Dossier Checklist: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion 2025-26

Candidate's Name:			
School/Co	ollege:		
Current R	ank/Title:		
Action:	Comprehensive Review for Reappointment	Tenure	Promotion
A candidat	te's dossier must include the following items:		
Compl	eted dossier checklist		
UCD-7	signature form		
Primar	y unit criteria		
the	etement re: version of primary unit criteria candide case (previous or current criteria if candidate was his professor, current primary unit criteria s	ired with previ	
Initial o	offer letter		
	us RTP and personnel actions, if any (including crion forms, reappointment letters and VCAC memos,		
Faculty	Pandemic Impact Statement (optional)		
Faculty External Impact Statement (optional)			
Current curriculum vitae (See Office of Faculty Affairs website for suggested format.)			
Overall summary statement (two-to-three-page summary overview)			
Teaching (librarianship) statement (no more than three pages)			
Scholarly/creative work statement (no more than three pages)			
Leadership/service statement (no more than three pages)			
Supporting teaching (librarianship) materials			
FC	Q one-page summary table (see Office of Faculty)	Affairs website	2)

FCQs (Schools and colleges have discretion in terms of very large courses, but need to submit unbiased, representative samples of FCQs.)

Supporting scholarly/creative work materials

Supporting leadership/service materials

Primary Unit Evaluation Committee report

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

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

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

Primary Unit recommendation and vote (See Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers for acceptable wording for evaluation and vote count.*)

if vote is not unanimous, an explanation of dissenting views is required and a minority report by dissenting faculty may be added

Dean's review/advisory committee recommendation and vote (See Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers for acceptable wording for evaluation and vote count.*) (an independent analysis at this level is required)

if vote is not unanimous, an explanation of dissenting views is required and a minority report by dissenting faculty may be added

Dean's recommendation (See **Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers** for acceptable wording for evaluation.*)

External Review

Letters received from external reviewers

External Reviewers' biographical sketch or short vita

List of external reviewers contacted, indicating:

- whether candidate or primary unit recommended the evaluator
- relationship, if any, of the evaluator to the candidate or to a member(s) of the primary unit
- who responded
- a numbered order (for consistency if they are quoted in first-level and second-level recommendations)

Explanation of how reviewers were selected

Copy of the letter requesting external reviewer evaluation letters

Number of reviewers meets requirements explanation if requirement not met

Ratio meets requirements explanation if requirement not met

Reconsideration recommendations

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

Primary unit's reconsideration, if applicable

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

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

^{*}Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers dictates the acceptable wording for evaluation and vote counts of performance at each level. Reappointment/comprehensive review evaluation of teaching (librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service differ from promotion and tenure evaluations.