

## TENURED PROFESSOR – MERIT TO PROFESSOR, FURTHER ABOVE SCALE

### Definition

A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an Above-Scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinitely long and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

### General Information (see [The CALL - Regular Professor Series](#))

- Professors who have been four (4) years at Above-Scale may be considered for advancement to Further Above-Scale
- Faculty who have attained the rank of Above-Scale may use the title “Distinguished Professor X” as a working title
- The department must consider the candidate’s teaching, research and creative work, professional activity, and University and public service since the last personnel action ( [The CALL - Summary of Procedures #5](#))

### **Submit the following to Luskin:**

- ☐ Original plus one (1) single-sided copy of the dossier; for **accelerations** also include four (4) double-sided copies. For the double-sided copies, the cover page through the vote page must be single-sided, and thereafter double-sided.
- ☐ Two (2) copies of the Off-Scale Analysis

### **Dossier Contents in the order below:**

- ☐ **Further Above-Scale Advancement [Data Summary](#) cover page**
  - When the candidate has a joint or split appointment(s), notate all departments and the percentages in the Department section
  - Complete all fields in the Present Status and Proposed Status sections
    - Salary must be rounded to the nearest \$100
    - Proposed salary rate is marked as TBD if no specific salary is recommended
- ☐ If applicable, a **copy of the Joint Appointment waiver form**
- ☐ **History Record** (entire history; no handwritten entries)
- ☐ **Data Summary Vote page**
  - 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 (see [The CALL - Appendix 4](#))
  - Votes must add up and match the Departmental Assessment/Director’s letter
- ☐ **Data Summary, pages 3 - 6** (read instructions on each page)
  - **Candidate must initial these pages before committee or department review**
  - To ensure that a section is not overlooked, “N/A” or “None” should be notated
  - If the content does not fit on one page, append additional pages and number them with letters, for example 3a, 3b, 3c. Do not assign new numbers to the data summary pages.
  - Note:** CAP requests a separate teaching tabulation page with the following information: Quarter, Course, Number of Students, Response, Instructor Rating, Course Rating, and Department Average. Place this page directly behind data summary page 3.
- ☐ **Bibliography ([L & S format](#) must be used)**
  - The candidate must initial these pages before committee or department review
  - Mark “Since Last Advancement” in **ALL** sections
- ☐ **“Prior” Certification page**
  - **Must** be read by the candidate and signed before committee or department review
  - Bulky items (exhibits, grant proposals, etc.) should include a footnote, “See envelope (or box)”
  - Indicate items supplied by the candidate on the bottom section. Immediately after this page, include:
    - CV, required
    - Self-statement (*optional, but strongly encouraged*)
    - Sabbatical Report, if applicable
    - Bias list, if applicable

- ☐ **“After” Certification**

- **Must** be read by the candidate and signed after the Department Assessment Letter is finalized
- **Must** be dated on or after the Department Assessment Letter
- ☐ If applicable, **candidate's written response to Department Assessment**
- ☐ **Department Assessment/Recommendation Letter**
  - This is the letter setting forth the department's recommendation, written under the Chair's signature
  - The first sentence **must** include the candidate's name, action, proposed rank, salary, vote and effective date
  - Voting faculty have the right to review the letter prior to the candidate's review ([see memo from former VC](#))
- ☐ If applicable, **Chair's individual recommendation** (submit in a separate statement)
- ☐ If applicable, **Departmental ad hoc or standing committee report**
  
- ☐ If applicable, **Department's UC interdisciplinary sample solicitation letter with Statement of Confidentiality**
- ☐ If applicable, **letters of evaluation from UC interdisciplinary entities** (noted on the Prior Cert Page)
- ☐ **Peer evaluation of teaching must be submitted**
- ☐ If applicable, **Department's unsolicited sample solicitation letter with Statement of Confidentiality**
  - If an unsolicited letter of evaluation is received, a letter should first be sent to the writer setting forth the statement of confidentiality ([The CALL - Summary of Procedures #10](#)), asking that individual to respond whether in light of this policy the letter of evaluation should be included or returned. Conclude that if no response is received by an assigned date, it is assumed that the writer agrees to the inclusion of the evaluation letter.
  - Write "Unsolicited" at the top right corner of letter
- ☐ If applicable, **Unsolicited letters** (see [Helpful Hints](#) for more information)
  - All unsolicited letters received must be included in the dossier

### **Opus**

Process the action in Opus, and submit to the Dean's Office queue before the hard copies of the dossier are delivered.

### **Publications and Teaching Evaluations (for accelerations)**

Publications, teaching evaluations, and any supporting materials placed in boxes. Boxes must be clearly labeled on both sides to include candidate's name, department(s), action, effective date, box number (e.g. 1 of 2), etc.

- **Publications:** All publications since last review should be submitted, including in-press and work-in-progress manuscripts, if available. Publications must be numbered and stapled. *Note: A copy of the bibliography must be placed in the box or envelope (check off the items submitted).*
- **Teaching:** All teaching evaluations since last review should be submitted in reverse chronological order. Each packet should be stapled and have the OID evaluation summary sheet before the students' written comments.

### **Routing and Approval**

- **On-Time & Deferred:** Luskin analyst will review the case then forward it to the appropriate Dean for review. The Dean will write a recommendation, which will be included in the case when directed to APO. The Vice Chancellor decides the final outcome of the case.
- **Accelerated:** The Luskin analyst will review the case then forward it to the appropriate Dean for review. The Dean will write a recommendation, which will be included in the case when directed to APO. APO will send it to CAP. CAP will examine the case and make a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor, who has final approval authority.

The Luskin analyst will notify the department of the outcome.