



## Campus Administrative Policy Statement

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion</b>
Source:	Office of the Provost
Prepared by:	Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs
Approved by:	Mark Alan Heckler Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Effective Date:	July 8, 2005
Replaces:	August 5, 2004

---

### A. Introduction

Consistent with the Laws of the Regents and University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements, UCDHSC, Downtown Denver, has adopted policies and procedures designed to provide a thorough and fair review of all tenure-track and tenured faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. All reviews occur at various levels: primary unit, college/school or library, campus, President, and Board of Regents. Primary units, colleges, schools, and the library have policies and procedures for reviewing and recommending candidates. This administrative policy statement specifies the policies and procedures for reviewing and recommending candidates at each level.

#### 1. Faculty Rights and Privileges

A candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion has specific rights and privileges in the review process. These are described in the Faculty Handbook, [http://www.cusys.edu/faculty/fac\\_handbook/](http://www.cusys.edu/faculty/fac_handbook/), and in the Standards, Processes, and Procedures Document, Appendix A to the Laws of the Regents, <http://www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/AppendixA.html>.

#### 2. Standards for Pre-Tenure Faculty

- a. Each college or school and the library have written *Standards for Pre-Tenure Faculty* which are to be made available to all tenure track faculty at the time of the initial appointment and at the beginning of any year in which a tenure track faculty member is to be considered for comprehensive reappointment review, tenure, or promotion.
- b. At the beginning of every academic year, the Dean shall provide a copy of the college's, school's, or library's *Standards for Pre-tenure Faculty* to the Provost and to the Chair of the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee.

## **B. Table of Contents**

- A. Introduction
- B. Table of Contents
- C. Policy Statement
- D. Schedule for Reviews
- E. Standards for Review
- F. Dossiers
- G. Candidate Responsibilities
- H. Limitation on Reviewer Participation
- I. Primary Unit Responsibilities
- J. External Reviewer Letters
- K. Dean's Responsibilities
- L. The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee
- M. Decisions by the Provost
- N. Decisions by the Chancellor

## **C. Policy Statement**

All evaluations of tenure track faculty at all levels for comprehensive reappointment review and for tenure and promotion must be conducted in accordance with this policy.

## **D. Schedule for Reviews**

### **1. Appointment Length**

Tenure-track appointments are for an initial four-year appointment with eligibility for a three-year reappointment, contingent upon a successful comprehensive reappointment review.

### **2. Requirement for Comprehensive Review**

- a. Assistant Professors are required to undergo comprehensive reappointment review before they may be considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
- b. For Associate Professors tenure-track, the review that determined the specification of that rank during the hiring process may constitute the comprehensive review.

### **3. Timing of Reviews**

- a. Reappointment and tenure reviews normally take place in the last year of the current appointment.
- b. The comprehensive reappointment review is conducted in the fourth year of the initial four-year appointment. If the comprehensive reappointment review is unsatisfactory, the fifth year is the terminal year.
- c. Regental rules regarding tenure provide for review in the seventh year and, if tenure is approved, the award of tenure at the beginning of the eighth year. For candidates denied tenure, the eighth year is the terminal year.

### **4. Failure to Submit a Dossier**

A faculty member who (1) declines or fails to submit a dossier for review at the scheduled time or (2) submits a dossier with missing material is deemed not to apply for reappointment or tenure. In this situation, the faculty member's appointment terminates at the end of the existing contract. There is no terminal year beyond the end of the existing contract.

## **5. Request for Early Consideration for Tenure**

Tenure-track faculty members must have been teaching at UCDHSC, Downtown Denver, for at least three years and have undergone comprehensive review as specified in B.2, above, before they may apply for tenure consideration. A primary unit may require that a faculty member wait until the seventh year to apply for tenure.

## **6. Deadlines**

- a. Dossiers and related materials for candidates under review are due in the Office of the Provost no later than the Wednesday immediately preceding/falling on January 15. College, school, and library deadlines must be sufficiently early in the fall term to meet this deadline. In the case of mid-year appointments, consult with the Office of the Provost regarding the date dossiers are due.
- b. Deans who wish to submit dossiers to the Office of the Provost after the due date (see preceding paragraph) must submit a request for a delay in the submission date, in writing, to the Provost and the Chair of the campus-level RTP Committee.

## **E. Standards for Review**

### **1. Tenure**

- a. Tenure-track faculty members must have been teaching at UCDHSC, Downtown Denver, for at least three years and have undergone comprehensive review as specified in B.2., above, before they may apply for tenure consideration.
- b. Tenure may be awarded only for demonstrated meritorious performance in each of teaching, research/creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or research/creative work.

### **2. Promotion**

- a. *Associate Professor.* At UCDHSC, Downtown Denver, the review for promotion to Associate Professor occurs at the same time as the tenure review. There is no consideration for promotion to Associate Professor separate from consideration for tenure. Promotion to Associate Professor requires considerable successful teaching experience and promising accomplishment in research. Occasionally, experienced individuals are hired as tenure-track Associate Professors.
- b. *Professor.* Promotion to Professor requires (a) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and (c) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.

## F. Dossiers

### 1. Color of Dossier

Colleges, schools, and the library provide each candidate with up to three, three-ring binders, color-coded as follows:

Architecture and Planning	gray	Engineering	red
Arts and Media	royal blue	Liberal Arts & Sciences	green
Auraria Library	brown	Public Affairs	black
Business	maroon		
Education	pale blue		

