August 24, 2017

**Philip Kass**, Vice Provost
Academic Affairs

Re: **Revised Voting Procedures: Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences**

Dear Vice Provost Kass,

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the second revision of the Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences changes in voting procedures, submitted via the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs on August 4, 2017. CAP approves the revised voting procedures. The vote was six in favor and none opposed, with three members absent.

Sincerely,

Rida Farouki, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

Cc: Lara Stilling, Academic Affairs
PROFESSOR RIDA FAROUKI, CHAIR  
Committee on Academic Personnel  

RE: Revised Voting Procedures – Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences  

Dear Rida:  

I am forwarding the proposed revisions to the Academic Senate Voting Procedures for the Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences for review and approval by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP).  

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

Sincerely,  

Philip H. Kass  
Vice Provost—Academic Affairs  
Professor of Analytic Epidemiology,  
Population Health and Reproduction (Veterinary Medicine),  
and Public Health Sciences (Medicine)  

/lhs  

Enclosures  

c: Dean Lairmore  
Executive Associate Dean Pascoe  
Chair Pypendop  
Director Rott  
Analyst Heta
Re: Proposed changes to VSR voting procedures

Dear Dr. Pascoe,

Please find attached revised documents in response to the review by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) of our proposal to change our departmental voting procedures. We would like to thank CAP for their thoughtful comments; I also attach a detailed response to the suggestions made. We would like to request your approval of the revised documents, and respectfully ask that you forward them to CAP and the Vice-Provost – Academic Affairs for their approval.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Bruno Pyepenop
Professor & Chair

Attachments: VSR Voting Procedures; Response to CAP
Response to suggestions made by the Committee on Academic Personnel

Thank you for your thoughtful review of our proposal for revising our voting procedures. The documents have been revised accordingly, and you will find below a description of how each suggestion was addressed.

Sincerely,

Bruno Pypendop
Professor & Chair

It is unclear whether the 3 pages submitted represent the entirety of the Department’s voting procedures. If not, please provide them. CAP also suggests the Department create a single document in which general voting procedures are followed by specific procedures for different series, in outline format or as bullet points, for readability and easy reference.

The 3 pages submitted are the full description of the Department’s voting procedures. In an attempt to avoid confusion, the 3 documents were consolidated in a single one, and a summary of procedures was added at the beginning of the document.

Page 3 (Academic Senate), paragraph 1, lines 4-6: “In addition, a Department vote will be held each year before May 1st to decide if Department meetings will be held to discuss other types of actions (e.g., regular merits) during the following academic year.” CAP is concerned that this statement is unduly restrictive. The Department may need flexibility in deciding on and adjusting its consultation procedures and the timing of a depart ent vote to decide this may be best handled internally. CAP suggests to delete or revise this to a more general statement, stating that Department meetings may be held prior to voting to discuss regular merit actions.

The statement was modified to be less prescriptive: “In addition, Department meetings may be held to discuss other types of actions (e.g. regular merits), based on consultation with Department members”.

Page 3, paragraph 2, lines 4-5: “...and [votes] will not be separated between those eligible to vote and those to whom the vote has been extended, if applicable.” Please clarify or delete. There is no indication elsewhere in the document (that we could find) that votes could be extended to others who are not eligible to vote.

This statement was included to specify that the votes would not be reported by rank when Department members at lower ranks vote on actions for members at higher ranks, based on the statement in APM UCD-220, Exhibit A that “Academic Senate faculty members at or above the proposed rank shall have the right to vote on all actions at a level up to and including their own
rank” (emphasis added), and since we have extended voting right to all ranks on all actions. Our understanding is that members at a lower rank are not a priori eligible to vote on actions for members at higher ranks, but rather that the voting rights are extended to them by the departmental procedures. Nevertheless, since CAP deemed the statement unnecessary, it was deleted.

CAP encourages the Department letter to report the cumulative vote outcomes for each step, consistent with Step Plus guidelines.

