

Suggestions for Preparing a Dossier for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, or Promotion

These suggestions are intended to assist faculty candidates in preparing materials for personnel review. Ultimately, it is the candidate's choice of what is included. Although you may think of this as an onerous clerical task, treat it as you would other aspects of your faculty work: all scholarly projects require reflection, gathering of appropriate evidence, good writing, and professionalism. The dossier is your opportunity to introduce your work to colleagues and to make a reasoned, well-supported argument about the value of this work. In addition to providing information that is the basis of personnel decisions, the dossier demonstrates how your work complements the overall work of the department and university.

A. General Suggestions

B. Audience. Remember that although one level of review involves your disciplinary colleagues, some of whom may have a direct knowledge of your work, some readers of this dossier will be from outside your specialty. Just as you would for a grant proposal, write as clearly and specifically as possible for a general audience. Show respect for readers' time by presenting materials in an organized, concise, professional way.

C. Central Questions. Prepare your dossier as an answer to the questions that review committees will use in their evaluations:

- *(for reappointment)* In the past year, how does this faculty member's work demonstrate that he/she should be reappointed for next year?
- *(for continuing appointment)* How does this faculty member's work demonstrate that he/she is someone the university should retain indefinitely?
- *(for promotion)* How does this faculty member's work demonstrate that he/she has met at least the minimum requirements for promotion to a more senior rank?

D. Organization. Each dossier may be organized in slightly different ways, based on the nature of the work being presented, the discipline, varying departmental guidelines, and the faculty member's own preferences. The outline in this handout is a general recommendation for organizing dossiers, likely to be modified based on individual records and departmental guidelines.

E. Format. Although SUNY Fredonia does not currently have a standard system for electronic portfolios, faculty who wish to present their materials in an electronic format are certainly encouraged to do so. Print or electronic dossiers should be compact, professional looking and easy to navigate, with apparatus that allows browsing and quick reference. For a print dossier, there should be room to turn pages, clearly labeled sections, and easy cross-references. Many readers prefer an overview, with supporting materials presented in an appendix or link.

F. Bulk. Assume that the same principles that guide your responses to student work, websites, or professional writing are appropriate here: you would not want to read raw data, poorly organized or written documents, or reports that seem padded with unnecessary materials.

Before including anything in the dossier, ask whether it is necessary to your overall argument and whether the material you include documents an activity that the committee needs to look at in detail or would misunderstand if the documentation were not included.

There is never a reason to submit an entire crate of materials. In fact, even if you include all elements of the outlines here, a print dossier could be completely contained in a 1" binder (with any published books also submitted). Use good professional judgment, and show respect for readers' time.

Here are some typical dossier fillers that you *should not* include:

- manuscripts of work in progress;
- drafts submitted for publication;
- notes on an uncompleted project;
- proposals for grants that were not funded (unless the department is interested in seeing these so that colleagues can be more helpful in revising and resubmitting);
- every handout for every course;
- every page of completed student evaluations (finding a way to include results in a concise, easy-to-read format is essential, but no reviewer needs to look at all raw data and decipher hand-written comments)
- student papers or completed tests/exams (*see Teaching and Learning section below for exceptions*)
- conference proposals submitted;
- personal correspondence from students or colleagues, unless they have given permission and the correspondence documents claims in the dossier;
- memos or minutes that show you were appointed to committees or present at meetings;
- perfunctory thank-you letters and notes;
- routine correspondence about materials already in print (such as acceptance letters).
- conference programs (including the presentation slides or text would be useful; showing your name in the program would not)
- performance programs alone (colleagues may wish to see your name on a program, but more important is something that allows them to evaluate the performance or exhibition)

- A. Tone.** The writing you do for this dossier reflects your attitude toward your work, your students, your colleagues, and your profession. Be careful about the tone you use: committees can be confused or annoyed by chatty diction, sarcasm, fluff, hyperbole, and defensiveness. You may feel oppressed by this process or angry at letters you received the previous year, but the file is not the place to vent such frustrations, criticize your colleagues or the administration, request financial support, or make a case for changing departmental or university policies.
- B. Time.** Doing this process well requires time for both thinking and assembling materials. Start as early as possible, and seek feedback from trusted colleagues as you work out sections of the narratives. Others will be able to ask questions or let you know where you have not

been clear. Although many people delay compiling materials until just before the deadline, finishing well in advance of the due date will give you ample time for reflection and revision, as well as more energy for the start of the fall semester.