### 2. Content of Dossier

- a. *Organization.* Dossiers are organized with dividers into specific sections, with each section containing the necessary relevant information. Omitted sections or sections without documentation are detrimental to the candidate.
- b. *Limitation.* Dossiers are limited to three (3), three-ring binders. The first binder contains all essential information. Supporting documentation, such as actual FCQ's, must be submitted in separate binders. Sample dossiers are available for review in the Center for Faculty Development.
- c. *Presentation of material.* Material in the dossier must be presented in an easily readable form without having to be removed from the dossier. Material is not to be presented in three-hole punched plastic sleeves.
- d. *Labeling of material.* Each dossier must be separately tabbed by section with text, not alpha or numeric labels.
- e. *Order of material.* Each dossier must contain the following material in the order listed below. If material is omitted or is not in the order specified, the Office of the Provost will return the dossier to the Dean's office without referring it to the RTP Committee.
  - (1) Dossier Checklist
  - (2) Form UCD-7
  - (3) Primary Unit Criteria
  - (4) All previous RTP and personnel action letters for the candidate
  - (5) Primary unit's evaluation, vote, and recommendation  
If vote not unanimous, explanation and possible minority report
  - (6) First level review evaluation, vote, and recommendation  
If vote not unanimous, explanation and possible minority report
  - (7) Dean's evaluation and recommendation
  - (8) Candidate's summary statement and Professional Plan

- (9) Candidate's current vita (in the required format contained in Appendix A), prominently tabbed
- (10) Letters from external evaluators, if required
  - Summary table of reviewers contacted, with information on each, and indicating which were recommended by candidate and by primary unit, and which provided letters
  - Explanation of how reviewers were chosen
  - Explanation if total number of reviewers fails to meet requirements
  - Explanation if ratio of candidate's to primary unit's fails to meet requirements
  - Explanation of lack of geographical diversity, if applicable.
- (11) Teaching or Librarianship
  - Committee or subcommittee report
  - Candidate's statement and summary table of courses taught, and numbers of students enrolled in each course
  - Summary of average overall course and overall instructor ratings from the Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) for all courses taught since arriving at UCDHSC, Downtown Denver
  - Other evaluative data (peer review, student letters, other)
  - Supporting material in a separate binder
  - FCQs (including student comments) in a separate binder
  - Sample syllabi
- (12) Research and Creative Work
  - Committee or subcommittee report
  - Candidate's statement
  - Clarification about the types of journals or venues in which the candidate's work has been published, performed, or displayed (refereed vs. non-refereed), the role of the candidate in multiple-authored/created works, and information about the quality of the venues in which the work has appeared (e.g., journal or gallery ratings)
  - Evaluative data (summary of publications, grants, awards, etc.)
  - Supporting material in a separate binder
- (13) Service
  - Committee or subcommittee report
  - Candidate's statement (including an explanation about any additional compensation received for service activities)
  - Supporting material in a separate binder

- f. *Supporting material.* Candidates are entitled to submit to the primary unit any relevant material or information that may be helpful in evaluating the candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. Dossiers may be accompanied by supporting materials such as books, monographs, refereed journal articles, photographs of works of art, etc. Supporting materials, if provided in separate binders, accompany the dossier, but are not part of it.
- g. *Adding material during the process.* If significant material is added to the dossier or information that could have changed the outcome of the primary unit or subsequent levels of review is provided at any stage in the review process beyond the primary unit level, the case must be reconsidered by all levels of review. Any reconsideration must be completed by the specified submission deadline to the Office of the Provost or the additional material or information cannot be included.

### 3. Return of dossiers

Dossiers and supporting documentation, except external letters, are returned to the candidate at the end of the RTP process.

## G. Candidate Responsibilities

### 1. General

- a. Candidates for reappointment, tenure, or promotion are responsible for ensuring that the material in the dossier:
  - (1) is NOT contained in plastic sleeves;
  - (2) is submitted in the order specified;
  - (3) is separately tabbed with text, not alpha or numeric, labels that are well-secured in their plastic tabs;
  - (4) is complete, accurate, and properly organized in the teaching, research/creative work, and service sections; and
  - (5) presents the strongest possible case.
- b. While the candidate is expected to provide information about his or her entire career, evaluations focus on activities since the date of the last appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

### 2. Dossier

- a. *Current Vita.* The vita must be current to the date of submission and must follow the format provided in the Appendices to this policy. See Appendix A for the vita format and Appendix B for a sample vita. Primary units shall not propose, require, or use different vita formats.
- b. *Summary Statement.* This is a two-to-three-page summary overview of the candidate's entire record, dossier, and plans for the future, including responses to any suggestions and/or recommendations made in prior RTP reviews.
- c. *Teaching.* Material related to teaching includes a statement of teaching philosophy and changes in teaching methods over the years, a summary report on the history of courses taught and the number of students in classes (see Appendix G), work with students outside the classroom, methods used to review teaching, grading practices, a summary of the student evaluations, and a response to the evaluation data. A summary of the average overall course and instructor ratings, from the Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) should be included. Actual FCQs for at least the most recent three (3) years must be provided in a separate binder. If a selection of actual FCQs is provided, the means of selection must be described.
- d. *Librarianship.* Library faculty include materials related to the practice of librarianship and work with students in that context.

- e. *Research and Creative Work.* Material related to research and creative work includes a statement describing the focus of the candidate's research/creative work to date, anticipated future directions, and information related to publications, performances, galleries, grants, and related research, scholarly and other creative activity. Where the candidate has co-authors, the candidate must explain the role of each co-author and the meaning of the order of co-authors' names. For refereed journals, some indication should be given about the level of the journal, e.g., the reputation of the journal; the circulation rate of the journal; the acceptance and rejection rates (include the number of submissions) for the journal, etc. Similarly, for creative work (performances or exhibitions), an attempt must be made to evaluate the venue. Creative work, like scholarship, must be peer-reviewed. Where the candidate has received support for research/creative activities (e.g., been granted course releases, bought out of teaching courses, or received separate compensation for the creation or preparation of a commercial product), that information must be disclosed and explained in detail.
- f. *Service.* Material related to service includes all significant professional service to the university, city, state, region, nation, and to professional associations. An explanation must be provided for any separately-compensated service.

## **H. Limitations on Reviewer Participation**

### **1. Participation at only one level of the process**

A faculty member may speak to and vote only at one level on a case undergoing review and may not be present during or contribute to or influence in any way discussion and vote on the case at any other levels of the process. For example, a faculty member serving on a review committee at any other level beyond the primary unit, who votes on a case in his/her primary unit, may not be present during and must not contribute in any way to or influence the discussion, and must abstain from and not be present during voting on the case when it is considered by the review committee beyond the primary unit. If the faculty member does not participate in the primary unit discussion and vote on the case, the faculty member may participate in the discussion and vote on the case at only one subsequent level.

