Proposed Amended Bylaws
Document for Discussion at Academic Council Meeting
March 30, 2010
(NOTE: UCAG’s voice in red)

Section 1: Typographical errors and editorial changes

1. (3.2.7.6) (misplaced comma) YES
   Motion: to insert a comma and strike a comma in (3.2.7.6) so that it now reads:
   “3.2.7.6. The University Council shall establish its own rules and procedures. The Faculty Senate, ASMSU, and COGS shall keep minutes of their meetings which shall be distributed to all members of the University Council and to all academic unit offices. Individual faculty may receive copies of such minutes on a regular basis upon written request to the Secretary for Academic Governance.”

2. (3.4.1.3) The Steering Committee is usually capitalized T but is lower case t here. YES
   Motion: to strike the t and insert T in the Steering Committee in (3.4.1.3) so that it now reads:
   “3.4.1.3. The Provost or designee shall sit ex officio but with voting rights. The Secretary for Academic Governance shall be an ex officio member and shall serve as secretary to the committee. Along with support to academic governance (Section 3.4.9) the Office of Academic Governance will supply the clerical and administrative assistance to The Steering Committee Members.”

3. (4.2.2.1) Language is awkward, and implies that even if a chairperson is elected in the spring a chairperson must still be elected at the first committee meeting of the next year. YES
   Motion: to strike “such officer” and insert “these officers” and strike “at” and insert “no later than” in (4.2.2.1) so that it now reads:
   “4.2.2.1. After committees for the next year have been constituted in the spring, normally each new committee shall meet during its last business meeting at the end of spring semester to elect its Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson. In any case, these officers must be elected no later than the first committee meeting of the next academic year.”

4. (4.2.2.2) The “as appropriate” here needs to be better defined, with reference to where that committee normally reports. YES
   Motion: to insert “, based on where each committee normally reports” in (4.2.2.2) so that it now reads:
   “4.2.2.2. The chairperson of each Standing Committee shall prepare a report at the end of each semester, summarizing the activities and actions of the committee, including the projected activities for the next semester. The end of the semester summaries will be posted on the Website for Academic Governance. The Secretary for Academic Governance shall distribute these with the agenda or minutes for University Council or Faculty Senate. At least once each academic year each chairperson shall report to either the Faculty Senate or the University Council as appropriate, based on where each committee normally reports. The schedule for these reports will be put in place annually by the Secretary for Academic Governance.”

5. (4.2.2.4) Strange use of “diverse”, which makes it sound like an emphasis on the utilization of minority participants in academic governance rather than just the utilization
of the appropriately knowledgeable individuals for a particular issue. NO, diverse reflects differing perspectives, backgrounds etc. and was deliberately selected.

**Motion: to strike “diverse” and insert “appropriate” and “from the entire” in (4.2.2.4) so that it now reads:**

"4.2.2.4. Committees are encouraged to call on **appropriate** members **from the entire** university community for the perspective which they may bring to the consideration of issues. Such individuals are asked to render whatever services are reasonably requested."

6. (4.2.4.4) Members of the Steering Committee are faculty, students and administrators. Should specify that faculty, students and administrators may suggest items for a committee’s agenda **through The Steering Committee**. **NO, THIS IS NOT WHAT IS MEANT, RATHER THAT ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY AND STUDENTS MAY DIRECTLY RECOMMEND ITEMS FOR THE AGENDA, THEY DO NOT HAVE TO COME THROUGH THE STEERING COMMITTEE.**

**Motion: to strike “Members of The Steering Committee” and insert “through The Steering Committee” in (4.2.4.4) so that it now reads:**

"4.2.4.4. Each committee shall determine its own agenda. Administrators, faculty, and students may suggest items for a committee’s agenda **through The Steering Committee**. Announcements of committee meetings must be posted on the committee’s web page at least one week in advance and include time and place of the meeting and a listing of agenda items."

