

**COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS (CRE)****MEETING MINUTES****Monday, April 21, 2025****1:00pm – 2:30pm****ZOOM**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Rules and Elections met at 1:00pm on April 21, 2025. Chair Jeff Yoshimi presiding.

**I. Consent Calendar**

- A. Today's Agenda
- B. [March 17 Meeting Minutes](#)
- C. [April 7 Meeting Minutes](#)

**Action:**

- The Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

**II. Chair's Report – Jeff Yoshimi**

- A. Updates from [Divisional Council](#) Meetings (April 1 and April 8)

**April 1**

The EVC/Provost and Senate leadership are monitoring the impact of federal government actions and holding weekly meetings to stay updated. UCOP is also planning for impacts to the UC from federal government actions. UC President Drake announced that standalone DEI statements will no longer be required in faculty applications, though DEI content can still be included elsewhere. This change does not affect merit or promotion reviews. President Drake also implemented a UC-wide hiring freeze, however, hires to fill emergency needs are still permitted but will be required to go through a rigorous justification process. UC Merced has seen a decline in grant applications and awards, attributed to fewer National Institutes of Health (NIH) solicitations and disappearing funding sources. Faculty must now abide by new certifications when submitting grant proposals through the Sponsored Projects Office (SPO), and are encouraged to plan ahead due to the added requirements.

**April 8**

The two UCSF Memorials voted on by all UC campuses did not pass and will not move forward. The search for the next UC President continues, and the new hire is anticipated to begin the role this summer. Chancellor searches are also ongoing at the UCSB and UCR campuses. In response to a faculty request, the Academic Council declined to add a resolution on academic freedom to their April 23 agenda and instead drafted their own statement, which has been shared with Divisional Council members. Finally, UCOP is forming a rapid-response task force called the UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD) to address the shifting federal government actions. Membership for the task force is still being finalized.

**Actions:**

- Executive Director Paul shared the charge for the [Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions \(UCAD\)](#) with members during the meeting.
- Executive Director Paul informed members that there will be a Town Hall for UC Merced faculty tentatively scheduled for May 7, 2025. The date and time of the Town Hall will be confirmed once the Chancellor confirms his availability.

### III. Review of the Merced Division Bylaws and Regulations – Chair Yoshimi

At the January 27, 2025 CRE meeting, members agreed to review the UCM Bylaws and Regulations per item B.1. of the [CRE Duties](#).

Following the meeting, [assignments](#) were distributed to CRE members via email. CRE members were to review their assigned sections of the Merced Division Bylaws and Regulations and propose any amendments in tracked changes to the following Word documents:

- [Bylaws of the Merced Division](#)
- [Regulations of the Merced Division](#)

CRE members will resume their review and discussion of the Merced Division Bylaws and Regulations over the summer.

#### Actions:

- Chair Yoshimi will review members' comments and consult with Executive Director Paul to determine which proposed amendments are substantive and non-substantive.
- CRE will revisit this item during the summer.

### IV. [FWAF's Response to CRE: Proposed Revisions to FWAF Bylaws for the New Faculty Welfare Committee, Proposed New Academic Freedom Committee Bylaws, and Proposed Revisions to Part II. Titles III. and IV. of the Divisional Bylaws](#)

On April 14, 2025, FWAF responded to CRE's April 8, 2025 [memo](#), which outlined recommendations regarding FWAF's proposed revisions to their Bylaws. FWAF concurred with CRE's suggestions and proposed additional language to enhance clarity. Their full response is linked in the title above.

The updated Bylaws include additional revisions, which are noted in red, bold, underlined font.

Proposed amendments to the Bylaws for the CFW are available [here](#).

Proposed amendments to the Bylaws for the CAF are available [here](#).

No additional revisions were made to [Senate Bylaw II.III. and II.IV. \(Committees\)](#).

CRE thanked FWAF for considering CRE's recommendations and unanimously endorsed the proposed amendments to the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF) Bylaws, the proposed Bylaws for the Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) and the proposed amendments to Senate Bylaws II.III. and II.IV (Committees).

If the proposed amendments are endorsed by the Divisional Council (DivCo), they will be voted on at the Spring 2025 Meeting of the Division.

#### Actions:

- CRE members unanimously endorsed the proposed amendments to the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF) Bylaws, the proposed Bylaws for the Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) and the proposed amendments to Senate Bylaws II.III. and II.IV (Committees).
- The CRE Analyst transmitted a memo to FWAF and the Senate Chair containing CRE's

endorsement on April 22, 2025.

V. **Memo from the Undergraduate Council (UGC): Non-Senate Faculty Voting Rights on Academic Senate Committees – Chair Yoshimi**

On April 11, 2025, UGC issued a memo to CRE seeking clarification on non-Senate faculty voting rights on Academic Senate committees. In reviewing Systemwide Senate Bylaw 35, which governs membership and rights within Senate committees, UGC acknowledges that non-Senate members do not currently possess voting rights on Senate Committees. However, UGC would like to seek further clarification on the following highlighted statement from [Systemwide Senate Bylaw 35](#):

**35. Membership of Committees**

2. Only members of the Academic Senate may vote in Senate agencies and their committees when those agencies or committees are taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate, or giving advice to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Senate. **Persons other than Senate members may be given the right to vote on other questions, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit Bylaw provisions.** [See [Legislative Ruling 12.75](#)]

UGC seeks clarification on whether it is possible to amend the Merced Divisional Bylaws to include language that would grant non-Senate faculty voting rights on undergraduate student-related issues. Currently, the Merced Division [Bylaw Part I. Title II. Membership](#) does not include provisions for non-Senate faculty to vote on such matters, therefore, UGC is requesting a ruling.