### **2. Conflict of interest**

A member of the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee or a member of the campus-level RTP Committee may not be present during and must not contribute in any way to or influence the discussion, and must abstain from and not be present during voting on the case, where s/he has a conflict of interest with the candidate. A conflict of interest is defined to include, but is not limited to, being or having been an advocate for the candidate, having or having had a mentorship relationship with the candidate, being or having been a close colleague with the candidate, being or having been a collaborator with the candidate, or having a history of conflict with the candidate.

## **I. Primary Unit Responsibilities**

- 1. Department Chair/Primary Unit Head.** The Department Chair/Primary Unit Head is responsible for (a) fully advising candidates of the areas of performance that will be examined and other factors that have a material bearing on the decision, standards of performance that must be met, and primary unit criteria used in making decisions about performance; (b) ensuring that dossiers are reviewed and submitted to the college, school or library Dean's office in a timely fashion, and (c) re-reviewing cases, if required. The

Department Chair/Primary Unit Head is also responsible for overseeing the process by which external reviewers are selected and their evaluations utilized.

## **2. Dossier**

- a. *Primary Unit Criteria.* Criteria used by the primary unit in evaluating the candidate's record. In addition to traditional criteria, these criteria should include (1) evidence of productivity in the field to demonstrate that an candidate is at or above average in research/creative work productivity, (2) an explanation of how research/creative achievements that are not traditional (e.g., on the Internet) are considered and evaluated, and (3) a description of service expectations.
- b. *Previous RTP and Personnel Action Letters.* If the candidate has previously undergone RTP review, copies of the following must be included: (1) previous primary unit evaluations, votes, and recommendations; (2) previous first level review evaluations, votes, and recommendations; (3) previous Dean's evaluations and recommendations; (4) previous RTP Committee evaluations and recommendations; (5) previous Vice Chancellor's evaluations and recommendations.
- c. *Subcommittee Reports.* Evaluation letters prepared by faculty in the primary unit are included in the dossier with supporting material in the sections for teaching, research or creative work, and service. A unanimous vote is not required. Split votes must be explained and a minority report may be submitted.
- d. *Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers.* Confidential letters of evaluation from external reviewers are required for the comprehensive reappointment review, tenure review, and promotion review. See Section J below for complete information.

## **3. Primary Unit Summary, Vote, and Recommendation**

- a. The primary unit provides a thorough and careful evaluation of the candidate in the three areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service. The primary unit's role is to evaluate, not to advocate for, the candidate. It is essential that these evaluations carefully and thoroughly assess the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
- b. The vote must specify the number of faculty members present and the actual vote (e.g., six of eight faculty members were present and voted 4-2 in favor of promotion and tenure). A unanimous vote is not required. Negative comments or votes or split votes must be explained and a minority report may be submitted. A statement such as "we do/do not recommend reappointment" is not sufficient. See Appendix E for a sample primary unit letter.
- c. Following its bylaws, the primary unit must vote on the action under consideration, prepare a summary of the evaluation, and a recommendation for action, and include this information in the dossier.
  - (1) For Assistant Professors, the issue of tenure and promotion is one action requiring one decision.
  - (2) For Associate Professors without tenure, the issue of tenure is one action requiring one decision.
- d. The Department Chair/Head of the primary unit promptly informs the candidate orally of the primary unit's recommendation and provides the candidate with a copy of the

primary unit recommendation letter and the Chair's letter at the time the letters are inserted in the candidate's dossier.

- e. Form UCD-7. This form is completed and signed by the Department Chair/Head of the primary unit and placed in the appropriate section of the candidate's dossier.

## **J. Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers**

### **1. Affiliation and Location of External Reviewers**

- a. External reviewers should be faculty members at institutions outside the University of Colorado system. If a primary unit believes that a University of Colorado faculty member is the most appropriate external expert, the primary unit must provide a written rationale.
- b. External reviewers should be chosen from individuals and institutions that are widely dispersed geographically. If there are extenuating reasons why a number of external letters must come from a particular institution or region, the primary unit must provide a written rationale for selecting a geographically focused group of external reviewers.

### **2. Rank of External Reviewers**

- a. External reviewers for comprehensive reappointment review and promotion/tenure review should be tenured Associate or Full Professors
- b. For promotion to Professor, the external reviewers should be tenured Professors.
- c. Exceptions may be made when external reviewers hold high positions in education, business, government, or the arts.
- d. External reviewers should be asked to provide a current summary or short vita.

### **3. Candidate Nomination of External Reviewers**

- a. The candidate may recommend to the primary unit a list of potential external reviewers from which a reviewer or two may be chosen.
- b. Persons recommended by the candidate to write evaluation letters must not be relatives or close friends, mentors, dissertation advisors, or individuals with whom the candidate has a close professional or personal relationship.

### **4. Confidentiality**

- a. The names and institutional affiliations of external reviewers and their letters of evaluation are confidential and must not be divulged to or provided to the candidate.
- b. Copies of external evaluators' letters are retained only in the Office of the Provost and must not be retained in the department, division, or Dean's office.

### **5. Solicitation of External Letters**

- a. The primary unit or the Dean, not the candidate, must solicit external letters of evaluation.

- b. It is in the best interest of both the candidate and the primary unit if the external letters are solicited in late spring or early summer prior to the fall review.
- c. Several more evaluators than the minimum required should be contacted to determine their willingness to serve, since some evaluators agree to assist but never do.
- d. The external evaluators should be informed that their names, institutional affiliations, and letters are confidential and will not be divulged or provided to the candidate.
- e. Before the primary unit sends letters requesting the external evaluations, the Department Chair, Division Coordinator, Associate Dean, or Dean of the college, school, or library must approve the letters.
- f. See Appendix C for the format for letters to external evaluators for comprehensive reappointment review and Appendix D for the format for letters to external evaluators for promotion and tenure.

