October 16, 2016

Maureen Stanton, Vice Provost  
Academic Affairs  

Re: Revised Voting Procedures: Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics

Dear Vice Provost Stanton,

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the revised voting procedures for the Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics. The proposed version was approved by CAP by a vote of five in favor, zero opposed, with four members absent.

Sincerely,

Rida A.M.T. Farouki
Rida Farouki, Chair  
Committee on Academic Personnel  

Cc: Lynn Daum, Academic Affairs
PROFESSOR DEBRA LONG, CHAIR
Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Revised Voting Procedures – Department of Microbiology & Molecular Genetics

Dear Debra:

I am forwarding additional revisions to the Academic Senate Voting Procedures for the Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics for review and approval by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP).

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

Sincerely,

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

/Imd

Enclosures

c: Interim Dean Wainwright
   Chair Heyer
   Analyst DiVecchia
Maureen Stanton, Ph.D.
Vice Provost
Academic Affairs

15 April 2016

Re: Requested change in revised voting procedures and voting rights

Dear Vice Provost Stanton:
In response to your letter of April 15, 2016 to Interim Dean Wainwright, I am attaching the revised sample ballot with the requested addition in wording.

With this letter I want to record revised voting procedures and voting rights for the Department of Microbiology & Molecular Genetics, formerly Department of Microbiology/Section of Microbiology.

Our department has a long-standing policy to grant voting rights on all personnel actions to Assistant Professors and Lecturers with Security of Employment as approved February 8, 1995 by the Committee on Academic Personnel (see attachment 1).

On October 17, 2014, Department of Microbiology & Molecular Genetics faculty [1] reiterated our longstanding policy that all departmental members of the Academic Senate, other than the candidate, are entitled to vote on personnel matters; and [2] adopted a new paper ballot template (see attachment 2) to record votes under the Step Plus System for personnel actions. The vote was conducted by secret paper ballot (attachment 3).

On the first question (see attachment 3), of the 17 eligible faculty 17 voted yes and 0 no. On the second question (see attachment 3), of the 17 eligible faculty 16 voted yes and 1 no.

On October 16, 2015, Department of Microbiology & Molecular Genetics faculty discussed the extension of voting right to academic senate members holding the title Lecturer with the potential for security of employment (LPSOE). This category of academic senate members was not covered in the previous policy. The vote was conducted by secret paper ballot (attachment 4).

Of the 17 eligible faculty 17 voted yes and 0 no.

With my best regards

Wolf-Dietrich Heyer, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics

Attachments:
1. Microbiology 02.08.95 Voting Procedure Merit Action
2. MMG ballot template for personnel actions
3. Faculty ballot Oct. 9, 2014
4. Faculty ballot Oct. 16, 2015
February 8, 1995

ACTING VICE PROVOST HIMELFARB:

RE: Revised Voting Procedures - Section of Microbiology.

In view of Chair Stephen C. Kowalczkowski's response of January 17, 1995 to the request for additional information, the Committee on Academic Personnel approves the voting procedures of the Section of Microbiology, Division of Biological Sciences, which were adopted on November 11, 1994.

John Poulos, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

JP:bcj

CC: Interim Dean M. McNamee
Professor S. Kowalczkowski
17 January 1995

HARVEY HIMELFARB
Acting Vice Provost--Faculty Relations

Dear Vice Provost Himelfarb:

The number of faculty who are able to vote on the voting procedures for the Section of Microbiology includes 7 full Professors (Artz, Baumann, Kowalczykowski, Manning, Meeks, Privalsky, and Villarejo) and 2 Associate Professors (Klionsky and Nelson). Given the small number of Associate Professors involved, separate reporting of the vote could breach the confidentiality of the vote. For this reason, aggregation of the vote was necessary.

Votes were cast by using ballots that were sealed in blank envelopes which, in turn, were contained within larger envelopes that were signed on the outside. The inner envelopes were removed and counted randomly in the presence of the Section's MSO. I believe that this procedure complies with By-Law 55.

If you have any further questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Stephen C. Kowalczykowski
Professor and Chair

c: Interim Dean McNamee
January 9, 1995

PROFESSOR STEPHEN KOWALCZYKOWSKI, CHAIR
Section of Microbiology

The Committee on Academic Personnel requests the following additional information concerning the voting procedures for the Section of Microbiology:

1. Since the full professors, the associate professors, and the senior lecturers (SOE) have extended voting rights on all academic personnel actions to faculty in the lecturer with security of employment series, the vote of the full professors, the associate professors, and the senior lecturers (SOE) must be separately reported. In addition, the number of faculty entitled to vote on this question in each series (i.e., full professors, associate professors and senior lecturers, SOE) must be reported. If separate reporting would breach the confidentiality of the vote, the department chair may aggregate the vote. However, when the chair aggregates the votes to maintain confidentiality, the chair must provide a statement demonstrating why aggregation was necessary to maintain confidentiality.

2. Was the vote to extend voting rights to the lecturer with security of employment series case by secret ballot as required by By-Law 55?

I would appreciate your prompt attention to this request.

Harvey Himelfarb
Acting Vice Provost--Faculty Relations

HH:lb

cc: Interim Dean M. McNamee
January 4, 1995

ACTING VICE PROVOST HIMELFARB:

RE:  Request for Additional Information on Revised Voting Procedures - Section of Microbiology.

The Committee on Academic Personnel cannot approve the voting procedures of the Section of Microbiology, Division of Biological Sciences, without the following additional information:

1. Since the full professors, the associate professors, and the senior lecturers (SOE) have extended voting rights on all academic personnel actions to faculty in the lecturer with security of employment series, the vote of the full professors, the associate professors, and the senior lecturers (SOE) must be separately reported. In addition, the number of faculty entitled to vote on this question in each series (i.e., full professors, associate professors and senior lecturers, SOE) must be reported. If separate reporting would breach the confidentiality of the vote, the department chair may aggregate the vote. However, when the chair aggregates the votes to maintain confidentiality, the chair must provide a statement demonstrating why aggregation was necessary to maintain confidentiality.

