



MEMORANDUM

David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA
Department of Neurobiology
73-235 / CHS
176318

April 3, 2003

TO: Richard Gold, Chair
Council on Academic Personnel

FROM: Marie-Francoise Chesselet, Chair
Department of Neurobiology

RE: Bylaw 55

Our department is in the process of modifying our Academic Review procedures. Our current voting procedures, in accordance with Bylaw 55, are as set forth below. Our departmental operating procedures are consistent with The CALL. Please note the enclosure, "Proposal for Creation and Operation of Academic Review Committees in the Department of Neurobiology" (dated March 7, 2000).

1. All ladder, in-residence and recalled Emeritus faculty are eligible to vote on all new departmental appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate.
2. All ladder, in-residence and recalled Emeritus faculty are eligible to vote on all cases of promotion to the ranks of Associate and Full Professor in the regular, in-residence and adjunct series.
3. All cases of non-reappointment or termination of Assistant Professors or Assistant Professors-in-Residence are voted upon by all ladder, in-residence and recalled Emeritus faculty.
4. Advancements to Step VI and Above Scale as well as fourth-year appraisals are voted upon by all ladder, in-residence and recalled Emeritus faculty.
5. For all other advancements within any rank, voting is delegated to departmental Review Committees (elected for a three-year period) as follows:
 - a. A committee of six (6) Assistant, Associate and/or Full Professors and recalled Emeritus faculty is elected to review merit increases of all ladder,

In-residence and Adjunct Assistant Professors. This committee is elected by all ladder, in-residence and recalled Emeritus faculty.

- b. A committee of six (6) Assistant, Associate and/or Full Professors and recalled Emeritus faculty is elected to review merit increases of all ladder, In-residence and Adjunct Associate and Full Professors. This committee is elected by all ladder, in-residence and recalled Emeritus faculty.
6. After the committee reviews the proposed action, the action is presented to the faculty at large for discussion and is then submitted to faculty who are eligible (as designated above) for a vote by secret ballot.
 7. In the case of new appointments to the ladder and in-residence professorial series, the Chair shall appoint an appropriately chosen ad hoc committee to screen the candidate(s) 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 faculty in the ladder and in-residence series, as well as recalled Emeritus faculty, shall vote on the candidate by secret ballot.
 8. The appointments of Visiting Professors, Adjunct Lecturers, and recalled Emeritus faculty are presented and discussed in regularly scheduled faculty meetings for a voice or show-of-hands vote.
 9. The numerical result of the vote is promptly reported first to the individual whose action is being voted upon and then to those who were entitled to vote.
 10. On November 10, 1994, a departmental vote was taken regarding non-recalled Emeritus faculty. The results of the vote were that they are not permitted to vote on personnel matters. In addition, they (as a class) are not allowed to vote on Department/School actions.

3/7/00

Proposal for Creation and Operation of Academic Review Committees in the Department of Neurobiology.

1. Two standing committees (6 regular members and 3 alternates per committee) will be elected by all ladder, in-residence and recalled emeritus faculty of the Department of Neurobiology. One committee will evaluate faculty under consideration for advancement in the Assistant Professor rank and for promotion to the level of Associate Professor. This committee will also consider the promotions of Assistant Researchers. The other committee will evaluate faculty under consideration for advancement in the Associate and Full Professor ranks as well as for promotion to Full Professor. This second committee will also consider the promotions of Associate Researchers and advancements of Researchers to Step VI. A quorum of 4 committee members will be required to discuss each action. Each committee will have two co-chairs that will share the responsibility of committee letter writing. Each committee member will serve for 3 years. Election of these committees will take place in March of the relevant year.
2. For actions that involve promotion to Associate Professor and Professor and merit advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above Scale and for the 4th- year review, all members of the relevant committee will review the dossier and be required to read the relevant papers or manuscripts (maximum of 5) that the candidate selects as her/his most important work. If the primary appointment of the person under consideration is in another department, the relevant committee will take under consideration the letter of evaluation coming from the primary department, provided this letter is available at the time of the meeting. In conjunction with these actions, the candidate will be offered the opportunity to present a seminar (*see 11/15/00 footnote*). At the candidate or departmental Chair's request or if the committee deems it necessary, the committee will consult with experts from the Department who can aid in the evaluation. Experts can be sought elsewhere in the University if they are not available within the Department. These experts will be designated by the committee 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.
3. Following the committee meeting, one of the committee co-chairs will draft a letter for review and discussion by all eligible departmental faculty members. The draft letter should accurately reflect the recommendations made by each member of the committee on the action under consideration. All elected members of the committee will read and approve the draft letter. Thereafter, a redacted version of the letter will be made available to the candidate for a response, *with particular emphasis on errors of fact and omissions*.
4. The faculty is expected to read the dossier in advance of the faculty meeting, to discuss the dossier and committee letter at the meeting and to make recommendations for amendment if necessary. The faculty will vote on the action by secret ballot within 2 working days of the faculty meeting. The designated committee chair will make appropriate changes in the draft letter to reflect the faculty discussion, and the final letter will be forwarded with the

dossier to the Chair of the Department after it is made available for final comments by all interested faculty. If there is not complete agreement on the language or content of the letter, dissenting faculty can write minority reports. After the committee has released the final letter, with deadlines permitting, there will be a time limit of 3 working days for filing additional written reports. *The final 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 Department Chair.* The final letter (and minority report, if applicable) will be forwarded with the dossier to the office of the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and from there to the Council on Academic Personnel (if the specific action requires the latter).

5. By virtue of an open vote of the Neurobiology faculty at a faculty meeting on January 14, 2000, the right to vote on all professorial promotions and major advancements (to Step VI and Above Scale) was extended to all ladder, in-residence and recalled emeritus faculty. All faculty in attendance who were eligible to vote voted in favor of this policy.
6. Mechanism for the election process.

All ladder, in-residence and recalled emeritus faculty (except those who opted not to be reviewed by our departmental committees) will elect the members of the two standing committees. Each faculty member will vote for nine individuals for each committee. With the exception of the Chair of the Department, all voting members are eligible to serve on these committees. The makeup of the committees will be determined by the individuals who receive the most votes. The 6 individuals receiving the highest number of votes will serve as regular committee members, and the 3 individuals with the next highest number of votes will serve as alternates. If a given individual is elected to both committees, she/he will choose the committee on which she/he wishes to serve. In the case of a tie for positions 6 and 7 and 9 and 10, the final decision on who will serve on the committee (and in what capacity) will be made by the flip of a coin. Committee co-chairs will be chosen by the elected members of each review committee. Assistant Professors cannot serve as committee chairs.

4/19/00 Footnote: In initiating the above bylaws to elect new Review Committees, an issue arose that was not explicitly delineated in the bylaws. The Chair decided that in the event of a tie for the 6th-place slot on a Committee, the person who received the most votes for the relevant Committee, in the presence of the Academic Personnel Coordinator (APC), will flip a coin to determine which person should fill the 6th member slot.

4/27/00 Footnote: The APC will contact Committee alternates only if we have not been able to reach a quorum of 4 after contacting the 6 Committee members.

11/15/00 Footnote: It is up to the candidate to decide whether he/she wishes to open her/his seminar to postdoctoral fellows and people from outside the Department.