

Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE)**Draft Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 13, 2019**

The Committee for Rules and Elections met at 10:00 AM in Room 326 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Christopher Viney presiding. Vice Chair Anna Song was not able attend the meeting due to a scheduling conflict.

I. Chair's Report

[10 mins]

A. [DivCo \(3/4\)](#) update

Chair Viney reported on the March 4 Divisional Council meeting, which included an update from Academic Council about the UC/Elsevier negotiations impasse. The Chair, in his capacity as the Senate Parliamentarian, reviewed and suggested revisions to a Senate Memorial on UC-funded investments in fossil fuel companies. The Memorial was subsequently distributed to the Merced Division on March 11. Other items of discussion included the UC Chancellors' signing of the letter on boycotting UC investment in Israel forwarded by some faculty members. Several concerns were raised locally by FWF and others about the lack of consultation related to the representation of the campuses perspectives without prior consultation with the Senate faculty. There is some discussion at the systemwide level about possible removal of inappropriate comments from student course evaluations. Additionally, Provost Camfield attended at DivCo's March 4th meeting, and made a request of formal procedures for support of the retention of faculty.

B. Update on [CRE's Request for Nominees to CoC](#)

Senate Associate Director Paul updated CRE on the status of the Committee on Committee's nominations. CoC will convene on March 22nd. CRE has asked CoC to field nominations directly, as CRE needs to receive five more nominations for CoC positions, and two more Senate At-Large nominations to reach the threshold where calling an election is deemed necessary by Senate bylaws.

II. Consent Calendar

[5 mins]

- A. March 13 Agenda
- B. February 13th [Meeting Minutes](#)

The Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

III. Campus Review Items

[15 mins]

A. [UGC Request for Ruling – Chair Viney](#)

Members discussed the request from the Undergraduate Council for a ruling on potential conflicts of interest for members of UGC who also sit on the GE Executive Committee. CRE recognizes that this is an important matter, as most faculty members sit on multiple committees in service to the campus community. CRE will offer a ruling, but would like to first solicit input from relevant faculty leads and/or committee members.

The following general comments and questions about conflict of interest guidelines were raised during the discussion of this topic:

1. Members were concerned that the creation of additional policies for committee members who are members of two or more committees would necessitate multiple iterations of a conflict of policy attempting to address all relationships. CRE is disinclined to set a precedent of creating ever-more specific policies per individual cases of cross-committee membership.
2. CRE believes that a culture of openness and transparency should be cultivated by all campus committee members, with potential conflicts of interest made public and the process of recusal a part of membership duties, should general members feel uncomfortable

about their positionalities.

3. CRE also believes that members of any committee should be representing the specific constituency they are serving during meetings of that committee, rather than broadly representing multiple committee interests they are a part of.

4. Any conflict of interest, actual or potentially perceived, on the part of a committee chair might be addressed by the following path: a memo on the potential conflict is to be sent to the Senate Chair; the Senate Chair will decide if the conflict is a concrete threat to impartiality, and will issue a ruling to resolve the situation.

While the discussion of UGC’s request yielded possible solutions, CRE decided to pursue two sets of actions in response to this important request:

Action (Immediate): By March 17, CRE will confirm with UGC that they will review the request and provide a ruling following consultation with the chairs of UGC and the GE Executive Committee (GEEC) and committee members, as appropriate. CRE will consult with Vice Chair Song, as she was absent from the meeting.

Action (next steps): CRE will consult with the Chairs of UGC and GEEC regarding the policy's use by members, separately and/or together, for input. This includes asking GEEC to consider drafting its own policy, as UGC and other senate committees already have COI policies. Additionally, CRE will consider possible revisions to its own committee conflict of interest policy.

CRE will issue a ruling on this matter.

B. [Proposed Teaching and Preparation Program, Distance Education](#)

The lead reviewer for this item is Vice Chair Anna Song. Her comments were shared with CRE prior to today’s meeting.

CRE members discussed [a proposal from University Extension](#) to establish a distance education version of the non-degree program *UC Merced Extension Teacher Preparation Program, Multiple Subject Credential and Single Subject Credential*. The onsite version of this program was approved by the Senate in April 2018 and Graduate Council’s previous opinion can be found [here](#). Members discussed:

- Whether the proposal would meet campus credit requirements (120 credit bearing hours) specified in the relevant [guidelines](#), or if the program units required are actually lower than the campus minimum.
- The need to explicitly state what GPA is needed to meet “good standing” in the program, as the guidelines stipulate that minimum scholarship standards are 2.0 GPA for each course attempted. The proposal should adopt at least this standard or describe its own standard above the stipulated minimum.
- How the total number of required hours (1890) mentioned in the February 5, 2019
- cover sheet was decided upon and how that metric directly translates to training requirements.

Action: By March 22, CRE members will transmit their comments on behalf of Vice Chair Song ¹ to Senate Chair Schnier and University Extension.

IV. Systemwide Review Items

[30 mins]

A. [UC Transfer Admission Guarantee](#) – Chair Viney

¹ CRE Chair Viney is a member of the University Extension Curriculum Advisory Board

Members discussed the proposal regarding a UC Transfer Admission Guarantee for all eligible California Community College students. A joint memo from Academic Council Chair May and Provost Brown was issued on March 7 and is provided [here](#) as contextual information.

Upon review, CRE agreed with the spirit of equity in the proposal, as it could help UC reach the desired ratio of two freshman to one transfer student on every campus. CRE raised a specific concern about how the admissions guarantee might affect campus enrollment. CRE believes that serving transfer students is a worthy endeavor and finds the proposal favorable, but also believes there is a more efficient way to meet this proposed state mandate without continuous pressure placed on campus resources. CRE members suggest that one of the most efficient ways to use available capacity to admit more transfer students is to focus on populating smaller majors. When promoting UC programs, in materials and through active recruitment, all majors must be considered, not just the 21 most popular majors by campus. In CRE's estimation, such action will be more work, but worth the effort.

Action: By March 22, CRE will transmit comments to the Senate Chair. CRE comments will also be shared with the Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee (AFAS).

- B. [Proposed Revision to Senate Bylaw 636 \(Entry Level Writing Requirement\)](#) – *Chair Viney*
Members reviewed the [proposed revisions](#) to [Senate Regulation 636.E](#), addressing how UC students are allowed to satisfy the University's Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). At issue is the interpretation of the policy itself. As written, the original text is difficult to understand. As CRE understands the policy, the proposed revisions are not necessary if the policy's aim is interpreted as not allowing students who have enrolled at a UC to meet *subsequent* campus writing requirements at another institution. If indeed the policy seeks to regulate the ways in which students can fulfill the Entry Level Writing Requirement as a condition of enrollment, revisions to the entirety of SR 636.E (i.e. not just the addition of a sentence) may be needed to clarify the policy's meaning.

Actions:

1. Vice Chair Song will be invited to share her thoughts on the proposal.
2. By April 23rd, CRE members will transmit their comments on these proposed revisions to the Senate Chair.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 AM.