2. Was the vote to extend voting rights to the lecturer with security of employment series cast by secret ballot as required by By-Law 55?

John Poulos, Chair  
Committee on Academic Personnel

JP:bcj
December 6, 1994

HARVEY HIMELFARB
Acting Vice Provost - Faculty Relations

Dear Harvey,

The Section of Microbiology has requested a revision in their voting procedures. I am requesting approval of extension of voting rights as indicated in Chair Kowalczykowski's letter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark G. McNamee
Interim Dean

MGM:jcj
Attachments

monemelvotamicchg
November 30, 1994

INTERIM DEAN MARK McNAMEEE
Division of Biological Sciences

Subject: Academic Voting Rights

Dear Interim Dean McNamee:

I write to inform you that by a written vote of 9 in favor, 0 against, the eligible faculty in the Section of Microbiology have agreed to extend voting rights on all academic personnel actions to faculty in the Assistant Professor series.

Also, by a written vote of 6 in favor, 3 against, the eligible faculty in the Section of Microbiology have agreed to extend voting rights on all academic personnel actions to faculty in the Lecturers with Security of Employment series.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Stephen C. Kowalczykowski
Chair

.vote.mgm
BALLOT

SECTION OF MICROBIOLOGY
DIVISION OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

November 11, 1994

I agree: __________
I disagree: __________

with the proposal to extend voting rights on all personnel actions in the Section of Microbiology to faculty in the Assistant Professor Series.

I agree: __________
I disagree: __________

with the proposal to extend voting rights on all personnel actions in the Section of Microbiology to Lecturers with Security of Employment.
Department of Microbiology & Molecular Genetics

Ballot Title: Prof. [name]: Merit from Professor, Step X
Review Period: 07/01/20XX–06/30/20YY
Voting Period: XX/XX/20XX–XX/XX/20XX
Effective Date: 07/01/2015

Indicate your evaluation for each of the appraisal criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Substantially Above</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Substantially Below</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for the action that you feel is most appropriate. Choose only one option, noting that a vote for a higher advancement indicates support also for all lesser advancements.

☐ I vote in favor of a 2.0 step increase (acceleration of one full step).
   A two-step advancement will require a strong record in all three areas of review, with outstanding performance in at least two areas. In most cases, one of those areas will be scholarly and creative activity ... Two-step advancement requests will go to CAP for review and the Vice Provost–Academic Affairs for decision.

☐ I vote in favor of a 1.5 step increase (acceleration of one-half step).
   This advancement requires a strong record with outstanding achievement in at least one area of review across research or creative work, teaching, and service. However, outstanding achievement in one area may not qualify the candidate for 1.5-step advancement if performance in another area does not meet UC Davis standards.

☐ I vote in favor of a 1.0 step increase (regular merit advancement).
   A balanced record, appropriate for rank and step, with evidence of good accomplishments in all areas of review is rewarded with normal advancement. All Academic Senate faculty can expect to advance at normal rates, unless a major flaw in their performance is evident.

☐ I do not support merit advancement (requires explanation in comment area below).

☐ Abstain (please explain in comment area below).

Please comment on the candidate's teaching, scholarship, service and contributions to diversity. Use a separate sheet as needed or desired.

REVISED: 16 April 2016
Question 1:
The statement below reaffirms the voting rights in the Department of Microbiology & Molecular Genetics on personnel matters.

"As of 2/9/95 it is the policy of the Department of Microbiology & Molecular Genetics (formerly Section of Microbiology, formerly Department of Microbiology) that, other than the candidate, all departmental members of the Academic Senate are entitled to vote on personnel matters. This policy has been reaffirmed by a departmental vote on xx/xx/2014."

If you agree vote yes.   YES 

IF you disagree vote no.  NO 

Question 2:
The new Step-Plus merit procedure requires each department to approve new ballots for personnel actions. We discussed this ballot at our faculty meeting on Oct. 3, 2014. A final version has been sent to you by email.

If you approve of the ballot vote yes.   YES 

If you do not approve of the ballot vote no.  NO
Ballot MMG Faculty Meeting Friday Oct. 16, 2015

Do you support that Academic Senate members with the title LPSOE are endowed with full voting rights?

YES  NO  ABSTAIN
April 15, 2016

INTERIM DEAN PETER WAINWRIGHT
College of Biological Sciences

RE: Voting Procedures – Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics

Dear Peter:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the voting procedures for the Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics and recommends an additional change, as outlined in their attached memo.

Please forward a revised copy of the Voting Procedures to my office for submission to CAP.

Sincerely,

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

/Imd

Attachment

c: Associate Dean Harada
   Chair Heyer
   Analyst DiVecchia
March 29, 2016

Maureen Stanton, Vice Provost
Academic Affairs

Re: Revised Voting Procedures: Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics

Dear Vice Provost Stanton,

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the proposed revisions to the Academic Senate Voting Procedures for the Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, submitted via the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs on February 19, 2016. CAP recommends that the following change be made:

In the new ballot (attachment 2), the sentence "A two-step advancement will require a strong record in all three areas of review, with outstanding performance in at least two areas" should be followed by "In most cases, one of those areas will be scholarly and creative activity." This wording appears in the current Step Plus guidelines.

CAP sees no need to change the sentence that follows these ("Two-step advancement...").

Sincerely,

Debra Long, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

Cc: Lynn Daum, Academic Affairs