1. Frequently Asked Questions. Here are answers to some typical questions candidates ask:

- A. How can I keep a review committee from missing something important in my record?** Make sure it's easy to find, not buried in a jumble of other things. An effective letter of transmittal is another way to let committees see the highlights of your record, and most readers appreciate when that letter summarizes the most important pieces of the file.
- B. Why do I have to include narratives about my courses?** Review committees will not be in your classrooms or have any other way of knowing whether the objectives outlined on your syllabus were actually met in your courses. More importantly, there is a significant difference in the ways we explain our courses to our students (on handouts, syllabi, etc.) and the ways we can explain our process and resulting student learning to our colleagues. Valuing teaching and learning means that we include reflective writing, evidence of effectiveness, connections to other scholarly work, and evidence of scholarly inquiry about teaching and learning in our practice.
- C. How can I possibly explain very complex ideas in my discipline to people who are from other fields?** You won't be able to explain, in this dossier, the elegance of your approach to a performance or problem you've worked out in an article written for disciplinary colleagues. But a brief explanation of your inquiry—the central questions your research or creative activity asks—will probably be understood by your colleagues in different fields. The dossier is being read by other faculty and by administrators with academic credentials: trust that they can know the environments of scholarly work, even if they do not share your disciplinary expertise. Colleagues outside your discipline (and those in other subfields) may not know the significance of particular journals, presses, performance venues, and conferences in your field, so it's a good idea to let them know if, for example, your work appears in a journal with a 10% acceptance rate or you are selected for a prestigious juried exhibition. It's not bragging; it's helping readers to understand the ways peers have valued your work.
- D. I'm not much of a writer. Why should that matter here?** All scholarship comes down to writing, whether it results in an article, book, report, or abstract. No one is hoping for flowery prose or elaborate autobiography here, but readers do expect to find efficient, literate writing. It is the basis of our measurement of literacy and professionalism, and, as in any other profession, writing matters. It's not fair, perhaps, but a lack of attention to such boring tasks as proofreading, spelling, and mechanics will be noticed by committees—perhaps raising questions about a candidate's standards or academic credentials. The last response you would want from a committee would be doubt about your ability to teach and evaluate students, to reflect on teaching and learning, or to produce publishable research, but poorly organized or articulated writing raises such doubts. If you know you have trouble with editing, work out the drafts of the file early, and ask trusted colleagues to review drafts.
- E. How do I respond to negative student or peer evaluations, or is it better not to mention these at all?** You can't ignore these. Your review committees will not. And it is tricky to respond without being dismissive, sarcastic, or overly defensive. It's all right to explain why certain

comments do not trouble you or cause you to revise the courses, why others have caused concern and possibly adjustments. Everyone has some negative comments from students from time to time; committees will be looking for evidence of how you respond to these, how you use course evaluations, midterm evaluations, or other assessments to guide your thinking about how students learn. No one wants you to “water down” courses or make pleasing students your aim: the goal is for students to learn, and a thoughtful instructor who is able to challenge and support students in their learning is essential. With peer evaluations, it is essential that you comment in some way to the praise and criticism you receive. Keep your tone respectful and explain how you are using the evaluator’s comments as you consider your course design or delivery.

- F. I have a significant publication that came out the year before I was hired at SUNY Fredonia. Shouldn’t this be part of my first reappointment file? Shouldn’t it “count” for continuing appointment?** When you step onto the tenure track, the clock begins again. So although your *curriculum vitae*—included in each year’s dossier—lists this publication, you would not include it among your accomplishments in the year under review. It “counts” in that it may have been significant in your being hired, but is not part of the review period. It is part of the overall record that is reviewed for continuing appointment, but committees at that point are looking for sustained work through the reappointment years as well.
- G. Should I respond to letters I received in the previous reappointment?** If previous reappointment letters from chairs and administrators have suggested or insisted upon certain actions, be sure to show how you’ve responded to these recommendations. If you’ve been advised to do something (such as seek broader venues for your research or work with a mentor on some aspect of your teaching), committees will be looking to see that you’ve done this and will be hoping for good results. Make sure that your efforts to respond to suggestions are not lost in the file. If you have not followed some specific recommendation from a chair or dean, there is no hiding; explain this directly. There is no need, however, to respond to specific comments on committee members’ ballots: these can sometimes be contradictory, and they represent an individual’s response, not the official advice from the academic unit.
- H. Should I seek external reviews of my work?** At SUNY Fredonia, no external reviews are required for continuing appointment or promotion decisions. But especially because departments can be small, there may be very few people on campus who work in your specialty area. Having the perspective of those who teach the same courses, perform in similar ways, or engage in similar scholarly work may strengthen your dossier. You can invite people to comment on a publication or a teaching portfolio. Avoid a letter campaign, however. A few letters by people knowledgeable in the field is far more valuable than a stack of testimonials solicited by the candidate.

2. Suggested Outline of the Dossier

This outline of suggested sections and contents of your dossier might be useful in organizing your materials in print or electronic format.

