

Faculty Senate Committee on Rules
Response to Charge Three
March 2, 2016

FACULTY SENATE CHARGE THREE

Charge: Rules should consider consolidating and explaining the challenge and appeals process for all council actions with logically explained steps that anyone can follow. This includes a consideration of whether the details of the appeals process for all council actions should be moved from Article II to Article VI (curricular process).

Rationale: The section that describes the process for appealing the action of any Senate body involved in the curricular process (college councils, graduate council, EPPC, or CGEIP) is buried within Article II (college councils), with Articles III-V referring back to Article II. In short it is very confusing and spread out over multiple sections which often result in confusion and misunderstanding of the process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR RULES REPORT

History of the Bylaws	1
Findings and conclusions	2
Summary of proposed changes to the Bylaws	3
Original language	4
Proposed changes	11
Final language	24

RULES PROCESS FOR CHARGE THREE

History of the Bylaws:

The Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty were adopted April 16, 1987. The original process for challenges and appeals of council/committee actions was as follows:

1. Any action of a College Council, Graduate Council, the Committee on Teacher Education, or the Committee on Intercollegiate Programs (precursor of CGEIP) could be **challenged** by 10% of the ranked faculty of a single undergraduate college.
2. If the faculty of an undergraduate college were challenging an action of their own College Council, the challenge was an “Intracollege Challenge” and was adjudicated within the college.
3. If the faculty of an undergraduate college were challenging an action of another college council, Graduate Council, the Committee on Teacher Education, or the Committee on Intercollegiate Programs, the challenge was an “Intercollege Challenge” and was adjudicated by the combined councils/committees involved.
4. For any council/committee action there was a single challenge period of 20 calendar days following distribution to the faculty during which both intracollege and intercollege challenges could be submitted.

5. After expiration of the 20 day challenge period, the university ranked faculty could **appeal** any council/committee action within 10 calendar days. The appeal could be issued by a Department Head, a College Council Chair, or by 30 members of the ranked faculty. Appeals were adjudicated by the full Faculty Senate.

Changes made since 1987 (current ART II SEC 10 & 11):

1. The intercollege challenge process has been eliminated, and the intracollege/intercollege language has been removed. All challenges to council actions are intracollege.
2. Any Graduate Council action may be challenged by 10% of the Graduate Faculty. Such challenges are adjudicated within the Graduate College by the graduate faculty.
3. The challenge period has been reduced to 10 calendar days. Thus, college council and Graduate Council actions are followed, in sequence, by a 10-day challenge period and a 10-day appeals period. CGEIP and EPPC actions are followed by a 10-day appeals period

Findings and conclusions:

1. The descriptions of the challenge and appeals processes have always been located within Article II, with Articles III and IV referring back to Article II. However, when the bylaws for Graduate Council were extracted from Article II and placed into a new Article V, descriptions of the challenge and appeals processes for Graduate Council were left in Article II. Currently, Article V (Graduate Council) contains no reference to the challenge and appeal processes.
2. Article III Section 10 states that “each EPP member shall have the right at all times to appeal any EPPC action.” This is true but misleading since all members of the ranked faculty (EPP members or not) have the right to appeal any Council action (ART II SEC 11). Any Department Head or Council Chair can appeal an EPP action on behalf of their constituencies, and most of these individuals are not EPP members.
3. Article IV Section 11 states that “each undergraduate college faculty shall have the inherent right to appeal any CGEIP action.” This is true but misleading since all ranked faculty members of the university have this right (ART II SEC 11) and it is not clear that “each undergraduate college faculty” amounts to the same thing.
4. Article VI Section 7C stipulates incorrectly that the Secretary of the Faculty will forward approved curricular proposals to the Provost after lapse of the appeals period. The Secretary forwards approved proposals after lapse of the Senate Action challenge period, which does not start until the appeals period lapses.
5. In some places the phrase “challenge period” is used to refer to the combined challenge and appeals periods for council actions, but in other places it is used to refer to the challenge period for Senate Actions. The phrase “challenge and appeals period” also appears in several places.
6. Article II Sections 10 and 11 state that council Actions (capitalized) may be challenged or appealed but does not indicate what qualifies as a council Action. Faculty Senate Actions are limited to affirmative votes on motions affecting policies and procedures to be followed by the university (ART I SEC 7A), but past practice holds that both the rejection and approval of a curricular proposal by a council can be challenged and appealed. Articles II, III, and IV originally contained sections entitled “Actions of <council/committee name>” but the word “Actions” was changed to “Duties” at some point. Thus the meaning of “council Action” is not specified.

7. The logical distinction between **challenges** and **appeals** is not clear. Formal objections to Faculty Senate Actions are also called challenges (ART I SEC 8). Challenges of council actions and challenges of Senate Actions can only come directly from the faculty by petition, whereas appeals of council actions can also come from department heads and council chairs, so this may be the intended distinction. Alternatively, the appeals process may be so named to clearly distinguish it from the alternative means of objecting to council actions that has a significantly different means of adjudication.
8. The process of challenges and appeals would be less confusing if the word “challenge” was not used for two different levels of review. However, the current terminology is so entrenched that the introduction of new terms might create even more confusion. Therefore, our recommendation is to retain the current challenge/appeal terminology but to substantially reorganize and clarify the relevant language in the Bylaws.

Summary of Proposed Changes:

1. Add a paragraph to ART I SEC 10 that defines “Council Action”.
2. Create a new Article VII devoted to describing the rights and process of challenge/appeal of Council Actions and Senate Actions. Move into this new Article the entirety of ART II SEC 10 (challenges to Council Actions), ART II SEC 11 (appeals of Council Actions), and ART I SEC 8 (challenges of Senate Actions).
3. Begin the new ART VII with new language (Section A) that summarizes the entire challenge/appeal/challenge process.
4. Correct the language in ART III SEC 10 and ART IV SEC 11, and add references to the new ART VII.
5. Add new sections to ART V (Graduate Council) and ART VI (Curricular Process) that identify the rights of challenge and appeal and refer to the new ART VII.
6. Replace descriptions of the challenge/appeals process removed from ART I (Faculty Senate) and ART II (College Councils) with references to the new ART VII.
7. Identify the specific actions that initiate the challenge period for Council Actions, the appeals period for Council Actions, and the challenge period for Senate Actions.
8. Use the terms “challenge period” and “appeals period” consistently.
9. Clarify the routing of curricular proposals.

PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGES FOR CHARGE THREE**Original Language (comments in italics)**

[Note: The language shown below incorporates changes that were recommended by the Senate Committee on Rules in response to charges one, nine, and twelve. However, the line numbers refer to the April 2015 edition of the Bylaws. If the changes recommended in response to charge one are not adopted by the Senate then this report will be withdrawn]

ART I FACULTY SENATE**SEC 5 Duties of the Officers – Faculty Senate****C The Secretary of the Faculty (*Line 431*)**

(9) Shall participate in the curricular process as described in ART VI SEC 7 of these *Bylaws*.

SEC 7 Faculty Senate Actions and Resolutions**A Faculty Senate Actions (*Line 541*)**

[Text omitted]

(1) The Secretary of the Faculty shall forward any Faculty Senate Action to the Provost who shall, within ten (10) calendar days after the expiration of the challenge and appeals period, forward the Faculty Senate Action to the president of the university with recommendation to approve or not approve.

SEC 8 Challenge and Veto of Faculty Senate Action (*line 607*)**A Right of Challenge**

The faculty shall have the inherent right to challenge any Faculty Senate Action. Such faculty challenge must be made within twenty (20) calendar days following distribution of the Faculty Senate Action to the faculty. In extraordinary circumstances, but not on curricular matters, the challenge period may, by unanimous vote of the Faculty Senate members present when a Faculty Senate Action is made, be reduced from twenty days to a number stipulated by the Faculty Senate.

B Form of Challenge

A faculty challenge of a Faculty Senate Action may be made by no fewer than fifty (50) members of the ranked faculty. Said challenge shall be made in writing and submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the challengers shall file a copy of the challenge with the Secretary of the Faculty.

C Disposition of Challenge

The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall send a copy of such a challenge to each member of the faculty, and no sooner than three (3) school days, but no later than six (6) school days after copies of the challenge have

been distributed to the faculty, the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall call a session of the ranked faculty for discussion of the challenge. Members of the administration may attend. The president of the university or the president's designee will preside at this session. The Secretary of the Faculty shall attend this session and record arguments for and against the challenge. No later than five (5) school days after the session, the Secretary of the Faculty shall distribute to all ranked faculty members ballots for voting on the challenge. The Secretary of the Faculty's summaries of the arguments for and against the challenge shall be sent with the ballots.

D Vote on Challenge

Voting shall be by secret ballot. Voted ballots must be returned to the Secretary of the Faculty within six (6) school days after the day on which the ballots are distributed. An affirmative vote to support the challenge, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the ranked faculty who are on active duty at the time of the challenge, shall constitute a veto of the challenged Faculty Senate Action.

