

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING DOSSIERS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

(Revised 5/4/05)

**Developed by the Peer Review Committee
College of Education and Human Services
Cleveland State University**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Structure And Contents Of A Dossier.....	2
Introduction.....	2
Suggested Structure and Contents of a Dossier.....	2
A. Title page.....	2
B. Blank section for recommendations by PRC, Chair, and Dean.....	2
C. Blank section for external reviews.....	2
D. Curriculum Vitae.....	2
E. Summary Statement.....	3
F. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness.....	3
G. Documentation of Creative Achievement (Scholarship).....	3
H. Documentation of Professional Service (Department, College, University, Community, and Professional Organizational levels).....	4
I. Documentation to Support Other Areas of Strength.....	4
Guidelines for Creative Achievement/Scholarship.....	4
Guidelines for Teaching.....	6
Guidelines for Outstanding Intellectual Leadership.....	7
General Comments On Dossier Preparation.....	9
Appendix A: Possible Items for Inclusion in a Teaching Portfolio.....	11
The Products Of Good Teaching.....	11
Material From Oneself.....	11
Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one's teaching.....	11
Information From Students.....	12
Information From Colleagues.....	12
Other Sources Of Information.....	12
Appendix B.....	14
Guidelines For Peer Evaluation Of Teaching.....	14
Formative.....	14
Summative.....	14
Appendix C.....	17
Grant Reporting Form.....	17

STRUCTURE AND CONTENTS OF A DOSSIER

Introduction

The dossier is the main document supporting the request of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure. As outlined in the Agreement between CSU and the AAUP (the Agreement, Section 12.11), the dossier is reviewed by the College Peer Review Committee (PRC), the Department Chairperson, and the Dean.

Suggested Structure and Contents of a Dossier

Not all the items in the following outline are mandatory for inclusion in the dossier, and the order may be changed to support your Area of Strength. However, this outline reflects the thinking of the College of Education Peer Review Committee as of the date of this document. It is also based on previous guidelines from the University Personnel Committee. The PRC recommends that candidates work with their Department Chairperson in the organization and development of the dossier. The committee also recommends that candidates prepare a draft of the dossier for the Chair's review and feedback well in advance of the deadline. Candidates may also find it useful to review the dossiers of senior faculty in the College who have successfully navigated the promotion/tenure process in the same designated area of strength.

- A. Title page**
- B. Blank section for recommendations by PRC, Chair, and Dean**
- C. Blank section for external reviews**
- D. Curriculum Vitae, including (not necessarily in this order):**
 - 1. Education
 - 2. Experience
 - 3. Courses taught
 - 4. List of publications (refereed journals asterisked) in chronological order with books separated from journals
 - 5. Research in progress
 - 6. Grants (awarded vs. proposals)
 - 7. Honors (service, publications, teaching)
 - 8. Department, College, University service assignments in chronological order
 - 9. Professional organizational memberships, service, editorial boards, offices held in chronological order
 - 10. Community service activities in chronological order
 - 11. Other appropriate sections regarding background or fields of expertise

E. Summary Statement

The Summary Statement is an important introduction to the dossier. It should begin with a clear statement of the Area of Strength and should be organized to highlight that Area of Strength. It should provide a clear focus on teaching, creative achievement (scholarship) and service. All three areas will need evidence of activity and accomplishment. There should be references in the Summary Statement to appropriate supportive documentation in various sections of the dossier. Candidates should aim for a concise, clear, and well-organized statement that analyzes their growth as a professional to date. The length of this statement will vary from candidate to candidate, but both excessively long statements (i.e. more than 10 pages) or cryptically short statements (a page or so) are unlikely to meet these criteria.

F. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

1. Statement of teaching philosophy and innovative practices, including technology and distance learning
2. Course Syllabi, including bibliographies
3. Self evaluation of teaching
4. Longitudinal peer evaluations of teaching. See Appendix B. (In an attachment to a memo on Promotion/Tenure dossiers from William Shorrock, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, dated April 6, 2001, it is stated: "Evidence of teaching competence and excellence that does not include peer evaluation [preferably longitudinal] should be regarded as incomplete.")
5. Student evaluations of teaching
6. Other materials (print and electronic) that demonstrate effective teaching

G. Documentation of Creative Achievement (Scholarship)

1. Copies of published articles/books/monographs. For co-authored materials, candidates must supply a statement from the co-author (or first author) of their contribution to the published work. This statement should be filed before the first page of the publication in the dossier. If published materials include on-line publications, the candidate must provide evidence of the peer review process, circulation, and other related evidence of the scholarly nature of those publications. Because on-line publications are so new to academia and so variable in content and quality the candidate has an extra responsibility to document the scholarly nature of these outlets for the committee.
2. Copies of works "in press" with evidence of time and place of publication.
3. Reviews of candidate's scholarly publications by persons in the field (if

available). Examples include published book reviews, comments by peer reviewers on manuscripts that eventually were published, editors' comments on chapters or articles, etc.

