**Chair’s Guide to Dossier Preparation[[1]](#footnote-1)**

Dossiers are prepared by the primary department. Following discussion between the candidate and the department chair regarding academic accomplishments and appropriateness for promotion, the candidate next prepares their portion of the dossier and submits that to the Chair (see *Candidate’s Guide to Dossier Preparation*).

The candidate is responsible for the following components of the dossier:

1. Statements on:
	1. research, scholarship and creative activity;
	2. service; and
	3. teaching.
2. Teaching portfolio, consisting of:
	1. the teaching statement;
	2. a summary table of courses taught;
	3. a table summarizing results of quantitative teaching evaluations;
	4. and an appendix of supporting documentation, including the individual course quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations
3. Curriculum Vitae (CV)

The chair or designee then completes the dossier assembly by adding the following elements:

1. Completed Checklist for Promotion Dossiers Prepared after September 2000 (see Note to Dossier Assembler, below) as cover sheet
2. Letters of evaluation, with signed Evaluation Access Permission Forms, from external and internal reviewers solicited by the Chair (see below)
3. Background information on letters:
	1. statement of how reviewers were selected
	2. sample copy of letter to reviewers seeking evaluations of scholarship or creative activity, the teaching portfolio, and public service contributions
	3. list of those to whom letters were sent
	4. list of those failing to respond
	5. current biographical sketches or brief curriculum vitae of reviewers
4. Unsolicited material, if applicable (clearly identified as such)
5. Candidate’s conditions of employment letter, with salary information redacted
6. Candidate’s Personnel Transaction Form, which indicates the recommended tenure or promotion action, with salary information redacted
7. Chair’s letter summarizing the dossier information and supporting the case for promotion (see below)
8. Advocate’s statement, if applicable

**Note to Dossier Assembler:** The sequence of each dossier component is important, and each section requires a separate divider sheet. Please refer to the university guidelines for the Checklist for Promotion Dossiers and for specific assembly guidance.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**LETTERS OF EVALUATION**

**A. General Information**

***Selection of Evaluators***

Evaluators may be selected by an ad hoc faculty committee appointed by the Chair, or by the Chair in consultation with faculty colleagues in the candidate’s field of expertise. The Chair is encouraged to seek the counsel of leading scholars from other peer institutions who work in the candidate’s field as well as those within the candidate’s department or school. The evaluators should hold a rank equal to or above the rank to which the candidate would be promoted.

**Internal Evaluators.** The Chair should seek evaluators who can best comment on the extent and quality of the candidate’s research or creative activity, teaching capabilities, ability to work with students, willingness and skill in working with colleagues and serving on committees, and other public or professional service as appropriate.

**External Evaluators.** The role of an external evaluator is to assess the candidate’s accomplishments, stature in the field, and future promise. Because the academic fields are small, it is possible that the evaluator may know or have worked with the candidate. However, evaluators should be disinterested; they should not be perceived as having a close personal or professional relationship with the candidate: friends, students, former teachers, and mentors, i.e., those who may potentially gain from the promotion in the form of “reflected glory.” If the chair includes materials from such interested people, they should be in addition to the required letters. In all such instances the chair must explain the rationale for their inclusion and why the assessments can be presumed important to the case.

***Number of Evaluators***

**Tenure Track.** there must be at least four letters from external reviewers (i.e., evaluators from outside of the University at Buffalo) and at least two letters from colleagues at the University at Buffalo or affiliated faculty, where applicable.

**Qualified Track.** there must be at least four letters, at least one of which is from an external reviewer (i.e., an evaluator from outside of the University at Buffalo).

***Materials to be Provided to Evaluators***

All individuals who agree to write an evaluation letter should be provided with the appropriate promotion standards (tenure track or qualified track), a list of specific questions to answer (see below) and an Evaluation Access Permission Form to be signed and returned with the letter. They also should be asked to provide a current copy of their biosketch and given a deadline by which to respond.