## **6. Nature of the External Letters**

- a. *External Letters for the Comprehensive Review.* External letters in these cases are to be of a constructive and counseling nature, rather than a rehearsal for tenure. At least three (3) external reviewers are required, with at most one (1) selected from the candidate's list, and at least two (2) selected outside the candidate's list.
- b. *External Letters for Promotion, Tenure, or Termination.* For promotion, tenure, termination, or any other review for which Regental action is required, at least six (6) external letters of evaluation are required, with at most two (2) selected from the candidate's list, and at least four (4) selected from outside the candidate's list.

## **7. Documentation of External Evaluations**

In the confidential external letters section of the candidate's dossier, the primary unit provides:

- a. a copy of the approved letter requesting external reviewer evaluation letters;
- b. full and complete documentation concerning:
  - (1) the selection of external reviewers;
  - (2) their credentials, including each evaluator's current summary or short vita;
  - (3) whether the candidate or the primary unit recommended the evaluator;
  - (4) the relationship, if any, of the evaluator to the candidate or to a member(s) of the primary unit;
  - (5) the rationale for selecting a geographically focused group of reviewers and/or a University of Colorado faculty member.
- c. See Appendix G for information on preparing a summary report on the reviewers.

## **K. Dean's Responsibilities**

## **1. First Level Review, Summary, Vote, and Recommendation**

- a. The appropriate body, as defined in the bylaws of the college, school, or library, reviews the candidate's dossier, votes on the proposed action, and forwards to the Dean an evaluation and a recommendation for action. The first level review is a thorough assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
- b. A member of the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee may not be present during and must not contribute in any way to or influence the discussion, and must abstain from and not be present during voting on the case, where s/he has a conflict of interest with the candidate. A conflict of interest is defined to include, but is not limited to, being or having been an advocate for the candidate, having or having had a mentorship relationship with the candidate, being or having been a close colleague with the candidate, being or having been a collaborator with the candidate, or having a history of conflict with the candidate.
- c. The vote must specify the number of members present and the actual vote (e.g., all three members were present and voted unanimously in favor of promotion and tenure). A statement such as "we do/do not recommend reappointment" is not sufficient. A unanimous vote is not required. Negative comments or votes or split votes must be explained and a minority report may be submitted.
- d. A copy of the review committee's letter is provided to the candidate at the time the letter is inserted in the candidate's dossier.

## **2. Dean's Recommendation**

- a. The Dean prepares an evaluation and recommendation for action that discusses the earlier reviews and points out areas of concern or disagreement. See Appendix F for a sample letter.
- b. The Dean should advise the Provost at the earliest opportunity of potentially problematic cases. If the Dean anticipates being unable to submit the dossier to the Provost's Office by the deadline (the Wednesday immediately preceding/following on January 15), s/he must request an extension, in writing, to the Provost and to the Chair of the RTP Committee.
- c. If the first level review committee and/or the Dean disagree with the recommendation of the primary unit, the Dean discusses the nature of the disagreement with the Chair of the primary unit. The primary unit reconsiders its original recommendation and reports the reconsidered judgment, in writing, to the Dean and the review committee. If due process will lead to a delay in the submission of the dossier, the Dean should notify the Provost's Office in writing and provide a probable time table for submission.
- d. Where differences of opinion exist among the primary unit, review committee, and/or Dean, a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and rationales for the various recommendations must be included in the Dean's letter to the Provost.
- e. The Dean promptly informs the Chair of the primary unit orally of the Dean's recommendation. The Chair of the primary unit promptly informs the candidate orally of the Dean's recommendation. The Dean provides the candidate with a copy of the Dean's letter to the Provost at the time the letter is inserted in the candidate's dossier.
- f. Form UCD-7. The Dean completes the appropriate section of the form and signs it.

- g. The Dean reviews the dossier to ensure all relevant information has been included, and prepared as specified in Section F above, completes and signs the dossier checklist, and forwards the complete dossier to the Provost's Office by the Wednesday in January preceding/falling on January 15.

## **L. The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee**

### **1. Membership**

- a. Faculty of the colleges and schools elect representatives to the RTP Committee. Each colleges, schools, and the library have one representative, except for CLAS, which has three representatives, who are from different departments. Colleges, schools, and the library are encouraged to consider the need for a diverse RTP Committee as they elect representatives to the committee.
- b. Faculty members of the RTP Committee, except for the library representative, must be tenured and hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Associate Professors may participate in considering and voting on applications for promotion to Professor.
- c. Faculty members may not serve on both the first level review committee and the RTP Committee.
- d. Faculty members who serve on the RTP Committee may not be considered for promotion to Professor while they are on the committee.
- e. Associate Deans and Department Chairs are not eligible to serve on the RTP Committee.
- f. Members of the RTP Committee must not be advocates for any candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, and their advocates must not discuss the candidate's case with members, including the Chair, of the CU-Denver RTP Committee, and vice versa.
- g. A member of the RTP Committee may not be present during and must not contribute in any way to or influence the discussion, and must abstain from and not be present during voting on the case, where s/he has a conflict of interest with the candidate. A conflict of interest is defined to include, but is not limited to, being or having been an advocate for the candidate, having or having had a mentorship relationship with the candidate, being or having been a close colleague with the candidate, being or having been a collaborator with the candidate, or having a history of conflict with the candidate.
- h. When faculty members agree to serve on the RTP Committee, they are expected to honor this commitment by attending all committee meetings during the spring semester.

### **1. Role and Responsibilities**

- a. The RTP Committee assists with the campus level review of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The committee is advisory to the Provost.
- b. The RTP Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating dossiers and making recommendations for all tenure-track candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and all tenured candidates for promotion to Professor. The committee makes

individual and collective judgments. The committee is guided by the standards, criteria, and guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion specified in the Laws and Policies of the Regents.

- c. All members of the RTP Committee review, vote on, and make recommendations on the following RTP actions:
  - (1) reappointment of assistant professors and associate professors without tenure
  - (2) comprehensive reappointment review required of each tenure-track assistant professor prior to the award of tenure
  - (3) promotion to associate professor and professor
  - (4) award of tenure
  - (5) appointments of new faculty members if they are requesting tenure and/or promotion at the time of the hiring
- d. Committee deliberations and votes are confidential. The Committee provides written recommendations to the Provost.

