DEPARTMENT OF NEUROBIOLOGY
DEPARTMENT BYLAWS

This document is written to be in conformity with both the Standing Rules of the Regents of the University of California and Bylaw 55 of the Statewide Academic Senate of the University (UC SB 55). It was adopted by two-thirds majority vote of Departmental members of the UCLA Academic Senate following a regularly scheduled faculty meeting held on January 14, 2016 (22 of 32 eligible faculty voted; 20 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain).

I. DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS

1.1. The Department operates according to the rules of both the UC state-wide Academic Senate and the UCLA divisional Academic Senate. These bylaws apply to all Departmental actions on “substantial departmental questions” [UC SB 55(A)(1)] and all academic personnel actions [UC SB 55(B)(1-7)]. Except as specified below, standard parliamentary procedures are followed. When needed A. Sturgis' The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedures (4th edition, 2001) is used for guidance.

1.2. Faculty members in the Department who are members of the Academic Senate and have active appointments are eligible to vote on the matters specified in section 1.1. Changes in this governance document can only be made if the proposed action is a listed agenda item for a meeting of Departmental faculty that has been scheduled and publicized in advance according to normal Department procedures. A two-thirds majority by secret ballot vote of all voting Senate members is required for approval of changes in this document. Any recommended changes will be documented.

1.3. All primary faculty members with Senate series titles and active appointments have equal voting rights in all Departmental matters, including personnel actions. Voting on all series was discussed at the Department faculty meeting on December 10, 2015. Personnel voting rights on all actions were extended to In-Residence series Professors by a two-thirds majority by secret ballot of Full Professors on December 16, 2015 (14 yes, 0 no). Personnel voting rights on all actions were extended to Associate-level Senate faculty by a two-thirds majority by secret ballot of Professors and In-Residence Professors on December 22, 2015 (12 yes, 0 no). Personnel voting rights on all actions were extended to Assistant-level Senate faculty by a two-thirds majority by secret ballot of Senate series Professors and Associate Professors on December 30, 2015 (18 yes, 2 no, 1 abstain). Personnel voting rights on all actions were extended to Emeriti on Active Recall by a two-thirds majority by secret ballot of Senate faculty (Professor, Associate, and Assistant rank) on January 6, 2016 (17 yes, 1 no).

1.4. Senate faculty members with joint appointments in other units have voting rights on Departmental personnel actions, unless otherwise waived. Waivers are valid for a three year period and must be renewed. Joint appointees will have voting rights on all non-personnel Department matters regardless of waiver status.

1.5. Non-Senate (Adjunct) and temporary (Visiting) faculty members may attend Departmental faculty meetings, but do not have voting privileges on Departmental personnel actions. Permanent, non-Senate appointees will have voting rights on all non-personnel Department matters.
1.6. Emeriti may participate in Departmental meetings. Emeriti on active recall from Senate series have voting privileges on all personnel and non-personnel Department matters. Non-recalled Emeriti do not have voting privileges on Departmental personnel actions, regardless of appointment as Research Professors.

1.7. As per 1.1–1.4 above, all Academic Senate members regardless of rank will be eligible to vote on all Departmental academic personnel actions (otherwise not delegated to the Department Academic Review Committee), including but not limited to:

- Appointments
- Promotions
- Merit Increases
- Reappointments
- Joint Appointments
- Fourth Year Appraisals
- Eight Year Limit Reviews
- Five Year Reviews
- Change in Series

1.8. The Department does not utilize the Lecturer (SOE) titles.

II. VOTING PROCEDURES

2.1. Notice of proposed personnel actions are sent to all members eligible to vote on the action, with date of Department meeting at which action will be discussed, and date (subsequent to Department meeting) by which vote must be made.

2.2. Dossiers are available in the Neurobiology Administrative Offices for inspection by voting members.

2.3. Voting is by secret ballot. Currently, a secure electronic ballot system, maintaining voter anonymity, is used.

2.4. Majorities are determined on the basis of pro and con (yes and no) votes only. Votes to abstain do not count in the total. Absences do not count in the total.

2.5. Faculty may vote on their own personnel actions.

2.6. Dissenting faculty at any step in the process may write minority reports. After the Committee has released the final letter, with deadlines permitting, there will be a time limit of three working days for filing additional written reports. The committee letter and any minority reports will be submitted, in redacted form, to the candidate who will have an opportunity to write a response to the Chair of the Department.