The statements on reporting the results of the votes were modified accordingly: “The actual vote totals for each step will be recorded in the Department letter (…)” for Academic Senate titles; “The Department letter will summarize the aggregate vote for each step (…)” for Health Sciences Clinical Professor and Adjunct Professor series, and Academic Federation titles other than Health Sciences Clinical Professor and Adjunct Professor.
SUMMARY

- **General procedures**
  - Dossier available to all Academic Senate and Academic Federation Department members
  - All ranks discuss and vote on all actions
  - Department meeting
    - Barrier steps
    - Appraisals
    - 5-year review
    - Optional for other actions
  - Department letter
    - Reports cumulative outcome of vote for each step
    - Summary of verbal comments from Department meeting
    - Written comments from ballot
    - Summary of comments from Academic Federation members
      - During Department meeting
      - Directly to Chair
    - Reviewed by Department FPC
    - Revised version available to members of voting group upon request

- **Academic Senate Titles**
  - Voting group: Academic Senate Department members

- **Health Science Clinical Professor and Adjunct Professor Series**
  - Voting group: Academic Senate and Academic Federation Department members

- **Academic Federation Titles other than Health Science Clinical Professor and Adjunct Professor**
  - Additional review by Peer group prior to Departmental review
  - Voting group: Academic Senate and Academic Federation Department members
REVIEW AND VOTING PROCESS FOR ACADEMIC SENATE TITLES

The dossier for appointment, merit and promotion actions will be made available for review by all Academic Senate and Academic Federation members of the Department. A Department meeting will be held to discuss the action prior to voting for all barrier steps actions (promotion, Professor step 6, above-scale), appraisals and 5-year reviews. In addition, Department meetings may be held to discuss other types of actions (e.g. regular merits), based on consultation with Department members.

Voting will be by individual, confidential ballot. The voting group consists of all Academic Senate members of the Department. Members at all ranks (Assistant, Associate, Full) have the right to discuss and vote on actions for members at any rank. The actual vote totals for each step will be recorded in the Department letter, even if the vote is unanimous. No vote will be recorded in a case where only one faculty member is eligible to vote. Verbal comments from the Department meeting and written comments submitted anonymously through the voting process will provide commentary for the Department letter. Academic Federation members of the Department will be given the opportunity to provide comments during the Department meeting if one is held, or directly to the Department Chair if no meeting is held or they are unable to attend.

The Department letter will be reviewed by a Department Faculty Personnel Committee comprising three faculty appointed annually by the Chair from Department Academic Senate members not being considered for review during that academic year. Members of this Committee will review the draft Department letter and all written comments provided during the voting process, and suggest to the Chair modifications to the letter if they believe it does not accurately summarize the vote and comments. Department faculty eligible to vote on the action who are not part of the Department Faculty Personnel Committee will be given the opportunity to review the revised letter and comments provided during the voting process, and suggest further changes to the Department Chair if requested. The Department Chair will finalize the Department letter, including voting member suggestions if deemed representative of the overall opinion of the Department members.

REVIEW AND VOTING PROCESS FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES CLINICAL PROFESSOR AND ADJUNCT PROFESSOR SERIES

The Department review and voting process for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor and Adjunct Professor Series will be identical to that for Academic Senate titles, with the exception that Academic Federation members of the Department are included in the voting group. The Department letter will summarize the aggregate vote for each step, including the Academic Senate and Academic Federation members. Members at all ranks (Assistant, Associate, Full) have the right to discuss and vote on actions for members at any rank.

REVIEW AND VOTING PROCESS FOR ACADEMIC FEDERATION TITLES OTHER THAN HEALTH SCIENCES CLINICAL PROFESSOR AND ADJUNCT PROFESSOR

Merit and promotion actions will be reviewed by a peer group. The peer group will consist of a minimum of five Academic Federation members of the School of Veterinary Medicine, with at least one member from the same title series as the candidate being reviewed. The peer group will evaluate the candidate’s record and provide comments to the Department Chair. These comments will be available to all members of the voting group prior to the vote. The consultation process, including whether a Department meeting is held to discuss the action, the review of the
Department letter, and the manner of recording the votes will be identical to that for Academic Senate titles. The voting group for appointment, merit and promotion actions will consist of all Academic Senate and Academic Federation members of the Department. The Department letter will summarize the aggregate vote for each step, including the Academic Senate and Academic Federation members. Members at all ranks (Assistant, Associate, Full) have the right to discuss and vote on actions for members at any rank.
DEAN MICHAEL LAIRMORE  
School of Veterinary Medicine  

RE: Voting Procedures – Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences  

August 2, 2017  

Dear Michael:  

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the voting procedures for the Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences and recommends additional changes, as outlined in their attached memo.  