4. Documentation of citations of candidate's work in the work of others
5. Copies of scholarly presentations at international, national, regional, state, and local conferences (For any conferences that involved peer review of proposals those presentations should be asterisked).
6. Record of grant development efforts, with funding noted
7. Published electronic materials (e.g. CD-ROMS, computer programs, multimedia programs)
8. Copies of work in progress

H. Documentation of Professional Service (Department, College, University, Community, and Professional Organizational levels)

1. Written materials that the candidate has had a significant role in developing (e.g. Annual Reports and projects from committees)
2. Documentation of public service presentations (e.g. agenda for the event, publicity that identifies the candidate's role, etc.).
3. Letters of support attesting to the candidate's service.
4. Peer evaluations of the document and the scope and nature of the candidate's service contributions. The goal here is to give a sense of the contribution the candidate has made to the activity. This is not needed for committees that are a regular and ongoing part of the University such as Graduate Council or Faculty Senate unless the candidate's participation was unusually extensive.

I. Documentation to Support Other Areas of Strength (See sections on "Guidelines for Teaching" and "Guidelines for Outstanding Intellectual leadership" in this document)

Guidelines for Creative Achievement/Scholarship

According to the Agreement Between Cleveland State University and American Association of University Professors CSU Chapter (the Agreement), effective August 16, 2000 through August 15, 2003, standards for creative achievement/scholarship are:

[For] appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor...the candidate shall demonstrate significant scholarship beyond publication of material contained in his or her dissertation (12.8, C-3). [For] appointment or promotion to the rank of professor...the candidate shall have an outstanding record as a scholar...(12.8, C-4). The standard of scholarship requires a working commitment to inquiry and research and to creative achievement. The University obligation for the generation of new knowledge and practices imposes a responsibility for creativity, whether in inquiry and investigation, writing, design and production, or in the performing and fine arts. In the best of scholars

and the best of teachers, creative inquiry is joined with effective classroom teaching. Candidates for promotion/tenure who submit co-authored material for review shall also provide an explanation of their contribution to such materials (12.12B).

In preparing the dossier, take the following guidelines into account. If your area of strength is creative achievement/scholarship, emphasize the documentation of achievement in this area (not necessarily in order of significance):

1. Books
2. Chapters of books and/or chapters published in books.
3. Copies of articles published in journals.
4. Copies of grant proposals.
5. Copies or abstracts of conference presentations.
6. Book reviews, editorials, local publications, reports of committee proceedings, or reports of grant-related activities.

It is crucially important to provide information regarding the quality of your creative/scholarly works. Because the PRC may not include members from your discipline you bear the responsibility of informing the committee about the quality of your contribution to your discipline. The following are some ideas of how to establish the quality of items in areas listed above:

Additional Creative Achievement/Scholarship Evaluation Criteria:

1. Explanation of the refereeing process for publications and grants, including the type of review, number of reviewers, and acceptance rate.
2. Information about the stature of the grants you received or publishing houses through which your publications were published.
3. Information about the status of each journal in its field, and whether it is international, national, regional, state, or local in circulation.
4. Size of grants awarded and funding agency.
5. Published reviews of your publications or references to your grant-related activities, from those in your field.
6. Evidence attesting to your specific contribution to co-authored materials (e.g., grant proposals, books, chapters, articles, conference proceedings).
7. Explanation of the ways in which each grant proposal or publication represented an intellectual, creative achievement.
8. Explanation of the ways in which the design of the practices, program, or research described in each grant or publication was an intellectual, creative achievement.
9. Explanation of how each grant or publication relates to your other creative/scholarly work.
10. Citations of your work in the work of others.

Note:

Depending upon how grant activity is evaluated based on the “Additional Creative Achievement/Scholarship Evaluation Criteria” outlined above, a funded grant may count more than, less than, or as much as a published peer-refereed journal article. However, to be eligible for promotion and tenure under creative achievement, at least some of a candidate’s accomplishments in this area must be publications such as peer-refereed journal articles, book chapters, or books.

