UC DAVIS: ACADEMIC SENATE
Committee on Academic Personnel - Oversight

June 17, 2009

VICE PROVOST BARBARA A. HORWITZ
Academic Personnel

Re: Voting Procedures – Art Studio Program

The Committee on Academic Personnel has reviewed the voting procedures for the Art Studio Program in the Department of Art and finds them acceptable. CAP thanks the department for providing clearly written procedures.

William H. Casey, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

WHC:sb
PROFESSOR BILL CASEY, CHAIR
Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Revised Voting Procedures – Art Studio Program - Department of Art

Dear Bill:

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

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

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Barbara A. Horwitz
Vice Provost—Academic Personnel

/Imd

cc: Dean Jessie Ann Owens
Chair Lucy Puls
Analyst Jenni Mattheis

Enclosure
May 6, 2009

Dean Jessie Ann Owens
Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies
College of Letters and Science

Dear Dean Owens:

Enclosed are new academic personnel procedures for the Art Studio faculty of the Department of Art. The procedures are intended to replace those currently in effect in the department. I ask that you send the new procedures forward to CAP for their review and approval.

The procedures were discussed at department meetings on March 6 and April 10, 2009. At the second meeting, and the procedures were voted on by secret ballot and were unanimously approved by all present. The vote was 7 yes 0 no (5 yes among tenured faculty, 2 yes among untenured assistant professors). A tenured member not present at the meeting voted yes by absentee ballot, for a total vote of 8 yes 0 no. Three faculty members not present at the meeting (two tenured, one not) did not vote.

The new procedures specify how the department will assemble a candidate’s file, review the file and vote, and prepare the departmental recommendation. The procedures are consistent with By-law 55. They do not extend voting rights to any group of faculty not vested with that right by the By-law.

Thank you for attention to this matter. I look forward to CAP’s approval of the procedures. I believe that they will materially improve the department’s conduct of its personnel reviews.

Sincerely,

Lucy Puls, Chair
Art Studio Program
Department of Art

[Signature]

I CONCUR
May 6, 2009

DEPARTMENT OF ART: PROGRAM IN ART STUDIO

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCEDURES

ASSEMBLING THE FILE

1. Individual faculty members are responsible for providing a complete list of publications and creative activity and all other required file materials.

2. In actions requiring outside letters of evaluations, faculty members must submit materials by the middle of the summer preceding the fall-quarter action. A specific deadline will be established by department staff in consultation with the chair.

3. In actions not requiring outside review, faculty members must submit all materials no later than the middle of September. Department staff, in consultation with the chair, will establish a specific deadline.

4. Any delays in established schedules must be approved by the chair.

PEER REVIEW

1. Voting on Art Studio personnel actions is by members of the Art Studio faculty. Art History faculty members vote separately on their own personnel actions.

2. All Academic Senate members of the Art Studio faculty are eligible to vote on new appointments.

3. Assistant Professors vote on all assistant professor actions (including appraisals) except promotions to tenure.

4. Tenured faculty vote on all actions within or below their rank. That is, Associate Professors vote on all actions involving Associate and Assistant Professors. Full Professors vote on all professorial actions.

5. Faculty on leave or otherwise away from campus may vote if they choose.

6. Emeritus faculty members are not eligible to vote.

7. Assistant Professors are encouraged to review the files of tenured professors. By invitation, one or more Assistant Professors may attend meetings called to discuss the personnel actions of tenured colleagues. Assistant Professors may attend all meetings called to discuss the appraisals of other Assistant Professors.
8. On a quarterly basis as needed, Lecturer appointments are considered and voted on at a faculty meeting. Emergency hires are at the discretion of the chair, in consultation with individual faculty members. Courtesy appointments are recommended to the dean by the chair without faculty vote. (Faculty recommendations will be solicited and considered.)

9. Deferrals are arranged in consultation with the department chair. Fifth-year reviews are conducted either by the department chair or by a vote of eligible faculty members, depending on the preference of the chair (Reference: UCD APM 220.II.B.4.)

ROLE OF THE CHAIR

1. Before the file has been assembled, and upon request, the chair will meet with individual faculty members to explain procedures.

2. Once the file has been assembled and verified, the chair or his or her designate will meet with the candidate to review the file and secure signed approval to open the file to colleagues.

3. In all promotions to Associate Professor and Professor and advancements to Professor VI and Professor Above Scale, the chair will secure letters of evaluation from outside reviewers after consultation with both the candidate and relevant members of the department, the campus, or the profession.

4. The chair will draft the department letter, following the procedures described under “Departmental Recommendation” below.

PROCESS OF DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW

1. Prior to review by the department and the department vote, the chair will give the candidate an opportunity to inspect the file and correct any errors of fact. (Reference: UCD APM 220.IV.F.7.)

2. All materials assembled by the candidate—in addition to letters from extramural referees and any materials specially solicited—will be made available for review by colleagues for a period of one week.

3. In the case of appointments, appraisals, promotions, advancements to Professor Step VI and Professor Above Scale, as well as in any special reviews mandated by CAP, a meeting will be held to discuss the action, to which all department members eligible to vote will be invited. Comments at the meeting will not be recorded and will not be quoted verbatim in the departmental letter.

4. Faculty members eligible to vote in major actions (including members who do not attend the meeting) will be given a ballot, to be submitted not more than three days subsequent to the meeting, exclusive of weekends. On the ballot, members will indicate their
support or non-support of the proposed action. They are expected to provide a written comment in explanation of their vote.

5. In all other actions, after the candidate’s file has been open for one week, faculty members will be given a ballot and asked to indicate 1) their support; 2) their non-support; 3) their reasons for support or non-support; and 4) whether they want a meeting to be called to discuss the action. If two or more faculty members request a meeting, one will be called. A deadline for submission of ballots will be established by department staff in consultation with the chair.

6. All votes will be conducted anonymously, using the Academic Senate double-envelope procedure. The outside envelopes will be opened by one person and the inside envelopes by another, acting separately. The chair will tally the votes.

7. All ballots are to be submitted in hard copy, not by e-mail or telephone. Exceptions to this requirement may be granted by the chair.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

1. The chair will draft the departmental letter, basing the letter on the materials contained in the file, the external letters (if any), and the comments provided by faculty members on their ballots. Letters from external specialists will be sent forward with the file.

   NOTE: In 2009-2010, the department will experiment with sending forward all ballot comments verbatim, as an attachment to the departmental letter. After that year’s personnel actions, the department will decide whether to continue this practice in subsequent years.

2. Where no comments on creative activity or teaching or service are forthcoming from colleagues, the chair will be responsible for assessing those portions of the record.

3. The departmental letter will be opened to members of the department for a minimum of three days, excluding weekends. The chair will consider recommendations for change but will not negotiate the contents of the letter.

4. After the letter is complete and the file is ready for transmittal, it will be opened for review by the candidate. The candidate may then write a letter of rebuttal. (Reference: UCD APM 220.IV.F.7.a.)

5. In all matters not covered in these procedures, the chair will be guided by the relevant sections of the Academic Personnel Manual and the Annual Call for Merit Increases and Promotions.