

Frequently Asked Questions

Reference Letter Requirements

Q. What are considered 'stronger' letters? Are there benchmarks we can take reference from?

- A.** Reference letters where the referees (of reputable standing in the field and from renowned institutions) can attest and provide glowing tribute to the candidate's achievements as well as the quality, significance and impact of his / her work on the research, education, service and / or professional fronts, are considered strong letters. If the referees indicate in their letters that the candidate is a global leader / master clinician / master educator in the field and ranks in the top 1 – 5% of scholars in his / her stage of career, etc, such letters will be considered strong letters.

Q. How many more than the minimum would be considered 'better'? To what extent is quantity important?

- A.** It is the quality of the reference letters that matters. Of course, the minimum no. of reference letters required for the different faculty appointment types, academic ranks and tenure types will need to be adhered to.

Q. What are the best practices for ACP to adopt when soliciting reference letters. E.g. Mechanism to determine referees, mix of referees, learning from university practices, etc.

- A.** 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, High Court judges or equivalent may also be selected as reviewers. Letters should ordinarily be solicited from reviewers who are in peer institutions or better. There may be external reviewers 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. All reviewers are appointed as experts in the field who are able to offer an objective, scholarly and confidential evaluation of the candidate.

Q. Can reference letters be reused despite difference in proposed academic rank, track and/ or tenure status?

- A.** New Reference Letters to be solicited for revised proposed academic rank, track and / or tenure status

ACPs are requested to be certain of the faculty academic rank, track and / or tenure status that they would like to propose their candidates for, before the ACPs send the request for reference letters to the referees. If the ACPs subsequently wish to propose an academic rank, track and / or tenure status for their candidates which differs from those for which reference letters had already been sought for the original proposed rank, track and / or tenure status, new (i.e. fresh) reference letters clearly stipulating the revised proposed academic rank, track and / or tenure status should be solicited.

Dossier Submissions

Q. Which sections of the CV is compulsory during submission?

- A. All sections are highly essential and information accuracy is considered by the committee during review. The following are examples that needs to be avoided.

Example 1: The candidate stated “Corresponding and last author”, but under the List of Authors, the candidate was listed as “2nd-to-last”.

Top 10 Publications (*Section 9C of the Duke-NUS SingHealth CV*)

Rank	Article Title	List of Authors with candidate's name in bold	Publication Name	Edition No.	Publication Year	Remarks (*Indicate Candidate's Role and Contribution)
1	Article A	Author 1, Author 2, Author 3, Author 4, Candidate , Author 6	Journal X	Not Applicable	201X	Corresponding and last author.

Example 2: Role of the **candidate** was not defined in Projects A and B, and only listed in Project C.

Other Intellectual Property (Trademark / Copyright / Patent) (*Section 10H of the Duke-NUS SingHealth CV*)

Registration / Publication Date	Type of IP	Title	Inventor(s)	Registration / Publication No	Country	Patent Office
Date	Patent	Project A	Inventor A Co-Inventor B Co-Inventor C	PCT12345	USA	USPTO
Date	Patent	Project B	Inventor D Co-Inventor C Co-Inventor E	67890W	SINGAPORE	IPOS
Date	Patent	Project C	Inventor B Candidate Co-Inventor F	88888X	UK	Others

Q. Do I need to provide an exact breakdown for the time commitment for the various activities?

- A. For candidates proposed for Associate Professor and Professor on Clinician-Scientist Track, it would be essential to provide a breakdown in clinical versus research activities and list previous and current year clinical activity - type of practice and estimate of time commitment in Section 13 of the Duke-NUS SingHealth CV, included here for clarity:

Clinical Activities (*Section 13 of Duke-NUS SingHealth CV*)

<u>Type of Practice</u>	<u>Commitment %</u>	<u>From</u> <u>(DD/MM/YYYY)</u>	<u>To</u> <u>(DD/MM/YYYY)</u>