Preamble: This guide has two parts to help you assemble a dossier that conforms to the expectations the VCAC has for an easy-to-read and, thus, easy-to-evaluate dossier. Not preparing a dossier properly can delay the process, sometimes to the detriment of a candidate.

The first part of this guide indicates how all dossiers should be organized and tabbed. The second part addresses how letters in the dossier should be presented in terms of terminology and organization. Both are essential in dossier preparation and apply not only to candidates in their dossier preparation, but to primary units and schools/colleges/library. Complying with these recommended guidelines will tend to increase the VCAC’s confidence that the primary units and schools/colleges/library have done due diligence in understanding and applying campus and system-wide policies and procedures for faculty evaluation.

The dossier checklists on the next pages require that items be placed in the dossier in a particular order. The ordering applies to reappointment/comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion dossiers (Dossier Checklist: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion) as well as hire with tenure dossiers (Dossier Checklist: Hire with Tenure). Dossiers not conforming to the checklist order will be returned for remediation before they are considered by the VCAC. We recognize that certain dossiers may not have all the items that are indicated, but the ordering of what is placed in the dossier should follow the guidelines given.

In addition to the required ordering, every dossier must be clearly tabbed and every section within a tab that has multiple items must have the multiple items clearly separated. An example of this is the section of external letters, where every letter needs to be separated by some means like a sheet of heavy, colored paper. The VCAC spends a great deal of time on every dossier. It needs to be able to find things easily to avoid delay.

The system and campus policy documents on reappointment, tenure, and promotion can be found at:

University of Colorado Board of Regents Laws and Policies

University of Colorado Office of Policy and Efficiency

University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus Policies and Guidelines
Dossier Checklist: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Candidate’s Name: ________________________________________________________________

Action: [ ] Reappointment    [ ] Comprehensive Review    [ ] Tenure    [ ] Promotion

School/College: _______________________________________________________________

A candidate’s dossier must be presented in no more than three, three-ring binders, no larger than three inches. If a candidate submits multiple binders, the case for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must be made in Binder #1; this is all that should be in Binder #1. Supporting materials are to be presented in the remaining binder(s). Items on this checklist are listed in their required order. Each item is to be clearly tabbed.

[ ] Completed dossier checklist

[ ] UCD-7 signature form

[ ] Primary unit criteria (include statement re: acceptance of current primary unit criteria if candidate was hired with previous criteria in place)

[ ] Initial offer letter

[ ] Previous RTP and personnel actions, if any

[ ] Current curriculum vitae

(The VCAC often finds that CVs are not clearly presented. Strategies for Success has a suggested template that should be followed. Clear indications of pagination in published works, clear delineations of refereed work, and clarity about what has been published, what is in press, and what is in progress are essential features of a properly presented CV. In addition, placing dates for all activities including published works on the left margin in bold makes reading a dossier much easier as does conforming to a 12-point font size. Faculty in the creative arts have more leeway, but clarity is an absolute requirement.)

[ ] Candidate’s summary statement (two-to-three-page summary overview)

[ ] Candidate’s teaching (librarianship) statement (no more than three pages)

[ ] FCQ one-page summary table (see Strategies for Success Appendix D)

[ ] Candidate’s scholarly/creative work statement (no more than three pages)

[ ] Candidate’s leadership/service statement (no more than three pages)

Other materials supporting teaching (librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service should be placed in logical places in Binders #2 and #3. (There has developed a tendency to place too much material in binders. The VCAC believes that clear, concise materials need to populate dossiers, and that too much material actually can be harmful to critical reading of a case.)

[ ] Supporting teaching (librarianship) materials (to be placed in supplementary binders)

[ ] FCQs in separate binder number _____ (schools and colleges have discretion in terms of very large courses, but need to submit unbiased, representative samples of FCQs)

[ ] Other supporting teaching (librarianship) materials in separate binder number _____

[ ] Supporting scholarly/creative work materials in separate binder number _____
[ ] Supporting leadership/service materials in separate binder number ____

[ ] Primary Unit recommendation and vote (see Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers*)

[ ] if vote is not unanimous, an explanation of negative votes is required and a minority report may be added (If there is no minority report, do not include an empty tabbed section)

[ ] Primary Unit analysis of teaching (librarianship) (subcommittee report, if relevant)
   (Documentation requires peer reviews of teaching/librarianship, other multiple methods of evaluation, and critical, relevant teaching/librarianship analyses)

[ ] Primary Unit analysis of scholarly/creative work (subcommittee report, if relevant)

[ ] Primary Unit analysis of leadership/service (subcommittee report, if relevant)

[ ] First level review/Dean’s advisory/review committee recommendation and vote (see Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers*) (an independent analysis at this level is required)

[ ] if vote is not unanimous, explanations and minority reports may be added (helpful, but not required)

[ ] Dean’s recommendation (see Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers*)

[ ] Reconsideration recommendations
   (If the Dean’s advisory/review committee or the Dean disagrees with the recommendation of the Primary Unit, the dossier is returned to the Primary Unit for reconsideration, after which the Primary Unit returns its reconsidered judgment to the Dean for further consideration.)

