

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair,
Riverside Division

FROM: Gillian Wilson, Chair, Executive Committee
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

DATE: March 25th 2013

RE: Systemwide Review of Revised Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

The CNAS Executive Committee did not have a meeting scheduled before comments were due on the revised proposed amendments to Senate Bylaw 55, so comments were solicited by email. The following four sets of comments were received:

1) “The proposed changes to the revision require each Department to make the decision by secret ballot and allow a review of the decision after one year. This provides adequate safeguards in cases where voting by non-Senate members is problematic. I also like the requirement that the votes of the senate faculty must be recorded separately from the votes of the non-senate faculty, and both get reported to CAP. If the two groups do have different expectations and make different decisions, this will now be evident to the Department and to CAP. Exposing such conflicts paves the way to solving them.

I see no reason to restrict this to the Health Sciences, so I prefer version 2.”

2) “Concerning the proposed changes to non-Academic Senate Faculty in Health Sciences my concern is that it seems arbitrary that this is a special case for only health science faculty and the proposed change further highlights the inequity of non-senate status and excluding from voting rights cooperative extension faculty in the Agricultural Experiment Station. Nationally, I believe the lower status of cooperative extension faculty (relative to other faculty) is unique to California/UC.”

3) “The revised proposal to amend Bylaw 55 seems improved from the previous submission. Particularly have only Associate and above vote on the department preference and having both votes (on promotion and such) sent to CAP.”

4) “In regard to the Systemwide Revised Proposal to Amend Bylaw 55, I don’t see much effect. You will probably hear some concerns about having non-academic senate members comment on academic senate members’ files, but this is already happening at

UCR. In my own department, our non-academic senate colleagues in Cooperative Extension cast ‘advisory’ votes on all files (even those above their level). This has been going on since about 1985. The world has not yet come to an end as a result. Interestingly, the academic senate members cast votes that count (non-advisory) on all the Cooperative Extension faculty. Speaking for myself, becoming aware of what everyone else is doing has had a positive effect on establishing cooperative research projects, not to mention the esprit-de-corps in the department.”

