VICE PROVOST BARBARA A. HORWITZ
Academic Personnel

Re: Voting Procedures – Section of Molecular & Cellular Biology

The Committee on Academic Personnel has reviewed the voting procedures for Academic Senate faculty in the Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology. CAP finds the voting procedures appropriate.

Catherine Morrison Paul, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

CMP:sb
PROFESSOR CATHERINE MORRISON PAUL, CHAIR
Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Revised Voting Procedures – Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology

Dear Cathy:

I am forwarding the revised Academic Senate Voting Procedures for the Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology in the College of Biological Sciences 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
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Enclosures

c: Nanci Bristowe
   Judy Callis
November 9, 2005

BARBARA HORWITZ
Vice Provost – Academic Personnel

Dear Barbara:

On behalf of the College of Biological Sciences, I am supportive of the change in voting procedures that the Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology wishes to submit to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). Since recent changes have occurred with CAP reviews, some actions that once were considered redelegated actions (i.e., Associate III to IV), are now nonredelegated actions. As a result, the Section would like to update their voting procedures to ensure that they are in sync with the current academic personnel review policies.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kenneth C. Burtis, Ph.D.
Interim Dean
Professor of Genetics
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c:  Chair Dahmus
    Vice Chair, Callis
    MSO, Jones
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November 8, 2005

To: Interim Dean Ken Burtis

From: Judy Callis, Professor and Vice-Chair for Academic Personnel
       Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology

Re: Change in Voting Procedures

Dear Dean Burtis:

The Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology respectfully submit for approval by the Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Personnel a change in our voting procedures. According to APM UCD-220 Exhibit A, such changes to voting procedures must be submitted in writing through the appropriate Dean.

The Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology would now like to require the vote of the entire faculty for merit actions that are reviewed by the Committee on Academic Personnel.

This change requires the addition of one sentence to our document “Procedures for the Review of Merits and Promotions for Faculty in the Professorial Research Series Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology” (approved 1997-1998).

The sentence will be added at the end of the first paragraph under the subheading entitled, “Definition of Faculty to Be Involved in Merit and Promotion Actions” and the sentence is, “Any merit action that requires evaluation by CAP will require the participation of all faculty.” Please see the attached revised document.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Judy Callis
Professor and Vice-Chair
November 8, 2005

To: Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Personnel

From: Judy Callis, Professor and Vice-Chair for Academic Personnel
       Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology

Re: Change in Voting Procedures

To whom it may concern:

The Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology in the College of Biological Sciences submit for your approval a change in our section’s faculty voting procedures.

The Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology would now like to require the vote of the entire faculty for merit actions that are reviewed by the Committee on Academic Personnel.

This change requires the addition of one sentence to our document “Procedures for the Review of Merits and Promotions for Faculty in the Professorial Research Series Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology” (approved 1997-1998).

The sentence will be added at the end of the first paragraph under the subheading entitled, “Definition of Faculty to Be Involved in Merit and Promotion Actions” and the sentence is, “Any merit action that requires evaluation by CAP will require the participation of all faculty.” Please see the attached revised document.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Judy Callis
Professor and Vice-Chair
Procedures for the Review of Merits and Promotions
for Faculty in the Professorial Research Series
Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology
1996-97 (modified 2005-2006)

Voting Rights

All faculty in the professorial series shall be eligible to vote. Although we welcome and value input from lecturers, secondary members and emeritus faculty, they will not have voting rights.

Definition of Faculty to Be Involved in Merit and Promotion Actions

Initial appointments and promotions to associate professor, full professor, step VI and above scale require participation of the entire faculty. Full faculty participation will also be required for promotions to lecturer with SOE. Any merit action that requires evaluation by CAP will require the participation of all faculty.

Merit actions require the involvement of a subset of the Section's faculty. The evaluation of a candidate's file by faculty with expertise in the area of the candidate's research and firsthand knowledge of the candidate's contributions in teaching are of primary importance. To insure a critical review of the file, ten faculty with expertise appropriate to the candidate being reviewed will be selected by the Chair and the Vice Chair. To facilitate the selection, the candidate will be asked to suggest ten faculty he/she feels would be most qualified to review the merit action. The ten faculty appointed have the responsibility to carefully review the file and vote on the action. All faculty in the Section will be informed of the merit actions under consideration and are welcome to review the candidate's file and vote. However, only faculty with sufficient time to critically review the file should vote. The candidate will be appraised of the outcome of the review at which time he/she has the option of requesting a review by the entire faculty.

Normal actions

Promotions:

The candidate will be asked to submit a list of at least eight outside references. The chair will solicit letters from both reviewers recommended by the candidate and reviewers selected independently by the Chair and Vice Chair. The candidate will be asked to provide a 3-5 page summary of research accomplishments and contributions in teaching and service.

An *ad hoc* committee of two faculty will be asked to provide a critical and candid analysis of the candidate's accomplishments. This committee need not reach a conclusion about the overall merits of the case. This review is to assist the faculty in their review of the file and to help the Chair and Vice Chair in the preparation of the Section's letter.
The entire faculty will then be asked to review the file, including the report of the ad hoc committee, and to vote. Faculty should include comments on the ballot that explain their vote. These comments are also helpful in the preparation of the Section’s letter. Negative votes must include a statement explaining the basis for the decision. If the faculty feel that a meeting would be helpful in reaching an informed decision, such a meeting will be scheduled. The Vice Chair and Chair will then prepare a letter that reflects the Section’s views. The letter will be made available for review prior to submission to the Dean.

Merits:

The procedure is the same as above except that outside letters are not needed and the faculty voting on the action may be limited as described in the preceding section.

The ad hoc report for normal merits can be reduced to an abbreviated format. However, it must include the following:

Research:  
1) a summary of major research accomplished since the last merit action, and  
2) an evaluation of the quality and significance of these findings.

Teaching:  
1) a summary of contributions at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and  
2) an assessment of the quality of teaching based on review of student evaluations which are required for all merit actions, and peer evaluations when available.

Service:  
Comment on both the quantity and quality of service.

Accelerations

Candidates to be considered for an acceleration will be identified as follows:

1. The updated CVs turned in during the summer will be reviewed by the Chair and Vice Chair for possible accelerations. Faculty who fail to update their CV in a timely fashion may miss an opportunity for an acceleration.

2. The candidate can inform the Chair or Vice Chair that he/she would like to be considered for an acceleration.

3. Anyone aware of outstanding contributions of a colleague can recommend to the Chair or Vice Chair that a given faculty member may warrant review for an acceleration.

Faculty eligible for an acceleration that would require outside letters, namely promotions to associate professor, full professor or above scale, would need to update their CV by July 1, whereas faculty eligible for an accelerated merit would need to update their CV by August 1.