

# Academic Senate

#### **COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION**

Date: October 22, 2025

To: Christian Shelton, Member

Riverside Division, Dept. of Computer Science & Engineering

From: Randolph C. Head, Chair

Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: (Request for Interpretation) Clarification regarding UC Bylaw 55.C - Departmental

**Voting Rights** 

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has carefully considered this request for interpretation of UC Senate Bylaw 55.C. The questions raised in this query are covered by one sentence in UC Senate Bylaw 55.C, (UCR Senate Bylaw 04.55.03.01): "Voting privileges on personnel matters within any department may be extended to one or more of the classes of non-Emeritae/i Academic Senate members of that department, as a class, who are not otherwise entitled to vote under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw, upon at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of those Faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw. "

Question 1 - How to interpret "those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question...": The Committee finds that the complete clause, "those Faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw" provides sufficient guidance on this question.

Only those faculty entitled in paragraphs 1-6 of the systemwide Bylaw 55 are entitled to vote on the extension of voting privileges to other classes. (This corresponds to answer 1A in this query). The fact that some department members may have received the privilege of voting on specific personnel cases for the past year is different from the privilege of voting on the extension of voting rights for the coming year. Only those department members entitled by their rank, according to paragraphs 1-6, and <u>not</u> those privileged through any previous extension of voting rights, may vote on the extension of voting rights.

Question 2 - "How to interpret "two-thirds majority": The Committee notes that it has previously ruled on this question, most recently, on February 4, 2011, stating that "The

Committee determines that the term '...two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot...' refers to two thirds of faculty entitled to vote, not to two thirds of faculty participating in a vote. Therefore, eligible faculty who do not participate (or are not present due to leave etc.) still need to be accounted for towards the two-thirds criterion." (This corresponds to answer 2A in this query).

The Committee today affirms this ruling, which rests on the phrase in Bylaw 55.C, "of those Faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question." Our ruling conforms to the ruling of UR&J 12.17 (<a href="https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/appendix2.html">https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/appendix2.html</a>). While UR&J's ruling explicitly covers extension of voting rights in personnel cases to Emeriti/ae faculty, it contains a general discussion of the meaning of the provision "two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question." UR&J rules that Bylaw 55.C specifies the population, two-thirds of which must vote affirmatively in order to make the extension, namely, "those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question." Therefore, "UCR&J rules that extension of voting rights may not be made without an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire membership class, not merely of those voting." UR&J Ruling 12.17 explicitly expands this discussion beyond the specific question of extending voting rights on personnel cases to Emeriti/ae faculty, instead providing guidance for "all other Senate bylaws in which a specific proportion of votes is required for an action."



#### Cherysa Cortez <cherysac@ucr.edu>

## New Business - Bylaw 55: R&J question about bylaw 55.C

3 messages

Moriah Joyner <moriah.joyner@ucr.edu>

Thu, Oct 16, 2025 at 2:32 PM

To: Cherysa Cortez <cherysa.cortez@ucr.edu>, Kenneth Barish <Kenneth.Barish@ucr.edu> Cc: Randolph Head <rhead@ucr.edu>, Christian Shelton <cshelton@ucr.edu>

Hello,

Please see below for an item (directly) submitted as a request for guidance to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction. I am submitting the Senate Chair via the Executive Director to direct this item through the appropriate channels.

Copied are the requesting party (Christian Shelton) and the Rules and Jurisdiction Chair (Randolph Head).

Best regards,

Moriah Joyner Analyst, Academic Senate University Office Building 231 Ext. 24785| moriahj@ucr.edu

#### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RIVERSIDE

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail communication and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information for the use of the designated recipients named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error and that any review, disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the Academic Senate Office immediately by telephone at EXT 24785 or email at <a href="mailto:moriah.joyner<a href="mailto:mo

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Christian Shelton <cshelton@cs.ucr.edu>

Date: Tue, Oct 14, 2025 at 12:25 PM Subject: R&J question about bylaw 55.C

To: <randolph.head@ucr.edu> Cc: <moriah.joyner@ucr.edu>

Randolph,

I have two related questions about Bylaw 55.C that I'm hoping R&J can clarify. Specifically, I'm trying to interpret the phrase

"at least two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question"

I have my own opinions and interpretations, but it really matters what the official ruling on this is.

Question 1: How to interpret "those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question." Is that

A. Those faculty entitled explicitly by bylaw 55.B.x

0

B. Those faculty entitled by bylaw 55.B.x plus those entitled by a previous (and still valid) vote according to bylaw 55.C

Question 2: How to interpret "two-thirds majority." Is that

A. 2/3rds of those eligible to vote must vote "yes"

- B. 2/3rds of those eligible to vote who did not vote "abstain" must vote "yes"
- C. 2/3rds of those who submitted votes must vote "yes"
- D. 2/3rds of those who submitted non-abstain votes must vote "yes"

Put differently, if the vote yields Y yes votes, N no votes, A abstain votes, and X faculty do not submit a vote, is the correct fraction to consider

- A. Y/(Y+N+A+X)
- B. Y/(Y+N+X)
- C. Y/(Y+N+A)
- D. Y/(Y+N)

Question 1 is not critical this year for my department. The answer to Question 2 will have an effect on the voting rights for my department this year.

Thank you.

Sincerely, Christian

Christian Shelton Professor & Department Chair Computer Science & Engineering University of California, Riverside

### Cherysa Cortez <cherysa.cortez@ucr.edu>

Thu, Oct 23, 2025 at 2:23 PM

To: Christian Shelton <cshelton@ucr.edu>

Cc: Kenneth Barish <Kenneth.Barish@ucr.edu>, Randolph Head <rhead@ucr.edu>, Moriah Joyner <moriah.joyner@ucr.edu>

October 22, 2025

CHRISTIAN SHELTON, CHAIR, DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

### RE: OCTOBER 14, 2025 QUESTION TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION ABOUT UC BYLAW 55.C

Dear Christian.

On behalf of Academic Senate Chair Ken Barish, I transmit the attached letter from the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction in reply to your October 14. 2025 inquiry.

Regards,

#### Cherysa Cortez

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error and that any review, disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the Academic Senate Office immediately cherysa.cortez<at>our.edu and permanently delete all copies of this communication and any attachments.

[Quoted text hidden]