- A. Letter of transmittal.** Address a letter, on letterhead and in standard business letter format, to the department chair and Departmental Personnel Committee. It should present the central argument of the dossier and thank colleagues for reading and evaluating. Reviewers find it very

helpful when a candidate uses this letter to summarize the highlights of the record during the review period: this can be accomplished in a brief (1- or 2-page) letter with bullet lists. Think of this letter as providing a clear, brief response to the question the committee will ask (such as how your work in the past year demonstrates that you should be reappointed).

- B. *Policies for Reappointment/Tenure/Promotion.*** So that all reviewers have quick access to the policies that govern your personnel action, include copies of these policies: appropriate pages from the departmental handbook policies for reappointment, continuing appointment, or promotion; appropriate pages from the SUNY Fredonia *Handbook*.
- C. *Curriculum Vitae.*** Include an updated *curriculum vitae* that outlines all completed professional work—even that which pre-dates your hire at SUNY Fredonia. If you keep your material updated in Digital Measures—Activity Insight, you can easily generate the c.v. Include full information for scholarly/creative work, following the citation conventions of your discipline. It may be helpful to reviewers if your c.v. highlights those accomplishments completed within the time period under review.
- D. *External Reviews (if included).*** External review is not required; however, if you do have letters of evaluation or support, include them in this section.
- E. *Teaching and Learning.*** See the details in Section 4 below for suggested organization of materials related to Teaching and Learning.
 - 1) Narrative overview
 - 2) Courses taught in the review period
 - 3) Curricula/program/accreditation materials developed
 - 4) Assessments and evidence of student learning
 - 5) Goals for future courses
 - 6) Supporting materials
- F. *Scholarly and Creative Activity.*** See the details in Section 5 below for suggested organization of materials related to Scholarly and Creative Activity.
 - 1) Narrative overview
 - 2) Annotated bibliography/list of work completed during the review period
 - 3) Work in progress
 - 4) Goals for future scholarship and creative activity
 - 5) Supporting materials
- G. *Service.*** See the details in Section 6 below for suggested organization of materials related to Service.
 - 1) Narrative overview
 - 2) Annotated listed of service completed during the review period
 - 3) Goals for future service contributions
 - 4) Supporting materials

3. Documenting Teaching and Learning

This section of the dossier is very important at SUNY Fredonia, with our commitment to student success. It is a chance to reflect upon and provide evidence for an essential part of your faculty role, so this section needs to include more than syllabi and course evaluation scores, which reveal only a small part of the picture.

Reviewers of the dossier want to know how you approach and design your courses, how you engage students in and outside of class, how you evaluate student work and use multiple forms of assessment to improve teaching/learning, how your teaching complements the work of your departmental or program colleagues, and how you connect your courses to the critical questions of your discipline. Excellent teaching goes far beyond content mastery of one's field or the ability to organize and deliver a clear lecture: it includes deep understanding of the curriculum and ways students learn best, course designs with high expectations and rigor, assignment and project designs that scaffold learning, appropriate uses of technology, attention to inclusion and diversity, and guidance and feedback as students are challenged to learn.

At SUNY Fredonia, excellent teaching also includes effective academic advising (course selection, career guidance, and other issues), collaboration on curriculum development and assessment, willingness to assist students inside and outside class, and extending learning beyond the classroom through service-learning, experiential learning, and collaborative research/creative activity.

The following outline might be a way to organize the Teaching and Learning section of your dossier:

- A. **Narrative overview.** Begin this section with a brief narrative about your teaching in the review period and how it is *scholarly*, as well as effective. This is different from a more general "teaching philosophy" statement that one ordinarily includes in an application for a teaching position, and this narrative is going to change through each year of the reappointment process.

You might approach this narrative by considering what you hope to demonstrate about your teaching. These are some typical questions the narrative might answer—although you would certainly not attempt to address all of these:

- How did your teaching develop or change over the review period?
- How has your field changed, and how do your courses reflect those changes?
- What have you discovered about SUNY Fredonia students and the ways they learn best?
- What is innovative about your courses?
- How do you attend to and measure student learning?
- How do your courses complement other efforts to achieve departmental, program, or institutional goals (such as global focus, attention to diversity, environmental stewardship, community engagement, undergraduate research)?
- How does your teaching connect to other forms of scholarship?
- What questions do you ask of your own teaching?
- What are your scholarly practices regarding teaching (inquiry, reading, collaboration, revision)?
- What texts or theories have influenced the ways you think about your discipline, the students you teach, and the ways you design your courses?

- How has new learning of your own (such as scholarly interests, participation in workshops and seminars, expertise with technology, community engagement) affected your courses and your students' learning?

B. Courses taught in the review period. List all the courses you taught during the review period, by semester. A table that includes course enrollments may be an effective way to present this simply and clearly. You may want to include a brief narrative (paragraph or two) about each of the courses you have taught during the review period, with references to course materials in the Supporting Materials section.. How did the course evolve over the semesters you have taught it? What changes have you made in content, class format/delivery, assignments, uses of technology? Why? What tells you whether they worked? What is particularly challenging or rewarding about teaching a certain class?