In preparing the section in your dossier on creative achievement/scholarship, be sure to keep all information consistent. Information such as dates, titles, and numbers of articles and grants should be the same throughout the dossier, for example in the vita, the summary statement, and the documentation sections.

Guidelines for Teaching

According to the Agreement, standards for teaching are:

Appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor is based on evidence that the candidate is a fully competent teacher (12.8, C-3). Appointment or promotion to the rank of professor is based on evidence of sustained excellence in teaching (12.8, C-4). Exceptional achievement as a teacher for the purposes of these rules refers to outstanding performance as a teacher in the classroom, significant accomplishments in the development of courses and teaching methods, and significant contributions through the preparation of teaching materials. Evidence of good teaching may include longitudinal peer evaluations, student evaluations, teaching portfolios, papers, reports, and other materials submitted for this purpose (12.8, C-6). The highest standards [of teaching are comprehensive knowledge of the field of study, thorough preparation, intense interest in students as well as sensitivity to student interest, open-mindedness, independence and integrity and, above all, intellectual enthusiasm which is transmitted to students (12.12A).

Since teaching is a sine quo non for promotion and tenure, take the following guidelines into account as possibilities in preparing your dossier, whether or not teaching is your major area of strength:

1. A complete list of all courses taught at CSU (and elsewhere, if they are part of the information for your probationary period). Indicate whether each course is at the undergraduate or graduate level (or both).
2. Copies of syllabi for the latest offering of each course. Include older syllabi only if you are making a case for course improvement in one or more courses).
3. Summaries of student evaluations for all courses taught. Scores should be presented in comparison with College of Education norms.

4. Longitudinal peer evaluations of your teaching (i.e., not limited to observation of one meeting of one course).
5. Evidence of development of new courses or workshops and/or the substantial redesigning of existing courses.
6. Other innovations in curriculum and/or delivery systems

If you are claiming teaching as your designated area of strength, you will need to pay special attention to providing documentation of "exceptional achievement as a teacher" (12.8, C-3). Since most college professors consider themselves "excellent teachers", your case for promotion/tenure in this area needs to be especially rigorous. Following are some guidelines for this area in addition to those cited above:

Additional Teaching Evaluation Criteria:

1. Published journal articles about some aspect of your teaching (please refer to the list on pages 2-3 for information to include in documenting these publications).
2. Curriculum products (e.g., textbooks, software, simulations, exercises) that have been published or adopted by others.
3. Funded grants related to teaching (please refer to the list on pages 2-3, for information to include in documenting these grants).
4. Requests for teaching assistance from others (e.g., teaching consultations, teaching demonstrations).
5. Examples of students who have excelled in your field in advanced courses or after graduation due to your influence.
6. Demonstration of significant course redesign that has resulted in excellent student learning outcomes.
7. Awards for excellence in teaching by the College, University, or Professional organizations.
8. Significant innovations and applications of technology and distance learning.
9. Statements about your teaching achievements from administrators and peers at CSU and elsewhere.
10. Self-reflections about philosophy, growth, and improvement as a teacher.

Teaching portfolios have been recommended as a way of documenting excellence in teaching. You may want to look at *The Teaching: Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship, in Teaching* (1991), by Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan (Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education). Appendix A provides a listing of "Possible items for inclusion" in a teaching portfolio taken from that work.

Guidelines for Outstanding Intellectual Leadership

According to the Agreement, standards for intellectual leadership are:

Appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor is based on evidence that the candidate is a fully competent teacher. In addition, the candidate shall demonstrate

significant scholarship...or outstanding intellectual leadership beyond the University community...(12.8, C-3). Appointment to the rank of professor is based on evidence of sustained excellence in teaching. In addition, the candidate shall have an outstanding record as a scholar or shall demonstrate sustained outstanding intellectual leadership as a practitioner in his or her field. Evidence of reputation in the discipline or a related discipline beyond the local community is required. In rare instances, promotion to the rank of professor may be based in significant part upon sustained and generally acclaimed leadership in the realization of the mission of the University (12.8, C-4). Outstanding intellectual leadership for the purposes of these rules means the attainment of a position of prominence in the field which is demonstrated by activities (other than simply holding positions in committees and organizations) evidencing that the candidate has played a major role in developing a policy or program in the field which can be documented by papers, reports or other tangible evidence appropriate to the discipline (12.8, C-5).

