PROFESSOR AHMET PALAZOGLU, CHAIR  
Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Revised Voting Procedures – Science and Technology Studies Program

Dear Ahmet:

I am forwarding the revised Academic Senate Voting Procedures for the Science and Technology Studies Program which includes the corrections requested by the Committee on Academic Personnel in their attached letter dated March 5, 2010.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Horwitz  
Vice Provost—Academic Personnel

/Imd

c: Associate Dean Winterhalder  
   Director Dumit  
   Analyst Torfi

Enclosures
Consultation and Voting Procedures
Science & Technology Studies
September 2009

New Faculty Appointments:

When the STS Program receives approval for recruitment of tenure track faculty, a recruitment committee is formed consisting of Senate faculty on the STS Program Committee and any additional faculty chosen for their expertise for a particular recruitment.

If the FTE is to be partially or fully placed in a department other than STS (such as Anthropology or Philosophy), that department is actively involved in the selection process and is represented by at least one member of the recruitment committee. Two votes for appointment are also taken: one by the STS Program Committee and another by the participating department. In the case of the STS vote, all Senate faculty members of the Program Committee vote on the appointment, regardless of rank.

Merits and Promotions:

The candidate's dossier, including research, teaching evaluations and, when appropriate, outside letters of recommendation, is made available to all Senate faculty on the STS Program Committee regardless of rank. There is a formal meeting for discussion of the dossier followed by a vote of all Program Committee Senate faculty (other than the candidate) regardless of rank. If a decision cannot be reached immediately, additional information may be requested and subsequent meetings are held until the faculty are able to make its recommendation. In cases where there is not a unanimous vote, the votes and views of the dissenting faculty are to be reported in the Director's letter.

In split appointments, separate meetings are held by the STS Program Committee and the second department. Two separate votes are taken and recorded. The dossier is compiled by the home department but includes separate departmental letters signed by STS Director or the appropriate Chair.

Deferrals:

At the request of the candidate, the Director will convene a meeting with Program Committee Senate faculty to discuss and vote on the deferral.

Appraisals:

After reviewing the appraisal dossier, all Program Committee Senate faculty formally meet to discuss and vote on recommendations.

Other Decisions:

Changes in status are discussed and voted on by all Program Committee Senate faculty.

Lecturers/Non-Senate Faculty (NSF):

All Academic Senate faculty on the Program Committee may participate in review of Unit 18/Non-Senate Faculty.

Initial appointment is recommended by the NSF Review Committee consisting of the Program Director and two Senate faculty.

NSF are reviewed for reappointment by the NSF Committee on an annual basis.

All Academic Senate faculty on the Program Committee may vote on the Excellence Appraisal which takes place between the thirteenth and fifteenth quarters. A simple majority will determine the outcome of the
vote. A Continuing NSF from within the Program may participate in the review but will be excused from the vote.

All Academic Senate faculty of the Program Committee may vote on the Initial Appointment of Continuing Non-Senate Faculty which takes place during the seventeenth or eighteenth quarter. A simple majority will determine the outcome of the vote. A Continuing NSF from within the Program may participate in the review but will be excused from the vote.

All Academic Senate faculty of the Program Committee may review the file and vote on merit actions for NSF. A Continuing NSF from within the Program may participate in the review but will be excused from the vote.

General:

Voting is confidential. In none of the instances specified above (excepting Lecturer positions) may the right to vote be delegated to a committee. The actual method of voting shall be determined by the eligible voters; subject, however, to the provision that no voter may be denied the option to require a secret ballot.

Recognizing that there may be various grounds for abstention, any faculty member has the right to abstain from the vote.

In all decisions, emeritus faculty may be consulted by the Program Director, although they do not receive a vote.

Consistent with the requirements of confidentiality and the policies and procedures of the University, the Program Director will report the vote and will provide a brief account of dissenting and abstaining votes in the departmental letter to the Dean.

The Program Director will then disclose to the individual involved the departmental letter including the departmental recommendation, following procedures and confidentiality as outlined in APM 220-80 and APM 160-20.

