

# ASSISTANT PROFESSOR PROMOTION TO TENURE (and Eight Year Limit Review)

## Dossier CHECKLIST

An Assistant Professor is eligible for promotion to tenure after serving two years at Step IV. During the seventh year of service as an Assistant Professor, the candidate must undergo a required review (Eight-Year Limit Review) for consideration of promotion to tenure. The department must consider the candidate's research, teaching and service since appointment at UCLA. Please refer to [The CALL, Regular Professor Section, VII](#) for information on Eight-Year Limit Reviews. Additional procedural information can be found in [Summary of Procedures, #8](#).

Deferrals of the Seventh-Year Review may be requested (refer to [The CALL, Appendix 14](#), Article VII) for further information). A [form](#) for this request is available at the Academic Personnel Office's website. A PDF interactive form can also be found on the SPH Academic Personnel Website under Academic Forms and Procedures.

--	--	--

<b>Faculty Name:</b>	<b>Effective Date:</b>	<b>Date submitted to the Dean</b>
<b>JOINT APPOINTMENT?</b> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>OTHER DEPARTMENT:</b>	

DOCUMENTS	NOTES AND REFERENCES
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review Committee Nominations</b>	Names of three faculty the department considers suitable to serve as a departmental representative if a Review Committee (RC) is appointed (Academic Senate and greater or equal rank only)
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Alpha list of co-authors</b>	Academic Senate Only
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assistant Prof Data Summary Cover Page</b>	Type of Review: Promotion, # of Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Employment History</b>	Dean's Office
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Vote Page</b>	The vote page for an Assistant Professor Action should reflect all votes taken on actions since beginning of appointment. Be specific as to the motion voted on and the proposed effective date. The sum of the vote tally must equal the number eligible to vote. For additional guidelines on faculty voting rights, please see <a href="#">CALL, Appendix 4</a>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Data Summary Pages</b>	Pages 3-7 faculty initials lower right corner
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Bibliography</b>	Bracket new material since last review. Faculty initials lower right corner
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Prior Cert Page</b>	Candidate must read, sign and list additional materials submitted.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Self Statement</b>	Self-Statement (three pages maximum). The Self-statement should include information regarding research/scholarly, teaching, administrative and professional activities since their appointment.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>After Cert Page</b>	Faculty member signs after departmental review is completed.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Department Assessment (Chair's Letter)</b>	This is the Chair's summary of the department meeting and the department's recommendation. The department's vote should be reiterated in the first paragraph of this letter. Include Rank/Step, Salary (if known) and effective date. The letter should address the candidate's activities and accomplishments since the time of appointment at the Assistant Professor level with an emphasis on activities since the last review.
<b>INTRAMURAL LETTERS (3-5)</b>	<a href="#">Internal letters should be requested from knowledgeable sources, but with regard to the need to preserve a pool of faculty from which a review committee can be formed if necessary. Internal referees should only be selected if they can provide special information not available from other sources.</a>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Sample solicitation letter</b>	Department's sample solicitation letter with statement of confidentiality. Please write "Sample solicitation letter" at the top

## ASSISTANT PROFESSOR PROMOTION TO TENURE (and Eight Year Limit Review) Dossier CHECKLIST

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>List of referees in alpha order</b>	List all evaluators solicited, even if they did not respond or declined.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Letters in reverse chronological Order</b>	All solicited letters received must be included in the dossier
	<b>EXTRAMURAL LETTERS (4-6)</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Sample solicitation letter</b>	Department's sample solicitation letter with statement of confidentiality. Please write "Sample solicitation letter" at the top
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>List of referees in alpha order w/biosketches</b>	A brief one paragraph biography is required for each evaluator listed. The list must indicate if the evaluator was suggested by the candidate or by the department or by both. List all evaluators solicited, even if they did not respond or declined. <b>It is essential that there be a balance between nominees suggested by the candidate and those named independently by the chair. Referees should be of appropriate rank with research credentials and from quality institutions.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Letters in reverse chronological Order</b>	"CCB" STAMP on the lower right hand corner on page 1 of each letter. All solicited letters received must be included in the dossier.
	<b>STUDENT LETTERS*</b>	* If necessary, to supplement the teaching record.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Sample solicitation letter</b>	Department's sample solicitation letter with statement of confidentiality. Please write "Sample solicitation letter" at the top.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>List of students</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Student Letters</b>	in reverse chronological order
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>UNSOLICITED LETTERS</b>	If an unsolicited letter of evaluation is to be included in the dossier, a letter should first be sent to the writer setting forth the Statement of Confidentiality and asking that individual to respond whether in light of this University policy the letter of evaluation should be included or returned" (CALL, Summary of Procedures #10, last sentence). Please write "Unsolicited" at the top right corner of letter.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Peer Teaching Evaluation</b>	Submission of this report is required, per <b>The CALL, Appendix 3, II.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Teaching Evaluations</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Updated CV</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Publications &amp; inventory list</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Redacted copy of dossier given to Faculty member</b>	(make sure all letters are redacted)

The Dean will write a recommendation on the case and it will be forward to APO. APO will send it to CAP. CAP normally requests a Review Committee (RC). The RC reviews the file and submits a report to APO who forwards it to the Dean for a final recommendation. APO receives the Dean's recommendation and forwards both the Dean's and the RC's recommendation to CAP. CAP then writes a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor, who decides the final outcome of the case. The Vice Chancellor will stay a final decision, however, if at this point in the review process the case does not support tenure. A preliminary assessment will be issued instead. Procedures that must be followed upon the issuance of a preliminary assessment are detailed in the **Regular Professor Section** of The CALL, Article IX. Further information on preliminary assessments may be found in **APM 220-84**, section b.