7. Ex-officio is only hyphenated about ½ the time, and is hyphenated when used in Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised. **YES**

**Motion: to insert hyphens so that all instances of ex officio and Ex officio now read “ex-officio” and “Ex-officio” respectively.**

8. Wrong name for committees **YES**

**Motion: to strike “Academic Policy” and insert “Studies” in 4.5.5**

3.2.6.1
3.3.6.2
4.8.10
5.2.3.1.1

**Motion: to strike “Assembly” and insert “Congress” in 3.1.1.2**

9. (3.2.1.1.2) Membership of the Appointed Council: I believe that all the Deans mentioned not just those of the MSU Colleges meet regularly with the Provost and this body is commonly called the Deans’ Council. Hence I would strike the explicit definitions reference to Dean’s council in line two of 3.2.1.1.2.Its exclusion makes no difference to the listing of academic officers while inclusion may create confusion

**Motion: exclude “(Dean’s Council)” from this sentence. YES, BUT DROP THE LISTING OF DEANS. NOW SHOULD STATE: THE APPOINTED COUNCIL SHALL BE COMPOSED OF ALL DEANS AND THE DIRECTORS OF LIBRARIES AND NATIONAL SUPERCONDUCTING CYCLOTRON LABORATORY THE PRESIDENT AND THE PROVOST.**

10. **FIX TYPO: 3.5 CHANGE “GOVERNACE” TO “GOVERNANCE”**
Section 2: Presumed Non-Controversial Changes

1. (3.2.2) The Provost chairs the meetings in the absence of the President, but there is no provision for what happens in the Provost’s absence. The practice has been to have the Associate Provost chair those meetings (this has happened at least once in the last year). There should be some language to this effect in the Bylaws if the Provost is to be specified to chair in the President’s absence. (3.2.2) also obviates (3.2.7.1) which says the exact same thing, but without additional titles like Chairperson and Vice Chairperson.

Motion: to add a section 3.2.2.3 to read: YES

“3.2.2.3 When both the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of University Council can not be in attendance at a meeting of University Council, the Chairperson will designate an individual, typically the Senior Associate Provost, to preside at that meeting.”

And to strike “The President or, in his or her absence, the Provost” and insert “The Chairperson, or, in his or her absence, the individual designated in (3.2.2)” in section 3.2.7.1 so that it now reads: “3.2.7.1. The Chairperson, or in his or her absence, the individual designated in (3.2.2), shall preside at meetings of the University Council. The Secretary for Academic Governance shall be secretary of the University Council and shall serve as a non-voting ex officio member of the University Council.”

2. (3.3.1.5) Should specify that the ex-officio COGS rep (and others) to the faculty council Senate have voice but no vote. YES

Motion: to strike “The non-voting ex-officio members will include: ” and insert “will serve ex-officio with voice but no vote” in section (3.3.1.5) so that it now reads:

“3.3.1.5 The President, the Provost, one elected member from the Academic Assembly of ASMSU, one elected member from COGS, and the Chairperson of the Athletic Council (or designee) will serve ex-officio, with voice but no vote.”

3. (3.4.1.2.4) A student could potentially serve on The Steering Committee for a year before being elected to two consecutive terms as the President of COGS or the ASMSU Academic Assembly Chair. In such a case the term limit should be disregarded to allow for that individual to be most effective in his or her leadership role in student government. YES

Motion: to insert “unless a student holds the office of President of COGS or ASMSU Academic Assembly Chair and would serve on The Steering Committee in excess of two terms as a result of holding that position, in which case that student would be permitted to serve on The Steering Committee while serving in that office” in (3.4.1.2.4) so that it now reads:

“3.4.1.2.4. The term of office for student members of The Steering Committee shall be for one year. No student may serve more than two consecutive terms on The Steering Committee unless a student holds the office of President of COGS or ASMSU Academic Assembly Chair and would serve on The Steering Committee in excess of two terms as a result of holding that position, in which case that student would be permitted to serve on The Steering Committee while serving in that office. Student members will be identified by the end of each Spring Semester.”