Digitally signed by Joseph Dumit
DN: cn=Joseph Dumit, o=UC Davis,
ou=Science and Technology Studies,
email=jpdumit@ucdavis.edu, c=US
Date: 2010.04.02 02:45:06 -07'00'

Joseph Dumit, Director
Science & Technology Studies
VICE PROVOST BARBARA A. HORWITZ
Academic Personnel

Re: Science & Technology Studies Voting Procedures

The Committee on Academic Personnel has reviewed the revised voting procedures for the Program of Science & Technology Studies. CAP finds them acceptable, with the exception of the corrections and/or deletions shown on the attached document. Please have the program forward a corrected copy when complete.

Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

AP: sb

Attachment
New Faculty Appointments:
When the STS Program receives approval for recruitment of tenure track faculty, a recruitment committee is formed consisting of Senate faculty on the STS Program Committee and any additional faculty chosen for their expertise for a particular recruitment.

If the FTE is to be partially or fully placed in a department other than STS (such as Anthropology or Philosophy), that department is actively involved in the selection process and is represented by at least one member of the selection committee. Two votes for appointment are also taken: one by the STS Program Committee and another by the participating department. In the case of the STS vote, all Senate faculty members of the Program Committee vote on the appointment, regardless of rank.

Merits and Promotions:
The candidate's dossier, including research, teaching evaluations and, when appropriate, outside letters of recommendation, is made available to all Senate faculty on the STS Program Committee regardless of rank. There is a formal meeting for discussion of the dossier followed by a vote of all Program Committee Senate faculty (other than the candidate) regardless of rank. If a decision cannot be reached immediately, additional information may be requested and subsequent meetings are held until the faculty are able to make its recommendation. In cases where there is not a unanimous vote, the votes and views of the dissenting faculty are to be reported in the Director's letter.

In split appointments, separate meetings are held by the STS Program Committee and the second department. Two separate votes are taken and recorded. The dossier is compiled by the home department but includes separate departmental letters signed by STS Director or the appropriate Chair.

Deferrals:
At the request of the candidate, the Director will convene a meeting with Program Committee Senate faculty to discuss and vote on the deferral.

Appraisals:
After reviewing the appraisal dossier, all Program Committee Senate faculty formally meet to discuss and vote on recommendations.

Other Decisions:
Changes in status are discussed and voted on by all Program Committee Senate faculty.

Lecturers/Non-Senate Faculty (NSF):
All Academic Senate faculty on the Program Committee may participate in review of Unit 18/Non-Senate Faculty.

Initial appointment is recommended by the NSF Review Committee consisting of the Program Director and two Senate faculty.

NSF are reviewed for reappointment by the NSF Committee on an annual basis.

All Academic Senate faculty on the Program Committee may vote on the Excellence Appraisal which takes place between the thirteenth and fifteenth quarters. A simple majority will determine the outcome of the
vote. A Continuing NSF from within the Program may participate in the review but will be excused from the vote.

All Academic Senate faculty of the Program Committee may vote on the Initial Appointment of Continuing Non-Senate Faculty which takes place during the seventeenth or eighteenth quarter. A simple majority will determine the outcome of the vote. A Continuing NSF from within the Program may participate in the review but will be excused from the vote.

All Academic Senate faculty of the Program Committee may review the file and vote on merit actions for NSF. A Continuing NSF from within the Program may participate in the review but will be excused from the vote.

General:

Voting is confidential. In none of the instances specified above (excepting Lecturer positions) may the right to vote be delegated to a committee. The actual method of voting shall be determined by the eligible voters; subject, however, to the provision that no voter may be denied the option to require a secret ballot.

Recognizing that there may be various grounds for abstention, any faculty member has the right to abstain from the vote.

Although

In all decisions, emeritus faculty may be consulted by the Program Director. However, they do not receive a vote.

Consistent with the requirements of confidentiality and the policies and procedures of the University, the Program Director will report the vote and will provide a brief account of dissenting and abstaining votes in the departmental letter to the Dean.

The Program Director will then disclose to the individual involved the departmental letter including the departmental recommendation, following procedures and confidentiality as outlined in APM 220-80 and APM 160-20.

Joseph Dumit, Director
Science & Technology Studies