

***Faculty Senate Committee on Rules***  
**Response to Charges**

**Rules Committee members:** Seth Hoelscher (chair), Terrel Gallaway, Kartik Ghosh, Beth Walker, Lanya Lamouria (*ex officio*), Cindy MacGregor (*ex officio*)

**Charge #3 *Part A***

**Review and Clarification/Updating of Substantive/Non-Substantive Distinction in Curricular Proposals (ART VI, SEC 2.C)**

The current distinction between substantive and non-substantive curricular changes was established by Senate Action 11-93/94 in 1993 and has not been changed since. When curricular changes were processed by paper, non-substantive changes (e.g., periodicity changes) were routed directly to Senate for review and approval without being reviewed at lower levels: “for non-substantive changes the path is purely informational and requires no approval by the various bodies.” However, with the introduction of the CAW, there is no means by which lower level review can be circumvented, so essentially all proposals are now treated as substantive proposals in the CAW

However, because the Senate Action has not been repealed, even though the CAW treats both kinds of proposals similarly, the distinction technically remains. As a result, department proposers can indicate that their proposals are non-substantive and some College Councils are not formally voting on them, but are passing them on to the next level of review. Proposals that are claimed to be non-substantive but are really substantive are therefore almost through the entire process before being reviewed, and are often being sent back to the originator. We are asking Rules to review this distinction and clarify what kinds of proposals need review and approval at what levels of the curricular process described in ART VI.

**Recommendation by Committee**

The Committee recommends the following Internal Senate Action.

## **Internal Senate Action**

Recommended by the Faculty Senate Committee on Rules

February 14, 2022

Whereas, the Faculty Senate Committee on Rules was charged to investigate the distinction between substantive and non-substantive curricular items; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate Committee on Rules has found no current value in the distinction established by Senate Action 11-93/94 from 1993; and

Whereas, the periodicity for courses, a characteristic labeled non-substantive by Senate Action 11-93/94, is now handled in an expedited manner separate from the complete curricular review process; and

Whereas, the differentiation between substantive and non-substantive provided by Senate Action 11-9/94 was found to be ambiguous by a review of the Faculty Senate Committee on Rules; and

Whereas, the investigation for this charge revealed that this ambiguous distinction between substantive and non-substantive is creating inconsistent review of curricular items by various faculty committees and councils;

Therefore, Be it Resolved, that the distinction between substantive and non-substantive curricular items be dropped; and

Therefore, Be it Resolved, that the question asking about such a distinction be removed from all online forms within the Curricular Action Workflow (CAW).