4. (3.4.2.4) Should include Student Governing Bodies, since the current language would prevent The Steering Committee from recommending that the Provost consult COGS on the abolition of the Graduate School, for example. YES BUT REWORD TO SAY

FACULTY, ACADEMIC AND STUDENT GOVERNANCE BODIES
Motion: to insert “and student” in (3.4.2.4) so that it now reads:

“3.4.2.4. The Steering Committee shall advise the Provost regarding the appropriate Faculty, academic and student governance bodies and academic governance bodies, if any, to consult on proposals for creation, merger, or abolition of basic academic units to include departments, schools, institutes, colleges, and the Graduate School.”

5. (4.4.7.) This should be a Graduate Studies Committee responsibility YES

Motion: to strike section 4.4.7 and insert a new 4.8.11 that reads:

“4.8.11 The University Committee on Graduate Studies shall advise and consult with the Provost and Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies on policy relating to research development.”

6. (4.5.3.) There should be a parallel between the Grad and Undergrad Studies committees duties with regard to review of courses, curricula and degree requirements. YES

Motion: to strike “review and “ and “proposed by academic units” and insert “recommended by the University Committee on Undergraduate Studies.” such that (4.5.3) now reads: YES

“4.5.3. The University Committee on Curriculum shall exercise the faculty's delegated authority to approve or reject all changes in undergraduate courses, curricula, and degree requirements recommended by the University Committee on Undergraduate Studies, and shall have delegated authority to approve or reject changes in graduate and graduate professional courses, curricula, and degree requirements, recommended by the University Committee on Graduate Studies.”

And to insert a new section (4.4.9) that reads: YES

“4.4.9. The University Committee on Undergraduate Studies shall exercise the faculty’s delegated authority on grading policy for undergraduate students and shall review all changes in undergraduate courses, curricula, and degree requirements proposed by academic units and recommend their approval or rejection to the University Committee on Curriculum.”

7. (1.1.1.3) The concern is that the suggested concepts of health professions and clinical faculty have no generally accepted definition or alternatively has multiple and varying definitions. Use of an established personnel system makes the definition clearer. YES

Motion: change the sentence to “Health professions faculty of MSU shall consist of all faculty appointed in the Health Programs Faculty Appointment System” (with the rest of the current language staying as proposed.) YES

8. There has been a related suggestion that since health professions faculty are included, the National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory faculty also should be included in the definition of MSU faculty since their appointment system also has been established by MSU in the same way as the Health Programs Faculty Appointment System. YES

Motion: Add a new 1.1.1.4: National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory (NSCL) faculty of Michigan State University shall consist of all faculty appointed in the NSCL Faculty Appointment System holding the rank of assistant professor, associate professor and professor but not appointed under the rules of tenure. YES

If inserted there would be a need to renumber 1.1.1.4 to 1.1.1.5 and 1.1.1.1.5 to 1.1.1.6. YES

9. (1.1.2.1) Motion: To change to: “The voting faculty in the election of ... shall be all regular faculty and full time fixed term-faculty (including health professions
and National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory faculty) who have served at least three consecutive years...”  YES

10. (3.1.1.2) Motion: To change to: “Full time fixed-term faculty, Health Professions Faculty, National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory FACULTY (including health professions and National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory faculty) who have served at least three consecutive years and are engaged in the academic activities of the University on a regular basis are voting members of the Academic Congress.” ALTERED ACCEPTED

11. (3.2.5.8.1) notes special procedures for the selection of University Administrators. 3.2.5.8.1 includes in the list of affected positions that of associate provost. I presume this means only the Senior Associate Provost. As a result of title changes the senior staff in the Office of the Provost all carry the title of associate provost whereas there is only one senior associate provost. I don’t think the intent is to include all the associate provosts. There is an administrative understanding that those carrying the title of senior in several of the offices listed should be limited to one person. Currently there is one other senior title connected to the senior associate vice president for Student Affairs and Services. I wonder if consideration was given to including this title in the list as well as the Senior Associate Provost (if that is the intent).  YES

Motion: Modify to read: “…the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services, the Senior Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Services, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of International Studies and Programs, the Senior Associate Provost, the Director of Libraries, and the Dean of the Honors College.”