SEC 9 Committees of the Faculty Senate *[Paragraphs A, C, and D omitted]*

B Standing Committees *[Committees (2)-(8) omitted]*

(1) Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate *[paragraph (b) omitted]*

(a) Purpose *(line 653)*

(aa) Shall participate in the curricular process as described in Article V, Section 7.

SEC 10 Councils of the Faculty Senate *[Proposed in response to charge one]*

A Definition and Duties of Councils *[Text omitted]*

B Council Responsibilities *[Text omitted]*

ART II COLLEGE COUNCILS

SEC 10 Challenge and Veto of Council Actions (*line 1107*)

A Right of Challenge

Each college faculty shall have the inherent right to challenge any College Council Action from its own college. The graduate faculty shall have the inherent right to challenge any Graduate Council Action. Such faculty challenge must be made within ten (10) calendar days following distribution of the Council Action to the faculty.

B Form of Challenge

A college faculty challenge of its own Council Action or a graduate faculty challenge of a Graduate Council Action may be made by no fewer than ten percent (10%) of the ranked faculty from that college or the Graduate College. Said challenge shall be made in writing and copies submitted to the chair of their college or graduate council, chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the Faculty.

The chair of the college or graduate council shall send a copy of such challenge to each ranked member of the college or graduate faculty. No sooner than three (3) school days, but no later than six (6) school days after copies of the challenge have been distributed to the faculty, the chair of the council shall call a session of the faculty for the discussion of the challenge. The dean of the college or his or her designee shall preside at this session. The secretary to the dean shall attend this session and record arguments for and against the challenge. No later than five (5) school days after the session, the secretary shall distribute to all ranked faculty members ballots for voting on the challenge. A summary of arguments for and against the challenge shall be prepared by the council chair and shall be sent with the ballots.

C Disposition of Challenge

An affirmative vote to support the challenge, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the ranked faculty of the college or by the graduate faculty, shall constitute a veto of the challenged Council Action.

SEC 11 Appeal and Veto of Council and Committee Actions (*Line 1137*)

A Right of Appeal

The university ranked faculty shall have the inherent right to appeal Actions of a college council, Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs. Appeals to the college councils and graduate councils must be made no sooner than the expiration of the challenge period, but no later than ten (10) calendar days during the regular academic year when classes are in session, excluding terminal week, following the expiration date. Appeals to the Educator Preparation Provider Council and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs must be made no later than ten (10) calendar days during the regular academic year when classes are in session, excluding terminal week, following distribution of the Action to the faculty. Since upholding an appeal would constitute a Faculty Senate Action, an upheld appeal is subject to the right of challenge as set forth in the *Bylaws*: Article I, Section 7, A, B, C, D.

B Form of Appeal

An appeal of a Council Action or Committee Action may be made by an academic department through the department head director, by a council through the council chair or by petition of no fewer than thirty (30) members of the ranked faculty. Said appeal shall be made in writing to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. If an appeal is made, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall place the issue on the agenda for the next Faculty Senate session.

C Disposition of Appeal

An affirmative vote to support the appeal, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the senators present and voting, shall constitute a veto of the Council or Committee Action. Since upholding an appeal would constitute a Faculty Senate Action, an upheld appeal is subject to the right of challenge as set forth in the *Bylaws*: Article I, Section 7, A, B, C, D.

SEC 12 College Council Rules (*Line 1168*)

ART III EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER COUNCIL

SEC 10 Appeal and Veto of Educator Preparation Provider Council Actions (*Line 1387*)

Each EPP member shall have the right at all times to appeal any EPPC Action. Such procedure is identical to that set forth for the appeal of any Council or Committee Action in the *Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty*: Article II, Section 11, A, B, C.

ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS

SEC 4 Responsibilities of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs (*Line 1534*)

A *[Text omitted]* A recommendation for the approval of a course proposal will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for review and disposition as described in ART VI SEC 7-9.

B *[Text omitted]* A recommendation to approve changes will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for review and disposition as described in ART VI SEC 7-9.

SEC 10 Duties of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs (*line 1635*)

[Text omitted] All curricular proposals recommended for approval by the council, amended or not amended, shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for disposition as described in ART VI SEC 7-9.

SEC 11 Appeal and Veto of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs Actions (*Line 1643*)

Each undergraduate college faculty shall have the inherent right to appeal any CGEIP Action. Such procedure is identical to that set forth for appeal of any Council or Committee Action in *Bylaws*: Article II, Section 11, A, B, C. Since upholding an appeal would constitute a Faculty Senate Action, an upheld appeal is subject to the right of challenge as set forth in the *Bylaws*: Article I, Section 7, A, B, C, D.

ART V GRADUATE COUNCIL

SEC 8 Amendments of Bylaws (*Line 1797*) [*Text omitted*]

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 4 Responsibility of College Councils (*Line 1863*) [*Paragraphs A and B omitted*]

- C A College Council shall recommend the approval of a departmental proposal, reject and return a proposal to the originating department, or amend and recommend approval of the proposal. A curricular proposal which has been amended may be tabled or withdrawn by motion of the representative of the academic department in which the proposal originated, without second or vote.
- D Curricular proposals recommended for approval by a College Council, amended or not amended, shall be forwarded to the College Dean for review and comment as stipulated below. After review and comment by the College Dean, or after the expiration of the review/comment period, the proposals shall be returned to the College Council Chair, who will forward them as follows:
 - (1) Program proposals for BS and MS in Education and Education Specialist degrees, and proposals for Professional Education courses, to the Chair of the Education Preparation Provider Council. Criteria for designation as a Professional Education course and a list of current Professional Education courses can be found on the EPP web site.

[Items 2 and 3 omitted]

SEC 6 Responsibility of Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs (*line 1909*)

[Paragraphs A and B omitted]

- C All proposals recommended for approval by the graduate council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs, amended or not amended, shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for disposition as hereinafter stipulated.

SEC 7 Responsibility of Secretary of the Faculty (*Line 1924*) [*Text omitted for paragraphs A and B*]

- C After lapse of the challenge period, recommended curricular proposals that are error-free shall be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for disposition as described in ART VI SEC 8.
- D Curricular proposals that have been approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall be distributed to all college deans, department heads, and faculty senators.
- E Approved curricular proposals shall be forwarded to the Provost after lapse of the appeals period.

SEC 8 Responsibility of Executive Committee of Faculty Senate (*Line 1934*) [*Paragraphs C and D*]

omitted]

- A *[Text omitted]* For curricular proposals that must be considered by the full Senate as described in ART VI SEC 9, the Executive Committee issues final approval only after the proposal has been approved by a vote of the full Senate. *[Text omitted]* This normally is a pro forma process; however, if within a challenge period any member of the committee determines that a curricular change warrants further review by the faculty then the committee has the right to bring the proposal to the floor of the Faculty Senate, in which case approval or rejection of the proposal is determined by a vote of the full senate.
- B Approved curricular proposals shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for dissemination as described in ART VI SEC 7D,E.

SEC 9 Responsibility of Faculty Senate (*Line 1945*)

The Faculty Senate shall consider and take action:

[Paragraphs A-E omitted]

SEC 10 Responsibility of University Administration (*Line 1969*)

All curricular proposals approved by the Faculty Senate become Faculty Senate Actions and shall be forwarded to the Provost by the Secretary of the Faculty after the lapse of the challenge and appeals period.

SEC 11 Origination of Curricular Proposals (*Line 1974*) *[Text omitted]*

SEC 12 Approval Process for Individual Sections of Variable Content Courses and Special Topics Courses (*Line 2021*) *[Text omitted for paragraphs A, C, and D]*

- B Before a specific section (topic) of an existing variable content course or special topics course may be offered for the third time, it must be proposed and approved by means of the procedures outlined in Sections 3 through 10 of the Article, as a “regular” section of that course just as if it were a new stand-alone course.

SEC 13 Approval Process for Courses Taught During an Intersession or Other Compressed-Time Format (*Line 2038*) *[Text omitted for paragraph A]*

- B Each proposal for a new course or a new “regular” section of an existing variable content or special topics course designed to be offered exclusively during an intersession or in another compressed time format must be approved through the normal curricular approval process outlined in Sections 3 through 11 of the Article. For each such offering, each relevant curricular review body must consider, in addition to the normal issues related to content, quality, and rigor, the three criteria listed in Part A of this Section.

SEC 14 Accelerated Course Approval Procedure (*Line 2061*) *[Text omitted for paragraphs B, E, and F]*

- A This section applies *only* to new courses that cannot fit under existing variable content or special topics course designations. Before any course approved through this accelerated process may be offered for a third time, it must go through the regular curricular approval process outlined in Sections 3 through 11 of

this Article.

