The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, as charged in Senate Bylaw 125, reviewed legislation to be presented for action to the Divisional Senate Assembly to verify conformity with the format and content of the Code of the Academic Senate and advised the Division, its Officers, Committees, Faculties, and members in matters of organization, jurisdiction, and interpretation of legislation of the Academic Senate and its agencies. CRJ held no formal meetings; it conducted its reviews electronically.

I. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO IRVINE BYLAWS

Bylaw 60, Committee on Committees
This proposal was submitted primarily to update the committee’s membership in light of the establishment of the College of Health Sciences. The Committee on Committees (COC) is also considering its responsibility in filling vacancies of resigned positions. CRJ determined that the proposed revisions are not in conflict with the Code of the Academic Senate.

Bylaw 181, Selection of the Council on Academic Personnel
This proposed revision relates to the selection of members for the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP). Specifically, the proposal is to allow a candidate to run unopposed and be elected to a full term when another suitable candidate cannot be found. CRJ determined that the proposed revision conforms to the Code of the Academic Senate.

Bylaw 60, Committee on Committees
COC submitted an additional revision regarding its responsibility in filling vacancies of resigned positions. CRJ determined that the proposed revision is not in conflict with the Code of the Academic Senate. However, CRJ noted some ambiguity in the new language.

Bylaw 48, Academic Personnel, Council on
Bylaw 60, Committees, Committee on
Bylaw 181, Selection of the Council on Academic Personnel
The proposed revisions concern the membership and selection of the Council on Academic Personnel. The legislation had been previously reviewed and significant changes were made by the Senate Cabinet in its meeting of July 15. Writing on behalf of the CRJ Committee, the CRJ Chair suggested that some clarification in Bylaw 48(A) (1 and 2) and Bylaw 181(B) (1 and 2) would be helpful.

II. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO IRVINE REGULATIONS

Regulation 510, American History and Institutions
The proposed revision corrects a minor error in the language. CRJ determined that it conforms to the Code of the Academic Senate.

III. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO APPENDICES TO THE IRVINE SENATE MANUAL

Appendix 1, Bylaws of the Faculties, Chapter VIII, College of Health Sciences
The College of Health Sciences (COHS) Bylaws were reviewed earlier but were based on an earlier draft and not on the final draft of the proposed revisions. Upon reviewing the final draft, CRJ determined that the proposed changes conform to the Code of the
Academic Senate. Typos were noted and corrected before the Bylaws were posted on the web. CRJ noted their interpretation of the COHS Bylaws, that any curriculum not associated with an MD degree will have to be reviewed by the appropriate UCI Academic Senate Committee, either the Graduate Council (GC) and the Council on Educational Policy (CEP).

Appendix I, Bylaws of the Faculties, Chapter IV, Department of Education
The main purpose of the revision is to extend the terms of office of the Faculty Chair and Faculty Executive Committee from one year to two years; other minor revisions were made for clarity and accuracy. CRJ determined that the proposed changes are not in conflict with the Code of the Academic Senate. CRJ made recommendations to consider for revising their bylaws in the future.

Appendix I, Bylaws of the Faculties, Chapter V, The Henry Samueli School of Engineering
The proposed revision is to Section 3: Standing Committees (C) (1). The revision adds an explicit specification of the time of the term served by the graduate student representative on the Graduate Studies Committee. On behalf of the CRJ Committee, the CRJ Chair determined that this change conforms to the Code of the Academic Senate.

Appendix III, Policies on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline
The Committee on Privilege and Tenure (CPT) proposed changes to Appendix III. CRJ determined that the proposed revisions are not in conflict with the Code of the Academic Senate. However, CRJ pointed out that a portion of Section II needs to be revised; the timelines need to be clarified. Some minor changes related to the organization of the Appendix were also suggested.

Appendix III was revised again by CPT and resubmitted for CRJ’s review. Since the new revisions, made largely in response to the previous review by CRJ, were not substantive, another full review by the full committee did not seem necessary. On behalf of the CRJ Committee, the CRJ Chair reviewed the newly proposed changes, finding them to be appropriate. She did, however, raise some concerns regarding the last paragraph of Addendum A.

Appendix XI, Teaching Proposal
The Council on Student Experience (CSE) proposed to delete this Appendix from the UCI Academic Senate Manual. The Appendix is not appropriate for the Manual and is most likely an error that occurred at the time the Standard Teaching Evaluation Form was being considered. CRJ found no conflict between the proposal and the Code of the Academic Senate. Furthermore, according to the supporting documents, the Teaching Proposal was never approved formally for inclusion in the Senate Manual. As such, deleting it would seem appropriate.

Appendix VIII, UCI Academic Senate Policy on Academic Honesty
The Office of the Ombudsman proposed a revision to clarify the role of the Ombudsman, emphasizing its participation in the process as mediating as opposed to resolving issues. The proposed changes also include one minor modification to refer to “Graduate Studies” as the “Graduate Division.” Since there was not sufficient time for a full review, the CRJ Chair reviewed the proposed changes and submitted comments on behalf of the
Committee. She found no inconsistencies in the proposed changes with the Code of the Academic Senate.

IV. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO SENATE BYLAWS

None

V. CRJ RULINGS

Senate Bylaw 55, Departmental Voting Rights
A ruling was requested on whether the extension of voting rights to graduate students in matters of academic personnel is allowed. CRJ determined that the bylaw does not explicitly allow the extension of voting rights to graduate students. Legislative Ruling 5.67 by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) confirms this finding, noting that voting rights are limited only to departmental members who are also members of the Academic Senate. Since graduate students are not members of the Academic Senate, this ruling suggests that voting rights cannot be extended to them.

VI. OTHER ISSUES

CRJ also offered informal opinions and advice on the following issues:

Disestablishment of the Department of Community and Environmental Medicine and Transfer of the Faculty and Ph.D. Program in Environmental Toxicology into the Department of Medicine in the College of Heath Sciences
The CRJ Chair commented on whether the votes by members of the faculties of the two affected departments will be sufficient or a “School Faculty” vote should be taken. It would seem that votes from the affected departments alone should suffice.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Garfinkel, Social Sciences, CRJ Chair
Kavita Arora, Biological Sciences
Elizabeth Bennett, Registrar (ex officio)
Gonzalo Navajas, Humanities
Steven Mailloux, Humanities
Michael Rugg, Health Sciences