12. (6.2) University Graduate Judiciary YES
Motion: 6.2.1. OMIT the year (1984) – this document has been updated since then and any date in the bylaws will be wrong as the documents are updated

13. New 6.3 Motion: Add NEW 6.3 University Medical Students Grievance and Complaint Board
6.3.1 The composition and jurisdiction of this body are set forth in the Medical Students Rights and Responsibilities (MSRR). YES
6.3 ALSO NOW BECOMES 6.4
6.4 BECOMES 6.5

This is a new addition to the bylaws, but the MSRR has been approved by the Colleges of Human Medicine, Osteopathic Medicine and Vet Medicine as well as the Board of Trustees as the governing rules for students’ rights and responsibilities. It just seems to have never reached the bylaws of the university. The Graduate Students Rights and Responsibilities (referred to in 6.2.1) does not govern the medical schools nor does the AFR, so it should probably be mentioned.

Section 3: Potentially Controversial Changes

Bylaws changes and Academic Congress:
(Banks)

1. 3.2.5.10 states that the University Council (UC) may propose BAG changes which must MAY be referred to the Academic Congress (AC) for endorsement or rejection.
2. 3.3.4.9 Has the same language as applying to the Faculty Senate (FS). YES, CHANGE "MUST" TO "MAY".

3. 3.1.2.1 states that the AC acts on BAG changes forwarded to it by the UC and FS. NOW, OK WITH THE ABOVE CHANGES.

This sequence is not altogether clear but I think means that all BAG changes come to the AC from either UC or FS, in other words that no bylaws changes can be addressed by AC except by these referrals. This could be clearly stated but probably it is ok.

Under this arrangement there may be some delay in considering BAG changes in the AC but since there is a minimum of AC meetings annually the delay will not be extreme.

But there may be other concerns:

4. Under 3.1.2.2 the AC may endorse or reject items (presumably covering BAG changes) and refer them back to the originating body. If rejected one assumes that UC or FS can reconsider the changes and decide to drop them, submit them again unchanged or submit with changes from the original version. I assume this to be true but options available could be more clearly spelled out. ENOUGH STATED, NO CHANGE HERE.

5. Under 3.1.4 which addresses quorum rules for the AC (especially in 3.1.4.2 and 3.1.4.3) there is commentary of what happens if the AC does not reach a quorum. Agenda items from the non quorum meetings are referred to the originating body for consideration. But again the options available are not clear e.g. placing on the agenda for the next AC meeting etc.? Depending on the general range of items potentially on the AC’s agenda bylaw changes (and other items) could sit a long time without action. It was for this reason that the current BAG states that for items including BAG changes for which a quorum is not reached the action of the Academic Council or Faculty Council would stand. LEAVE AS IS, BUT CHANGE 3.1.4.2. TO "REFERRING BODY FOR ACTION." NOT "THE RESPECTIVE BODIES FOR CONSIDERATION"

From COGS: Note: We probably do not want to implement these changes, but they indicate a problem with having bylaws go through Academic Congress.

6. (3.1.3.2.2): Changes from ‘a majority vote of Academic Council’ to ‘a vote of at least 50% plus one of the voting members of the University Council’ which is inconsistent with (3.2.5.10) which requires only a majority vote of University Council. Furthermore, if a majority at a meeting with quorum is no longer sufficient to refer matters to Academic Congress, it would effectively make it harder for students to refer amendments to the bylaws in the future.

NO, 3.1.3.2.2, AND 3.2.5.10 ARE TWO DIFFERENT ISSUES. THEY DO NOT HAVE TO BE THE SAME. THERE ARE OTHER WAYS TO REFER AMENDMENTS WITH THE PREVIOUS WORDING CHANGES.

7. (3.1.3.2) There are numerous ways for the faculty to call the Academic Congress into session but there is no provision for graduate students to refer matters outside of the University Council. NO , NOT NECESSARY, STUDENTS CAN ASK THROUGH THE STEERING COMMITTEE, FOR EXAMPLE.

8. Student Representation Ratios: not clear that COGS and ASMSU will agree on this. ASMSU will be voting this week, so we may want to wait to hear. (from COGS)
FOR LANGUAGE CONSISTENCIES “ADD TO THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL”
NO Leave as edited. (ADAM LOVGREN - REP FROM COGS on UCAG DID NOT SEEM TO HAVE AN ISSUE.)