### **3. Procedures**

- a. The RTP Committee convenes early in the fall semester to review recent policy changes and to confirm the spring meeting schedule. Typically, the committee meets every Friday during the spring semester. All committee recommendations should be submitted to the Provost prior to May 31.
- b. Prior to all RTP Committee meetings at which candidate dossiers are considered, the Chair assigns specific dossiers to committee members or subgroups. The members with specific dossier assignments present those cases to the committee. The presenter is always from a unit different from that of the candidate. After confidential deliberation and vote, the committee prepares a written recommendation to the Provost.
- c. If the RTP Committee and the Provost disagree with the recommendation of the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee and/or the Dean, the Provost discusses the nature of the disagreement with the Dean. The Dean's Review/Advisory Committee and the Dean reconsider their original recommendations and report the reconsidered judgment to the Provost and the RTP Committee.

### **4. Role of the Provost's Office**

The Provost's Office administers the RTP process: receives and secures dossiers, establishes the RTP calendar, schedules committee meetings, records the votes and recommendations of the committee for each case, and provides to the President's Office a summary report of the decisions on cases considered for promotion and tenure.

### **M. Decisions by the Provost**

- 1. The RTP Committee submits written ~~positive or negative~~ recommendations to the Provost, who reviews the dossiers and recommendations and makes a decision on each case. The Provost makes a decision, subject to approval by the Chancellor.

2. If the RTP Committee and the Provost disagree with the recommendation of the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee and/or the Dean, the Provost discusses the nature of the disagreement with the Dean. The Dean's Review/Advisory Committee and the Dean reconsider their original recommendations and report the reconsidered judgment to the Provost and the RTP Committee.
3. The Provost communicates directly with the Dean about all negative decisions.
4. The Provost sends each candidate a copy of the RTP Committee's letter, which specifies strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation process. The Provost informs the candidate of his/her decision and may emphasize particular points made in the RTP Committee's letter. The Provost generally notifies each candidate of the decision by the end of the academic year.

#### **N. Decisions by the Chancellor**

The Chancellor reviews decisions and recommendations by the Provost and makes the final decision. The Chancellor does not forward negative decisions on tenure and/or promotion to the President's Office.

## VITA FORMAT

### **Name**

### **Education**

### **Professional Experience**

### **Refereed Publications, Exhibitions, Performances, etc.**

Categories will depend on discipline. Exhibitions and performances included in this section should be in reverse chronological order and should only be those where peer review or screening was involved. All scholarly publications must include complete bibliographical information WITH page numbers.

### **Books and Book Chapters**

### **Book Reviews**

### **Non-Refereed Publications, Exhibitions, Performances, etc.**

Reverse chronology including meeting abstracts, proceedings, etc., technical reports, popular articles, or other exhibitions and performances.

### **Publications/Creative Works in Preparation**

Indicate whether papers are in press, under revision, under review, or being written. Cite journal, etc., when appropriate. Indicate scheduled exhibitions and performances.

### **Courses Taught**

### **Presentations at Meetings and Seminars Presented**

Indicate whether invited.

### **Recognitions, Honors, etc.**

### **Professional Organizations**

Memberships and offices held in professional societies and associations.

### **Other Indicators of Scholarly and Creative Activity**

Other indicators (both internal and external) of the quality of your scholarly and creative activity: grants, contracts, etc.; support received; citations of papers; reviews of your works; purchases of your works by museums; etc.

### **Service**

Department, college/school/Library, and University committees and activities, including faculty governance; state and national government agencies; accreditation and program review site visits; committees of professional societies or associations; session chair at professional meetings; consulting.

**SAMPLE VITA****IMA ROCK STONE****Education**

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>Major</u>
University of Nebraska	19XX	B.A.	Physics
University of California-Berkeley	19YY	M.S.	Geology
Stanford University	19ZZ	Ph.D.	Geophysics

**Professional Experience**

19RR - present	Assistant Professor of Geology, University of Colorado at Denver
19ZZ - 19RR	Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Geology, Columbia University
19YY - 19ZZ	Research Assistant, Department of Geophysics, Stanford University
19BB - 19YY	Teaching Assistant, Department of Geology, University of California-Berkeley
19AA - 19BB	Student helper, Physical Science Division, University of Nebraska

**Referred Publications**

20GH	Stone, I.R. Historic cartographic evidence for Holocene changes in the Antarctic ice cover. <u>Science</u> 80:820-823.
20GH	Stone, I.R. Geologic hazards and educational outreach. Invited paper. <u>Geotimes</u> 39:16-18.
20GH	Stone, I.R. and A.B. Jones. Elgygytyn crater, Siberia: Probable source of Australian Tektites, comments on. <u>Meteoritics</u> 13:153-157.
20FG	Stone, I.R. Ancient rivers of the planet Mars. <u>J. Geological Education</u> 23:129-134
19FG	Stone, I.R. Possible origin and probable discharges of meandering channels on the planet Mars. <u>J. Geophysical Res.</u> 79:2061-2073.
19FG	Stone, I.R. Bottom-line disclosure and assessment. <u>Teaching Professor</u> , July-August.
19EF	Stone, I.R. Outcomes of education on geologic hazards in the international decade of natural hazards reduction. <u>The Professional Geologist</u> 30:11-12.
19EF	Stone, I.R. Seismic and gravity studies at the South Pole. <u>Geophysics</u> 31:582-592.
19EF	Stone, I.R. Students as colleagues: the case for student management teams. <u>The Department Chair</u> 4:14-16. Permission granted for reprinting in <u>The New Academic</u> .

- 19DE Stone, I.R. and R.A. Ralph. Reconnaissance of a newly discovered area of mountains in Antarctica. J. Geology 73:660-669.
- 19DE White, R.F. and I.R. Stone. Two recently discovered glaciers, Antarctica. Arctic 14:18-19.
- 19DE Stone, I.R. Victoria land traverse, Antarctica. Arctic 14:18-19.
- 19CD Stone, I.R. The Wilkes Land Anomaly: Evidence for a possible hypervelocity impact crater. J. Geophysical Res. 87:4732-4742.
- 19CD Stone, I.R. Anyone can teach earth science! *invited paper*, J. Geological Education 38:15-17.
- 19BC Stone, I.R. and R.F. White. Dry valleys of southern victoria land, Antarctica. J. Geology 70:520-531.
- 19AB Stone, I.R. Polar regions of the Pleistocene. J. Geology 69:482-510.
- 19AB Stone, I.R. A short excursion to the Germany Valley area--one of West Virginia's finest classrooms. Mountain State Geol. 20:30-35.