- C Any college council may promulgate more stringent requirements than these; all councils should, however, observe at least the following minimum requirements:

[Requirements 1, 2, and 4 omitted]

- (3) If special consideration is granted, the chair distributes materials to council members and arranges Internet posting, all with a five-calendar-day turnaround for individual council members' responses to the council chair and for challenges to the curricular proposal decisions of the council.
- D The right of appeal in the accelerated process shall be the same as set forth in ART II, SEC 11, except that the appeal period shall consist of five calendar days.

ART VII AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS (*Line 2103*)

Proposed Changes
(additions bold, omissions struck through, comments italicized)

ART I FACULTY SENATE

SEC 5 Duties of the Officers – Faculty Senate

C The Secretary of the Faculty (*Line 431*)

- (9) Shall participate in the curricular process as described in ART VI SEC ~~7~~ **8** of these *Bylaws*.

SEC 7 Faculty Senate Actions and Resolutions

A Faculty Senate Actions (*Line 541*)

[Text omitted]

- (1) The Secretary of the Faculty shall forward any Faculty Senate Action to the Provost who shall, within ten (10) calendar days after the expiration of the challenge ~~and appeals~~ period, forward the Faculty Senate Action to the president of the university with recommendation to approve or not approve.

SEC 8 Challenge and Veto of Faculty Senate Action (*line 607*)

The ranked faculty shall have the inherent right to challenge any Faculty Senate Action, as described in Article VII Section 4 of these Bylaws.

[The text struck from this Section has been moved to new Article VII Section 4]

~~A Right of Challenge~~

~~The faculty shall have the inherent right to challenge any Faculty Senate Action. Such faculty challenge must be made within twenty (20) calendar days following distribution of the Faculty Senate Action to the faculty. In extraordinary circumstances, but not on curricular matters, the challenge period may, by unanimous vote of the Faculty Senate members present when a Faculty Senate Action is made, be reduced from twenty days to a number stipulated by the Faculty Senate.~~

~~B Form of Challenge~~

~~A faculty challenge of a Faculty Senate Action may be made by no fewer than fifty (50) members of the ranked faculty. Said challenge shall be made in writing and submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the challengers shall file a copy of the challenge with the Secretary of the Faculty.~~

~~C Disposition of Challenge~~

~~The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall send a copy of such a challenge to each member of the faculty, and no sooner than three (3) school days, but no later than six (6) school days after copies of the challenge have been distributed to the faculty, the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall call a session of the ranked faculty for discussion of the challenge. Members of the administration may attend. The president of the university or~~

~~the president's designee will preside at this session. The Secretary of the Faculty shall attend this session and record arguments for and against the challenge. No later than five (5) school days after the session, the Secretary of the Faculty shall distribute to all ranked faculty members ballots for voting on the challenge. The Secretary of the Faculty's summaries of the arguments for and against the challenge shall be sent with the ballots.~~

~~D Vote on Challenge~~

~~Voting shall be by secret ballot. Voted ballots must be returned to the Secretary of the Faculty within six (6) school days after the day on which the ballots are distributed. An affirmative vote to support the challenge, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the ranked faculty who are on active duty at the time of the challenge, shall constitute a veto of the challenged Faculty Senate Action.~~

SEC 9 Committees of the Faculty Senate [*Paragraphs A, C, and D omitted*]

B Standing Committees [*Committees (2)-(8) omitted*]

(1) Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate [*paragraph (b) omitted*]

(a) Purpose [*line 653*]

(aa) Shall participate in the curricular process as described in Article ~~V~~VI, Section 79.

SEC 10 Councils of the Faculty Senate [*Proposed in response to charge one*]

A Definition and Duties of Councils [*Text omitted*]

B Council Responsibilities [*Text omitted*]

C Council Actions [*New section*]

Council Actions include all formal recommendations or decisions made by a Council in response to its charges. Council Actions include rejections of curricular proposals, recommendations to approve curricular proposals, and all formal recommendations and decisions made while engaged in non-curricular duties.

D Challenges and Appeals of Council Actions [*New section*]

The ranked faculty of the University shall have the inherent right to challenge and appeal Council Actions as described in ART VII SEC 2 and ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.

ART II COLLEGE COUNCILS

SEC 10 Challenges and ~~Veto~~ Appeals of College Council Actions (*line 1107*)

- A The ranked faculty members of each academic college have an inherent right to challenge any Action of their College Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 2 of these Bylaws.**
- B The ranked faculty members of the University have an inherent right to appeal any Action of any College Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.**

[Text struck from SEC 10 and SEC 11 has been moved to new Article VII Sections 2 and 3]

~~A—Right of Challenge~~

~~Each college faculty shall have the inherent right to challenge any College Council Action from its own college. The graduate faculty shall have the inherent right to challenge any Graduate Council Action. Such faculty challenge must be made within ten (10) calendar days following distribution of the Council Action to the faculty.~~

~~B—Form of Challenge~~

~~A college faculty challenge of its own Council Action or a graduate faculty challenge of a Graduate Council Action may be made by no fewer than ten percent (10%) of the ranked faculty from that college or the Graduate College. Said challenge shall be made in writing and copies submitted to the chair of their college or graduate council, chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the Faculty.~~

~~The chair of the college or graduate council shall send a copy of such challenge to each ranked member of the college or graduate faculty. No sooner than three (3) school days, but no later than six (6) school days after copies of the challenge have been distributed to the faculty, the chair of the council shall call a session of the faculty for the discussion of the challenge. The dean of the college or his or her designee shall preside at this session. The secretary to the dean shall attend this session and record arguments for and against the challenge. No later than five (5) school days after the session, the secretary shall distribute to all ranked faculty members ballots for voting on the challenge. A summary of arguments for and against the challenge shall be prepared by the council chair and shall be sent with the ballots.~~

~~C—Disposition of Challenge~~

~~An affirmative vote to support the challenge, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the ranked faculty of the college or by the graduate faculty, shall constitute a veto of the challenged Council Action.~~

SEC 11 Appeal and Veto of Council and Committee Actions (*Line 1137*)

~~A—Right of Appeal~~

~~The university ranked faculty shall have the inherent right to appeal Actions of a college council, Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs. Appeals to the college councils and graduate councils must be made no sooner than the expiration of the challenge period, but no later than ten (10) calendar days during the regular academic year when classes are in session, excluding terminal week, following the expiration date. Appeals to the Educator Preparation Provider Council and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs must be made no later than ten (10) calendar days during the regular academic year when classes are in session, excluding terminal week, following distribution of the Action to the faculty. Since upholding an~~

~~appeal would constitute a Faculty Senate Action, an upheld appeal is subject to the right of challenge as set forth in the *Bylaws*:— Article I, Section 7, A, B, C, D.~~

~~B—Form of Appeal~~

~~An appeal of a Council Action or Committee Action may be made by an academic department through the department head director, by a council through the council chair or by petition of no fewer than thirty (30) members of the ranked faculty.— Said appeal shall be made in writing to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.— If an appeal is made, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall place the issue on the agenda for the next Faculty Senate session.~~

~~C—Disposition of Appeal~~

~~An affirmative vote to support the appeal, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the senators present and voting, shall constitute a veto of the Council or Committee Action.— Since upholding an appeal would constitute a Faculty Senate Action, an upheld appeal is subject to the right of challenge as set forth in the *Bylaws*:— Article I, Section 7, A, B, C, D.~~

~~SEC 1211 College Council Rules (Line 1168)~~

ART III EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER COUNCIL

~~SEC 10 Appeals and Veto of Educator Preparation Provider Council Actions (Line 1387)~~

~~Each EPP member shall have the right at all times to appeal any EPPC Action.— Such procedure is identical to that set forth for the appeal of any Council or Committee Action in the *Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty*: Article II, Section 11, A, B, C.— **The ranked faculty members of the University have an inherent right to appeal any EPPC Action, as set forth in ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.**~~

ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS

~~SEC 4 Responsibilities of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs (Line 1534)~~

~~A [Text omitted] A recommendation for the approval of a course proposal will be forwarded to the **Secretary of the Faculty Senate** for review and disposition as described in ART VI ~~SEC 7-9~~.~~

~~B [Text omitted] A recommendation to approve changes will be forwarded to the **Secretary of the Faculty Senate** for review and disposition as described in ART VI ~~SEC 7-9~~.~~

~~SEC 10 Duties of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs (line 1635)~~

~~[Text omitted] All curricular proposals recommended for approval by the council, amended or not amended, shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for disposition as described in ART VI ~~SEC 7-9~~.~~

~~SEC 11 Appeals and Veto of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs Actions (Line 1643)~~

~~Each undergraduate college faculty shall have the inherent right to appeal any CGEIP Action. Such procedure is identical to that set forth for appeal of any Council or Committee Action in *Bylaws*: Article II, Section 11, A, B, C. Since upholding an appeal would constitute a Faculty Senate Action, an upheld appeal is subject to the right of challenge as set forth in the *Bylaws*: Article I, Section 7, A, B, C, D.~~ **The ranked faculty members of the University have an inherent right to appeal any Action of the Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs, as set forth in ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.**