C. Advising in the review period. Indicate the number of advisees each semester, and describe your approach to advising. What are your goals with students? What do you do as an advisor, other than the required meeting for course selection? How have you refined your approach to advising through training and professional reading? How do you assess your advising sessions?

D. Curricula/program/accreditation materials developed. If you have been involved in developing new curricula, revising curricula, or developing materials for specialized accreditation review, list those contributions here. If the work is collaborative, explain your role (such as “responsible for 50% of the proposal or report”) and the scholarly contributions you made in this effort (such as “provided statistical background in developing the assessment system” or “researched models from other institutions” or “did most of the writing and editing of this report”). This helps colleagues to see the ways you brought your knowledge of your field and student learning to contribute an important part of the teaching and learning role of the department or program.

E. Assessments and evidence of student learning. Although the previous sections offer your reflection on what you are trying to do in your courses and the ways you design and deliver courses so that students learn, this section focuses on evidence of your claims and goals. No one measure—particularly student evaluations—gives the complete picture of instructor performance or student learning, so spend some time considering the many goals you have for student learning and the many ways that those goals might be measured. This list suggests evidence that you might include:

- **Peer evaluations of your teaching completed during the review period.** Try to have at least one of these for each semester before the decision for continuing appointment; this is not intended as a perfunctory requirement—just collecting the right number of “testimonials” about your delivery style—but a means of demonstrating that you are engaging colleagues from inside and outside your department in providing feedback that you can use to improve courses.

Because you probably demonstrated your effectiveness in delivering a presentation as part of your interview before hire, you don't need to keep having more people say that you organize material well, connect with students, speak professionally, and so on. Consider the other aspects of your teaching role that your reviewers might want to see, and invite people to observe and evaluate. You can ask colleagues at SUNY Fredonia or elsewhere to review your course design/syllabus, your assignment design, your

comments on student work, your ability to lead discussion or integrative learning approaches, your effectiveness in advising. The “parachute drop” into a course (an announced, one-time visit to watch you deliver a lecture) doesn’t provide any information that your reviewers don’t already have. What would help you measure another part of your teaching role? What would help reviewers to have a snapshot of your work in this area?

In this section, refer your readers to the evaluations themselves (in the Supporting Materials section), but comment here on those evaluations, summarizing their main points and responding to the evaluators’ ideas and suggestions.

- **Student evaluations of your teaching completed during the review period.** Student evaluations—in many forms—are not measures of instructional effectiveness, and the scores on such instruments should not be over-emphasized in the dossier or in review committees’ discussions. They cannot measure the instructor’s knowledge of the discipline or the content, and because the same students are not in all courses, they are not objective comparisons of courses. They are valuable, however, in providing student perspectives on whether the goals for a course were accomplished. No faculty member should water down courses, avoid trying new approaches, or attempt to sway students in the hopes of improving evaluation scores. Instead, the focus should be on developing rigorous courses and helping all students achieve the level of learning for each course. Evaluations provide a perspective on what is and what isn’t working.

In this section of the dossier, comment on what those evaluations tell you about your teaching, possibly how they have influenced your choices about the classroom. What have students said about your courses and how you have helped them learn? How have you used information from different forms of student feedback (classroom assessments, midterm evaluations, end-of-course evaluations/surveys) to reflect upon and possibly modify your course? How have student evaluations or comments reinforced your commitments to particular approaches or learning strategies? What may have surprised you about the feedback from students? How are you using this information as you plan future courses?

- **Self assessment of your teaching during the review period.** Based on what you have observed and what you have learned from peers and students, how do you rate your teaching in the period under review? To avoid assigning yourself a letter grade, you may want to approach this using the labels most frequently seen in curriculum maps: introductory, practice, and mastery. When you try a new approach or develop a new course, your assessment might be “introductory,” with a certain set of questions for evaluating your effectiveness. Some courses might be “practicing” or “developing,” as you refine your approach, use new course materials, or design new assignments for engaging students in learning. You might label some courses as “mastery”: you’ve taught them enough times to have refined your approaches, and students who do the work you’ve outlined for them are generally successful in learning the course material. You need not use these labels, but they give you an idea of how you might approach self assessment in a more systematic way than saying, “I think I had a great year” and “I’ve enjoyed my teaching.”