* 1. **Tenure Track Evaluation Letters[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**External Letters.** There must be at least four letters from external evaluators. The evaluators should be disinterested distinguished scholars or professional practitioners from leading public or private research universities, preferably those institutions holding membership in the Association of American Universities.

**Internal Letters.** There must be at least two letters from colleagues at the University at Buffalo.

The Chair’s letter to evaluators should request that reviewers address the candidate’s suitability for promotion by addressing several topics, including but not limited to the following:

1. What is your relationship, if any, to the candidate? Have you had any current or prior collaborative or supervisory associations with the candidate?
2. Has the candidate's scholarly and/or creative work gained national or international recognition of excellence? What is the importance of this work within the candidate’s area of specialization? Can you comment on the candidate's role in any collaborative work?
3. Does the candidate's scholarly and/or creative work compare favorably with individuals at the same phase of their career at your institution or at other leading institutions? What is your estimate of the candidate's potential for future growth and continuing scholarly/ creative contribution?
4. If applicable, how would you assess the candidate's public and professional service, the application of the candidate’s academic expertise towards improving society's welfare or the welfare of the profession?
5. In your opinion, are the candidate's accomplishments of the same caliber as those in the discipline who have recently been promoted to associate professor/full professor in departments and professional schools at your institution? Would the candidate be eligible for promotion to associate professor/professor at your university?

Each letter to evaluators must indicate that the evaluation letter will be held in strict confidence unless the evaluator gives written permission for the candidate to see it.  An Evaluation Access Permission Form is to be enclosed with each letter of solicitation, with the evaluator indicating which of three options is preferred: that the entire letter be held in confidence; that the letter be available to the candidate with all references to the author deleted; or that the candidate may see the letter in its entirety. This form must be signed and returned with the evaluator’s letter and current biosketch. All letters received in response to the solicitation should be included in the dossier.  Refusals or disregarded requests should be noted as well. Evaluation letters not accompanied by the EAP form or received with an incomplete form shall be considered confidential and not shared with the candidate.

* 1. **Qualified (Non-Tenure) Track Evaluation Letters**

**Note Regarding Promotion to Research Professor:** Research Professor promotions are reviewed by the President’s Review Board, so it is recommended that the School’s Standards for Faculty Promotion in the Tenure Track, as well as the university’s guidelines for promotion in the tenure track,[[4]](#footnote-4) be followed.

**External and Internal Letters.** There must be at least four letters: at least one external (i.e., from an evaluator outside the University at Buffalo) and at least three internal (i.e., from colleagues at UB).

The Chair should seek evaluators who can best comment on the extent and quality of the candidate’s research or creative activity, teaching capabilities, ability to work with students, willingness and skill in working with colleagues and serving on committees, and on other public or professional service as appropriate. External reviewers for a Clinical Educator promotion are more likely to be local than those for a Research Educator promotion. The latter are expected to be more national or international. In every case, external evaluators must be disinterested.

The letter to evaluators should request that reviewers address the candidate’s suitability for promotion by addressing several topics, including but not limited to the following:

1. What is your relationship, if any, to the candidate? Have you had any current or prior collaborative or supervisory associations with the candidate?
2. If the candidate is involved in research, has their scholarly and/or creative work gained national or international recognition of excellence? What is the importance of this work within the candidate’s area of specialization? Comment on the candidate’s role in any collaborative work, if relevant. If the candidate is not directly involved in research, do they stay current with the literature, for example through study groups, journal clubs, or application of evidence-based dentistry to clinical teaching or practice?
3. If you can comment on the candidate’s teaching, please indicate the extent of the candidate’s knowledge and mastery of the subject matter, skill in communication and presentation, and ability to stimulate and challenge the intellectual capacity of students.
4. To what extent do the candidate’s service activities contribute to the overall mission of the school? These might include active participation on University, School, or Department committees, presentation of continuing education programs, and public service in organized dentistry or on government task forces and advisory groups, as well as health-related community service organizations.
5. Please indicate your overall assessment of the candidate, and whether you support the promotion based on the School of Dental Medicine promotion guidelines (enclosed).

