

**Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE)**

**Monday, April 8, 2024  
1:00pm – 2:30pm  
MINUTES OF MEETING**

---

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Rules and Elections met at 1:00pm on April 8, 2024. Chair Christopher Viney presiding.

**I. Consent Calendar****A. Today's agenda**

**Action:** Today's agenda was approved as presented and will be published on the Senate website.

**B. [March 11, 2024, Meeting Minutes](#)**

**Action:** Members to review minutes and share any edits with Sang and Petra with a copy to Chair Viney by 5:00 pm, Friday, April 12. In the absence of comments/edits by the deadline, the minutes will be considered approved and published on the Senate website.

**II. Chair's Report – Christopher Viney****A. Updates from [Divisional Council](#) Meetings ([March 11](#) and March 25)**

Chair Viney reported that at the March 25 meeting DivCo members endorsed UGC's Proposed Policy for Conflict of Interest with Course Material when Instructor is the Author.

Chair Viney provided an additional update regarding a memo he recently received from AFAC. The memo stated that at their February 16, 2024 meeting, AFAC reviewed CRE's December 4, 2024 recommendations regarding AFAC's proposed Bylaw revisions. AFAC unanimously approved CRE's additional amendments and were grateful for CRE's suggestions.

**B. Divisional Council [memo](#) to UGC/CRE Chair and GC Chair re: Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulations**

DivCo members unanimously endorsed the proposed amendments to Senate Regulations I.1.E (Passed/Not Passed) and Senate Regulation III.1.A.d (Satisfactory Progress – P/NP). However, DivCo members voted not to approve the proposed amendments to Senate Regulation I.2.B (Dropping a Course). Chair Viney noted that DivCo members had very valid concerns for not approving Senate Regulation I.2.B (Dropping a Course). Some of the noted concerns included the potential impact on students who may add a course with a high number of contact hours, the anticipated increased demand for certain courses, how the Registrar will address students switching courses, and students maintaining a full-time status. UGC is now looking to the Registrar and Interim VPDUE for their input while making revisions.

**III. CAP Proposed Bylaw Amendments – Chair Viney**

CAP was invited to consider revising its Bylaws and has agreed to consider the proposed edits. On April 4, 2024, CAP sent a [memo](#) to CRE addressing those edits and [suggesting additional amendments](#).

CRE members discussed the amendments and the reasons behind them. A member noted that removing ‘salaries’ from the Bylaws was a significant change and inquired why the change was being made. Chair Viney noted that he understood CAP has never made recommendations on salaries, therefore that particular language was being removed. Members agreed that it would be useful to add an explanation to the summary that will accompany the proposed revision in its routing for approval by DivCo and the Spring Meeting of the Division, to provide background information and clarification on the reason for this change.

**Action:** CRE members unanimously endorsed the proposed CAP Bylaw amendments. The CRE analyst drafted a memo reflecting the committee’s comments and circulated it to members for review.

#### IV. Systemwide Review Items – Chair Viney

##### A. [Proposed Revisions to APM – 710, Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave/Medical Leave](#)

The proposed revisions aim to expand paid sick leave for part-time and full-time academic appointees. The policy was updated to:

- Include an effective date of January 1, 2025.
- Clarify the policy applies to paid sick leave.
- Provide paid medical leave to Agronomists, Astronomers, and Curators who have a full-time appointment for at least a full academic year.
- Permit paid sick leave accrual and usage to certain academic appointees who have a paid appointment of at least thirty (30) calendar days, and to those with less than 50% appointments.
- Provide a paid sick leave bank to all faculty, Agronomists, Astronomers, and Curators who have an appointment of at least thirty (30) calendar days.
- Provide a paid sick leave bank to academic appointees in university extension who do not accrue sick leave and who have an appointment of at least thirty (30) calendar days.
- Include protected paid sick leave.
- Extend the period during which accrued and unused paid sick leave may be reinstated if an appointee is reemployed after a separation from employment and address the reinstatement of unused days from a paid sick leave bank.
- Allow use of paid sick leave for additional reasons, including preventive care, and for specified purposes for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
- Provide notice requirements for an academic appointee to use paid sick leave.
- Include recording of paid medical leave, paid sick leave bank, and paid sick leave accrual and use.

The systemwide Academic Senate has requested comments by April 22 to allow discussion at the April 24 Academic Council meeting.

***CRE is a lead reviewer.***

Chair Viney agreed to serve as lead reviewer.

Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **5:00 pm on Wednesday, April 17, 2024.**

Members discussed the proposed revisions and the corresponding draft memo. During the discussion, members wondered why only appointees under the Agronomists, Astronomers, and Curators titles were added to the list of individuals to receive paid medical leave. They noted it was unclear whether there are other groups of similar stature who will remain unserved by the proposed revisions.

**Action:** The CRE analyst updated the draft memo based on the committee’s comments and circulated a revised version of the memo for the committee’s review.

B. [Proposed UC Regents Policy on Public and Discretionary Statements by Academic Units](#)

This proposed policy supersedes the previous Regents [Policy on the Use of Administrative Websites](#), which the [Senate recently reviewed](#) in March. UCM’s comments are available [here](#).

Academic Council plans to discuss the Divisions’ comments on this proposed policy at its April 24 meeting and has requested comments by April 22. The Regents plan to adopt some version of a policy at their May meeting.

Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **5:00 pm on Wednesday, April 17, 2024**.

**Action:** Chair Viney agreed to serve as lead reviewer. Comments will be circulated via email by Friday, April 12 and will serve as the basis for CRE’s official response.

C. [Proposed Academic Statement on UC Quality \(“Characteristics of Educational Quality at the University of California”\)](#)

This document was prepared by the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP).

Background information is available on the hyperlinked memos from Academic Council Chair Steintrager and UCEP Chair Cocco, and the proposed statement is available on pp. 4-5.

Vice-Chair Petra agreed to serve as lead reviewer.

Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **5:00 pm on Friday, April 19, 2024**.

Vice-Chair Petra provided background information on the review item and a summary of the documents supplied by Academic Council. She then showed a comparison between the proposed UC Quality statement and the original version of the document that was developed in 2009-2010. Vice-Chair Petra noted that the statement appeared to be adequate and agreed with the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) that the statement is aspirational in nature.

Members discussed the statement and noted its importance with the possibility of fully online education moving forward. The document would help to ensure that the standard of educational quality is upheld at the University of California. Members also appreciated that the document addressed the significance of promoting interactive communities which include a rich learning environment with social interactions and opportunities for closely mentored relationships with faculty and other University affiliated personnel. Furthermore, it was noted that the aftereffects of such interactions and communications will be essential to students’ success as they continue after graduation.

**Action:** The CRE analyst updated the draft memo based on the committee’s comments and circulated a revised version of the memo for the committee’s review.

D. [Proposed Revisions to APM 016-University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline](#)

The proposal addresses the handling of simultaneous academic misconduct investigations and

personnel actions. The policy revisions are provided in tracked changes on pp. 4-10 and a clean version of the policy is available on pp. 11-17.

This proposal is based on a May 2023 recommendation from the Academic Council and the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure. Please see the relevant correspondence [here](#).

Key revisions:

- **Pause on Academic Personnel Review Actions:** At the beginning of a formal investigation of alleged misconduct by a faculty member, if the Chancellor (or Chancellor’s designee) finds that any of the alleged misconduct is relevant to the assessment criteria for academic personnel review actions, the Chancellor (or Chancellor’s designee) may impose a no-fault pause on any current or future academic personnel action (e.g., for merit, promotion, or advancement) of that faculty member. Locations are responsible for developing implementation procedures that address at what stage in existing local procedures the pause occurs and that identify the offices that have responsibility for providing written confirmation of the pause to the respondent, giving a respondent periodic updates on the status of the investigation, and for notifying relevant administrators of the beginning and end of the pause.
- **Conclusion of the pause:** The pause will end when the investigative and disciplinary processes are concluded. In the event of a disciplinary process following a formal investigation, the pause will end when a final decision is made whether to impose disciplinary sanctions. The academic personnel process may then proceed according to campus procedures.
- **Assistant Professors in Year 8:** If the investigative and disciplinary processes are not concluded by the beginning of the faculty member’s eighth year of service at the rank of Assistant Professor (or a combination of equivalent titles), the Chancellor is authorized to recommend to the President that the appointment be extended beyond the eighth year, in accordance with Regents Bylaw 40.3(c).

*CRE is a lead reviewer.*

Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **5:00 pm on Monday, May 6, 2024.**

**Action:** Chair Viney agreed to serve as lead reviewer. Comments will be circulated via email by Monday, April 29 and will serve as the basis for CRE’s official response.

## V. Campus Wide Review Items – Chair Viney and Vice-Chair Petra

### A. [Proposal to Change the Name of Materials Science & Engineering Department to Chemical & Materials Engineering](#)

This proposal intends to align the department name with the two undergraduate degree programs now offered by the Department following [approval of the Chemical Engineering B.S. degree program in May 2023](#) and to avoid confusion for the first class of Chemical Engineering students entering in AY 24-25. The proposed effective date for this name change is July 1, 2024.

Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **5:00 pm on Friday, May 3, 2024.**

*Chair Viney was recused due to a conflict of interest.*

Vice-Chair Petra provided background information on the review item and the reason for the name change. She noted that with the approval of the new Chemical Engineering B.S. degree program, it made sense to align the name of the department accordingly. Vice-Chair Petra also stated that the

proposal was very clearly written and the appropriate procedures were followed prior to the proposal being submitted.

Members discussed the proposal and noted that everything appeared to be done systematically and there did not appear to be any opposition within the School of Engineering. One point was made regarding the consultation with students. There was proof that an email went out to students, however only one student response was provided in the documentation. Members were not sure if providing only one response was sufficient. Members also questioned how the name change would be implemented and if that should be specified within the proposal.

**Action:** The CRE analyst updated the draft memo based on the committee's comments and circulated a revised version of the memo for the committee's review.

B. [Five-Year Planning Perspectives 2024-2029](#)

Provided as contextual information, a memo from UC Provost Newman to the Chancellors and a memo from EVC/P Dumont has been included.

The Senate previously reviewed the Five-Year Planning Perspectives in 2022. The relevant correspondence is available [here](#).

Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **Friday, May 3, 2024**.

**Action:** CRE members declined to opine. The CRE analyst consulted with Executive Director Paul to ensure this was an appropriate action. Executive Paul confirmed that it was, so the CRE analyst notified the Senate Chair that CRE declined to opine.

## VI. Any Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.

Attest: Christopher Viney, CRE Chair