- **Other assessments of teaching effectiveness** may include a list of these kinds activities and outcomes:
 - ◆ ways that your teaching advances the departmental/school/ college/campus or university mission;
 - ◆ evidence of improved performance, community engagement, research ability, or critical reading/writing/speaking/thinking skills for students in your courses;
 - ◆ evidence of learning beyond the classroom, studio, or laboratory;
 - ◆ evidence of ways that technology has improved student learning;
 - ◆ evidence of student achievement;
 - ◆ evidence of increased learning through service-learning projects in your courses;
 - ◆ evidence that your courses have developed interdisciplinary thinking;
 - ◆ evidence that your courses have engaged students in applying scholarship to real-world problems and issues;
 - ◆ ways that you have made your teaching public and scholarly (through presentations, publications, or other forms of scholarship);
 - ◆ evidence that you have done advising effectively;
 - ◆ ways that you have improved your teaching by developing your skills (courses, certifications, engagement in peer review activities, conferences, consulting or other real-world connections to the subject of your courses)

- **Teaching awards** you received or were nominated for during the review period. Be precise about dates and awarding organizations.

F. Goals for future courses. List, with brief explanations, your primary goals for teaching and learning in the coming semesters. Show how you are planning to the results of various assessments to refine and improve your teaching. For early-career faculty, these goals should then be addressed in the following year's reappointment dossier.

G. Supporting materials. Include clearly labeled materials to which you've referred in your narrative and other parts of the Teaching and Learning section of the dossier. When possible, choose representative samples, not everything you might include. Here are examples of the materials you might include:

- course/teaching portfolios (and internal and external reviews of these, if you have them);
- syllabi;
- sample assignments and projects;
- sample tests;
- innovative classroom assessment tools and results;
- sample lecture notes, media presentations, web pages;
- sample student work (used with permission and with identifying information removed);
- curricular proposals or assessment/accreditation reports;
- peer evaluations
- student evaluations (*See below.*)

Suggestions for Student Evaluations: Include in an organized, easy-to-read format the results of any student evaluations undertaken during the review period. To eliminate the need for huge, separate folders for all those individual forms, prepare this information as a summary report. Some departments may prepare such a report for candidates, and the Course Response tool allows you to generate a report easily. You can do this yourself by summarizing scores in tables, and typing up student comments (perhaps selecting most recent or representative semesters if the overall record is consistent). This report can be validated by having a faculty or administrative colleague sign a statement that he/she has double-checked your summaries against the original forms.

4. Documenting Scholarly and Creative Activity

This section of the dossier demonstrates the ways that you are engaging in scholarly and creative activity appropriate to your discipline and consistent with the expectations of your department. SUNY Fredonia, as a comprehensive regional university, expects faculty to be active and current in their disciplines; it is therefore important that before review for continuing appointment, faculty show that they can engage in scholarly and creative work and model scholarly inquiry for students. Scholarly and creative contributions can take many forms: compositions, publications, performances, presentations, engagement scholarship, and grants.

This outline provides suggestions for organizing this section of the dossier.

- A. *Narrative overview.*** In a few paragraphs, explain the ways that your scholarly and creative activity has changed since the last review. Because you will provide the details about the number of accomplishments in the next section, let this narrative tell readers more about the reasons for your choices. What is the focus of your scholarly and creative work? How do your current projects build on previous work? What is distinctive about the work you are doing? How does your work contribute to the discipline or to the community? What has been especially challenging in your scholarly and creative work?
- B. *Annotated list of creative/scholarly works completed in the review period.*** In this section, provide an annotated bibliography of works/activities that were completed (actually came out in print, presented, or performed) during the review period. Activity Insight (in Digital Measures) can easily generate this list in a Word document you can edit and include.
- C.** Works that are not yet in print but forthcoming (accepted but not yet published, performed, presented, or exhibit) should be noted as such with an expected date of publication. Work in progress should not be included in lists of printed/presented /accepted works but placed in a separate section; these works do not count in the current review, but they do demonstrate continuing inquiry in your field and provide some insights into your overall research or creative agenda.

Be sure not to pad this section: reviewers may well note, in subsequent reviews, whether the work in progress came to fruition. Committees become frustrated when this basic information is difficult to find or hard to understand, and they become angry when the presentation is vague or misleading. For all scholarly achievements, provide full information (including dates). Use the citation style of your discipline, being sure to preserve the priority of record for works with

multiple authors. Describe each entry briefly, and include documentation in the supplementary materials. Be accurate and complete.