ART V GRADUATE COUNCIL

SEC 8 Challenges and Appeals of Graduate Council Actions *[New section]*

- A The ranked members of the Graduate Faculty have an inherent right to challenge any Action of the Graduate Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 2 of these Bylaws.**
- B The ranked faculty of the University have an inherent right to appeal any Action of the Graduate Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.**

SEC 8-9 Amendments of Bylaws (*Line 1797*) *[Text omitted]*

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 4 Responsibility of College Councils (*Line 1863*) *[Paragraphs A and B omitted]*

- C A College Council shall recommend the approval of a departmental proposal, reject and return a proposal to the originating department, or amend and recommend approval of the proposal. A curricular proposal which has been amended may be tabled or withdrawn by motion of the representative of the academic department in which the proposal originated, without second or vote.**
- D All Department Heads/Directors and Faculty Senators from within the College shall be notified of the disposition of each curricular proposal and shall be given access to either a digital or paper copy of the proposal. This notification shall constitute dissemination to the College faculty and shall initiate the challenge period within the College.**
- ~~D~~ **E Curricular proposals recommended for approval by a College Council, amended or not amended, shall be forwarded to the College Dean for review and comment as stipulated below in Section 5 of this Article. Review by the College Dean may be concurrent with the challenge period.**
- F After review and comment by the College Dean, or after the expiration of the review/comment period, and after expiration of the challenge period or adjudication of a challenge, a proposal recommended for approval shall be forwarded by the College Council Chair proposals shall be returned to the College Council Chair, who will forward them as follows:**
 - (1) Program proposals for ~~BS and MS Bachelor of Science~~ **Bachelor of Science** in Education and ~~Education Specialist and Bachelor of Music Education~~ **Bachelor of Music Education** degrees, and proposals for Professional Education courses, to the Chair of the Education Preparation Provider Council. Criteria for designation as a Professional Education course and a list of current Professional Education courses can be found on the EPP web site. *[This*

corrects an error not caught previously. Proposals for graduate courses and programs go directly to Graduate Council]

[Items 2 and 3 omitted]

SEC 6 Responsibility of Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs (*line 1909*)

[Paragraphs A and B omitted]

~~C All proposals recommended for approval by the graduate council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs, amended or not amended, shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for disposition as hereinafter stipulated.~~

C Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

- (1) If a proposal is rejected, the CGEIP Chair shall notify the Department Head/Director and the Faculty Senator representing the academic department or special academic program from which the proposal originated. This notification shall initiate the appeals period for the CGEIP Action.**
- (2) The CGEIP Chair shall forward to the Secretary of the Faculty all proposals recommended for approval.**

D Educator Preparation Provider Council

- (1) If a proposal is rejected, the EPPC Chair shall notify the Department Head/Director and the Faculty Senator representing the academic department or special academic program from which the proposal originated. This notification shall initiate the appeals period for the EPPC Action.**
- (2) Recommended proposals affecting graduate programs or courses shall be forwarded to the Chair of Graduate Council. *[This order of review is consistent with existing language in ART VI SEC 3B]***
- (3) Recommended proposals affecting undergraduate programs or courses shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty.**

E Graduate Council

- (1) After a curricular proposal has been reviewed, all members of Graduate Council and all Faculty Senators shall be notified of the disposition of the proposal and shall be given access to either a digital or paper copy of the proposal. This notification shall constitute dissemination to the Graduate Faculty and shall initiate the challenge period within the Graduate College.**
- (2) If a curricular proposal stands rejected at the end of the challenge period or after adjudication of a challenge, the Department Head/Director and the Faculty Senator representing the academic department or special academic program from which the proposal originated shall be notified. This notification shall initiate the appeals period for the Graduate Council Action.**

- (3) If a curricular proposal is recommended for approval at the end of the challenge period or after adjudication of a challenge, the Graduate Council Chair shall forward the recommended proposal to the Secretary of the Faculty.**

SEC 7 Rights to Challenge and Appeal Council Actions *[New section]*

- A Members of the ranked faculty of each academic college have a right to challenge the rejection or recommended approval of any curricular proposal by their College Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 2 of these Bylaws.**
- B Ranked members of the graduate faculty have a right to challenge the rejection or recommended approval of any curricular proposal by Graduate Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 2 of these Bylaws.**
- C The ranked faculty members of the University have an inherent right to appeal the rejection or recommended approval of any curricular proposal by any Council of the Faculty Senate, as set forth in ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.**

SEC 7-8 Responsibility of Secretary of the Faculty *(Line 1924) [Text omitted for paragraphs A and B]*

- C All Department Heads/Directors of academic programs, all Faculty Senators, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall be notified of recommended curricular proposals that are error-free and shall be given access to digital copies. This notification shall constitute dissemination to the ranked faculty and shall initiate the appeals period for Council Actions.**
- CD After lapse of the ~~challenge~~ appeals period for Council Actions, recommended curricular proposals that are error-free shall be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for disposition as described in ART VI SEC 8 9.**
- DE Curricular proposals that have been approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall be distributed to all college deans, department heads, and faculty senators. This initiates the challenge period for Senate Actions.**
- EF Approved curricular proposals shall be forwarded to the Provost after ~~lapse of the appeals~~ challenge period for Senate Actions has lapsed without a challenge being submitted, or after a challenge to the Senate Action has been denied.**

SEC 8-9 Responsibility of Executive Committee of Faculty Senate *(Line 1934)**[Paragraphs C and D omitted]*

- A [Text omitted] For curricular proposals that must be considered by the full Senate as described in ART VI SEC 9 10, the Executive Committee issues final approval only after the proposal has been approved by a vote of the full Senate. [Text omitted] This normally is a pro forma process; however, if within a ~~challenge an~~ **appeals** period any member of the committee determines that a curricular change warrants further review by the faculty then the committee has the right to bring the proposal to the floor of the Faculty Senate, in which case approval or rejection of the proposal is determined by a vote of the full senate.**
- B Approved curricular proposals shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for dissemination as described in ART VI SEC 7 ~~D, E~~ 8D and 8E.**

SEC 9-10 Responsibility of Faculty Senate *(Line 1945)*

The Faculty Senate shall consider and take action:

[Paragraphs A-E omitted]

F On all challenges to approved curricular proposals.

SEC 11 Right to Challenge Senate Actions *[New section]*

The ranked faculty members of the University have an inherent right to challenge any Faculty Senate Action, as set forth in ART VII SEC 4 of these Bylaws. Within the curricular process, Senate Actions include the approval of a curricular proposal and the upholding of an appeal of a Council Action.

~~SEC 10~~**12 Responsibility of University Administration** *(Line 1969)*

All curricular proposals approved by the Faculty Senate become Faculty Senate Actions and shall be forwarded to the Provost by the Secretary of the Faculty after the lapse of the challenge ~~and appeals~~ period **for Senate Actions.**

~~SEC 11~~**13 Origination of Curricular Proposals** *(Line 1974) [Text omitted]*

~~SEC 12~~**14 Approval Process for Individual Sections of Variable Content Courses and Special Topics Courses** *(Line 2021) [Text omitted for paragraphs A, C, and D]*

B Before a specific section (topic) of an existing variable content course or special topics course may be offered for the third time, it must be proposed and approved by means of the procedures outlined in Sections 3 through ~~10~~**13** of ~~the~~ Article **VI**, as a “regular” section of that course just as if it were a new stand-alone course.

~~SEC 13~~**15 Approval Process for Courses Taught During an Intersession or Other Compressed-Time Format** *(Line 2038) [Text omitted for paragraph A]*

B Each proposal for a new course or a new “regular” section of an existing variable content or special topics course designed to be offered exclusively during an intersession or in another compressed time format must be approved through the normal curricular approval process outlined in Sections 3 through ~~11~~**13** of ~~the~~ Article **VI**. For each such offering, each relevant curricular review body must consider, in addition to the normal issues related to content, quality, and rigor, the three criteria listed in Part A of this Section.

~~SEC 14~~**16 Accelerated Course Approval Procedure** *(Line 2061) [Text omitted for paragraphs B, E, and F]*

A This section applies *only* to new courses that cannot fit under existing variable content or special topics course designations. Before any course approved through this accelerated process may be offered for a third time, it must go through the regular curricular approval process outlined in Sections 3 through ~~11~~**13** of ~~this~~ Article **VI**.