#### **Publications in Refereed Symposia Proceedings**

- 19GH Krogman, J.A., and Stone, I.R. Engineering management teams--can they work in the classroom? Proc. Amer. Soc. Engineering Education, North Midwest Section.
- 19FG Stone, I.R., and others. Involve your students in improving *their* teaching and learning community. 12th Annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching: The Greening of the Future, Oxford, Ohio, pp. 347-350.
- 19EF Stone, I.R., and others. Student management teams--applying group management concepts to the college classroom--a two hour workshop. The International Society for Exploring Teaching Alternatives (ISETA), Cocoa Beach, FL.
- 19DE Stone, I.R. Interdisciplinary programs for interdisciplinary problems--what makes them work? abs.: Eastern Sect. ASSMR Ann. Mtg. Program, April 1985. Also abs.: ASSMR Newsletter 1:8.
- 19CD Stone, I.R., and others. Involving students in building academic community through faculty development. 19CD POD Conference, Wesley Chapel, FL.

#### **Books and Book Chapters**

- 19FG Landslides and Slope Stability. Magill's Survey of Science Encyclopedia, Earth Science Series, pp. 1365-1374.
- 19EF Membership Directory of the American Institute of Professional Geologists, 208 pp.
- 19EF General Geophysics. Academic Press, 330 pp.
- 19DE Membership Directory of the American Institute of Professional Geologists, 192 pp.
- 19CD The Braggs and Development of X-Ray Diffraction. Magill's Great Events from History: Science and Technology, pp. 517-521.

## **Book Reviews**

19EF      The Evolving Earth by F.Y. Brown, Yale University Press. In: J. Geology 84:207.

## **Non-Refereed Publications**

19FG      Observations on the Planet Mars. Proceedings of the 19EF Annual Meeting of the Colorado Geological Society. Colorado Springs: 125.

## **Publications in Preparation**

In Press.      Stone, I.R. Antarctic warming trends. Geophysics.

In Review.      Black, W.R., and I.R. Stone. Surface shifting in Antarctic fault areas. J. Geophysical Res.

In Prep.      Stone, J.F. Mars rivers revisited.

## **Courses Taught**

Physical Geology I and II  
Physical Geology: Internal Processes  
Physical Geology: Surface Processes  
Colorado's Dynamic Geology  
Introduction to Oceanography  
Introductory Petrology  
Structural Geology  
Optical Mineralogy  
Mineral Resources in World Affairs  
Principles of Geomorphology  
Geology for Homeowners  
Seminar: Research and Writing in the Natural Sciences  
Introduction to Astrogeology  
Soil Chemistry of Hazardous Materials  
Soil Physics  
Volcanoes  
Mineralogy

## **Presentations at Meetings and Seminars Presented**

19FG      The Antarctic as a Laboratory - Invited seminar, University of California, Los Angeles.

19EF      Australian Tektites: Probable Sources - Annual Meeting, Geological Society of America, San Francisco.

19DE      Seismic studies at the South Pole - Annual Meeting, Geological Society of America, Chicago.

19DE      Mars and Its Rivers - Invited seminar, Colorado State University.

19CD      Glaciers of Antarctica: Why Study Them? The Colorado Geological Society, Golden.

19BC      The Wilkes Land Anomaly - Annual Meeting, Geophysical Society, Seattle.

19AB Polar regions of the Pleistocene. Annual Meeting, Geological Society of America, Washington, D.C.

### **Recognitions, Honors, etc.**

F.J. Pebble Award for the Outstanding Student Paper - 19XY. Geological Society of America.

### **Professional Organizations**

American Geophysical Union  
Geological Society of America  
American Association for the Advancement of Science  
Antarctican Society  
Rocky Mountain Association of Geologists  
American Institute of Professional Geologists  
Computer-Oriented Geological Society  
National Association of Geology Teachers  
International Society for Educational Teaching Alternatives

### **Other Indicators of Scholarship**

#### Research Support

19FG - HI National Science Foundation: Geomorphology of Antarctic Dry Valleys. \$130,000.  
19DE Julie B. Jones Foundation: Travel award to Antarctica. \$10,000.  
19BC National Geographic Society. Antarctic Expedition. \$30,000.

### **Service**

#### Department of Geology

19BC - FG Library Committee  
19FG - HI Chair, Seminar Committee  
19HI - JK Publicity Committee  
19JK - NP Equipment Committee

#### College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

19JK - LM College Council  
19LM Search Committee for Associate Dean

#### University

19JK Search Committee for Dean of Library  
19FG - HI Task Force on Research Support  
19LM - NP Graduate Council

#### State

19QR CCHE Faculty Productivity Committee

#### Professional Associations

19HI Time and Place Committee, Annual Meeting, Geological Society of America  
19LM Session Chair, Annual Meeting, Antarctican Society

**COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW**  
**Format for Letter from Chair or Dean to External Reviewer**

Dear Colleague:

On behalf of the Downtown Denver Campus of the University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center, I am writing to ask you to serve as an external reviewer of the research/creative work of Assistant Professor \_\_\_\_\_, who is being considered for reappointment at this time. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ is now in her/his fourth year as an assistant professor. During the seventh year, Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ will be considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor.

The University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center is the urban university of the three-university University of Colorado system and the only public university in the Denver metropolitan area. The Downtown Denver Campus serves approximately 23,000 students, whose average age is 30, over 85% work, and over 44% are graduate students. The Downtown Denver Campus offers 36 undergraduate degrees and 44 master's degrees through the Colleges of Architecture and Planning, Arts and Media, Engineering, and Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Schools of Business, Education and Human Development, and Public Affairs, and offers the Ph.D. in applied mathematics, civil engineering, health and behavioral sciences, educational leadership, planning and design, and public affairs. Classes are offered during weekday and evening hours, on weekends, at off-campus sites, and on-line. The Downtown Denver Campus values teaching and research equally, has a statutorily established applied research mission, and is expected to serve the complex higher education needs of its city, the region which depends on the city and, by extension, cities worldwide.