2.7. All ladder, in-residence and re-called emeritus faculty vote on the termination of in-residence and adjunct faculty due to the lack of funding.
IIII. ACADEMIC REVIEW COMMITTEE (NB-ARC).

3.1. One standing committee (five members) is elected by all ladder, in residence and recalled emeritus faculty of the Department of Neurobiology. The NB-ARC will evaluate faculty under consideration for advancement in all ranks of ladder, adjunct and in-residence faculty as well as their promotions. The NB-ARC also will consider promotions within the Research series. (Appointments and merits in the Research series are approved by the Department Chair.) A quorum of four committee members will be required to discuss each action. If not present at the committee meeting, the fifth member of NB-ARC must express in writing his/her evaluation of the candidate, approve and sign the Committee letter. The Committee chair is chosen annually from among the elected members of the NB-ARC.

3.2. The Department has delegated merit reviews on all faculty actions to the NR-ARC. Delegation of merit reviews to the NB-ARC was approved by a two-thirds majority by secret ballot of Senate faculty on March 23, 2016 (15 yes, 0 no).

3.3. The election process: All ladder, in-residence and recalled emeritus faculty (except those who have waived review in the department) will elect the necessary number of members of the NB-ARC in the month of May. With the exception of the departmental Chair, all voting members are eligible to serve on the NB-ARC. The make-up of the Committee will be proportional to the number of faculty in the department in two categories: 1) Professors and 2) Associate and Assistant Professors. At the time of each annual election, the faculty will be given ballots listing the faculty eligible for that election based on their rank, the number of positions to be filled and the need to have the Committee membership proportional to the distribution of the department's faculty in the two categories listed above. In the event there are insufficient eligible faculty members in one of the two categories, members of other categories will be eligible to make up the Committee, until such time as there are a proportional number of eligible faculty in each category.

3.4. Duration of service on the NB-ARC: Committee membership will be for three years. As members rotate off the committee, they are replaced by an equal number of newly elected members. Committee members are not eligible for consecutive terms. The new Committee will be activated June 1 annually.

3.5. The NB-ARC will handle all ordinary merit reviews. The Committee chair will assign primary responsibility for each dossier to one member of the Committee who will present the dossier and write the draft of the Committee letter. The NB-ARC Chair will have final responsibility for insuring that the letter reflects the Committee's opinion. Ordinary merit reviews do not require a departmental vote. However, should a faculty object to the Committee’s recommendation, he/she has the option to bring the case to the full faculty for a vote. (Per Senate ByLaw 55, a request for a meeting has to come from three Senate members other than the candidate, and the meeting has to be held within 10 days.)

3.6. For actions that involve fourth-year appraisals, promotion to Associate Professor
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or Professor and merit advancements to Professor VI and Professor Above Scale, an ad hoc committee will be formed by the NB-ARC. As indicated above, all other merit advancements will be considered by the NB-ARC. For all actions, members of the committee will review the dossier and be required to read the relevant papers or manuscripts (maximum of five) that the candidate selects as her/his most important work under School of Medicine guidelines. If the primary appointment of the person under consideration is in another department, the NB-ARC will not consider a dossier unless a letter of evaluation is received from the primary department. (If such an individual is being reviewed by the Committee on Joint Appointments (CJA) for continuation of the joint appointment in the same academic year that he/she is being considered for promotion/advancement, it is recommended that the CJA report is received by the NB-ARC before it considers the action.) In conjunction with these actions, the candidate will be offered the opportunity to present a seminar. It is up to the candidate to decide whether or not this seminar will be open to graduate students, postdoctoral fellows and individuals from outside the Department.

3.7. At the candidate’s or departmental Chair’s request, or if the NB-ARC deems it necessary, the committee will consult with experts from the Department who can aid in the evaluation. Experts in the candidate’s area of research can be sought elsewhere in the University if they are not available within the Department. These experts will be designated by the NB-ARC and invited by the departmental Chair. They will be ad hoc committee members for the specific action under consideration. They will review the dossier and participate in the committee discussion. By University rule, members of the ad hoc committee who are not members of the Department cannot vote on the recommendation of the ad hoc committee. A minimum of two members from the NB-ARC will serve on each ad hoc committee.

3.8. An ad hoc committee will also be formed by the NB-ARC for all actions concerning the Chair of the Department. As for the other ad hoc committees, a minimum of two members of the NB-ARC will serve on this committee, while the other members can be selected either from within or outside of the Department. The members of this ad hoc committee will be designated by the NB-ARC by a majority vote and invited to serve on the Committee by the Chair of the NB-ARC.