- C Any college council may promulgate more stringent requirements than these; all councils should, however, observe at least the following minimum requirements:

[Requirements 1, 2, and 4 omitted]

- (3) If special consideration is granted, the Chair distributes materials to council members and arranges Internet posting. ~~all with a five calendar day turnaround for individual council members' responses to the council chair and for challenges to the curricular proposal decisions of the council.~~ **Each council member must respond to the Council Chair within five calendar days.**
- D The rights of **challenge and appeal of Council Actions** in the accelerated process shall be the same as set forth in ~~ART II, SEC 11~~ **ART VII, SEC 2 and SEC 3**, except that the **challenge and** appeal periods shall **each** consist of five calendar days.

ART VII Challenges and Appeals of Council and Senate Actions *[New Article]*

SEC 1 Overview of Challenges and Appeals *[New text added for clarification]*

- A **The ranked faculty have an inherent right to contest any Council Action (as defined in ART I SEC 10C) and any Faculty Senate Action (as defined in ART I SEC 7A).**
- B **Summary of the process for challenges and appeals:**
- (1) **The ranked faculty of an undergraduate college may challenge any Action of their College Council within 10 days of its dissemination to the college faculty, as described in SEC 2 below.**
 - (2) **Ranked members of the Graduate Faculty may challenge any Action of the Graduate Council within 10 days of its dissemination to the Graduate Faculty, as described in SEC 2 below.**
 - (3) **The ranked faculty of the University may appeal any Action of any Council of the Faculty Senate within 10 days of dissemination of the Action to the faculty by the Secretary of the Faculty, as described in SEC 3 below.**
 - (4) **The ranked faculty of the University may challenge any Senate Action within 20 days of its dissemination to the faculty, as described in SEC 4 below.**
 - (5) **Challenges of Council Actions and Senate Actions may be initiated only by petition from the ranked faculty. Appeals of Council Actions may be initiated by petition from the ranked faculty, by a Department Head, or by a Council Chair.**

SEC 2 Challenge and Veto of College Council and Graduate Council Actions *[Text moved from ART II SEC 10, with paragraph A clarified to indicate that it is the ranked faculty who possess the right of challenge]*

A Right of Challenge

The ranked faculty of each undergraduate college shall have the inherent right to challenge any College Council Action from its own college. The ranked members of the Graduate Faculty shall have the inherent right to challenge any Graduate Council Action. Such faculty challenges must be made within ten (10) calendar days following distribution of the Council Action to the faculty by the Council.

B Form of Challenge

A college faculty challenge of its own Council Action or a graduate faculty challenge of a Graduate Council Action may be made by no fewer than ten percent (10%) of the ranked faculty from that college or the Graduate College. Said challenge shall be made in writing and copies submitted to the chair of their college or graduate council, chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the Faculty.

The chair of the college or graduate council shall send a copy of such challenge to each ranked member of the college or graduate faculty. No sooner than three (3) school days, but no later than six (6) school days after copies of the challenge have been distributed to the faculty, the chair of the council shall call a session of the faculty for the discussion of the challenge. The dean of the college or his or her designee shall preside at this session. The secretary to the dean shall attend this session and record arguments for and against the challenge. No later than five (5) school days after the session, the secretary shall distribute to all ranked faculty members ballots for voting on the challenge. A summary of arguments for and against the challenge shall be prepared by the council chair and shall be sent with the ballots.

C Disposition of Challenge

An affirmative vote to support the challenge, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the ranked faculty of the college or by the graduate faculty, shall constitute a veto of the challenged Council Action.

SEC 3 Appeal and Veto of Council Actions *[Text moved from ART II SEC 11.] [A statement that appears at the ends of both paragraph A and paragraph C is removed from paragraph A where it seems less appropriate.]*

A Right of Appeal

[This paragraph has been simplified by removing a reference to the challenge period for College Council and Graduate Council Actions. This reference is not necessary since the Secretary of the Faculty will not disseminate proposals until the challenge period has ended.]

The ranked faculty of the University shall have the inherent right to appeal Actions of a College Council, Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs. Appeals must be made no later than ten (10) calendar days during the regular academic year when classes are in session, excluding terminal week, following distribution of the Council Action to the faculty by the Secretary of the Faculty.

B Form of Appeal

An appeal of a Council Action may be made by an academic department through the Department Head or Director, by a council through the Council Chair or by petition of no fewer than thirty (30) members of the ranked faculty. Said appeal shall be made in writing to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. If an appeal is made, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall place the issue on the agenda for the next Faculty Senate session.

C Disposition of Appeal

An affirmative vote to support the appeal, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the senators present and voting, shall constitute a veto of the Council Action. Since upholding an appeal would constitute a Faculty Senate Action, an upheld appeal is subject to the right of challenge as set forth in Article VII Section 4 below.

SEC 4 Challenge and Veto of Faculty Senate Action *[text moved from ART 1 SEC 8. Paragraph A is clarified to indicate that it is the ranked faculty who possess this right]*

A Right of Challenge

The ranked faculty of the University shall have the inherent right to challenge any Faculty Senate Action. Such faculty challenge must be made within twenty (20) calendar days following distribution of the Faculty Senate Action to the faculty. In extraordinary circumstances, but not on curricular matters, the challenge period may, by unanimous vote of the Faculty Senate members present when a Faculty Senate Action is made, be reduced from twenty days to a number stipulated by the Faculty Senate.

B Form of Challenge

A faculty challenge of a Faculty Senate Action may be made by no fewer than fifty (50) members of the ranked faculty. Said challenge shall be made in writing and submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the challengers shall file a copy of the challenge with the Secretary of the Faculty.

C Disposition of Challenge

The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall send a copy of such a challenge to each member of the faculty, and no sooner than three (3) school days, but no later than six (6) school days after copies of the challenge have been distributed to the faculty, the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall call a session of the ranked faculty for discussion of the challenge. Members of the administration may attend. The president of the university or the president's designee will preside at this session. The Secretary of the Faculty shall attend this session and record arguments for and against the challenge. No later than five (5) school days after the session, the Secretary of the Faculty shall distribute to all ranked faculty members ballots for voting on the challenge. The Secretary of the Faculty's summaries of the arguments for and against the challenge shall be sent with the ballots.

D Vote on Challenge

Voting shall be by secret ballot. Voted ballots must be returned to the Secretary of the Faculty within six (6) school days after the day on which the ballots are distributed. An affirmative vote to

support the challenge, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the ranked faculty who are on active duty at the time of the challenge, shall constitute a veto of the challenged Faculty Senate Action.

ART ~~VH~~VIII AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

Final Language
(comments italicized)

ART I FACULTY SENATE

SEC 5 Duties of the Officers – Faculty Senate

C The Secretary of the Faculty *(Line 431)*

- (9) Shall participate in the curricular process as described in ART VI SEC 8 of these *Bylaws*.

SEC 7 Faculty Senate Actions and Resolutions

A Faculty Senate Actions *(Line 541)*

[Text omitted]

- (1) The Secretary of the Faculty shall forward any Faculty Senate Action to the Provost who shall, within ten (10) calendar days after the expiration of the challenge period, forward the Faculty Senate Action to the president of the university with recommendation to approve or not approve.

SEC 8 Challenge and Veto of Faculty Senate Action *(line 607)*

The ranked faculty shall have the inherent right to challenge any Faculty Senate Action, as described in Article VII Section 4 of these Bylaws.

SEC 9 Committees of the Faculty Senate *[Paragraphs A, C, and D omitted]*

B Standing Committees *[Committees (2)-(8) omitted]*

- (1) Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate *[paragraph (b) omitted]*

- (a) Purpose *(line 653)*

- (aa) Shall participate in the curricular process as described in Article VI, Section 9.

SEC 10 Councils of the Faculty Senate *[Proposed in response to charge one]*

A Definition and Duties of Councils *[Text omitted]*

B Council Responsibilities *[Text omitted]*

C Council Actions *[New section]*

Council Actions include all formal recommendations or decisions made by a Council in response to its charges. Council Actions include rejections of curricular proposals, recommendations to approve curricular proposals, and all formal recommendations and decisions made while engaged in non-curricular duties.

D Challenges and Appeals of Council Actions *[New section]*

The ranked faculty of the University shall have the inherent right to challenge and appeal Council Actions as described in ART VII SEC 2 and ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.

ART II COLLEGE COUNCILS

SEC 10 Challenges and Appeals of College Council Actions *(line 1107)*

- A The ranked faculty members of each academic college have an inherent right to challenge any Action of their College Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 2 of these Bylaws.
- B The ranked faculty members of the University have an inherent right to appeal any Action of any College Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.

SEC 11 College Council Rules *(Line 1168)*

ART III EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER COUNCIL

SEC 10 Appeals of Educator Preparation Provider Council Actions *(Line 1387)*

The ranked faculty members of the University have an inherent right to appeal any EPPC Action, as set forth in ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.

ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS

SEC 4 Responsibilities of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs *(Line 1534)*

- A *[Text omitted]* A recommendation for the approval of a course proposal will be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for review and disposition as described in ART VI.
- B *[Text omitted]* A recommendation to approve changes will be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for review and disposition as described in ART VI.