- 1) Publications.** List works which appeared in print during the review period. Do not list any other works, such as those completed before your SUNY Fredonia appointment. Publications include books, articles, book reviews, translations, published reports, edited books/journals, commercially available video and audio recordings, creative writing, commercially available compact discs, commercially available software. Give full bibliographic citations in the documentation style appropriate to your field. Your annotation should clarify whether the work was refereed or invited, and include the names of any co-authors. Include a statement about the nature of the journal so that those outside the specialty can have some sense of the stature of the publication. If such information is routinely reported in your discipline, tell how many times your work has been cited.
- 2) Performances, exhibitions, or other creative activities.** Faculty in fine arts and performance-based disciplines should list performances, exhibitions, or shows during the review period. Do not list events from outside this time period. Theatre and music performances, art exhibitions, juried shows, and so on should be presented in a documentation format appropriate to your discipline. Indicate whether each work was juried, invited, reproduced, cited/reviewed in publications. In addition, tell whether each work was international, national, regional/state, or local in its scope.
- 3) Grants.** List the grants both submitted and awarded during the review period. Include information about your role (such as principal writer or co-principal investigator), the granting agency, amount requested, and amount funded. Both internal and external grants should be listed here.
- 4) Scholarly presentations.** List scholarly presentations you have given during the review period. These may include keynote addresses, papers, posters, or workshops presented at academic conferences or in settings which may call for more applied scholarship (business, industry, community). Use the standard documentation style appropriate to your discipline, being sure to provide specific information about dates, titles, the nature of the conference (international, national, state, regional, local), and the nature of the presentation. Include the names of any co-authors, and tell whether the presentation was invited or refereed.
- 5) Awards and recognitions.** List any awards and recognitions for scholarly or creative activity conferred within the review period. Be sure to explain the nature of the recognition, date of award, as well as the organization sponsoring the award.
- 6) Scholarly participation at conferences/professional meetings.** List the events at professional meetings in which you have had an official role, other than presenting your own scholarship. This may include organizing a conference, developing and chairing a session, serving as an invited respondent to others' scholarship, or participating in a panel discussion. Be clear about the nature of your role, the nature of the meeting (international, national, state, regional), and the ways that your participation was scholarly, as opposed to being a service to your profession.

7) Professional growth:

- a. **Conferences attended.** List conferences, workshops, or other professional updating activities you attended within the review period. Provide specific information about the organization, location, and date of the meeting. Indicate whether each was international, national, regional, state, or local.
 - b. **Education/field experience.** List any formal education or field experience that you pursued during the review period. If you have attended classes, workshops, or training to further your education, note when each class was taken, and explain briefly the significance of this experience to your professional development.
 - c. **Professional memberships.** List any organizations to which you belong and in which you participate in a scholarly way (fulfill a role beyond paying your annual dues). Give the name of the organization, the dates of your membership (within the review period), and a brief explanation of the way this membership is part of your scholarship.
 - d. **Other evidence of professional growth.** Describe any aspects of your professional growth during the review period that do not fit into the above categories but which warrant consideration for tenure or promotion.
- D. *Work in progress.*** List briefly the projects that have been accepted or submitted, as well as those on which you are currently working. Be realistic, and avoid exaggeration here: you may be asked for documentation or expected to have this work completed by the next review.
- E. *Goals for future scholarship and creative activity.*** List your goals for scholarly and creative work in the future. Especially for faculty seeking reappointment, this list gives reviewers the opportunity to know about your long- and short-term plans.
- F. *Supporting materials.*** Include clearly labeled materials to which you've referred in your narrative and other parts of the Scholarly and Creative Activity section of the dossier. Here are examples of the materials you might include as copies (print) or scans (electronic):
- offprints of short publications;
 - copies of books (submitted to department if the dossier is electronic);
 - accessible form of creative works (such as scanned images, recordings);
 - conference presentations (paper read, PowerPoint slides, poster contents);
 - links to web-based (non-pdf) publications;
 - reports of engagement scholarship results;
 - abstracts;
 - grant proposals and grant reports;
 - performance programs;
 - reviews of publications, performances, and exhibitions;
 - project proposals and reports;
 - citations of your work;
 - appropriate correspondence (such as letters confirming acceptance of work in progress).

This section should be clean and straightforward, with the materials easy to find. Do not clutter up the dossier by including drafts, reviewers' comments, testimonials, or materials that appeared outside the review period.

5. Documenting Service

This section of the dossier need not be very long, but it's important to demonstrate the ways you are contributing to your department, the university, the community, and your profession. SUNY Fredonia, as a public, regional university, expects faculty to collaborate with colleagues in departmental matters and the curriculum and to take leadership roles on committees and in governance. Active engagement with the community (local and regional) is also valued, as is service to scholarly organizations.

The following outline might be a way to organize the Service section of your dossier:

- A) *Narrative overview.*** Begin with a very brief narrative that explains your choices about service and where you've directed your efforts during the review period.

- B) *Annotated list of service activities during the review period.*** In each category, list your committee work, leadership roles, and other responsibilities. You may want to estimate the time commitment of each of these activities, so that reviewers can easily see which activities required just a few hours, which required considerable investments of time.

For committees, clarify your role, whether you were appointed or elected, the dates of service, the nature of the work and your participation. Discipline-based citizenship may include such activities as organizing conferences, serving in an elected position, chairing sessions, serving as a reviewer for a journal, or serving as a peer evaluator for another institution. Include community service activities related to your professional role but not those you do because you're a good citizen: for example, volunteering to assist during a blood drive is good citizenship but not professional service—unless, for example, you are a microbiologist who is on hand as a voluntary professional to advise on blood analyses and infection prevention.

