WALTER STONE, Chair
Department of Political Science

Re: Revised Voting Procedures – Political Science

The Committee on Academic Personnel has reviewed the revised voting procedures of June 8, 2004 submitted by the Department of Political Science. CAP concurs with the document and thanks the department for preparing and forwarding the information.

Michael Maher, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel
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c: Dean S. Sheffrin
    Vice Provost B. Horwitz
TO: Dean Steven Sheffrin  
Division of Social Sciences  
College of Letters and Science  

Vice Provost Barbara Horwitz  
Academic Personnel  

FROM: Walter J. Stone, Chair  

RE: Voting Procedures for the Department of Political Science  

June 16, 2004  

At a Departmental faculty meeting on June 8, 2004, the faculty of Political Science voted unanimously to revise our 1993 Voting Procedures for faculty personnel reviews.

The Non Senate Faculty and Continuing Appointment procedures have been incorporated into the attached document. Other substantive changes include an explicit recognition that Lecturers SOE and Senior Lecturers SOE are defined as “tenured ladder faculty” for purposes of defining their voting eligibility, the candidate is given a copy of the department ad hoc committee report, and release of the departmental letter on personnel actions to all ladder faculty, whether or not they were eligible to vote on the action.
Voting Procedures
Department of Political Science
University of California, Davis
(Revised June 8, 2004, by unanimous vote of the faculty)

Tenured faculty members are eligible to participate in all reviews of departmental faculty including promotions (i.e., advancement to tenure/Associate Professor or Professor), appraisals, merit increases, deferrals, and changes in status.

Non-tenured ladder faculty are eligible to participate in cases involving: merit increases for Assistant Professors not including promotion to Associate Professor. Eligibility to vote on deferrals is determined by eligibility to vote on the relevant personnel action.

All ladder faculty are eligible to vote on advancing Non Senate Faculty (NSF) to a "continuing appointment," after their pre-six-year period of appointment. Continuing Appointment NSF do not vote on any departmental personnel issues, although they may be consulted on teaching evaluations of other NSF under review.

For purposes of these voting rules, Lecturers SOE and Senior Lecturers SOE are defined as "tenured ladder faculty."

Summary of voting policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Eligible Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>Tenured ladder faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals</td>
<td>Tenured ladder faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit increases for tenured faculty</td>
<td>Tenured ladder faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferrals for tenured faculty</td>
<td>Tenured ladder faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Status (movement to/from Lecturer)</td>
<td>Tenured ladder faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit increases for non-tenured faculty, not including promotion to Associate Professor</td>
<td>Tenured ladder faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferrals for non-tenured faculty</td>
<td>Ladder faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New appointments</td>
<td>Ladder faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdepartmental transfers</td>
<td>Ladder faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement of NSF to &quot;continuing appointment&quot;</td>
<td>Ladder faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department adheres to the following procedures with respect to promotions (including appraisals) and merit increases:

A comprehensive file is assembled on the candidate for advancement containing publications and other evidence of research achievement and promise; teaching, advising and curricular development records; student evaluations of the candidate's teaching and summary analyses of these evaluations; letters, if any, from extramural evaluators; peer observations of classroom teaching, if
applicable; the candidate's own statement; and such additional information as may be submitted by the candidate, students or other relevant parties.

The file is made available to members of the Department eligible to participate in the candidate's review. It is reviewed with special care by an ad hoc committee, usually of three faculty members, which deliberates separately on the case. This committee presents a written report to the Chair (subsequently made available to the relevant colleagues and the candidate) recommending the appropriate action, justifying that recommendation with relevant evidence, and indicating the committee vote.

In the case of promotions and advancement from Professor V to VI, a meeting of Associate and Full Professors is convened, action is discussed and a vote is taken by ballot. In the case of merit increases the vote is by ballot and a meeting of eligible faculty is convened only if at least two reviewing faculty so request, at the discretion of the Chair, or upon request of the candidate.

The departmental letter summarizing the deliberations and the reasons for the Department faculty's recommendation shall be made available to all ladder faculty, whether or not they were eligible to participate in the decision.