To be adopted:

Proposed change in Bylaw 8.8.2.1 -- Committee on Committees

Present:

8.8.2
The members of this committee are elected as follows: (Am 24 Apr 75)

8.8.2.1
The membership includes four representatives each from the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences and the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, and one member each from the College of Engineering, and the Anderson Graduate School of Management or the Graduate School of Education. No more than one member of any one department or program may be on the committee. (Am 24 Apr 75)(Am 25 May 95)(Am 30 May 06)

8.8.2.3
The election of a college representative is conducted entirely within the Faculty which he/she represents. Elections are conducted according to the procedure described in Chapter 7 and are held in time to be reported to the Division for confirmation at its last stated meeting of the academic year. (Am 24 Apr 75)

Proposed:

8.8.2
The members of this committee are elected as follows: (Am 24 Apr 75)

8.8.2.1
Each college or school that is represented on the Executive Council of the Academic Senate under Bylaw 8.5.1 shall have representation on the Committee on Committees. The membership includes four representatives each from the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences and the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, and two members from the College of Engineering. No college or school that is represented on the Executive Council of the Academic Senate under Bylaw 8.5.1 shall have fewer than one representative on the committee. No more than one member of any one department or program may be on the committee. (Am 24 Apr 75)(Am 25 May 95)(Am 30 May 06)

8.8.2.3
The election of a college representative is conducted entirely within the Faculty which he/she represents. Elections are conducted according to the procedure described in Chapter 7 and are held in time to be reported to the Division for confirmation at its last stated meeting of the academic year. (Am 24 Apr 75)
JUSTIFICATION:

1.) Continuous representation of each college or school (as defined) on COC is important to promoting a climate of mutual respect and harmony campus-wide.

2.) Continuous representation of each college or school will help to assure that no college or school is overlooked in terms of the expectation and opportunity to participate broadly in faculty governance.

3.) Continuous representation of each college or school will help to assure that new members to the faculty of each college or school can have a path to providing service to the campus and to becoming involved in the campus community.

4.) Continuous representation of each college or school will help to assure that mandates for broad representation on other committees, such as CAP, are adhered to.

5.) Continuous representation of each college or school will help to assure that COC includes a member who is likely to be familiar with the capabilities, background, commitment, and work ethic of individuals from the school who are considered for service on other committees.

6.) The proposed generic language will be robust to creation of new colleges or schools except in cases where the representation of a college or school is expanded beyond one.

7.) The proposal to increase the membership of COC by one additional member from the College of Engineering was originally proposed by the COC, which indicated that the change is warranted due to the increased size of that college and the diversity of disciplines within the college.

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: May 4, 2010
April 20, 2010

TO: RULES AND JURISDICTION COMMITTEE

FR: CHRISTINE GAILEY, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

RE: PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGES

The COC does not wish to change our bylaws at this point. More specifically, we do not wish to change the number of members for the following reasons.

1. The current number of people on the COC is 10, which is barely workable for the necessary weekly or at least biweekly 2-hour meetings throughout the academic year, and episodic meetings as required over the summer. It should be noted strongly that COC deliberations and appointments draw on each member’s general knowledge of faculty ACROSS campus, not as representatives from particular units.

2. Academic Senate committees appointed over the years have been as balanced as humanly possible, even for those whose unit composition is not mandated in the bylaws. See point 3 below. On occasion a committee whose divisional composition is not mandated in the bylaws may have a temporary skew. When this occurs it is due to circumstances beyond COC control: illnesses, unexpected leaves, ineligibility of faculty because of conflict of interest issues, or, unfortunately, sometimes refusal by nominated faculty to serve.

3. As of 2/25/2010, at UCR there were 17 faculty in Biomedical Sciences, 32 in AGSM, 32 in GSOE, 88 in COE, 373 in CNAS, and 393 in CHASS. There currently are 4 faculty each elected from CNAS and CHASS, 1 from COE, and 1 from AGSM or GSOE on a rotating basis. The current approximate number of faculty per COC member elected is 98 for CHASS and 93 for CNAS, 88 for COE, and 64 for GSOE and AGSM; Biomed faculty do not elect a representative. If the number of members were to grow, problems would ensue that would threaten either the fairness or the efficiency (or both) of the COC. Let us examine four possible scenarios developing out of the proposal R & J received and sent to the COC:

Scenario A. One representative at least from each College or Division and proportional after that. This would entail according one representative for Biomed Faculty and decreasing the approximate number of faculty per COC member elected
to 15-17, meaning 2 representatives each from GSOE and AGSM, 5-6 from COE, and fully 24 and 26 from CNAS and CHASS respectively. This of course, would be unworkable.

**Scenario B.** Biomed faculty remain as it is, not electing a COC member. AGSM and GSOE elect one member each, meaning the number of faculty requiring an elected member would be 30-32. This would mean COE would need 2 elected members, CNAS  11, and CHASS  12. Again, it would be unworkable.

**Scenario C.** Non-proportional representation, with one member each from each unit currently not electing a member each round and the rest of the membership elected as they are now. In this scenario Biomedical faculty would elect a member each round, as would AGSM and GSOE. Presumably the other units would remain the same, but this would be decidedly unfair to COE, which currently has 1 person elected: COE, however, has a faculty three times the size of AGSM and GSOE.

**Scenario D.** Non-proportional representation, with one member each from each unit currently not electing a member each round, and upping the number of faculty elected from COE to 3. This would raise the number of COC members to 14 (4 each CNAS and CHASS, 3 COE, 1 each AGSM, Biomed, & GSOE. The obvious problem that would arise, however, is the decided skew toward smaller units and division and the extreme under-representation of CHASS and CNAS. Onerous problems emerge trying to schedule weekly meetings (needed in Fall and Winter much of the Spring): Quorum issues arise.

As you can see, there is no workable resolution that does not over- or under-represent units or make the scheduling and discussions essential for the smooth and fair operation of the Committee on Committees impossible. Fortunately, however, the current arrangement operates using experienced UCR faculty who know and suggest names of faculty from across campus, not just their own division. COC has been operating effectively and fairly this way, producing efficient and relatively balanced committees, without complaint from any of the divisions until this year.

The COC does not wish to take valuable time needed for other matters deeply affecting faculty and students this Spring by bringing this to the full Senate in May.