3.9. Following the Committee meeting, the Committee letter is drafted. This letter should accurately reflect the recommendations made by each member of the committee on the action under consideration. The committee letter will be made available to the candidate only for correction of errors of fact and omissions. For actions requiring a full faculty vote, the Committee letter and the dossier will be available for review and discussion by all departmental faculty eligible to vote. The discussion at the faculty meeting will be summarized by the NB-ARC member presenting the action and transmitted to the Chair of the Department which can then be submitted as an addendum to the Committee letter if necessary.

IV. JOINT APPOINTMENTS

4.1. The Department of Neurobiology recognizes the desirability of offering joint appointments to faculty with exceptional research and teaching potential who share the goals of our faculty and are willing to participate actively in departmental activities.
4.2. Criteria for new joint appointments and continuation of joint appointments. Faculty with joint appointments are expected to:

a. Share the goal of the faculty of the Department of Neurobiology to be an outstanding research and teaching unit.

b. Be committed to actively participate in departmental affairs, including:
   - Teaching in professional, graduate, and undergraduate courses in their general area of expertise
   - Research-related programs, e.g., seminars and training grants
   - Service, e.g., committees

4.3. In recognition that these are joint appointments, the expected level of participation within the Department may be less than that from faculty whose primary appointments are in the Department of Neurobiology but, nonetheless, should be significant.

4.4. Procedure for initiating and renewing joint appointments.

a. Joint appointments will be proposed by at least two departmental faculty who are members of the Academic Senate or by the Chair. The proposal will be accompanied by a letter outlining and documenting the rationale for the proposed appointment. The documentation will be submitted to the Chair for initial consideration. The documentation and the Chair’s response will be forwarded in writing to the Committee on Joint Appointments (CJA). This committee will consist of 5 members elected by secret ballot by the Department for a period of 3 years. (See Addendum 3, Election Details). At least 2 of the Committee members should have joint appointments (without a waiver). The Committee will then review the documentation and make a formal recommendation to voting Academic Senate faculty members.

b. Joint appointments may be reviewed every 3 years. For this purpose, holders of such appointments should submit to the Committee on Joint Appointments a report on their contributions to the Department during the past 3 years and a list of proposed contributions for the next 3 years. The Committee will review this documentation and make a formal recommendation to renew or not renew the joint appointment. This recommendation will be forwarded to the Chair for comment. After discussion by the faculty, any recommendation by the Committee for change in joint appointment status will be subjected to approval by secret ballot of appropriate Academic Senate faculty. The Chair may waive this review.

4.5. Review of joint appointees and waiver: joint appointees are reviewed by the Department of Neurobiology at the time of proposed advancements in step or level by the same procedure as specified in the departmental Bylaws for faculty with primary appointments in the Department. A waiver to this rule can be requested. Extension of a waiver can be requested every three years. With a waiver in place, our faculty do not vote on proposed advancements or promotions of the joint appointee. In addition, the joint
appointee does not participate in the discussion and vote on proposed advancements or promotions of other faculty within the Department. After discussion of the waiver request, the faculty will vote by secret ballot to accept or reject the waiver. No request for a waiver can be submitted and considered when the process of reviewing the joint appointee has started (i.e., from the submission of the dossier to the final vote of the faculty on the proposed advancement).

V. RECRUITMENT OF NEW FACULTY

5.1. In the case of new appointments to the ladder, in-residence and adjunct professorial series, the departmental Chair shall appoint an appropriately chosen ad hoc committee to screen the candidates and advise the Chair. In the case of ladder appointments, this committee shall also conduct the search. Its choice shall then be presented to the entire faculty in an open meeting, and all Senate members shall vote on the candidate by secret ballot. The Department's Chair should seek the input of the faculty in terms of the research area of expertise of potential candidates, the advertisement of the position and the members of the Search Committee.

VI. COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION:

6.1. Chair Advisory Committee –committee consisting of the Department Chair, Department Vice-Chairs, and the chairs of the Academic Review Committee, Committee on Joint Appointments, and Block 5 of the medical student curriculum. Responsibilities: reviews and advises on department-level policies and strategies.

6.2. Neurobiology Academic Review Committee – five member committee elected for three year terms in May annually. Responsibilities: reviews most personnel actions. See section III above.

