

Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE)

DRAFT Minutes

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

10:00-11:30 AM – KL 326

The Committee for Rules and Elections met at 10:00 AM in Room 326 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Christopher Viney presiding.

- I. **Chair's Report – Christopher Viney**
Chair Viney welcomed everyone and gave a brief report regarding last month's Divisional Council.
- II. **Consent Calendar**
All Consent Calendar items were approved without objection.
- III. **Spring Senate Election (2019-2020)**
CRE Members approved the proposed election timeline and approved the draft Call for Nominations form, with a revision to the body of the nomination form: that school information also be requested from nominators as well as nominees. Members asked about recent issues with Qualtrics survey solicitations being sent to faculty junk mail inboxes, and Senate staff offered to work with SSHA staff to make sure this known issue will be addressed before the Spring Election survey is released on February 7th. Additionally, Senate staff will send out more reminders during the open call for both nominations and faculty election participation.
- IV. **Matters Arising**
The Chair asked about the status of the revised Conflict of Interest policy sent to the Senate Chair.

Action: The Analyst will follow up with the Chair on this item after the meeting.
- V. **Campus Review Items**
 - A. **Revised Recommended Voting Policies in Academic Personnel Cases**
Members discussed revisions, such as specifically changing the word "policies" to "Procedures" in the title of the proposal. They emphasized that the document serves as a brief history of voting models known to have been used or be available for use, as guidance for different academic units who are looking at their own practices. This document is not an endorsement of, or value statement on, any particular voting model option. As such, CRE respects different units' cultures and histories, as well as strongly approves inclusive practices, which includes voting practices. Additional revisions were made to reduce redundancy and shorten the text.

Action: The Chair asked that after the minutes of the meeting are made available, he will review them with the stated revisions and circulate the working document to other members of CRE. Then, after reviewing the document with the Chairs of FAWF and D&E in person, the Chair will confer with Peter Vandeschraaf (the previous lead review on this item) and have the Analyst draft a memo to accompany the transmittal of "changes tracked" and "clean" copies of the final document. Finally, the Chair will review the cover memo, following which the Analyst transmits the materials with the final draft of the memo to the Senate Chair.

B. [Policy for the Establishment of New Schools/Colleges](#)

Members discussed the proposed policy for the Establishment of New Schools and Colleges on the Merced campus. The CRE commented that grey areas without clear guidelines may subsequently lead to procedural questions and ultimately, their suggestions are intended to help the Academic Senate make as much of an informed decision on proposals as possible. They developed the following recommendations for consideration:

- In Section 2, where the development of pre-proposals is discussed, CRE recommends that the Senate's Divisional Council and Senate Chair, or relevant committee, be consulted in addition to other university entities.
- The proposal goes into detail regarding the review of proposed schools or colleges by campus administration (see Section 4). Direct involvement and deliberation by the Academic Senate could be further developed.
- Also in Section 4, there is little guidance or clarity on the process by which other committees, beyond a final vote by Academic Senate as a whole, review proposals. For example, what are the procedures for an appeal if various committees of the Academic Senate differ in their support of a particular proposal? As such, a clearer description of the path by which proposals move through both administrative and internal Senate review would be helpful. Further clarity about such processes would allow for informed deliberation.
- Clarity about how to best structure proposals originating on the UC Merced campus for systemwide review, or stated another way, guided effort to align Merced proposals to comply with the guidelines for school development listed in the [UCOP Compendium](#), is needed in explicit detail.
- The proposed policy has no discussion of the scale of a school's development nor the components needed to fully develop a school from idea to institution.
- Appendix 1 is limited and contains no discussion of startup costs or a recommendations about five to ten-year goals of a new school.
- The proposed policy doesn't discuss that, when creating a new school, a plan needs to be flexible to cover 10-20 years of development and detail overlapping areas of jurisdiction. CRE members encourage authors of proposals to also include descriptions about how resources may be diverted from existing units.

Action: The Analyst will send Vice Chair Song a draft memo, revise with her input and then circulate to the rest of committee. Once the Chair has approved the final draft, the memo will be sent to the Senate Chair by the extended January 16th deadline.

C. [Proposal to Change Name of Social Sciences and Management Academic Unit](#) – *Chair Viney*

Members passed a motion to endorse the name and will send comments to DivCo by February 13, 2019.

Action: The Analyst will draft a memo informing the Senate Chair of their endorsement after asking member Isborn, absent, for her comments on this item.

D. [Proposal to Change Title from L\(P\)SOE to Teaching Professor](#)

Members passed a motion to endorse the proposal, as they agree with the Dec. 10 memo and note that the category of “teaching professor” should be added to the categories included in the Procedures on Voting in Academic Personnel Cases as a footnote indicating that this issue is currently under review with the Senate.

Action: The Analyst will draft a memo for their review to be sent to DivCo by February 13, 2019.

VI. **Upcoming Review Items (will be on the Feb 13 agenda)**
Systemwide

A. [Proposed Presidential Policy for Open Access for Theses and Dissertations](#) – *Boaz Ilan*

Action: Lead Reviewer’s comments will be discussed at the February 13 CRE meeting. CRE’s comments are due to DivCo by February 25, 2019.

B. [Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336](#) – *Christine Isborn*

Members are asked to discuss the proposed revision to Senate Bylaw 336, which focuses on the Committee of Privilege and Tenure’s handling of disciplinary cases. Specific changes include the process by which Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence are reviewed.

Action: Lead Reviewer’s comments will be discussed at the February 13th meeting, as CRE’s comments are due to DivCo by February 25, 2019.

Campus

C. [Revisions to Master’s Degree Requirements of Merced Campus Regulations](#) – *Vice Chair Anna Song*

The proposal is to reduce the minimum of units of approved courses required by a master’s degree by comprehensive exam (Plan II) from 30 to 24 and commensurately, to reduce from 24 to 20 the number of units which must be from graduate-level courses in the 200 series. These changes seek to make masters degrees at UC Merced commensurate to those offered at other UC campuses.

Action: Lead Reviewer’s comments will be discussed at the February 13th meeting, as CRE’s comments are due to DivCo by February 25.

D. [Revisions to the Principles to Guide the Conduct of Executive Session](#) – *Chair Viney*

Action: Chair Viney was assigned the lead reviewer. CRE will discuss item at the February 13, 2018 meeting

VII. Any Other Competent Business

No new business was discussed and the meeting adjourned at 11: 24 AM.