Each letter to evaluators must indicate that the evaluation letter will be held in strict confidence unless the evaluator gives written permission for the candidate to see it.  An Evaluation Access Permission Form is to be enclosed with each letter of solicitation, with the evaluator indicating which of three options is preferred: that the entire letter be held in confidence; that the letter be available to the candidate with all references to the author deleted; or that the candidate may see the letter in its entirety. This form must be signed and returned with the evaluator’s letter and current biosketch. All letters received in response to the solicitation should be included in the dossier.  Refusals or disregarded requests should be noted as well. Evaluation letters not accompanied by the EAP form or received with an incomplete form shall be considered confidential and not shared with the candidate.

1. **CHAIR’S LETTER**

The Chair’s letter should provide a balanced evaluation of the candidate and must consider the performance expected in relation to the responsibilities assigned. This letter of endorsement transmits the dossier to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, Executive Council, and Dean and, for tenure-track and Research Professor positions, to the President’s Review Board and University. It represents the Chair’s recommendation and should include the quantitative vote (by secret ballot) on the candidate’s promotion by the department (or ad hoc committee) and the date of the vote. The Chair should include commentary on how the vote should be understood in terms of weight and degree of departmental support. The Chair’s letter is critical, as it is the summary document at the level of the discipline. It should interpret and contextualize the candidate’s work for subsequent reviewing bodies outside the discipline and be written with great care and clarity.

The Chair’s letter should address three areas of the candidate’s contributions:

**Scholarship and Creative Activity.**  A thorough description of the candidate’s work, including an explanation of the impact of the work on the discipline; any limiting or mitigating factors; the quality of publications and other scholarly endeavors; past accomplishments and future promise. Chairs should recognize the special nature of cross-disciplinary scholarship and ensure that the candidate’s degree of contribution is considered.

**Teaching.**  A description and analysis of the candidate’s teaching contributions based on student evaluations and materials contained in the candidate’s Teaching Portfolio, as well as any assessments of teaching made by internal evaluators.

**Service.** Describe contributions to professional or public service that draw upon the candidate’s professional or scholarly expertise as it is applied to improving society’s welfare. Include descriptions of the candidate’s contributions to the profession itself: participation in professional organizations, editorial responsibilities, etc. Summarize any administrative and committee service within the university and, if relevant, to the community.

**IMPORTANT DATES FOR TENURE TRACK PROMOTIONS**

Please note the following deadlines for dossier submission to the President’s Review Board. Dossiers are **due absolutely no later than these dates;** earlier submissions are strongly encouraged.

**Rank Deadline Anticipated Appointment Date**

Professor October 1 the following July 1

 December 1 the following September 1

Associate Professor October 1 the following January 1

All additional dossiers must be submitted no later than February 1. This is not a due date, but the last possible date for consideration of review for the academic year. **Earlier submissions are strongly urged.** Dossiers for all actions are accepted on a rolling basis; Full Professor cases should be prepared with this understanding in order to meet the October 1 deadline each year.

1. Based on university promotion dossier guidelines. Refer to this document for details, including example letters to internal and external evaluators: <https://www.buffalo.edu/provost/admin-units/faculty-affairs/presidents-review-board/procedures.html#dossier> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Dossier Assembly: https://[www.buffalo.edu/provost/admin-units/faculty-affairs/presidents-review-](http://www.buffalo.edu/provost/admin-units/faculty-affairs/presidents-review-) board/dossier-assembly.html [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. These guidelines also apply to candidates being considered for promotion to Research Professor [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UB Procedures for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure: https://[www.buffalo.edu/provost/admin-](http://www.buffalo.edu/provost/admin-) units/faculty-affairs/presidents-review-board/procedures.html#procedures [↑](#footnote-ref-4)