(3.2.4) ASMSU currently gets ~5 times more representatives than COGS by default (1/3 vs. 3/50) These reps should be allocated based instead on the ratio of undergrads to grads at the beginning of the academic year. We propose 40% (the previous total was 1/3 + 3/50 = 39.33%) of University Council, divided among COGS and ASMSU based on the ratio of graduate students to undergraduate students at the beginning of the academic year.

Motion 13: to insert “shall make up a total of 40% of the University Council, rounded to the nearest integer, and shall be divided among undergraduate students and graduate students based on the ratio of undergraduate students to graduate students at the beginning of the academic year.” in (3.2.4);
And to strike “to the University Council equal to one-third (1/3) of the total voting membership of the body. Representatives shall be rounded to the nearest integer.” And “a number of” And insert “the” and “such that” in (3.2.4.1);
And to strike the current (3.2.4.2) and replace it with “The Council of Graduate Students shall select the graduate student representatives such that the overall selection shall insure balanced collegiate representation, with consideration being given to University-wide representation insofar as possible.”;
So that section 3.2.4 now reads:
“3.2.4. Student Representatives shall make up a total of 40% of the University Council, rounded to the nearest integer, and shall be divided among undergraduate students and graduate students based on the ratio of undergraduate students to graduate and professional students (including those from the College of Law) at the end of the previous academic year.

3.2.4.1. The Academic Assembly of ASMSU shall select the undergraduate student representatives such that the overall selection shall insure balanced collegiate representation. The Student Assembly of ASMSU shall select no more than three (3) representatives to serve on the University Council.

3.2.4.1.1. Undergraduate student representatives to the University Council shall be chosen according to procedures established by the constitution of ASMSU and shall be chosen such that the diversity of the delegation is ensured.

3.2.4.2. The Council of Graduate Students shall select the graduate student representatives such that the overall selection shall insure balanced collegiate representation, with consideration being given to University-wide representation insofar as possible.

3.2.4.2.1. Graduate student representatives to the University Council shall be chosen according to procedures established by the constitution of COGS and shall be chosen such that the diversity of the delegation is ensured.”

9. Reporting lines for curriculum issues versus academic programs issues/disbandment

ASMSU IS OK WITH THE REPORTING LINES AS STATED. UCAG IS ALSO OK; THERE ARE NO FURTHER SUGGESTIONS BEYOND THE CHANGES THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN IMPLEMENTED IN THE REVISED DOCUMENT.

3.2.5.3. AND 3.2.7.4. REMAIN THE SAME.

Proposed language in 3.2.6.1 and 3.3.5 as well as in lots of other places makes clear the plan to implement different reporting lines of University level Committees, the option for designated
committees to get advice from the UC and the range of particular items assigned to committees reporting to the UC which also require FS review and action. (Banks)

Concerns identified relate to related processes:

10. 3.2.5.3 states that the UC shall participate in all major issues related to educational policy. This mainly has to do with items addressed by the Committees on Undergraduate and Graduate studies which report to UC. But one could argue that curriculum addresses aspects of educational policy and based on the provisions cited above the UCC at its discretion may only choose to seek UCC advice. Alternately the FC under 3.3.4.1 and 3.3.4.3 appropriately claims authority to speak on a variety of matters including on proposals developed in University level committees some of which do not report to the FS but to the UC. In practice this process may blur the capacity to clearly separate but also appropriately link consideration of matters in separate bodies. Leave as stated.

11. Finally it is worth noting that under 3.2.7.4 the UC has the right to receive as information items concerning recommendations from University level committees on "major academic policies" I assume this includes all recommendations from all committees even those reporting to FS. While the referrals are only as information items and do not permit actions to endorse, reject or modify, they do provide opportunities for deliberations, which could be forwarded on as information to the FS and the President among others. Leave as stated.