SEC 10 Duties of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs *(line 1635)*

[Text omitted] All curricular proposals recommended for approval by the council, amended or not amended, shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for disposition as described in ART VI.

SEC 11 Appeals of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs Actions (*Line 1643*)

The ranked faculty members of the University have an inherent right to appeal any Action of the Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs, as set forth in ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.

ART V GRADUATE COUNCIL

SEC 8 Challenges and Appeals of Graduate Council Actions [*New section*]

- A The ranked members of the Graduate Faculty have an inherent right to challenge any Action of the Graduate Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 2 of these Bylaws.
- B The ranked faculty of the University have an inherent right to appeal any Action of the Graduate Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.

SEC 9 Amendments of Bylaws (*Line 1797*) [*Text omitted*]

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 4 Responsibility of College Councils (*Line 1863*) [*Paragraphs A and B omitted*]

- C A College Council shall recommend the approval of a departmental proposal, reject and return a proposal to the originating department, or amend and recommend approval of the proposal. A curricular proposal which has been amended may be tabled or withdrawn by motion of the representative of the academic department in which the proposal originated, without second or vote.
- D All Department Heads/Directors and Faculty Senators from within the College shall be notified of the disposition of each curricular proposal and shall be given access to either a digital or paper copy of the proposal. This notification shall constitute dissemination to the College faculty and shall initiate the challenge period within the College.
- E Curricular proposals recommended for approval by a College Council, amended or not amended, shall be forwarded to the College Dean for review and comment as stipulated in Section 5 of this Article. Review by the College Dean may be concurrent with the challenge period.
- F After review and comment by the College Dean, or after the expiration of the review/comment period, and after expiration of the challenge period or adjudication of a challenge, a proposal recommended for approval shall be forwarded by the College Council Chair as follows:
 - (1) Program proposals for Bachelor of Science in Education and Bachelor of Music Education degrees, and proposals for Professional Education courses, to the Chair of the Education Preparation Provider Council. Criteria for designation as a Professional Education course and a list of current Professional Education courses can be found on the EPP web site.

[*Items 2 and 3 omitted*]

SEC 6 Responsibility of Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs (*line 1909*)
[Paragraphs A and B omitted]

C Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

- (1) If a proposal is rejected, the CGEIP Chair shall notify the Department Head/Director and the Faculty Senator representing the academic department or special academic program from which the proposal originated. This notification shall initiate the appeals period for the CGEIP Action.
- (2) The CGEIP Chair shall forward to the Secretary of the Faculty all proposals recommended for approval.

D Educator Preparation Provider Council

- (1) If a proposal is rejected, the EPPC Chair shall notify the Department Head/Director and the Faculty Senator representing the academic department or special academic program from which the proposal originated. This notification shall initiate the appeals period for the EPPC Action.
- (2) Recommended proposals affecting graduate programs or courses shall be forwarded to the Chair of Graduate Council.
- (3) Recommended proposals affecting undergraduate programs or courses shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty.

E Graduate Council

- (1) After a curricular proposal has been reviewed, all members of Graduate Council and all Faculty Senators shall be notified of the disposition of the proposal and shall be given access to either a digital or paper copy of the proposal. This notification shall constitute dissemination to the Graduate Faculty and shall initiate the challenge period within the Graduate College.
- (2) If a curricular proposal stands rejected at the end of the challenge period or after adjudication of a challenge, the Department Head/Director and the Faculty Senator representing the academic department or special academic program from which the proposal originated shall be notified. This notification shall initiate the appeals period for the Graduate Council Action.
- (3) If a curricular proposal is recommended for approval at the end of the challenge period or after adjudication of a challenge, the Graduate Council Chair shall forward the recommended proposal to the Secretary of the Faculty.

SEC 7 Rights to Challenge and Appeal Council Actions *[New section]*

- A Members of the ranked faculty of each academic college have a right to challenge the rejection or recommended approval of any curricular proposal by their College Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 2 of these Bylaws.

- B Ranked members of the graduate faculty have a right to challenge the rejection or recommended approval of any curricular proposal by Graduate Council, as set forth in ART VII SEC 2 of these Bylaws.
- C The ranked faculty members of the University have an inherent right to appeal the rejection or recommended approval of any curricular proposal by any Council of the Faculty Senate, as set forth in ART VII SEC 3 of these Bylaws.

SEC 8 Responsibility of Secretary of the Faculty (*Line 1924*) [*Text omitted for paragraphs A and B*]

- C All Department Heads/Directors of academic programs, all Faculty Senators, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall be notified of recommended curricular proposals that are error-free and shall be given access to digital copies. This notification shall constitute dissemination to the ranked faculty and shall initiate the appeals period for Council Actions.
- D After lapse of the appeals period for Council Actions, recommended curricular proposals that are error-free shall be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for disposition as described in ART VI SEC 9.
- E Curricular proposals that have been approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall be distributed to all college deans, department heads, and faculty senators by the Secretary of the Faculty. This initiates the challenge period for Senate Actions.
- F Approved curricular proposals shall be forwarded to the Provost after the challenge period for Senate Actions has lapsed without a challenge being submitted, or after a challenge to the Senate Action has been denied.

SEC 9 Responsibility of Executive Committee of Faculty Senate (*Line 1934*)
[*Paragraphs C and D omitted*]

- A [*Text omitted*] For curricular proposals that must be considered by the full Senate as described in ART VI SEC 10, the Executive Committee issues final approval only after the proposal has been approved by a vote of the full Senate. [*Text omitted*] This normally is a pro forma process; however, if within an appeals period any member of the committee determines that a curricular change warrants further review by the faculty then the committee has the right to bring the proposal to the floor of the Faculty Senate, in which case approval or rejection of the proposal is determined by a vote of the full senate.
- B Approved curricular proposals shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for dissemination as described in ART VI SEC 8D and 8E.

SEC 10 Responsibility of Faculty Senate (*Line 1945*)

The Faculty Senate shall consider and take action:

[*Paragraphs A-E omitted*]

- F On all challenges to approved curricular proposals.

SEC 11 Right to Challenge Senate Actions [*New section*]

The ranked faculty members of the University have an inherent right to challenge any Faculty Senate Action, as set forth in ART VII SEC 4 of these Bylaws. Within the curricular process, Senate Actions include the approval of a curricular proposal and the upholding of an appeal of a Council Action.

SEC 12 Responsibility of University Administration (*Line 1969*)

All curricular proposals approved by the Faculty Senate become Faculty Senate Actions and shall be forwarded to the Provost by the Secretary of the Faculty after the lapse of the challenge period for Senate Actions.

SEC 13 Origination of Curricular Proposals (*Line 1974*) [*Text omitted*]

SEC 14 Approval Process for Individual Sections of Variable Content Courses and Special Topics Courses (*Line 2021*) [*Text omitted for paragraphs A, C, and D*]

- B Before a specific section (topic) of an existing variable content course or special topics course may be offered for the third time, it must be proposed and approved by means of the procedures outlined in Sections 3 through 13 of Article VI, as a “regular” section of that course just as if it were a new stand-alone course.

SEC 15 Approval Process for Courses Taught During an Intersession or Other Compressed-Time Format (*Line 2038*) [*Text omitted for paragraph A*]

- B Each proposal for a new course or a new “regular” section of an existing variable content or special topics course designed to be offered exclusively during an intersession or in another compressed time format must be approved through the normal curricular approval process outlined in Sections 3 through 13 of Article VI. For each such offering, each relevant curricular review body must consider, in addition to the normal issues related to content, quality, and rigor, the three criteria listed in Part A of this Section.

SEC 16 Accelerated Course Approval Procedure (*Line 2061*) [*Text omitted for paragraphs B, E, and F*]

- A This section applies *only* to new courses that cannot fit under existing variable content or special topics course designations. Before any course approved through this accelerated process may be offered for a third time, it must go through the regular curricular approval process outlined in Sections 3 through 13 of Article VI.

- C Any college council may promulgate more stringent requirements than these; all councils should, however, observe at least the following minimum requirements:

[Requirements 1, 2, and 4 omitted]

- (3) If special consideration is granted, the Chair distributes materials to council members and arranges Internet posting. Each council member must respond to the Council Chair within five calendar days.

- D The rights of challenge and appeal of Council Actions in the accelerated process shall be the same as set forth in ART VII, SEC 2 and SEC 3, except that the challenge and appeal periods shall each consist of

five calendar days.