[ ] Primary unit’s reconsideration, if applicable

[ ] Additional reconsideration and vote of the Dean’s advisory/review committee and/or Dean, if applicable

[ ] External letters

[ ] Two lists of suggested reviewers (candidate’s and primary unit’s), with indication of who responded

[ ] Explanation of how reviewers were chosen

[ ] Copy of the letter(s) sent to the external reviewers

[ ] Number of reviewers meets requirements [ ] explanation if requirement not met

[ ] Ratio meets requirements [ ] explanation if requirement not met

[ ] Copies of External Reviewers’ curriculum vitae (to be placed in a tabbed section separate from the external letters with clear separations between CVs)

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 __________________

*Note that Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers carefully indicates the acceptable terms to evaluate performance at each level. Thus, reappointment/comprehensive review evaluation of teaching (librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service differ from promotion and tenure evaluations.
Dossier Checklist: Hire with Tenure

Candidate’s Name: _____________________________________________________________

School/College: ______________________________________________________________

Current Rank/Title: ____________________________________________________________

Action: [ ] Tenure  [ ] Promotion

A candidate’s dossier should be presented in a single three-ring binder. Items on this checklist are listed in their required order in the binder. Each item is to be clearly tabbed as such.

[ ] Completed dossier checklist
[ ] UCD-7 signature form
[ ] CU Denver official offer letter
[ ] Primary unit criteria for University of Colorado Denver primary unit
[ ] Criteria for tenure/promotion at candidate’s current institution
[ ] Current curriculum vitae

[ ] Evidence of meritorious or excellent teaching (e.g. peer reviews of teaching, student evaluations, syllabi, curriculum development, mentoring, awards) including a narrative summary that describes their merit or excellence in teaching

[ ] Examples of meritorious or excellent scholarly/creative work (three publications or other supporting documentation are sufficient)

[ ] Evidence of meritorious or excellent leadership/service

[ ] Primary unit recommendation and vote including analysis of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service
   [ ] if vote not unanimous, explanations and minority reports may be submitted

[ ] First level review/Dean’s advisory/review committee recommendation and vote
   [ ] if vote not unanimous, explanations and minority reports may be submitted

[ ] Dean’s recommendation including the three required points enumerated in Campus Administrative Policy 1021: Hire with Tenure (July 1, 2020)
   a) A statement of the specific merits of the candidate, including a summary of how the candidate meets or exceeds the Regental and school, college, or library standards for tenure, tenure and promotion, or tenure at the rank of professor.
   b) A description of the long-range fiscal and academic program plans for the unit.
   c) An explanation of how the personnel action fits into the unit’s plan.
[ ] **Letters of Recommendation** *(as appropriate to the situation)*

[ ] Situation A: Copy of the official letter granting the candidate tenure at the current institution
  *Candidate is currently a tenured associate professor at a comparable institution, and requests tenure as an associate professor.*

[ ] Situation B: Copy of the official letter granting the candidate tenure at the current institution
  AND
  three external letters of evaluation for promotion to the rank of professor OR letters of recommendation for hire
  *Candidate is currently a tenured associate professor at a comparable institution, and requests tenure and promotion to professor.*

[ ] Situation C: Copy of the official letter granting the candidate tenure at the current institution
  AND
  copy of the official letter granting the candidate the rank of professor at the current institution
  *Candidate is currently a tenured professor at a comparable institution, and requests tenure and the rank of professor.*

[ ] Situation D: Copy of the official letter granting the candidate the current rank at the current institution
  AND
  three external letters of evaluation for the award of tenure
  *(a very unusual situation): Candidate is not currently tenured at another institution, but has a record that clearly meets the Campus' standards for tenure. This would most likely only occur if the candidate is at a program/institution that does not grant tenure.*

[ ] **External Letters if required** *(if the letters of recommendation for hire are not used or if the candidate is not currently tenured at another institution)*

I have reviewed this candidate’s dossier and affirm that it is complete and is consistent with University policy.

Dean’s Signature .......................................................... Date ..................................................

*Note that **Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers** carefully indicates the acceptable terms to evaluate performance in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service.*
Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers

There are a number of necessary requirements in preparing letters in a case for the Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC). These typically depend on type of case.

(A) Comprehensive Review:

(a) Only use the designations approaching excellent, approaching meritorious, or not meritorious in reviews by the primary unit, the first level review, and the dean in Comprehensive Review evaluations. Do not invent other terminology.

(b) Record vote counts including the number of recusals and absences for teaching (librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service. Recusals from discussion and voting should apply if there is a conflict of interest or a bias regarding a candidate, meaning that a committee member is unable to render a fair and unbiased opinion.