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

Sincerely,  

Philip H. Kass  
Vice Provost—Academic Affairs  
Professor of Analytic Epidemiology,  
Population Health and Reproduction (Veterinary Medicine), and Public Health Sciences (Medicine)  

/Ihs  

Attachment  

c: Executive Associate Dean Pascoe  
Chair Pypendop  
Director Rott  
Analyst Heta
July 26, 2017

Philip Kass, Vice Provost
Academic Affairs

Re: Revised Voting Procedures: Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences

Dear Vice Provost Kass,

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences revised voting procedures, submitted via the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs on July 11, 2017. CAP appreciates the Department’s effort to align voting procedures for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor and Adjunct Professor series with APM 220-AF, Section III.A.3, and to clarify consultation procedures for all actions with the introduction of Step Plus.

CAP has the following comments and suggestions:

1. It is unclear whether the 3 pages submitted represent the entirety of the Department’s voting procedures. If not, please provide them. CAP also suggests the Department create a single document in which general voting procedures are followed by specific procedures for different series, in outline format or as bullet points, for readability and easy reference.

2. Page 1 (HSCP and Adjunct Professor). The voting process is clear and appropriate.

3. Page 2 (Academic Federation titles other than HSCP and Adjunct Professor). The review and voting process is clear and appropriate.

4. Page 3 (Academic Senate), paragraph 1, lines 4-6: “In addition, a Department vote will be held each year before May 1st to decide if Department meetings will be held to discuss other types of actions (e.g., regular merits) during the following academic year.” CAP is concerned that this statement is unduly restrictive. The Department may need flexibility in deciding on and adjusting its consultation procedures and the timing of a department vote to decide this may be best handled internally. CAP suggests to delete or revise this to a more general statement, stating that Department meetings may be held prior to voting to discuss regular merit actions.

5. Page 3, paragraph 2, lines 4-5: “…and [votes] will not be separated between those eligible to vote and those to whom the vote has been extended, if applicable.” Please clarify or delete. There is no indication elsewhere in the document (that we could find) that votes could be extended to others who are not eligible to vote.
6. CAP encourages the Department letter to report the cumulative vote outcomes for each step, consistent with Step Plus guidelines.

We would appreciate your consideration of these queries and suggestions and look forward to receiving a revised Voting Procedures document.

Sincerely,

Rida Farouki, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

Cc: Lynn Daum, Academic Affairs
PROFESSOR RIDA FAROUKI, CHAIR  
Committee on Academic Personnel  

RE: Revised Voting Procedures – Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences  

Dear Rida:  

I am forwarding the proposed revisions to the Academic Senate Voting Procedures for the Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences for review and approval by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP).  

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

Sincerely,  

Philip H. Kass  
Vice Provost—Academic Affairs  
Professor of Analytic Epidemiology,  
Population Health and Reproduction (Veterinary Medicine),  
and Public Health Sciences (Medicine)  

/lhs  

Enclosures  

c: Dean Lairmore  
Executive Associate Dean Pascoe  
Chair Pypendop  
Analyst Taylor  
Analyst Heta
Dear Dr. Pascoe,

The Department of Surgical and Radiological Sciences requests your approval of changes to our Department voting procedures, and respectfully requests that you forward these documents to the Committee on Academic Personnel, Academic Federation Personnel Committee, and Vice-Provost – Academic Affairs for their approval. The changes are detailed below; they affect our voting procedures for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, the Adjunct Professor series, and the Academic Senate titles.

For the Academic Federation titles, the changes are based on APM UCD 220-AF, and specifically the statement under section III.A.3. that “while employees holding an appointment in the Adjunct Professor series or Health Sciences Clinical Professor series are members of the Academic Federation, policies and guidelines administering Academic Senate appointees govern this series”. The proposed changes in our voting procedures aim to align our handling of actions for these employees to that for employees holding an Academic Senate title, specifically by removing the requirement for a peer review group as described in our current procedures dated August 14, 2007, and approved on October 8, 2007. These changes would not affect the procedures for review and voting for Academic Federation titles other than Health Sciences Clinical Professor and Adjunct Professor, although the composition of the peer review group for these other titles is also altered as a consequence of the proposed changes.

