DOSSIER DOs & DON’Ts

A CHECKLIST TO SUPPLEMENT THE GUIDE TO THE PROMOTION PROCESS

Formatting CVs
- Follow format in the dossier template, including listing publications in chronological order.
- List all publication information, including sequence of authors, title, journal, page numbers, and years.
- Clearly distinguish peer-reviewed from other publications.
- Only list pending or awarded grants and identify sources of funding (federal, state, industry, and foundations).
- Make sure the list of collaborators is complete.

Tabulating Workload Assignments
- Workload summaries should not include evaluative comments.
- Administrative, clinical, and extension duties should be distinguished from other service commitments.
- The summary should explain what counts towards research, teaching, and service activities.
- It should identify the number of course units per year required for the teaching assignment.
- Summaries should be prepared by heads and cosigned by candidates.

Soliciting External Reviews
- Use the current required template letter for soliciting external reviews in Appendix D. If modified, request permission for modification from Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs before sending to solicit external reviewers.
- Reviewers must have rank equal or superior to the title candidates are being reviewed for promotion.
- Letters should not come from individuals who have coauthored with candidates in the last five years.
- Such individuals should submit collaborator letters, which come right after external reviews in dossiers.
- Dossiers should contain 3 to 8 letters. If one or more are found to be collaborators or not rank eligible it strongly suggested to include at least 5 letters.
- No more than half of the external letters can be from the candidate’s list.

Forming Committees
- Department heads/directors and committee members should not have coauthored or collaborated closely with the candidate.
- Committees for candidates with shared appointments must have a member from the secondary departments.
- Administrators at dean’s level cannot serve on department committees.
- Department heads/directors going up for promotion cannot be reviewed by those in their department/unit of oversight.

Reviewing Teaching
- A separate and thorough memo evaluating the teaching/teaching portfolio must be included in section 7 that is signed by all members of the committee.
- TCE Reports (Comparison and Comments) should be discussed in the committee teaching evaluation memo.
- Committee members should draw up representative comments from students.
- Reviews of teaching should be conducted by rank-eligible faculty whenever possible.
- Observation reports should use the observation tools through the Office of Instruction & Assessment (OIA).
- Candidates may request that teaching portfolios be sent to external reviewers.

Reviewing Service
- Candidates who have major service and outreach duties should document their work in a service portfolio.
- Service portfolios should include assessments of outcomes and impact.
- Candidates may request that their service portfolios be sent to external reviews.

Recognizing Interdisciplinary Collaborations and Shared Appointments
- If the candidate is active in a GIDP, an evaluation from the GIDP chair must be included.
- Review committees should include representatives from GIDPs and joint appointment departments.
- Heads reviewing candidates with shared appointments may collaborate on a letter or submit separate reviews.

Completing Reviews
- Complete reviews by suggested deadlines to avoid disrupting candidates’ reviews.
- Reviews should identify candidates’ contributions with units’ criteria and mission.
- Assessments of research, teaching, and service should be weighted according to candidates’ workloads.
- If appropriate for the discipline, citation indices and impact factors can be used as benchmarks.
- Negative comments in external reviews must be addressed.
- Note strengths and weaknesses, include numbered vote count from committees and/or faculty, as well as minority statements for split votes.