Examples:

- the primary unit voted 3-1-0-0 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for approaching excellent in teaching with three committee members voting for approaching excellent and one for approaching meritorious

- voted 2-1-0-0 for approaching meritorious in scholarly/creative work with two committee members voting for approaching meritorious and one for not meritorious

- voted 1-2-0-0 for not meritorious in leadership/service with one committee member voting for approaching meritorious and two for not meritorious

Add a table like the one following to record evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Leadership/Service</th>
<th>Teaching (Librarianship)</th>
<th>Scholarly/Creative Work</th>
<th>Leadership/Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Primary Unit</td>
<td>7AE</td>
<td>5AE, 2AM</td>
<td>4AE, 3AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Review Committee</td>
<td>3AM, 4NM</td>
<td>1AE, 1AM, 5NM</td>
<td>5AE, 2AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Evaluation</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Record the overall vote for reappointment

Examples:

- the primary unit voted 6-1-0-1 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for reappointment

Add a table like the one following to record votes for reappointment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Recusal</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Primary Unit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Review Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Recommendation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

==================================
(B) Tenure and Promotion Review:

(a) Only use the designations **excellent**, **meritorious**, or **not meritorious** in Tenure and Promotion evaluations by the primary unit, the first level review, and the dean.

(b) Record vote counts including the number of recusals and absences for teaching (librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service. Recusals from discussion and voting should apply if there is a conflict of interest or a bias regarding a candidate, meaning that a committee member is unable to render a fair and unbiased opinion.

Examples:

- the primary unit voted 3-1-0-0 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for **excellent** in teaching with three committee members voting for excellent and one for meritorious
- voted 2-1-0-0 for **meritorious** in scholarly/creative work with two committee members voting for meritorious and one not meritorious
- voted 1-2-0-0 for **not meritorious** in leadership/service with one committee member voting for meritorious and two for not meritorious

Add a table like the one following to record evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Leadership/Service (E = excellent, M = meritorious, NM = not meritorious)</th>
<th>Teaching (Librarianship)</th>
<th>Scholarly/Creative Work</th>
<th>Leadership/Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Primary Unit</td>
<td>7E</td>
<td>5E, 2M</td>
<td>4E, 3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Review Committee</td>
<td>3M, 4NM</td>
<td>1E, 1M, 5NM</td>
<td>5E, 2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Evaluation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Record the overall vote for promotion and tenure

Examples:

- the primary unit voted 6-1-0-1 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for tenure and promotion

Add a table like the one following to record votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Recusal</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Primary Unit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Review Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Recommendation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(C) Promotion to Full Professor Review:

(a) Only use the designations **the record taken as a whole is excellent** or **the record taken as a whole is not excellent** in Promotion to Full Professor evaluations by the primary unit, the first level review, and the dean.

(b) Record vote counts including the number of recusals and absences for teaching (librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service as part of an overall recommendation. Recusals from discussion and voting should apply if there is a conflict of interest or a bias regarding a candidate, meaning that a committee member is unable to render a fair and unbiased opinion.

Examples:

- the primary unit voted 3-1-0-0 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for **excellent** teaching with three committee members voting for excellent and one voting for meritorious
- voted 2-1-0-0 for **meritorious** research with two committee members voting for meritorious and one for excellent
- voted 1-2-0-0 for **not meritorious** in service with one committee member voting for meritorious and two voting for not meritorious
- once the determinations above are made, an overall evaluation of **the record taken as a whole is excellent** or **the record taken as a whole is not excellent** can be made

Add a table like the one following to record evaluations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Leadership/Service (E = excellent, M = meritorious, NM = not meritorious)</th>
<th>Teaching (Librarianship)</th>
<th>Scholarly/Creative Work</th>
<th>Leadership/Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Primary Unit</td>
<td>7E</td>
<td>5E, 2M</td>
<td>4E, 3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Review Committee</td>
<td>3M, 4NM</td>
<td>1E, 1M, 5NM</td>
<td>5E, 2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Evaluation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Record the overall recommendation for promotion to Full Professor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>RECORD TAKEN</th>
<th>AS A WHOLE</th>
<th>IS EXCELLENT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Primary Unit</td>
<td>RECORD TAKEN</td>
<td>AS A WHOLE</td>
<td>IS EXCELLENT*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Review Committee</td>
<td>RECORD TAKEN</td>
<td>AS A WHOLE</td>
<td>IS EXCELLENT*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Recommendation</td>
<td>RECORD TAKEN</td>
<td>AS A WHOLE</td>
<td>IS EXCELLENT*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that there are three criteria for promotion to Full Professor. These are found in the system Administrative Policy Statement 1022.V.K.: [https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022](https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022).

===================================================================

(D) Other Situations:
In other evaluation situations, please subscribe to the examples given above as closely as possible.
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