Tenured Professor – Merit to Professor, Step VI

Definition
A merit to Step VI review is based on “… evidence of sustained and continuous excellence in each of the following three categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement; (2) University teaching; and (3) service. Above and beyond that, great academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching.” The CALL, Regular Professorial Series, V. A, 4.1. Additional information can be found at The CALL - Summary of Procedures #5.

Submit the following to Luskin:
- Original plus one (1) single-sided copy and four (4) double-sided copies of the dossier. For the double-sided copies, the cover page through the vote page must be single-sided, and thereafter double-sided.
- List the names, ranks and departments of three (3) faculty suitable to serve as a departmental representative if a Review Committee (RC) is appointed. Submit six (6) copies.
- Two (2) copies of the Off-Scale Analysis
- Publications, teaching evaluations, and any supporting materials placed in box. See below for details.*

Dossier Contents in the order below:
- Merit Advancement to Professor, Step VI Data Summary cover page
  - Use the appropriate Data Summary pages from the APO website
  - For joint or split appointment(s), notate all departments and the percentages in the Department section
  - Complete all the fields in the Present Status and Proposed Status sections
    - Annual salaries - Refer to Table 1: Faculty – Ladder Ranks – Professor Series, Academic Year
    - Salary must be rounded to the nearest $100
    - Proposed salary rate is marked as TBD if no specific salary is recommended
    - Salary above the proposed step on Table 1 is an off-scale salary
      - A request to increase off-scale percentage must be explained and justified
- 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 Letter

Department Assessment/Recommendation Letter
- This is the letter setting forth the department’s recommendation, written under the Chair’s signature
- The letter should be addressed to the Vice Chancellor
- The first sentence must include the candidate’s name, action, proposed rank and step, salary and whether the rate is
  off-scale, 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

List of Extramural (outside) evaluators solicited (Table format)
- List all evaluators solicited, even if they did not respond
- The list must indicate if the evaluator was suggested by the candidate, department, or both
- A brief biography is required for each evaluator that was solicited
  Note: CAP recommends the receipt of 6-8 letters, and a reasonable balance between evaluators from the candidate’s
  list and the department’s list. Otherwise, the department must solicit additional letters accordingly.

Department’s sample solicitation letter with Statement of Confidentiality
- A sample solicitation letter (Summary 13) and the Statement of Confidentiality can be found in The CALL
  - You may NOT change any part of the Statement of Confidentiality. It must be copied into a solicitation letter, or
    supplied as an attachment in this exact text
- Notate “Sample solicitation letter” at the top

Extramural (outside) evaluation letters (see Helpful Hints for more information)
- All solicited letters received must be submitted, including declinations
- For evaluators who respond via email, include the first page of the email

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

List of former and current students solicited
- The list must indicate if the student was suggested by the candidate, department, or both
- List all students solicited, even if they did not respond

Department’s sample Student Solicitation letter with Statement of Confidentiality
- A sample solicitation letter and the Statement of Confidentiality can be found in The CALL
  - You may NOT change any part of the Statement of Confidentiality. It must be copied into a solicitation letter, or
    supplied as an attachment in this exact text.
  - Write “Sample solicitation letter” at the top

Former and current student evaluation letters (see Helpful Hints for more information)
- All solicited letters received must be included in the dossier

If applicable, Unsolicited sample Student letter of evaluation with Statement of Confidentiality
- If an unsolicited letter of evaluation is included in the dossier, a letter should first be sent to the writer setting forth
  the Statement of Confidentiality (The CALL, Summary of Procedures #10) and asking that individual to respond
  whether in light of this University 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 the sample letter

If applicable, Unsolicited Student 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
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 promotion to Full Professor and any notable works prior must 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 advancement in rank or with a maximum reporting period of 5 years at UCLA 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
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 may request a Review Committee (RC) be appointed.

- When an RC is not appointed, CAP reviews the file and makes a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor, who then decides the final outcome of the case.
- When an RC is appointed, the RC reviews the file and submits a report to APO, who forwards it to the College AP Office for the Dean’s review. If the Dean writes an addendum, it will be directed to APO. APO will forward both the Dean’s and the RC’s recommendations to CAP. CAP will write a recommendation, and the Vice Chancellor will decide the final outcome.

The Luskin analyst will notify the department of the outcome.