VICE PROVOST MAUREEN STANTON
Academic Affairs

Re: Revised Voting Procedures for Department of Philosophy

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the Department of Philosophy August 2012 revision of its original proposed changes in voting procedures, submitted June 11, 2012. At its September 12, 2012, meeting, CAP voted, nine in favor and none opposed, to approve the revised proposed changes.

CAP thanks the Department of Philosophy for finalizing its voting procedures, and for providing CAP with an updated copy of the document.

John R. Hall, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

Enclosures
PROFESSOR JOHN HALL, CHAIR  
Committee on Academic Personnel  

RE: Revised Voting Procedures – Department of Philosophy  

Dear John:  

I am forwarding the proposed revisions to the Academic Senate Voting Procedures for the Department of Philosophy for a second review by the Committee on Academic Personnel.  

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

Sincerely,  

Maureen L. Stanton  
Vice Provost—Academic Personnel  
Professor—Evolution and Ecology  

/Imd  

C: Dean Mangun  
Associate Dean Winterhalder  
Chair Copp  
Analyst Torfi  

Enclosure
17 August 2012

TO: Dean George R. Mangun  
Division of Social Sciences  
FR: David Copp, Chair 
Department of Philosophy  
RE: Voting Procedures

Dear Dean Mangun

Attached please find amended voting procedures for the Department of Philosophy. I submitted a new set of procedures for approval on June 11th. CAP raised a concern and I have revised the rules accordingly.

CAP asked the department to clarify rule 3(a), which read as follows in our June 11 document:

3. Deferrals/Five Year Reviews

   a. Deferrals:

   At the request of the candidate, deferrals are ordinarily handled by the Chair with a vote being taken of the appropriate faculty. In cases requiring special consideration, the Chair will convene a meeting with the appropriate faculty to discuss and vote on the action. In addition, a formal meeting will be held if requested by any member of the appropriate faculty. Eligibility to vote is the same as in merit and promotion cases. The actual method of voting shall be determined by the eligible voters except that a secret ballot is required in all cases.

CAP did not find the meaning of the phrase, “In cases requiring special consideration,” to be transparent. CAP therefore requested that we revise the rule to clarify the meaning of this phrase and to resubmit the rules.

The sentence in question was in the previously approved rules and we kept it simply to minimize what we were changing. We interpreted it to give the chair discretion to call a formal meeting, but the sentence is clearly redundant in light of the sentence following it, which allows any member of the appropriate faculty including the Chair to call a formal meeting. For this reason,
instead of trying to clarify the sentence, we have simply deleted it. The proposed rule now reads as follows:

3. Deferrals/Five Year Reviews

a. Deferrals:

At the request of the candidate, deferrals are ordinarily handled by the Chair with a vote being taken of the appropriate faculty. If requested by any member of the appropriate faculty, a formal meeting of the appropriate faculty will be held to discuss and vote on the action. Eligibility to vote is the same as in merit and promotion cases. The actual method of voting shall be determined by the eligible voters except that a secret ballot is required in all cases.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

David Copp
Professor, Chair
1. Merits, Promotions, Appraisals

a. Merits, Promotions:

All Academic Senate faculty at or above the rank of Associate Professor (or equivalent, as in item #8 below) have the right to vote on all cases of promotion to the ranks of Professor or Associate Professor and on all cases of advancement within any rank. The actual method of voting shall be determined by the eligible voters except that a secret ballot is required in all cases. In cases of advancement within rank, the eligible voters shall follow the same procedures used for cases of promotion and non-reappointment.

The candidate's dossier, including research, teaching evaluations and, as appropriate, outside letters of recommendation, is made available to all faculty with the right to vote on the case. (Such faculty are herein designated “appropriate faculty.”) The appropriate faculty may consult about the case prior to taking a formal vote. This consultation may be entirely informal, but if a formal meeting is requested by any member of the appropriate faculty, a formal meeting will be held before the formal vote is taken. If a decision cannot be reached immediately, additional information may be called for and subsequent meetings may be held until the faculty is able to make its recommendation. The Departmental letter reflects the views of the appropriate faculty, not just those of the chair, and it reports any reasons expressed for no or abstention votes.

b. Appraisals:

All Academic Senate faculty at or above the rank of Associate Professor (or equivalent as in item #8 below) discuss and vote on recommendations. A formal meeting will be held if requested by any member of the appropriate faculty. The actual method of voting shall be determined by the eligible voters except that a secret ballot is required in all cases.

2. Appointments to New Faculty Positions at Any Level, to Joint Professor Positions at Any Level, and to Lecturer and Professional Research Positions

a. New Faculty Positions:

A selection committee reviews applications and narrows the field to the finalists. These candidates may be invited to the department for interviews and lectures, or may be interviewed by the search committee at an appropriate meeting of the American Philosophical Association (APA). Interviews may be held by telephone or by Skype or similar method. Finalists will all be treated alike. The selection of the final candidate, for all ranks, is voted on by all Academic Senate faculty. The actual method of voting shall be determined by the eligible voters except that a secret ballot is required in all cases.
b. Lecturer and Visiting Professor Positions:

A selection committee will solicit applications from select universities and other UC campuses, if the appointment is for one or two quarters only. The committee will make the decision on the final candidate, without consultation of the remaining faculty. If the appointment is for one year, the position is advertised in the APA bulletin, Jobs for Philosophers. The selection committee will review the applications and may interview the finalists at an appropriate APA meeting, if possible. They may consult the rest of the Academic Senate faculty if necessary. All temporary positions are filled on a one year basis with fresh applications required each year. This applies to candidates applying for a second year of temporary work.

3. Deferrals/Five Year Reviews

a. Deferrals:

At the request of the candidate, deferrals are ordinarily handled by the Chair with a vote being taken of the appropriate faculty. If requested by any member of the appropriate faculty, a formal meeting of the appropriate faculty will be held to discuss and vote on the action. Eligibility to vote is the same as in merit and promotion cases. The actual method of voting shall be determined by the eligible voters except that a secret ballot is required in all cases.

b. Five Year Reviews

See Item #1a above.

4. Interdepartmental Transfers and Phased Retirements

Changes in status, interdepartmental transfers, and applications for phased retirement are discussed and voted on by all Academic Senate faculty.

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

In all decisions, emeritus faculty may be consulted by the Chair of the department. However, they do not receive a vote.

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
For the purpose of interpreting this document, Lecturers SOE are considered to be of the same rank as Associate Professors, and Senior Lecturers SOE are considered to be of the same rank as Professors.
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