If appropriate, refer readers to supplementary materials related to service, as you list the activities of each of these categories:

1. Service to the department
 2. Service to the university
 3. Professional service to the community
 4. Service to the discipline
 5. Professional consulting, technical advising, or other appropriate, service (Indicate whether you were paid for these services. This is not held against you, but reviewers will want to know.)
 6. Any other evidence of service not covered in the other categories
- C) *Goals for future service contributions.*** Very briefly, explain your goals for service activities in the next review period. What strengths could you bring to your department and the

university? What kind of service do you see as the most engaging and the best use of your time?

D) Supporting materials. Very few supporting documents are needed for this section of the dossier. Some possibilities are reports or sample materials produced by you alone or with a committee. Distinctive letters about the value of your contributions could be included, but avoid including routine thank you letters and notes.

7. Resources to Assist You

Preparing materials for personnel reviews may feel like solitary task, but there are many campus resources available to assist you. Remember that although it may seem—because this is an evaluative process—that others are against you, it is in everyone’s best interest for you to succeed in your professional work at SUNY Fredonia.

These resources may be especially valuable:

- Workshops offered by the Professional Development Center
- Connections mentoring program, through which you can be paired with someone to assist you in implementing your professional development plan and in documenting your work in the dossier
- Meetings with your department chair well before the day you submit your dossier
- Good conversation with your colleagues about your work, their work, and the directions in which the department/campus/university are moving
- Sources on the Professional Development Center shelves in Reed Library
- Other publications about faculty work/roles, documentation, and issues in teaching/learning and scholarship. Here are some examples of works you may find useful:

Ambrose, Susan A. *et al.* *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

Angelo, Thomas A. and K. Patricia Cross. *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Bain, Ken. *What the Best College Teachers Do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Bakken, Jeffrey P. and Cynthia G. Simpson. *A Survival Guide for New Faculty Members: Outlining the Keys to Success for Promotion and Tenure*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 2011.

Banta, Trudy W., Elizabeth A. Jones, and Karen E. Black. *Designing Effective Assessment: Principles and Profiles of Good Practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2009.

Barkley, Elizabeth F., K. Patricia Cross, and Claire Howell Major. *Collaborative Learning Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

Barkley, Elizabeth F. *Student Engagement Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty*. Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

Becker, Howard. *Writing for Social Sciences: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Belcher, Wendy Laura. *Writing Your Journal Article in Twelve Weeks: A Guide to Academic Publishing Success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2009.

Boice, Robert. *Professors as Writers: A Self-Help Guide to Productive Writing*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press, 1990.

- Bowdon, Melody A. et al., eds. *Scholarship for Sustaining Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*. Advances in Service-Learning Research Series. Information Age Publishing, 2008.
- Branche, Jerome, John Mullennix, and Ellen R. Cohn, eds. *Diversity Across the Curriculum: A Guide for Faculty in Higher Education*. Bolton, MA: Anker, 2007.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. and Stephen Preskill. *Discussion as a Way of Teaching: Tools and Techniques for Democratic Classrooms*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Buller, Jeffrey L. *The Essential College Professor: A Practical Guide to an Academic Career*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Burnham, Joy J., Lisa M. Hooper, and Vivian H. Wright. *Tools for Dossier Success: A Guide for Promotion and Tenure*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.
- Boice, Robert. *Advice for New Faculty Members: Nihil Nimus*. Allyn and Bacon, 2000.
- Cahn, Steven M. *From Student to Scholar: A Candid Guide to Becoming a Professor*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2008.
- Chism, Nancy Van Note. *Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Bolton, MA: Anker, 2007.
- Connelly, Rachel and Kristen Ghodsee. *Professor Mommy: Finding Work-Family Balance in Academia*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011.
- Dallalgar, Arlene, et al., eds. *Transforming Classroom Culture: Inclusive Pedagogical Practices*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.
- Diamond, Robert M. *Designing and Assessing Courses and Curricula: A Practical Guide*. 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2008.
- Diamond, Robert M. *Preparing for Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Review: A Faculty Guide*. 2nd ed. Bolton, MA: Anker, 2004.
- Doyle, Terry. *Helping Students Learn in a Learner-Centered Environment: A Guide to Facilitating Learning in Higher Education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2008.
- Filene, Peter. *The Joy of Teaching: A Practical Guide for New College Instructors*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- Finkel, Donald L. *Teaching with Your Mouth Shut*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2000.
- Garrison, D. Randy and Norman D. Vaughan. *Blended Learning in Higher Education: Framework, Principles, and Guidelines*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2008.
- Germano, William. *Getting It Published: A Guide for Scholars and Anyone Else Serious about Serious Books*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Ginsberg, Margery B. and Raymond J. Wlodkowski. *Diversity and Motivation: Culturally Responsive Teaching in College*. 2nd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2009.
- Gray, Paul and David E. Drew. *What They Didn't Teach You in Graduate School: 199 Helpful Hints for Success in Your Academic Career*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2008.
- Grunert Judith, Barbara J. Millis, and Margaret W. Cohen. *The Course Syllabus: A Learning-Centered Approach*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008.
- Gurung, Regan A.R., et al., eds. *Exploring Signature Pedagogies: Approaches to Teaching Disciplinary Habits of Mind*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2009.
- Hooks, bell. *Teaching Critical Thinking: Practical Wisdom*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.
- Huston, Therese. *Teaching What You Don't Know*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Hutchings, Pat, Mary Taylor Huber, and Anthony Ciccone. *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011.