ART VII Challenges and Appeals of Council and Senate Actions *[New Article]*

SEC 1 Overview of Challenges and Appeals

- A The ranked faculty have an inherent right to contest any Council Action (as defined in ART I SEC 10C) and any Faculty Senate Action (as defined in ART I SEC 7A).
- B Summary of the process for challenges and appeals:
- (1) The ranked faculty of an undergraduate college may challenge any Action of their College Council within 10 days of its dissemination to the college faculty, as described in SEC 2 below.
 - (2) Ranked members of the Graduate Faculty may challenge any Action of the Graduate Council within 10 days of its dissemination to the Graduate Faculty, as described in SEC 2 below.
 - (3) The ranked faculty of the University may appeal any Action of any Council of the Faculty Senate within 10 days of dissemination of the Action to the faculty by the Secretary of the Faculty, as described in SEC 3 below.
 - (4) The ranked faculty of the University may challenge any Senate Action within 20 days of its dissemination to the faculty, as described in SEC 4 below.
 - (5) Challenges of Council Actions and Senate Actions may be initiated only by petition from the ranked faculty. Appeals of Council Actions may be initiated by petition from the ranked faculty, by a Department Head, or by a Council Chair.

SEC 2 Challenge and Veto of College Council and Graduate Council Actions

A Right of Challenge

The ranked faculty of each undergraduate college shall have the inherent right to challenge any College Council Action from its own college. The ranked members of the Graduate Faculty shall have the inherent right to challenge any Graduate Council Action. Such faculty challenges must be made within ten (10) calendar days following distribution of the Council Action to the faculty by the Council.

B Form of Challenge

A college faculty challenge of its own Council Action or a graduate faculty challenge of a Graduate Council Action may be made by no fewer than ten percent (10%) of the ranked faculty from that college or the Graduate College. Said challenge shall be made in writing and copies submitted to the chair of their college or graduate council, chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the Faculty.

The chair of the college or graduate council shall send a copy of such challenge to each ranked member of the college or graduate faculty. No sooner than three (3) school days, but no later than six (6) school days after copies of the challenge have been distributed to the faculty, the chair of the council shall call a

session of the faculty for the discussion of the challenge. The dean of the college or his or her designee shall preside at this session. The secretary to the dean shall attend this session and record arguments for and against the challenge. No later than five (5) school days after the session, the secretary shall distribute to all ranked faculty members ballots for voting on the challenge. A summary of arguments for and against the challenge shall be prepared by the council chair and shall be sent with the ballots.

C Disposition of Challenge

An affirmative vote to support the challenge, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the ranked faculty of the college or by the graduate faculty, shall constitute a veto of the challenged Council Action.

SEC 3 Appeal and Veto of Council Actions

A Right of Appeal

The ranked faculty of the University shall have the inherent right to appeal Actions of a College Council, Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs. Appeals must be made no later than ten (10) calendar days during the regular academic year when classes are in session, excluding terminal week, following distribution of the Council Action to the faculty by the Secretary of the Faculty.

B Form of Appeal

An appeal of a Council Action may be made by an academic department through the Department Head or Director, by a council through the Council Chair or by petition of no fewer than thirty (30) members of the ranked faculty. Said appeal shall be made in writing to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. If an appeal is made, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall place the issue on the agenda for the next Faculty Senate session.

C Disposition of Appeal

An affirmative vote to support the appeal, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the senators present and voting, shall constitute a veto of the Council Action. Since upholding an appeal would constitute a Faculty Senate Action, an upheld appeal is subject to the right of challenge as set forth in Article VII Section 4 below.

SEC 4 Challenge and Veto of Faculty Senate Action

A Right of Challenge

The ranked faculty of the University shall have the inherent right to challenge any Faculty Senate Action. Such faculty challenge must be made within twenty (20) calendar days following distribution of the Faculty Senate Action to the faculty. In extraordinary circumstances, but not on curricular matters, the challenge period may, by unanimous vote of the Faculty Senate members present when a Faculty Senate Action is made, be reduced from twenty days to a number stipulated by the Faculty Senate.

B Form of Challenge

A faculty challenge of a Faculty Senate Action may be made by no fewer than fifty (50) members of the ranked faculty. Said challenge shall be made in writing and submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the challengers shall file a copy of the challenge with the Secretary of the Faculty.

C Disposition of Challenge

The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall send a copy of such a challenge to each member of the faculty, and no sooner than three (3) school days, but no later than six (6) school days after copies of the challenge have been distributed to the faculty, the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall call a session of the ranked faculty for discussion of the challenge. Members of the administration may attend. The president of the university or the president's designee will preside at this session. The Secretary of the Faculty shall attend this session and record arguments for and against the challenge. No later than five (5) school days after the session, the Secretary of the Faculty shall distribute to all ranked faculty members ballots for voting on the challenge. The Secretary of the Faculty's summaries of the arguments for and against the challenge shall be sent with the ballots.

D Vote on Challenge

Voting shall be by secret ballot. Voted ballots must be returned to the Secretary of the Faculty within six (6) school days after the day on which the ballots are distributed. An affirmative vote to support the challenge, equal to a majority of the votes cast by the ranked faculty who are on active duty at the time of the challenge, shall constitute a veto of the challenged Faculty Senate Action.

ART VIII AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

Faculty Senate Rules Committee
Response to Charge Five
March 2, 2016

FACULTY SENATE CHARGE FIVE

Charge: In light of the fact that senate membership is now extended to include non-ranked faculty, Rules should review membership criteria on senate committees and see whether they seem to be consistent with senate membership criteria.

Rationale: We are letting non-ranked faculty participate in faculty governance but we do not allow them to participate on committees that report to senate. For example: Does it make sense to have only ranked faculty to be members on CGEIP when a bulk of the Gen Ed courses are being taught by non-ranked faculty? I am attaching a table which I created using the By Laws and the Committee book which specifies how members are selected and the status of the faculty member needed for membership on any senate committee. The Rules committee could use this table to facilitate discussion on this topic.

Table Provided by Faculty Senate Chair

Name of Committee	Member selection process	Membership Criteria
Academic Relations Committee	Appointed by Faculty Senate Chair	Does not have to be ranked faculty; May include faculty, administrators, students, and alumni
Budget & Priorities	Elected	Ranked faculty only
CASL	Appointed by Chair of Faculty Senate	Can be unranked or ranked faculty
College Councils	Elected	Ranked faculty only
Education Preparation Provider Council	Elected	EPP faculty only
CGEIP	Elected	Ranked faculty only
Graduate Council	Elected	Ranked faculty only
Faculty Student Judicial Commission	Elected	Can be unranked or ranked faculty
Faculty Concerns Committee	Elected	Ranked faculty only
Honorary Degrees Committee	Appointed by Chair of Faculty Senate	Can be unranked or ranked faculty
Judicial Review Committee	Pre-determined	Past senate chairs
Rules Committee	Appointed by Chair of Faculty Senate	Can be unranked or ranked faculty
Study Abroad Advisory Committee	Appointed by Chair of Faculty Senate	Can be unranked or ranked faculty

University Hearing Committee	Elected	Ranked faculty only
------------------------------	---------	---------------------

Investigation by Rules Committee

The Rules committee examined the information provided by the Faculty Senate Chair and the current Faculty Senate Bylaws. The eligibility requirements for departmental representatives to the Senate can be found in lines 57-59, specifically, “Eligible department representatives include all ranked faculty, as well as those instructors and clinical faculty who have served no less than two consecutive academic years at Missouri State University by the September session of their term.” Here is the table of information developed from that investigation:

Committee/Council	Relevant Lines in Bylaws start at:	Selection Process	Membership details
<i>Elected Membership Restricted to Ranked Faculty</i>			
Faculty Concerns	720	Elected	Ranked faculty
CGEIP	1567	Elected	Ranked faculty
Budget and Priorities	793	Elected	Ranked Faculty
College Councils	980	Elected	Ranked faculty
Faculty-Student Judicial Commission	530	Elected	Ranked faculty
<i>Appointed by FS Chair, Not Limited to Ranked Faculty</i>			
Citi-ship & Service Learning (CASL)	856	Appointed by FS Chair	No use of word “ranked”
Honorary Degrees	913	Appointed by FS Chair	No use of word “ranked”
Rules	815	Appointed by FS Chair	No use of word “ranked”
Academic Relations	755 [Bracketed description is found only in the FS committee document.]	Appointed by FS Chair	[May include faculty, administrators, students, and alumni]; No use of word “ranked”

Appointed or Elected, Membership Restricted but not Based on “Ranked” status

EPPC	1220	Elected	No use of word “ranked”; EPP Faculty only
Graduate Council	1672	Elected	Graduate Faculty; no use of word “ranked”

Not Relevant For Rules to Review

Judicial Review	833	Predetermined	NA; Past Senate FS Chairs
Study Abroad Advisory Committee	Not found in Bylaws; Found only in the Faculty Senate Council and Committees document	Appointed by FS Chair	Can be unranked or ranked
University Hearing Committee	Not found in Bylaws; Found only in the Faculty Senate Council and Committees document	Elected	Elected, Ranked faculty only

The following committees/councils have membership restricted to ranked faculty; these restrictions are found in the Bylaws and are relevant to a discussion by Rules. The results of these discussions by Rules are recorded in the table below.