12. Academic Program Issues (From COGS)

While academic program issues may often be matters affecting the professional responsibility of the faculty to establish and maintain the intellectual authority of the university (see 1.2.3.1.3), they are nearly always issues that are directly related to student interest (see preamble). Consider program discontinuance - closing a program does not establish or maintain the intellectual authority of the university in that program (taken literally, it does just the opposite). Students, both past and present, are then hurt by that decision, since the quality of a program affects the value of their educational credentials. Students should have the right to hear committee reports on the closing of academic programs, and these decisions should therefore be brought to University Council rather than Faculty Senate.

Faculty have the delegated authority for the curriculum. Academic programs changes, such as the creation, discontinuation or merger of academic programs are ultimately the responsibility of the administration, where the entire university community acts in a consistorial role on these actions. As such, we would like to see language placing academic programs within the core responsibility of the faculty removed. We would also like to see committee reports on these actions brought to University Council rather than Faculty Senate, so that the University Community can fulfill its role in consulting on these actions. Previously worked out, see below.

A compromise on this issue was reached in section (4.5.1.1):

(4.5.1.1.) The University Committee on Curriculum will report to Faculty Senate. If the University Committee on Curriculum or The Steering Committee decide that feedback is needed from the entire University Community, the University Committee on Curriculum will seek advice from the University Council before reporting to Faculty Senate. In case of Program discontinuance, the University Committee on Curriculum will report to the University Council.

The rest of the BAG is inconsistent with this section
To bring the rest of the document into alignment with (4.5.1.1) we propose the following changes:

13. (3.2.5.1.) Specifies that academic program issues are the core responsibility of the Faculty Senate. (4.5.1.1.) makes a program discontinuance (an academic program issue) the responsibility of University Council.

14. THIS NEEDS TO BE DISCUSSED FURTHER IN FACULTY COUNCIL.

3.3.4.1., 3.3.5.1.

Motion: to strike “academic program issues,” from (3.2.5.1) so that it now reads:
“3.2.5.1. The University Council brings together faculty, student, and administration representatives to discuss issues that involve the entire university. While input may be sought from University Council by Faculty Senate on proposals regarding curricular issues, faculty tenure and promotion issues, and faculty salary and benefits issues, the primary focus of discussion in University Council is on other issues that are not the core responsibility of the Faculty Senate.”

(3.3.4.1) Faculty council is not solely charged with academic program issues, which affect the broader university community, especially students.

Motion: to strike “academic program issues,” from (3.3.4.1) so that it now reads:
“3.3.4.1. Faculty Senate is a deliberative, representative, and legislative body for MSU Faculty. As such, Faculty Senate is the major, regularly meeting body in which curricular issues, faculty tenure and promotion issues, and faculty salary and benefits issues are presented. While input may be sought from the University Council on appropriate issues, Faculty Senate will form and communicate a majority position of the MSU Faculty on these issues.”

(3.3.5.1) Curriculum and faculty life should report to Faculty Council, academic programs should report to University Council.

Motion: to strike “and academic programs” from (3.3.5.1) so that it now reads:
“3.3.5.1. University-level standing committees, which deal with issues of the curriculum and those dealing predominantly with issue of faculty life (tenure and promotion, salary, benefits) report to Faculty Senate.”

15. (3.3.6) It is most important for issues regarding academic programs, especially disbandment and merger, to be considered by University Council. These should not be referred exclusively to Faculty Senate. We propose the same compromise for (3.3.6.2) and (3.3.6.3) as in (3.3.6.1) where these issues go to Faculty Senate first but still come before University Council.

Motion: to insert “In case of Program discontinuance, the University Committee on Curriculum will report to the University Council.” in (3.3.5.4) so that it now reads:
“3.3.5.4. University Committee on Curriculum will report to Faculty Senate. In case of Program discontinuance, the University Committee on Curriculum will report to the University Council. In order to obtain feedback from the entire University community, at its discretion, UCC may request an appearance before University Council.” Already addressed.

16. (3.3.6) It is most important for issues regarding academic programs, especially disbandment and merger, to be considered by University Council. These should not be referred exclusively to Faculty Senate. We propose the same compromise for (3.3.6.2) and (3.3.6.3) as in (3.3.6.1) where these issues go to Faculty Senate first but still come before University Council.