- Jacoby, Barbara and Associates, eds. *Civic Engagement in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009.
- Koritz, Amy and George J. Sanchez. *Civic Engagement in the Wake of Katrina: The New Public Scholarship*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2009.
- Lang, James M. *Life on the Tenure Track: Lessons from the First Year*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Learnson, Robert. *Thinking about Teaching and Learning: Developing Habits of Learning with First Year College and University Students*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 1999.
- Light, Greg, Roy Cox, and Susanna C. Calkins. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: The Reflective Professional*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2009.
- Luey, Beth. *Handbook for Academic Authors*. 5th ed. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Mastascusa, Edward J., William J. Snyder, and Brian S. Hoyt. *Effective Instruction for STEM Disciplines: From Learning Theory to College Teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2011.
- McGlynn, Angela Provitera. *Successful Beginnings for College Teaching: Engaging Your Students from the First Day*. Madison, WI: Atwood, 2001.
- McHaney, Roger. *The New Digital Shoreline: How Web 2.0 and Millennials Are Revolutionizing Higher Education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011.
- Mohrman, Susan Albers and Edward E. Lawler, III, eds. *Useful Research: Advancing Theory and Practice*. Center for Effective Organizations. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koeler Publishers, 2011.
- Nilson, Linda B. *Teaching at Its Best: A Research-Based Resource for College Instructors*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Ogden, Thomas E. and Israel A. Goldberg. *Research Proposals: A Guide to Success*. 3rd ed. Elsevier Science. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 2002.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn and R. Eugene Rice. *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Palmer, Parker J. *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life*. 1998. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2007.
- Perlmutter, David D. *Promotion and Tenure Confidential*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann and Tracey Laszloffy. *The Black Academic's Guide to Winning Tenure—Without Losing Your Soul*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2008.
- Saltmarsh, John and Matthew Hartley, eds. *"To Serve a Larger Purpose": Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2011.
- Seldin, Peter, and J. Elizabeth Miller. *The Academic Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Documenting Teaching, Research, and Service*. Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009.
- Seldin, Peter et al. *The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decision*. 4th ed. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Silvia, Paul J. *How to Write a Lot: A Practical Guide to Productive Academic Writing*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2007.
- Stanley, Christine A., ed. *Faculty of Color: Teaching in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities*. Bolton, MA: Anker, 2006.

- Strand, Kerry, *et al.* *Community-Based Research and Higher Education: Principles and Practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Strober, Myra H. *Interdisciplinary Conversations: Challenging Habits of Thought*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011.
- Suskie, Linda. *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009.
- Svinicki, Marilla and Wilbert J. McKeachie. *McKeachie's Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers*. 13th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2011.
- Timpson, William M., *et al.* *147 Practical Tips for Teaching Diversity*. Madison, WI: Atwood, 2005.
- Vai, Marjorie and Kristen Sosulski. *Essentials of Online Course Design: A Standards-Based Guide*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2011.
- Walvoord, Barbara E. and Virginia Johnson Anderson. *Effective Grading: A Tool for Learning and Assessment in College*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Ward, Kelly. *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 29.5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Weimer, Maryellen. *Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2002.
- Zubizarreta, John. *The Learning Portfolio: Reflective Practice for Improving Student Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009.

8. Final Comments

The dossier preparation process may seem overwhelming the first time you go through it, but it becomes easier in time. A good strategy is to develop the habits that will assist you in the review process:

- routinely collecting materials in an organized way;
- updating your Digital Measures—Activity Insight data so that it's easy to download a current *curriculum vitae* or bibliography or course information;
- regularly meeting with your department chair so that you have a clear understanding of expectations and perceived areas to improve;
- allowing regular time to reflect not only on your day-to-day work but also on your career trajectory and your own ideas of success;
- relying on your skills as a scholar and a writer to prepare materials that demonstrate your professionalism;
- allowing more time than you think you'll need to do this well.

If you were hired in a tenure-track position, SUNY Fredonia wants you to succeed and to develop the kind of record that leads to continuing appointment. Be confident, do good work, and give your colleagues a clear picture of how your work helps the department and SUNY Fredonia advance its mission.