VICE PROVOST BRUCE R. WHITE
Academic Personnel

Re: Voting Procedures – Art History Program

The Committee on Academic Personnel has reviewed the revised voting procedures for the Art History Program. CAP finds the voting procedures appropriate.

Christopher Reynolds, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel
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Enclosure
PROFESSOR CHRIS REYNOLDS, CHAIR
Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Voting Procedures – Art History Program

Dear Chris:

I am forwarding the proposed revisions to the Academic Senate Voting Procedures for the Art History Program in the College of Letters and Science for review and approval by the Committee on Academic Personnel.

I appreciate your assistance and look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Bruce R. White
Interim Vice Provost—Academic Personnel

/lmd

c: Dean Owens
   Director Sadler

Enclosures
March 31, 2008

Dear Dean Owens:

Please find enclosed, for your approval, a copy of the voting By-laws of the Art History Program, which have been revised by a unanimous vote of eligible faculty at Professor Rank. The change is in paragraph 3 of section 1:

"Professors and Associate Professors may vote in all cases of promotion or of personnel action to the rank of Professor. All ladder rank faculty may vote in all actions regarding Assistant Professors or Lecturers with extended contracts."

In effect this means that all tenured faculty will be allowed to vote on all merits and promotions; Associate Professors thereby will vote on Professor actions for the first time.

The Art History faculty are cognizant that the Dean’s Office prefers voting to be limited to rank and above. However, my colleagues feel that the concern to protect more junior faculty from pressure from above-rank faculty does not really pertain to the Art History Program at this time. First, Assistant Professors will remain limited to voting on actions no higher than their own rank. Second, the Art History Program is too small, its faculty feels, to be subject to quite the same political pressures and patterns as those typical of larger programs and departments.

Indeed, it seems that Art History has been subject to a converse pattern, one identified in the report into personnel problems written for us by UC Mediation Services. This pattern has been one of a distressing divide between senior and junior faculty. It was especially acute a few years ago when the Program was composed of four Assistant Professors and three Full Professors, with no Associate Professors in between, and it should be noted that this proposed change in the By-laws, had it existed then, would have had little or no effect on that dysfunction. But the legacy of that dysfunction is an extreme sensitivity among lower-ranking faculty to any perceived disempowerment, particularly among those now at Associate Professor rank who protested their disenfranchisement in their comments (or absence of comments) in the 2007-08 round of Professor merit actions in the Art History Program. Senate members of Art History have concluded that the Program’s mission for greater collegiality and transparency will be aided, maybe even confirmed, by this revision to the By-laws.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Simon Sadler
Director, Art History Program
1. MERITS, PROMOTIONS, APPRAISALS:

The Program Director notifies candidates for personnel actions of the timetable and dossier requirements for the review in a timely manner and in writing. The candidate is informed of the nature of the review process and the performance expectations for the review. A candidate may initiate an accelerated personnel action, or the Director may recommend it.

All Academic Senate faculty within the Program in Art History are invited to review all personnel actions and to provide confidential written comments to the Program Director. Only those Academic Senate members qualified to vote on a particular case, according to the specifications given below, may review letters obtained under the promise of confidentiality. The voting members may approve of, disapprove of, or abstain on the proposed personnel action.

Professors and Associate Professors may vote in all cases of promotion or of personnel action to the rank of Professor. All ladder rank faculty may vote in all actions regarding Assistant Professors or Lecturers with extended contracts.

The Program Director then writes a letter of recommendation, incorporating the vote of the faculty and representing the views expressed in their comments. This representation will distinguish between the comments of voting and non-voting faculty. The Director does not distinguish voters according to their step level within ranks. Only votes that are actually cast are reported.

At any time prior to the final balloting, the candidate, the Director, or any member of the Program faculty qualified to vote in a particular case may call for a full meeting of the faculty to discuss the case.

The Program Director reads the letter to the candidate. The candidate may write a response or supplement to the Director’s letter. The candidate signs a statement of disclosure. The dossier is forwarded to the Deans’ Office.

2. APPOINTMENTS TO NEW FACULTY PROPOSITION AT ANY LEVEL, TO JOINT PROFESSOR POSITIONS AT ANY LEVEL, AND TO VISITING LECTURER AND PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH POSITIONS:
All Academic Senate faculty vote. In all such cases, non-voting Academic Senate members in Art History should be invited to review the dossier and comment for the Director’s letter of recommendation, according to the procedures described above.

3. **DEFERRAL/FIVE YEAR REVIEWS:**

   See #1 above.

4. **INTERDEPARTMENTAL TRANSFERS AND PHASED RETIREMENTS:**

   All Academic Senate faculty vote.

5. **VOTING PRIVILEGES OF PERMANENT FACULTY:**

   All Academic Senate faculty members have voting privileges on departmental issues except personnel matters covered in Item #1.

6. **VOTING PRIVILEGES OF EMERITI FACULTY:**

   Emeriti faculty are not eligible to vote on personnel actions.

7. **VOTING PRIVILEGES OF PHASED RETIREMENT SENATE FACULTY:**

   All Academic Senate faculty on phased retirement have full voting rights on personnel and all other departmental concerns.

8. **VOTING PRIVILEGES OF LECTURERS, SOE/SR. LECTURERS, SOE:**

   All Lecturers, SOE/SR. Lecturers, SOE may vote in all actions regarding Lecturers, SOE/ SR. Lecturers, SOE.