It seems clear that "outstanding intellectual leadership" goes beyond "service" to "accomplishment". The examples given in the Agreement are development of a policy or program. The dictionary definition of "policy" is "a definite course of method of action selected from among alternatives and in light of given conditions to guide and determine present and future decisions", or "a high-level overall plan embracing the general goals and acceptable procedures esp. of a government body." "Program" is defined as "a plan or system under which action may be taken toward a goal."

If outstanding intellectual leadership is your chosen area of strength, you need to be creative and resourceful to make your case for promotion and tenure. Following are some guidelines for this area:

Suggestions for Documenting Outstanding Intellectual Leadership

1. Documentation of your position of prominence within the field (e.g. letters of appointment, letters of reference, certificates).
2. Documentation of the policy or program that you were instrumental in establishing (e.g., copies of plans, laws, articles, reports, evaluations).
3. Documentation of your leadership role in the development of the policy or program (e.g., personal statement of explanation, letters from others attesting to your leadership, newspaper articles, awards and recognitions).
4. Documentation of the value of the policy or program to the field (e.g., reviews, published and unpublished articles, letters from prominent practitioners).
5. Published reports, journal articles, book chapters, or books related to the program, policy, or practices you were instrumental in designing or implementing (please refer to the list on pages 2-3, for information to include in documenting these publications).
6. Funded grants related to the program, policy, or practices you were instrumental in designing or implementing (please refer to the list on pages 2-3, for information to include in documenting these grants).

Note:

Depending upon how your grant activity is evaluated based on the documentation suggested above, a funded grant may count more than, less than, or as much as a published peer-refereed journal article.

For promotion to professor, it is necessary to demonstrate a sustained pattern of intellectual leadership over a period of years.

GENERAL COMMENTS ON DOSSIER PREPARATION

The purpose of the dossier is to make a cogent case for promotion/tenure by providing relevant information. Therefore, it is important to prepare the dossier with the readers in mind. Anything that can be done by the candidate to help the readers locate and evaluate pertinent materials that support the promotion/tenure request will strengthen the dossier.

An ideal dossier should include the following:

- All relevant material but **no irrelevant material**. The weight and volume of the dossier is unrelated to its evaluation. Dossiers should be clear, concise, and free of “fillers”. Selectively is the key. Include only those materials which are directly relevant to your case for promotion/tenure. Be sure, however, to fully document your major area of strength. The PRC strongly advises you to get feedback on the relevance and completeness of the dossier from senior colleagues. When providing copies of unpublished materials use double-sided copying to reduce the bulk of the dossier.
- A Table of Contents and other organizers so that the material you have included is accessible. Use tabs, and dividers to separate sections of your dossier. **An overfilled dossier that is difficult to navigate is by definition unorganized.**
- A clear and unambiguous designation of an area of strength included in the opening section of the summary statement.

According to the Agreement, the candidate should select one of the following strength areas:

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure:

1. Significant scholarship beyond publication of material contained in [the] dissertation, OR
2. Outstanding intellectual leadership beyond the University community, OR
3. Exceptional achievement as a teacher.

For promotion to Clinical Associate Professor:

Referring to "Suggested Structure and Contents of a Dossier on pages 2 - 4 of this document, letters A, B, C, D, E, F and H

For promotion to Full Professor:

1. Outstanding record as a scholar,
OR
 2. Sustained outstanding intellectual leadership as a practitioner in his or her field,
OR
(In rare instances) Sustained and generally acclaimed leadership in the realization of the mission of the University.
- Consistent presentation of material. Be sure that dates, titles of publications, numbers of items (such as numbers of publications, courses, or presentations) and other factual and statistical information are consistent in various parts of the dossier.
 - A well-constructed curriculum vitae that provides a concise and accurate overview of your professional accomplishments and is consistent with statements in other sections of the dossier.

APPENDIX A

POSSIBLE ITEMS FOR INCLUSION IN A TEACHING PORTFOLIO

The Products Of Good Teaching

- Students' scores on teacher-made or standardized tests, possibly before and after a course has been taken as evidence of learning.
- Student laboratory workbooks and other kinds of workbooks or logs.
- Student essays, creative work, and project or field-work reports.
- Publications by students on course-related work.
- A record of students who select and succeed in advanced courses of study in the field.
- A record of students who elect another course with the same professor.
- Evidence of effective supervision of Honors, Master's or Ph.D. theses.
- Setting up or running a successful internship program.
- Documentary evidence of the effect of courses on student career choice.
- Documentary evidence of help given by the professor to students in securing employment.
- Evidence of help given to colleagues on teaching improvement.

