchmarking template to RAD. The respective Search Committee / NAC Chair can then compile the peer benchmarking report into the candidate's dossier.

(C) External Reviewer (ER) Summary Table

A standalone copy of the External Reviewers (ER) Summary table (Including names & affiliations of **ALL** ERs nominated by the candidate and Duke-NUS) with indications of whether the ERs were selected by Duke-NUS, status of ERs (e.g. accepted / declined / did not respond / accepted but did not submit letter / did not invite), and date of ER letters received, should be submitted to RAD together with the candidate's dossier. Please note that the ER Summary table **MUST** include information of **ALL** ERs (i.e. those who accepted / declined / did not respond / accepted but did not submit letter / did not invite).


Please refer to [“Template-External Reviewers Summary Table”](#)

Note:

External reviewer in NUS' context is the equivalent of external referee in Duke-NUS' context.

(D) Additional Documents Required for submission to UPTC

The following additional documents are required for submission to the UPTC together with the candidate's dossier. Please note that the additional documents will have to be submitted to RAD before RAD can submit the candidate's dossier to UPTC for review.

S/N	Documents	Template
1	<p>A list of all the internal reviewers (including names and affiliations of APT Committee members and vote counts) who had reviewed the candidate's case.</p> <p>(Note: Please refer to the “Template-List of Internal Reviewers for UPTC Review” and modify accordingly, if needed. RAD will fill up the information in the “APT</p>	 <p>Template-List of Intrnl Reviewers for</p>

	Comm” tab after the completed Excel file is submitted to RAD.)	
2	PDF copies of top 10 publications listed in candidate’s CV	-
3	Student feedback reports for most recent 3 years, if any (If there isn’t any for the most recent 3 years, older ones will suffice as well.).	-
4	Sample letter of invitation to ER (to an ER who provided letter).	-
5	One-page biography of each of the ER who provided letters. Note: Order of the one-page biography of each ER who provided letter should be arranged in the same order as the list of names in the ER Summary table.	-
6	Peer review reports of teaching, if any.	-