The University of Colorado requires that assistant professors undergo a comprehensive review before their evaluation for promotion and tenure. This comprehensive review must include evaluations from scholars in the candidate's field of specialization. Although the substance of your evaluation will be summarized for Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, you and your institution will not be identified. Your candor in evaluating Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s research/creative work will be greatly appreciated.

At this time, we are soliciting your evaluation of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s demonstrated research/creative accomplishments to date. *We ask that your letter be of a constructive and counseling nature, so that we may give Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ constructive suggestions as to the direction, quantity, and quality of work to be accomplished by the seventh year, when Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s tenure review will occur.*

For a successful comprehensive review, Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ should be making progress toward a viable research/creative work program which can be expected to have an impact on his/her field. Your evaluation is extremely valuable to us in making this assessment.

Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s teaching course load since the time of her/his appointment has been \_\_\_\_\_ [the specific load over several years and any reductions].

All reappointments, promotions, and awards of tenure at the University of Colorado consider the candidate's record in teaching, research/creative work, and university and public service. I have included a copy of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s current vita; his/her personal statements regarding teaching, research/creative work, and service; copies of the research papers/creative works s/he has submitted to us; and the Primary Unit Criteria used to evaluate Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s work.

In evaluating Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s research/creative work, please address each of the following points in order:

1. The nature of your acquaintance, if any, with Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ and your knowledge of and/or familiarity with his/her research/creative work prior to this request.
2. The quality and quantity of the research/creative work, especially in relationship to productivity in this field.
3. The main thrust(s) of the research/creative work and the impact of this research/creative work on this field.
4. The degree of creativity and originality of the research/creative work.
5. To what degree the research/creative work is evolving.
6. How Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s research/creative work and productivity compare with others with similar training and experience in this field.
7. How you would categorize Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s research/creative work accomplishments--below average, average, above average, or outstanding--compared to others in this field at a similar point in their careers.
8. What suggestions do you have for changes that Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ should make in planning and carrying out her/his research/creative work for the next three years?

As Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ will be evaluated by faculty outside of his/her department who may be unfamiliar with your career or field, please include a copy of a current *summary* vita with your evaluation letter.

If you have any questions concerning the comprehensive review, please call me at the telephone number listed below. I would appreciate receiving your evaluation no later than October 15.

Thank you very much for your willingness to assist the University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center in this very important academic review process.

**PROMOTION and TENURE**  
**Format of Letter from Chair or Dean to External Reviewer**

Dear Colleague:

On behalf of the University of Colorado at Denver, I am writing to ask you to serve as an external reviewer of the research/creative work of [Assistant Professor \_\_\_\_\_, who is being considered at this time for tenure and for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor] [or Associate Professor \_\_\_\_\_, who is being considered at this time for tenure]. We are soliciting your evaluation of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s demonstrated research/creative accomplishments to date.

The University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center is the urban university of the three-university University of Colorado system and the only public university in the Denver metropolitan area. The Downtown Denver Campus serves approximately 23,000 students, whose average age is 30, over 85% work, and over 44% are graduate students. The Downtown Denver Campus offers 36 undergraduate degrees and 44 master's degrees through the Colleges of Architecture and Planning, Arts and Media, Engineering, and Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Schools of Business, Education and Human Development, and Public Affairs, and offers the Ph.D. in applied mathematics, civil engineering, health and behavioral sciences, educational leadership, planning and design, and public affairs. Classes are offered during weekday and evening hours, on weekends, at off-campus sites, and on-line. The Downtown Denver Campus values teaching and research equally, has a statutorily established applied research mission, and is expected to serve the complex higher education needs of its city, the region which depends on the city and, by extension, cities worldwide.

The University of Colorado requires the research of candidates for tenure and promotion to be evaluated by scholars in the candidate's field of specialization. Although the substance of your evaluation will be summarized for Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, you and your institution will not be identified. Your candor in evaluating Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s research/creative work will be greatly appreciated.

All reappointments, promotions, and awards of tenure at the University of Colorado consider the candidate's record in teaching, research/creative work, and university and public service.

For promotion to associate professor and award of tenure in the seventh year, Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ must have (1) demonstrated meritorious performance in teaching, research/creative work, and service, and (2) demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research/creative work. Your evaluation is extremely valuable to us in making this assessment.

Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s teaching course load since his/her comprehensive review has been \_\_\_\_\_ [the exact average over the years, not what it would have been without reductions].

I have included a copy of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s current vita; his/her personal statements regarding teaching, research/creative work, and service; copies of the research papers/creative works s/he has submitted to us; and the Primary Unit Criteria used to evaluate Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s work.

In evaluating Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s research, please address each of the following points in order:

1. The nature of your acquaintance, if any, with Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ and your knowledge of and/or familiarity with his/her research/creative work prior to this request.

2. The quality and quantity of the research/creative work
3. The main thrust(s) of the research/creative work and the impact of this research/creative work on this field.
4. The degree of creativity and originality of the research/creative work.
5. The degree to which the research/creative work has evolved.
6. How Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s research/creative work and productivity compare with others with similar training and experience in this field.
7. How you would categorize Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s research/creative work accomplishments--below average, average, above average, or outstanding--compared to others in this field at a similar point in their careers.

As Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ will be evaluated by faculty outside of his/her department who may be unfamiliar with your career or field, please include a copy of a current *summary* vita with your evaluation letter.

If you have any questions concerning the review, please call me at the number listed below. We would appreciate receiving your evaluation no later than October 15.

Thank you very much for your willingness to assist the University of Colorado at Denver in this important academic review process.

### Sample PRIMARY UNIT Evaluation Letter

Dear Dean \_\_\_\_\_:

I am forwarding the dossier for Dr. \_\_\_\_\_. The Department of \_\_\_\_\_ has carefully evaluated the teaching, research, and service record of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ for the purpose of reappointment. The detailed assessments in each area are recorded in the subcommittee letters included with Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s dossier.