Motion: to insert “before the reports are considered by University Council” in (3.3.6.2) and (3.3.6.3) so that these sections now read:
“3.3.6.2. University Committee on Undergraduate Academic Policy will report primarily to University Council. An exceptional situation can occur when UCUAP deals with issues that relate to establishment, disbandment, or merger of undergraduate academic programs. In this case UCUAP must report to Faculty Senate before the reports are considered by University Council. YES
3.3.6.3. University Committee on Graduate Studies will report primarily to the University Council. An exceptional situation can occur when UCGS deals with issues that relate to establishment, disbandment, or merger of graduate or graduate-professional academic programs. In this case UCGS must report to Faculty Senate before recommendations can be considered by University Council.” YES

17. (4.4.1.1.) Academic program issues can go to Faculty Senate first but still come before University Council.
Motion: to insert “before recommendations can be considered by University Council” and “first” in (4.4.1.1.) so that this section now reads:
“4.4.1.1. The University Committee on Undergraduate Studies shall report primarily to the University Council. However, the University Committee on Undergraduate Studies has the responsibility to report to the Faculty Senate first on issues that relate to establishment, disbandment, or merger of undergraduate academic programs before recommendations can be considered by University Council.” YES

18. (4.8.1.1) Academic program issues can go to Faculty Senate first but still come before University Council.
Motion: to insert “first, before recommendations can be considered by University Council” in (4.8.1.1.) so that this section now reads:
“4.8.1.1. The University Committee on Graduate Studies will report primarily to the University Council. An exception can occur when the committee deals with issues that relate to establishment, disbandment, or merger of graduate or graduate professional academic programs. In such cases the Committee will report to Faculty Senate first, before recommendations can be considered by University Council.” YES

19. Inclusion of Faculty Liaison to Board of Trustees in the Bylaws
Note: President Simon has said at Academic Council that she will not suggest that the Board of Trustees approve inclusion of this in the bylaws. Knowing that, we may want to just take this part out.

3.4.2.9. CHANGE THE LANGUAGE TO “WILL BE DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES”

(3.4.2.9) There is a proposal to establish a Faculty Liaison Committee to the Board of Trustees with roughly the same composition as currently, but to have its role become part of the BAG rather than via a separate Board of Trustees adopted procedure. This committee includes no students and we would like to see that the student members of the current liaison committee be extended the same role as a part of the BAG, rather than to assume that they can stay in place. We propose that those student members of the new liaison be the ASMSU Academic Assembly Chair and the COGS President or their designees.

Motion: to insert “4) The ASMSU Academic Assembly Chair and the COGS President or their designees.” and “and student” in (3.4.2.9) so that it now reads:
“3.4.2.9. The liaison for communication with the Board of Trustees will consist of the following: 1) The at-large members of The Steering Committee; 2) One non-tenured faculty member in the tenure stream elected from the Faculty Senate; 3) The Chairpersons or designees of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs and the University Committee on Faculty Tenure (replacing the current Faculty Liaison). 4) The ASMSU Academic Assembly Chair and the COGS President or their designees. The liaison’s responsibility will be to act as a two-way bridge between faculty and student concerns and suggestions and the thoughts and directions of the Board of Trustees. The Chairperson of The Steering Committee will attend all Board of Trustee public meetings and stand ready to interact with the Board members at any time."
20. 4.8.2. STRIKE THE LAST SENTENCE: ONE OF THE GRADUATE STUDENT MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES SHALL BE SELECTED TO SERVE ON THE STEERING COMMITTEE.

21. THIS IS IN 3.4.1.2.4.1 AND 3.4.1.2.4.1
CHANGE “OR” TO “AND”

22. 4.9.4.1. STRIKE THE 2ND SENTENCE. ADD “REVIEWED BY UCFA”

23. Delete words “SECTION 2.3” of GRADUATE STUDENTS RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES: SOME FOLLOW-UP MAY BE NECESSARY TO SEE WHO REVIEWS CHANGES TO THIS DOCUMENT.