September 23, 2016

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Kambiz Vafai
   Chair, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Review of Proposed [Campus Review] APM Revision: Proposed SOM
    Bylaw Change: ME, ME2.1, ME5.2.5.3, ME5.3, ME5.3.1, ME5.4.1,
    ME5.4.2, ME5.5, ME5.5.1, ME5.8, and ME5.8.3

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed the proposed change to SOM Bylaw
ME, ME2.1, ME5.2.5.3, ME5.3, ME5.3.1, ME5.4.1, ME5.4.2, ME5.5, ME5.5.1, ME5.8,
and ME5.8.3 and although these changes do not violate the code of the Academic Senate,
the Committee has the following comments/suggestions:

ME - This proposed change looks redundant and unnecessary. The original bylaw
already states that the governance of the school of medicine is subject to the bylaws of
the Riverside Division and Systemwide Academic Senate at UC, which clearly lay out
everyone's roles in shared governance. We don’t think there is a need for the
Administration to further assert its role here.

ME2.1 – The committee can see why the inclusion of a reference to “resource
allocations” might be important, but the latter half of the proposed change, e.g. reference
to “shared governance” is redundant.

ME5.3.1 - The proposed change is vague. While the committee can see how a case can be
made to clarify and broaden the powers of the Medical Education Committee (from
advisory role to the faculty executive committee to direct enforcer of the educational
policies), the committee thinks that the language of the change is too vague and wordy.
R&J recommends something like: “The duty of this Committee is to take action on all
matters pertaining to the educational policies and curriculum of the UCR School of
Medicine, in consultation with the Faculty Executive Committee.” Otherwise, the
committee is inclined to recommend that the original language should stand.

ME 5.4.1 - The reference to “difficult problems” is quite vague. How are “difficult
problems” defined?