A general meeting for all faculty in the department was held on November 28, 20XY, to discuss personnel cases. Of the [number] of faculty eligible to vote for tenure at the meeting, [number] were present, and the vote for [reappointment of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ for three years at the rank of Assistant Professor] was [number] in favor, [number] against reappointment, and [number] abstentions.

The Subcommittee on Teaching finds that Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ is "extremely well-organized and well-prepared" for classes and that s/he is both prompt and fair in the handling of course materials. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s FCQ scores are consistently above the department average. For fifteen courses taught in the last four years, FCQ scores average 3.2 for Course and 3.4 for Instructor. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s professionalism and enthusiasm in the classroom are also reflected in the assessments by colleagues who visited classes. In addition, Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ has developed [number] new courses, including [number] online or hybrid courses, and has been actively and enthusiastically involved in the department's curriculum revision efforts.

The Subcommittee on Research and Publications notes that Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ has written three scholarly articles in the short time since his/her appointment. Two have already been accepted, and the other has been submitted to a refereed journal. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ is currently preparing one textbook under contract and is planning another textbook. In addition, Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ presented three papers, including one invited paper, at national professional meetings.

The Subcommittee on Service finds that Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ has amassed an "especially impressive" record. Beginning with Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s first academic year on the Downtown Denver Campus, s/he has been a member of two college committees and one University committee. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ has carried out his/her duties in a most professional manner and has kept the department well informed about committee activities.

Among the reasons for which Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ was recruited was the coordination of lower-division courses, a responsibility which s/he has carried out with consummate professionalism. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s efforts have helped to place the program on a more solid academic foundation. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s performance as coordinator is all the more remarkable in view of her/his teaching and research accomplishments.

There is ample evidence that Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ is performing well. The Personnel Committee enthusiastically recommends that s/he be reappointed. As Chair, I wholeheartedly endorse the Department's recommendation.

Appendix F

**Sample FIRST LEVEL REVIEW or DEAN'S Letter**

Dear Dean or Provost \_\_\_\_\_:

I am forwarding the dossier of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, who is being considered for promotion to Professor. The Dean's Advisory Group has fully considered the case. One committee member examined the dossier and made a presentation to other committee members, all of whom had reviewed the dossier. The four-member committee was unanimous in favor of promotion.

Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ came to the Downtown Denver Campus in 19AB, after teaching at the University of \_\_\_\_\_ and at \_\_\_\_\_ State University. S/he has consistently been of immense value to the department and the institution. S/he is an excellent teacher at all levels of instruction and in the broadest senses of the term, from helping freshmen to advancing the research capabilities of graduate students. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s research is admired by the best scholars in her/his field. In the last five years s/he has developed a research program that promises to earn him/her an even finer reputation. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s service is extraordinary. The departmental evaluations of her/his work are detailed and specific. I will highlight the contributions that make him/her one of our most valuable faculty members.

Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ has long been one of the college's finest teachers. S/he is a two-time winner and a three-time finalist for the Excellence in Teaching Award, convincing evidence of students' high regard for him/her. Faculty colleagues who have examined her/his course syllabi, exams, range of subjects taught, and levels of teaching, and observed his/her classroom performance, concur. The quality of her/his teaching is matched by his/her dedication. Since s/he became the program director in ekistics, I have observed first-hand another contribution to the college's teaching function. After assuming his/her responsibilities, Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ promptly improved procedures to ensure that students were well and fairly served and that academic standards were observed.

As colleagues and external reviewers attest, everything Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ has done is of high quality and recognizable importance. Some early work was "ground-breaking" and lasting. Her/his more recent work has implications for applied as well as theoretical study. His/her current research is almost certain to enlarge her/his reputation and that of the Downtown Denver Campus as s/he continues to investigate problems and to derive results that are "significant" (the adjective most repeated by his/her peers). Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ has consistently produced excellent published research that external reviewers assumed had already earned him/her a professorship. S/he is certain to produce more.

Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s service contributions are of the same high quality as her/his teaching and research. S/he is always willing to take on responsibility and does an excellent job. As department chair, s/he excelled at complex paperwork and provided leadership to develop coherence and direction for academic programs and research potential. With her/his guidance, the department revised, improved, and expanded its undergraduate curriculum and graduate programs. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ is a much sought after speaker and workshop leader in the community, building a good name for the department.

Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ belongs to that select group of individuals whose teaching, research, and service are all excellent and whose contributions are highly valued. We/I enthusiastically recommend him/her for promotion to Professor.

## Dossier Checklist for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Candidate's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Action:     Reappointment     Comprehensive Review     Tenure     Promotion

School/College: \_\_\_\_\_

A candidate's dossier may be presented in no more than three (3), three-ring binders. If a candidate submits multiple binders, the case for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must be made in Binder #1, with supporting materials in the remaining binder(s).

Items on this checklist are listed in their required order in Binder #1.

- This checklist
- Form UCD-7
- Primary unit criteria
- Previous RTP and personnel actions, if any
- Primary unit recommendation
  - if vote not unanimous, explanation and minority report
- First level review/Dean's advisory committee review
  - if vote not unanimous, explanation and minority report
- Dean's recommendation
- Summary statement by candidate
- Candidate's current vita
- External letters
  - Two (2) lists (candidate's and primary unit's), with indication of who responded
  - Explanation of how reviewers were chosen
  - Copy of the letter(s) sent to reviewers
  - Total number meets requirements                       explanation if requirement not met
  - Ratio meets requirements                                       explanation if requirement not met
- Teaching
  - Subcommittee report
  - Candidate's statement
  - Supporting material
    - FCQs                                       in separate binder
    - Peer review                                       in separate binder
    - Other                                       in separate binder
- Research/Creative Scholarly Activities
  - Subcommittee report
  - Candidate's statement
  - Supporting material                                       in separate binder
- Service
  - Subcommittee report
  - Candidate's statement
  - Supporting material                                       in separate binder
- ALL Signatures

I have reviewed this candidate's dossier and affirm that it is comprised of \_\_\_\_\_ binders, is complete, and is consistent with University policy.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date