For the Academic Senate titles, our current approved procedures (initially proposed on December 5, 2007, and reintroduced on June 27, 2012, with approval on August 15, 2012) state that a Department meeting will be held for specific actions only, not including regular merits. However, with the introduction of Step Plus, we have started to hold meetings to discuss all actions; earlier this year, Department faculty voted in favor of continuing to meet to discuss every action for the 2017-2018 merit and promotion cycle. The language on Report of Consultation was revised to list the actions for which the Department would always hold a meeting, and proposes to hold an annual vote to decide whether meetings should be held for the remaining actions (i.e. the merits).

The Department members voted on the proposed procedures as follows; Academic Federation members were invited to vote on the procedures for Academic Federation titles only, whereas Academic Senate members were invited to vote on all procedures.
Twenty-four department faculty voted, twenty-five faculty did not vote, and one did not vote due to administrative responsibilities at another level. The tally is as follows:

- Procedures for Health Sciences Clinical Professor and Adjunct Professor series: 24 in favor, 0 opposed.
- Procedures for Academic Federation titles except Health Sciences Clinical Professor and Adjunct Professor series: 24 in favor, 0 opposed.
- Procedures for Academic Senate titles: 24 in favor, 0 opposed.

Sincerely,

Bruno Pypendop  
Professor & Chair

John R. Pascoe, BVSc, PhD  
Executive Associate Dean  
In Concurrence, 6/7/2017
REVIEW AND VOTING PROCESS FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES CLINICAL PROFESSOR AND ADJUNCT PROFESSOR SERIES

The Department review and voting process for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor and Adjunct Professor Series will be identical to that for Academic Senate titles, with the exception that Academic Federation members of the Department are included in the voting group. The Department letter will summarize the aggregate vote, including the Academic Senate and Academic Federation members. Members at all ranks (Assistant, Associate, Full) have the right to discuss and vote on actions for members at any rank.
REVIEW AND VOTING PROCESS FOR ACADEMIC FEDERATION TITLES OTHER THAN HEALTH SCIENCES CLINICAL PROFESSOR AND ADJUNCT PROFESSOR

Merit and promotion actions will be reviewed by a peer group. The peer group will consist of a minimum of five Academic Federation members of the School of Veterinary Medicine, with at least one member from the same title series as the candidate being reviewed. The peer group will evaluate the candidate’s record and provide comments to the Department Chair. These comments will be available to all members of the voting group prior to the vote. The consultation process, including whether a Department meeting is held to discuss the action, the review of the Department letter, and the manner of recording the votes will be identical to that for Academic Senate titles. The voting group for appointment, merit and promotion actions will consist of all Academic Senate and Academic Federation members of the Department. The Department letter will summarize the aggregate vote, including the Academic Senate and Academic Federation members. Members at all ranks (Assistant, Associate, Full) have the right to discuss and vote on actions for members at any rank.
The dossier for appointment, merit and promotion actions will be made available for review by all Academic Senate and Academic Federation members of the Department. A Department meeting will be held to discuss the action prior to voting for all barrier steps actions (promotion, Professor step 6, above-scale), appraisals and 5-year reviews. In addition, a Department vote will be held each year before May 1st to decide if Department meetings will be held to discuss other types of actions (e.g. regular merits) during the following academic year.

Voting will be by individual, confidential ballot. The voting group consists of all Academic Senate members of the Department. Members at all ranks (Assistant, Associate, Full) have the right to discuss and vote on actions for members at any rank. The actual vote totals will be recorded in the Department letter, even if the vote is unanimous, and will not be separated between those eligible to vote and those to whom the vote has been extended, if applicable. No vote will be recorded in a case where only one faculty member is eligible to vote. Verbal comments from the Department meeting and written comments submitted anonymously through the voting process will provide commentary for the Department letter. Academic Federation members of the Department will be given the opportunity to provide comments during the Department meeting if one is held, or directly to the Department Chair if no meeting is held or they are unable to attend. The Department letter will be reviewed by a Department Faculty Personnel Committee comprising three faculty appointed annually by the Chair from Department Academic Senate members not being considered for review during that academic year. Members of this Committee will review the draft Department letter and all written comments provided during the voting process, and suggest to the Chair modifications to the letter if they believe it does not accurately summarize the vote and comments. Department faculty eligible to vote on the action who are not part of the Department Faculty Personnel Committee will be given the opportunity to review the revised letter and comments provided during the voting process, and suggest further changes to the Department Chair upon request. The Department Chair will finalize the Department letter, including voting member suggestions if deemed representative of the overall opinion of the Department members.