

1.4 Department Consultation & Voting

1. General

The department chair is responsible for complying with the provisions of [Academic Senate Bylaw 55](#), departmental bylaws, as well as all applicable academic personnel policies and procedures regarding academic reviews.

Departments may develop their own rules, if necessary, for consultation or voting on academic personnel actions not covered by Academic Senate Bylaw 55. The establishment and revision of departmental bylaws requires Academic Senate review.

The department chair must make clear in the departmental recommendation letter the degree of consultation with the faculty.

Departments and ORUs should establish voting procedures for academic review actions for Research Scientists.

2. Departmental ad hoc committees

Related Manual Sections: 2.4.8 3.4.12
--

Although the department chair is responsible for documenting and presenting the departmental recommendation, a departmental ad hoc committee may be appointed to advise the chair.

Departments are encouraged to document in bylaws how departmental ad hoc committees are used.

Departmental ad hoc committee membership and recommendations (if any) should be included in a file as outlined below:

- a. If an ad hoc committee is convened and advises the department via a formal report, its recommendation becomes part of the file. A signed copy of the ad hoc committee report, with full membership indicated at the end (with member's signatures), must be included in the file. This is a confidential document, and references to ad hoc members must be avoided in the departmental recommendation letter.
- b. If an ad hoc committee is convened to advise the department but no formal report is produced, the department chair should summarize the ad hoc committee's feedback in a few sentences within the departmental recommendation letter. The department chair should avoid identifying any ad hoc committee members within the departmental recommendation letter. Additionally, ad hoc committee membership should be included as an addendum to the Referee I.D. List.

When using ad hoc committees, chairs should ensure the following:

- a. Remind ad hoc committee members of the confidential nature of their assignment;
- b. Verify the academic appointee's mentors, co-authors, or collaborators do not chair ad hoc committees. However, they may serve as committee members if their expertise is needed. In these cases, an explanation of why they were asked to serve should be included below the signature block on the ad hoc committee report;

If the departmental ad hoc report fails to describe the content and importance of research and/or creative activity, this should be included in the departmental recommendation letter.

3. Departmental Vote

The results of a department vote must be reflected accurately on the appropriate UC San Diego Academic Summary form and thoroughly discussed in the departmental recommendation letter. Except in unusual circumstances, whenever University or departmental policy requires a vote on a proposed action, the action must be supported **by at least 50% of the members eligible to vote and in residence on campus in the quarter when the vote is taken**. Unusual circumstances may make it impossible to comply with this rule. In such cases, the department chair should explain the circumstances in the recommendation letter. In general, a proposal where the vote does not comply with Bylaw 55 requirements should not come forward from the department. Files forwarded without an explanation of why the 50% threshold is not met will be returned as incomplete and risk delayed review.

If faculty members are on approved leave away from campus, or otherwise are unavailable, they should be counted as absent. If known, the reasons for negative votes should be explained in the departmental letters. **Departments should encourage faculty to list the reasons why they do not support a proposed action, if possible, so that it is easy to include comments in the departmental recommendation letter.** Members of the voting faculty who are on the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel or who will comment on the file (i.e., deans, etc.) should abstain. The department chair may also choose to abstain.

Methods of voting, including the use of mail ballots and electronic voting systems are at the discretion of the department within the constraints of Bylaw 55. Departments are strongly encouraged to document departmental voting procedures in bylaws, and the departmental voting procedures must be provided to the Committee on Academic Personnel. It is expected that voting faculty will familiarize themselves with the candidate's academic file in order to render an informed vote.

Using the following guidelines, votes should be solicited in accordance with Bylaw 55 (when applicable) and departmental bylaws:

- a. Faculty should be notified that the file is available for review and that voting will be conducted for a designated period of time that is consistent for all actions voted on.

- b. Votes should be tallied at the end of the voting period and the results recorded on the Academic Recommendation Summary form and discussed in the departmental recommendation letter.
- c. Except for appraisals, votes should be “for,” “against,” “abstain,” or “absent,” as defined below:

FOR	The voter is in favor of the proposed action.
AGAINST	The voter is not in favor of the proposed action.
ABSTAIN	The voter is available, but has elected to refrain from voting.
ABSENT	The voter is unavailable for voting due to an approved leave or other absence from campus.