If granting voting rights to non-Senate members is not feasible, UGC wonders if it would be possible to amend the Divisional Bylaws to add an additional Unit 18 Lecturer or ex-officio, non-voting member to represent the interests of undergraduate students. One Unit 18 Lecturer currently attends all UGC meetings as an observer.

For more information, please refer to the [email](#) from the Fatima to the UGC Chair, sent on April 2, 2025.

CRE members discussed the interpretation and implications of Systemwide Senate Bylaw 35, particularly in relation to voting rights for non-Senate faculty. Chair Yoshimi noted that the use of the word “final action” within the Bylaw is vague and lacks clear definition, making it unclear what it specifically entails. CRE members agreed that it would be helpful to review examples of committee Bylaws that explicitly allow non-Senate faculty to vote, to gain a better understanding of how such provisions are typically written.

A CRE member highlighted the significant teaching contributions of Unit 18 Lecturers and expressed that Unit 18 Lecturers should have a voice in teaching-related matters.

Executive Director Paul reiterated the current Legislative Ruling 12.75, stating that individuals who are not members of the Academic Senate, including Unit 18 Lecturers, may be granted the right to vote on certain matters, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit Bylaw provisions. In the case of the Undergraduate Council (UGC), which makes binding decisions on academic programs and courses rather than mere recommendations, non-Senate members would not be permitted to vote. Executive Director Paul noted that many campuses do not include Unit 18 Lecturers on their Senate committees.

A CRE member referenced the response from the UCSB Analyst, indicating that while some Senate councils and committees include Unit 18 Lecturers, these individuals typically serve as representatives rather than as voting members. CRE members questioned whether such representatives are permitted to vote on Senate committees.

Executive Director Paul noted that if Unit 18 Lecturers were permitted to vote, those individuals would also be expected to undertake the full responsibilities associated with the committee membership. CRE members expressed concern about how this might intersect with their current labor regulations.

CRE members agreed that it would be valuable to seek additional clarification from the Analysts at the UCD, UCLA, and UCSF campuses. In particular, CRE members posed the following questions for follow-up:

- Are there any individual committee Bylaws at UCSF that allow non-Senate ex-officio members to vote on specific actions?
- Does the statement in the UCD [Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction \(CERJ\)](#)'s [Ex Officio Voting Rights](#) document “there are no explicit Bylaw provisions that give the right to vote on ‘other questions,’ so non-Senate members do not have the right to vote on any issue” remain accurate? Or have provisions since been introduced that allow some non-Senate members limited voting rights?
- Are there examples from UCLA of committee Bylaws that permit non-Senate faculty serving as “representatives” to cast advisory votes, distinct from formal member votes, when explicitly allowed?

Members agreed to revisit the discussion once additional examples and information are gathered, particularly in instances where non-Senate faculty are granted voting rights. If necessary, it may be advisable to seek further clarification and guidance from the Systemwide [University Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction \(UCRJ\)](#).

#### **Actions:**

- Following the meeting, Chair Yoshimi provided the CRE Analyst with follow-up questions for the UCD, UCSF and UCLA CRE Analysts.
- The CRE Analyst requested further clarification from the UCD, UCSF and UCLA CRE Analysts regarding language within their Bylaws which permits non-Senate faculty to have voting privileges.
- The CRE Analyst will obtain information regarding how Senate service complies with Unit 18 Lecturer union regulations.
- Once additional information is gathered, CRE will request guidance from the University Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (UCRJ).

## **VI. Systemwide Review Items – Chair Yoshimi**

### **A. [Presidential Policy on High-Containment Research](#)**

The policy includes the following key provisions:

- All high-containment facilities and research activities at all University-owned and/or operated locations.
- The authority of the UC High-Containment Laboratory Oversight Committee is formalized.
- The required elements of a High-Containment Research Program are identified as the local High-Containment Laboratory Oversight Group, the designated High-Containment Laboratory Director, and the High-Containment Laboratory Plan, which details the

management and operational safety plan for each high-containment facility.

At the March 17, 2025 CRE meeting, Member Petersen agreed to serve as lead reviewer. His comments are available [here](#).

Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **Friday, April 25, 2025**.

Member Petersen summarized the proposed policy and his comments. CRE members agreed with the comments in the draft memo.

**Actions:**

- Members unanimously voted to approve the draft memo.
- The CRE Analyst transmitted the memo to the Senate Chair on April 21, 2025.

B. [Proposed Revisions to APM 360 – Appointment and Promotion, Librarian Series](#)

The proposed revisions are intended to update the definition of the Librarian Series.

On March 25, 2025, Member Beman agreed to serve as lead reviewer. His comments are available [here](#).

Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **Friday, April 25, 2025**.

Member Beman summarized the proposed revisions and his comments. CRE members agreed with the comments in the draft memo.

**Actions:**

- Members unanimously voted to approve the draft memo.
- The CRE Analyst transmitted the memo to the Senate Chair on April 21, 2025.

**VII. Other Business**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00pm.

Attest: Jeff Yoshimi, CRE Chair