6.3. Committee on Joint Appointments – five member committee elected for three year terms annually in May. Responsibilities: review of all applicants for joint appointment in the Department and review of the continuation of all joint appointments every three years. This committee focuses on the contributions of the faculty member to the Department.

6.4. Ad Hoc Committees – the Chair may form ad hoc committees as needed.
March 28, 2016

To: Linda Bourque, Chair
   Rules & Jurisdiction

From: Paul E. Micevych, Chair
       Department of Neurobiology

Re: Neurobiology Department Bylaws

We are pleased to respond to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction’s letter from February 22, 2016 requesting clarification on issues related to the revised Department of Neurobiology Bylaws, resubmitted on February 15, 2016. We are responding to the questions raised below. We have also revised the bylaws to clarify the questions and re-voted on one issue.

"Second, once again, the Committee points out that what is now in Section 1.2, is incorrect. Amendments to bylaws are approved by a two-thirds majority in a secret ballot, not by a "simple majority vote of all voting Senate members." This section must be corrected. In addition the information in the introductory paragraph must be corrected to indicate that the vote was by secret ballot. If the vote on the bylaws was not by secret ballot, the vote must be redone." We have revised to clarify the two-thirds requirement. The vote was by secret ballot.

"Third, all the actions reported in Section 1.3 must be by secret ballot. If they were not, they will have to be redone. Also in Section 1.3, extension of voting rights to In Residence series Professors should have been by a two-thirds majority in a secret ballot of all Full and Associate Professors in the Regular series. Please correct the reports of these votes or, if secret ballots were not held, please redo them." All of these votes were "by a two-thirds majority of a secret ballot" to each and every vote.

"Fourth, in Section 1.5, it is still not clear who you are referencing as "permanent, non-Senate appointees." Non-Senate faculty do not have voting rights in departments unless the Academic Senate faculty extends those rights by a two-thirds majority in a secret ballot. If voting rights on non-personnel actions are extended, the votes of non-Senate faculty are advisory only, and must always be separately reported. There is no evidence presented in the Bylaws that Academic Senate faculty approved this. No tallies and dates of votes are included in Section 1.5 of the department’s bylaws. Nor, is it indicated that any secret ballots were conducted." We have clarified this section to indicate what series was referenced and that this refers to non-
personnel actions. Non-Senate faculty may attend these meetings and advise but cannot vote on personnel actions.

“To extend rights to a category of non-Senate faculty, the persons in the series should all be career or permanent and preferably be appointed at 100% time, or at least at more than 50% time. The extension is to all non-Senate faculty in the series under consideration.” We are not extending rights to non-Senate faculty on personnel matters. This is clearly stated in section 1.5.

“Fifth, in Section I.1.6 there is no indication that the non-Emeriti Academic Senate Faculty have extended the vote to Recalled Emeriti faculty on Academic Personnel Actions.” Voting rights to Recalled Emeriti was voted on and the votes listed in section 1.3. This was conducted by secret ballot and passed by a two-thirds majority.

“Sixth, in Section III, it is our understanding that the Academic Review Committee (NB-ARC) is elected and is involved in at least two activities: 1) final review of all ordinary merit reviews; and 2) the appointment of ad hoc committees to pre-review fourth-year appraisals, promotion to Associate Professor or Professor and merit advancements to Professor VI and Professor Above Scale. To delegate final review of merit actions to the NB-ARC, the Academic Senate faculty must vote by a two thirds majority to delegate to the Committee. This vote does not have to be by secret ballot. See SB 55 (B)(7). It appears that this vote was never conducted.” We have voted on this and the vote passed. The vote was by secret ballot and passed by a two-thirds majority. The vote date and count is listed in section 3.2.

“Seventh, there is no indication that the Academic Senate Faculty voted to delegate actions on Merit Actions to the Academic Review Committee. This must be voted on and the vote must be reported in the Bylaws.” As noted above, the vote was by secret ballot and passed by a two-thirds majority. The vote date and count is listed in section 3.2.

“Finally, it is still not clear in the Bylaws how the Chair of the NB-ARC is selected. The Chair should be selected by the elected members of the committee.” This has been revised and clarified in section 3.1.

We expect that this will clarify the Committee’s concerns.

cc: Carole Goldberg, Vice Chancellor
    Jason Throop, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
    James Crall, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
    Marian Olivas, Committee Analyst, Rules & Jurisdiction
    Meg Buzzi, Academic Personnel Office
    Heather Small, Information Technology Services
    Bonnie MacDougall, Vice Chancellor’s Office
    Mark Lucas, CAO