Material From Oneself: Description of current and recent teaching responsibilities and practices.

- List of course titles and numbers, unit values or credits, enrollments with brief elaboration.
- List of course materials prepared for students.
- Information on professor's availability to students.
- Report on identification of student difficulties and encouragement of student participation in courses or programs.
- Description of how films, computers or other non-print materials were used in teaching.
- Steps taken to emphasize the interrelatedness and relevance of different kinds of learning.

Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one's teaching.

- Maintaining a record of the changes resulting from self-evaluation.
- Reading journals on improving teaching and attempting to implement acquired ideas.
- Reviewing new teaching materials for possible application.
- Exchanging course materials with a colleague from another institution.

- Conducting research on one's own teaching or course.
- Becoming involved in an association or society concerned with the improvement of teaching and learning.
- Attempting instructional innovations and evaluating their effectiveness.
- Using general support services such as the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) in improving one's teaching.
- Participating in seminars, workshops and professional meetings intended to improve teaching.
- Participating in course or curriculum development.
- Pursuing a line of research that contributes directly to teaching.
- Preparing a textbook or other instructional materials.
- Editing or contributing to a professional journal on teaching one's subject.

Information From Students

- Student course and teaching evaluation data, which suggest improvements or produce an overall rating of effectiveness or satisfaction.
- Written comments from a student committee to evaluate courses and provide feedback.
- Unstructured (and possibly unsolicited) written evaluations by students, including written comments on exams and letters received after a course has been completed.
- Documented reports of satisfaction with out of-class contacts.
- Interview data collected from students after completion of a course.
- Honors received from students, such as being elected "teacher of the year".

Information From Colleagues

- Statements from colleagues who have observed teaching either as members of a teaching team or as independent observers of a particular course, or who teach other sections of the same course.
- Written comments from those who teach courses for which a particular course is a prerequisite
- Evaluation of contributions to course development and improvement
- Statements from colleagues from other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared for graduate studies.
- Honors or recognition such as a distinguished teacher award or election to a committee on teaching.
- Requests for advice or acknowledgment of advice received by a committee on teaching or similar body.

Other Sources Of Information

- Statements about teaching achievements from administrators at one's own institution or from other institutions.
- Alumni ratings or other graduate feedback.
- Comments from parents of students.
- Reports from employers of students (e.g., in a work-study or "cooperative" program).
- Invitations to teach for outside agencies.
- Invitations to contribute to the teaching literature.
- Other kinds of invitations based on one's reputation as a teacher (for example, a media interview on a successful teaching innovation).

The Teaching: Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship, in Teaching (1991), by Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan (Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education).

APPENDIX B

Guidelines For Peer Evaluation Of Teaching

The appropriate sequence planning a peer evaluation is: 1) the faculty member seeking the observation to approach an observer, 2) the faculty member and observer discuss the course to be observed, the primary goals of the course, the goals of the selected class meeting(s) and purpose of the evaluation, and 3) the faculty member and observer agree on a format for the evaluation. Procedures for the actual observation may vary but the decision to schedule the observation or conduct the observation unannounced is the faculty member's. Following the observation and completion of the evaluation forms, the observer and the faculty member should meet to discuss the results of the evaluation. The evaluation results are the sole property of the observed faculty member. The faculty member is the holder of the privilege and is the only individual who can choose to share the results.

Formative

The formative course observations are potentially of use to any individual wishing to enrich and improve his or her teaching. Junior and senior faculty being considered for promotion may choose to include results of these formative teaching observations/evaluations as evidence of the motivation to improve their teaching in their dossiers, but are not required to do so. These formative evaluations are intended purely as vehicles for teaching improvement. As such, the person being evaluated has the right to ask for confidentiality of the content of the evaluation and the feedback. The nature of the instrument used (qualitative, quantitative, or a combination) is the choice of the faculty member's being observed. Nevertheless, if formative evaluations are going to be included in the dossier, it will be most helpful to the promotion process if those evaluation results are presented in a manner that informs readers of the faculty member's process of growth and development as an instructor.

