

 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
**UCRIVERSIDE** | **Academic  
Senate**  
**COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION**

January 8, 2018

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Kambiz Vafai  
Chair, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: 17-18. CR. Revisions to Appendix 7

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed the proposed Revisions to Appendix 7. The committee had quite a bit of reservations regarding the inadequate presentation of this proposal. The committee strongly felt that the proposal should have been presented in the standard two-column format for proposed revisions with crossed out texts indicating the revision areas.

#### 7A Definitions

It appears these definitions are copied verbatim without acknowledgment from the mentioned 'compendium'. Any material copied from external sources including other UC sources should be so specified with exact, chapter/verse references. This applies to any portion of the proposed App 7, not just the definitions section.

The paragraph 'Reasons for imposing a moratorium...' appears to be a policy rather than a definition. Is this policy taken from the 'compendium'?

#### 7B

Some contradictory and vague statements about the role of the administration (systemwide and at UCR) and the finality of the decision at the level of the divisional senate needs to be clarified. For example, In paragraph 3 of 7.B "TCDD action for an academic program," further clarification is necessary for this sentence: "Where existing policies are not adequate, supplemental policies shall be developed by the Systemwide Administration through appropriate consultation with the Academic Senate." Does "systemwide administration" refer to U.C.-wide administration and, if so, which branch or office? Does "Academic Senate" refer to the U.C.-wide Senate?

Statements such as “(i) if the Divisional Senate is not appropriately involved, or (ii) if any systemwide implications are not satisfactorily addressed.” should be clarified. These exceptions seem too broad and vague. Furthermore, the sentence “If the proposed action affects a program the Divisional action is final; if it affects a unit the Divisional vote is advisory to the Chancellor.” appears to be in contradiction with earlier pronouncements.

The sentence ‘The reasons for proposing reconstitutions of academic programs vary, but may include...’ is too vague for a rule. The reasons must be specified.

The sentence ‘Similarly, the campus decisions on the reconstitution of graduate degree programs are final in most instances. There are however two exceptions: (i) if the Divisional Senate is not appropriately involved, or (ii) if any systemwide implications are not satisfactorily addressed....’ needs to be clarified. As is, it is poorly written.

Also, there needs to be some reference to the fate of untenured senate members, who potentially are in the most vulnerable positions in cases of reconstitution.