Summative

Junior faculty who are tenure-track individuals are recommended to include in their dossiers at least one peer evaluation of their teaching for each year of their employment. These evaluations are considered summative in nature. They are intended to be as helpful as possible for the faculty member, and also provide information to the Peer Review Committee with evaluative data about the strengths and weaknesses of the individual's instructional ability. Faculty are encouraged to choose the individual who will evaluate them; junior faculty must choose from among senior faculty, who may be from any department in the University. There may be times when an observer from another department may have a fresh or unique view of one's teaching techniques separate from those peers in the department of the person being evaluated. The instrument used for the summative evaluations may be quantitative or qualitative, and written in a broad, generic manner that enables individual departments

to add specific items that are germane to their disciplines. One instrument that is suggested is the Peer Observation Evaluation Criteria evaluation form, which is adapted from the Cornell Teaching Handbook (The suggested instrument is included at the end of Appendix B . If the instrument to be used is qualitative, the observer and faculty member being observed may choose to jointly develop the teaching components to be evaluated. Senior faculty applying for promotion to Full Professor may also wish to provide several Peer Evaluations of their teaching that are representative of their levels of performance in the classroom, preferably several over the years between their promotion to Associate and their application for Full Professor.

To further operationalize the above general statements, consider the following:

1. Determine your goal in participating in peer observation. Are your goals primarily related to content (e.g., to get feedback on the way you teach challenging material)? If so, choose a faculty member to observe who has expertise in the discipline. Are your goals more directly related to instructional methodology (e.g., how can I structure a four-hour class to keep the group engaged for the entire time)? In that case, you may prefer to select a faculty member who is known for their skill in engaging students more than their content expertise. Are you most interested in documenting the quality of your teaching and demonstrating your best work?
2. Select two or three observers in mind in the event that your first choice is not available and try to schedule at least two visits at different times in the semester. Ideally, the second observation will involve your implementation of the suggestions presented after the first observation.
3. Have peer observation in at least two different courses if possible, preferably with different formats and content.
4. Plan the observations carefully. Each observation has 3 parts:
 - A pre-observation meeting in which you present the syllabus and related instructional materials to your observer. Use that time to discuss your instructional goals for the course, that particular class meeting, and other pedagogical considerations.
 - The observation itself
 - A post-observation feedback session in which the observer shares his or her written evaluation of your teaching with you and discusses that feedback with you.
5. Consider using a standardized peer observation form or a structured set of questions for the observer to respond to in the written evaluation. What you want to avoid is the peer observation report that is vague and general about your teaching approach. The greater the specificity in the identification of strengths and weaknesses the more credible and useful the observation will

be, both for your development as a faculty member and as a part of your dossier.

6. The standard for promotion and tenure is full competence as a teacher not extraordinary teaching. What the PRC looks for is not superlatives in all evaluations, but rather a commitment to quality teaching and evidence that a faculty member is engaged in a process of scholarly reflection about his or her teaching and modifies that teaching to better serve the students.
7. No single form for peer observation has been mandated by the College. Whatever form you use, a complete record of feedback from peers will include the following:
 - Discussion of your knowledge of the subject matter taught (including the breadth and currency of your knowledge of the discipline)
 - Review of the organization and clarity of your presentation and course materials (handouts, syllabi, overheads, etc.)
 - Attention to the ways in which you engage students in the subject matter and the ways in which you address student questions, confusions, or challenges during the class
 - Use of written materials, visual aids, technology, and the like to facilitate student learning
 - Capacity to foster a positive classroom climate which respects the dignity and integrity of each participant
 - Recommendations regarding both the strengths and weaknesses of the content and instructional methodology used in the classes observed.
8. For more information on peer observation, teaching portfolios, and the like the Website of the American Association of Higher Education is a good starting point. www.aahe.org

APPENDIX C

Grant Reporting Form

The COEHS does not require grant writing as an activity for all faculty. Nevertheless, grants are encouraged and are fully considered in the promotion and tenure review process. The purpose of this grant reporting form is to assist the candidate in reporting his/her grant information in a clear and concise way to help the PRC in its review of the dossier. While use of this form is not required, it can be an enhancement to the dossier in addressing the role of grants in support of a candidate's area of strength.

Title of Grant (and length):

Date of Grant Received:

Author(s):

Amount and Duration of Grant:

Name of Funding Agency/Foundation:

Agency/Foundation Information:

Agency/Foundation Review Process:

Annual Agency/Foundation Report: Number of Grant Submissions vs. Funded Grants:

Relationship of Grant to Candidate's Teaching, Research/Scholarship or Service Responsibilities:

Target Audience for this Grant:

Co-Authored Grants: Describe (in detail), candidate's responsibilities in writing, implementing, evaluating and reporting the results to the agency/foundation. (Note: Statements from co-authors on your contribution must be included for the final tenure review process, earlier if possible)