Faculty Concerns	720	Elected	Ranked faculty
-------------------------	-----	---------	----------------

Discussion by Rules: The members of the Rules committee decided to recommend that Faculty Concerns membership should be open to full-time instructors and clinical faculty in order to include their perspectives in this committee. The recommendation of Rules is to align membership requirements to those of departmental representatives on Faculty Senate.

CGEIP	1567	Elected	Ranked faculty
--------------	------	---------	----------------

Discussion by Rules: The members of the Rules committee decided to recommend that CGEIP membership should be open to full-time instructors and clinical faculty because of the number of

CGEIP courses taught by non-ranked faculty. The recommendation of Rules is to align membership requirements to those of departmental representatives on Faculty Senate.

Budget and Priorities 793 Elected Ranked Faculty

Discussion by Rules: The members of the Rules committee decided to recommend that Budget and Priorities membership should remain the same, i.e., limited only to ranked faculty, given the additional protection of rank in potential disputes arising from reports made by the committee.

College Councils 980 Elected Ranked faculty

Discussion by Rules: The members of the Rules committee decided to recommend that College Council membership should be open to full-time instructors and clinical faculty because there are likely departments desiring representation beyond their limited ranked faculty. The same rationale was given for changing the qualifications for Faculty Senate departmental representatives. The recommendation of Rules is to align membership requirements to those of departmental representatives on Faculty Senate.

**Faculty-Student
Judicial Commission** 530 Elected Ranked faculty

Discussion by Rules: The members of the Rules committee decided to recommend that the Faculty-Student Judicial Commission membership should remain the same, limited only to ranked faculty, given the additional protection of rank in potential disputes arising from reports made by the committee.

Recommendation from Rules:

Membership requirements for service on Faculty Concerns, CGEIP, and College Councils should be expanded to include instructors and clinical faculty. Language describing membership requirements should parallel the language currently found in ART I SEC 3A(2) for departmental representatives to the Faculty Senate: "Eligible department representatives include all ranked faculty, as well as those instructors and clinical faculty who have served no less than two consecutive academic years at Missouri State University by the September session of their term."

PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGES FOR CHARGE FIVE

Original Language (comments in italics)

[NOTE: The language shown below includes changes that have been proposed by Rules in response to charges one and two. If any of these proposed changes are rejected by Faculty Senate then the original language will be reinstated. This will not affect the changes being proposed in this report.]

ART I FACULTY SENATE

SEC 9 Committees of the Faculty Senate

B Standing Committees

(2) Committee on Faculty Concerns

(b) Election of Members to the Committee on Faculty Concerns

- (bb) At the beginning of the spring semester, the ranked faculty in each academic department within each undergraduate college shall elect, by and from the ranked faculty in that academic department, one nominee for each vacancy for service on the Committee on Faculty Concerns. The academic department head will prepare a ballot of all eligible ranked faculty within the academic department and conduct the election. Voting shall be by secret ballot, and each voting Faculty member shall vote for one member for each vacancy within the academic department. The academic department head shall, in writing, notify the academic dean of the college, chair of the college council, and the Secretary of the Faculty of the outcome of the election.

ART II COLLEGE COUNCILS

SEC 5 Election of Members to College Councils

- A On the same date as the election of departmental representatives to the Faculty Senate, the ranked faculty in each academic department within each discipline-based undergraduate college shall elect, by and from the ranked faculty in that academic department, a college council representative. The academic department head will prepare a ballot of all eligible ranked faculty within the academic department and conduct the election. Voting shall be by secret ballot and each voting faculty member shall vote for one member within the academic

department. The academic department head shall, in writing, notify the academic dean of the college and the Secretary of the Faculty of the outcome of the election.

ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS

SEC 6 Election of Members to Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

- A At the beginning of the spring semester, the ranked faculty in each academic department within each undergraduate college shall elect, by and from the ranked faculty in that academic department, one nominee for each vacancy for service on the Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs. The academic department head will prepare a ballot of all eligible ranked faculty within the academic department and conduct the election. Voting shall be by secret ballot, and each voting Faculty member shall vote for one member for each vacancy within the academic department. The academic department head shall, in writing, notify the academic dean of the college, chair of the college council, and the Secretary of the Faculty of the outcome of the election.

Proposed Language
(additions bold, omissions struck through, comments italicized)

ART I FACULTY SENATE

SEC 9 Committees of the Faculty Senate

B Standing Committees

(2) Committee on Faculty Concerns

(b) Election of Members to the Committee on Faculty Concerns

- (bb) At the beginning of the spring semester, the ~~ranked~~ **eligible** faculty in each academic department within each undergraduate college shall elect, by and from the ~~ranked~~ **eligible** faculty in that academic department, one nominee for each vacancy for service on the Committee on Faculty Concerns. **Eligible faculty are ranked faculty, as well as those instructors and clinical faculty who have served no less than two consecutive academic years at Missouri State University by the September session of their term.** The academic department head will prepare a ballot of all eligible ~~ranked~~ faculty within the academic department and conduct the election. Voting shall be by secret ballot, and each voting Faculty member shall vote for one member for each vacancy within the academic department. The academic department head shall, in writing, notify the academic dean of the college, chair of the college council, and the Secretary of the Faculty of the outcome of the election.

ART II COLLEGE COUNCILS

SEC 5 Election of Members to College Councils

- A On the same date as the election of departmental representatives to the Faculty Senate, the ~~ranked~~ **eligible** faculty in each academic department within each discipline-based undergraduate college shall elect, by and from the ~~ranked~~ **eligible** faculty in that academic department, a college council representative. **Eligible faculty are ranked faculty, as well as those instructors and clinical faculty who have served no less than two consecutive academic years at Missouri State University by the September session of their term.** The academic department head will prepare a ballot of all eligible ~~ranked~~ faculty within the academic department and conduct the election. Voting shall be by secret ballot and each voting faculty member shall vote for one member within the academic department. The

academic department head shall, in writing, notify the academic dean of the college and the Secretary of the Faculty of the outcome of the election.

ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS

SEC 6 Election of Members to Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

- A At the beginning of the spring semester, the ~~ranked~~ **eligible** faculty in each academic department within each undergraduate college shall elect, by and from the ~~ranked~~ **eligible** faculty in that academic department, one nominee for each vacancy for service on the Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs. **Eligible faculty are ranked faculty, as well as those instructors and clinical faculty who have served no less than two consecutive academic years at Missouri State University by the September session of their term.** The academic department head will prepare a ballot of all eligible ~~ranked~~ faculty within the academic department and conduct the election. Voting shall be by secret ballot, and each voting Faculty member shall vote for one member for each vacancy within the academic department. The academic department head shall, in writing, notify the academic dean of the college, chair of the college council, and the Secretary of the Faculty of the outcome of the election.

Final Language

ART I FACULTY SENATE

SEC 9 Committees of the Faculty Senate

B Standing Committees

(2) Committee on Faculty Concerns

(b) Election of Members to the Committee on Faculty Concerns

- (bb) At the beginning of the spring semester, the eligible faculty in each academic department within each undergraduate college shall elect, by and from the eligible faculty in that academic department, one nominee for each vacancy for service on the Committee on Faculty Concerns. Eligible faculty are ranked faculty, as well as those instructors and clinical faculty who have served no less than two consecutive academic years at Missouri State University by the September session of their term. The academic department head will prepare a ballot of all eligible faculty within the academic department and conduct the election. Voting shall be by secret ballot, and each voting Faculty member shall vote for one member for each vacancy within the academic department. The academic department head shall, in writing, notify the academic dean of the college, chair of the college council, and the Secretary of the Faculty of the outcome of the election.

ART II COLLEGE COUNCILS

SEC 5 Election of Members to College Councils

- A On the same date as the election of departmental representatives to the Faculty Senate, the eligible faculty in each academic department within each discipline-based undergraduate college shall elect, by and from the eligible faculty in that academic department, a college council representative. Eligible faculty are ranked faculty, as well as those instructors and clinical faculty who have served no less than two consecutive academic years at Missouri State University by the September session of their term. The academic department head will prepare a ballot of all eligible faculty within the academic department and conduct the election. Voting shall be by secret ballot and each voting faculty member shall vote for one member within the academic department. The academic department head shall, in writing,

notify the academic dean of the college and the Secretary of the Faculty of the outcome of the election.

ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS

SEC 6 Election of Members to Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

A At the beginning of the spring semester, the eligible faculty in each academic department within each undergraduate college shall elect, by and from the eligible faculty in that academic department, one nominee for each vacancy for service on the Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs. Eligible faculty are ranked faculty, as well as those instructors and clinical faculty who have served no less than two consecutive academic years at Missouri State University by the September session of their term. The academic department head will prepare a ballot of all eligible faculty within the academic department and conduct the election. Voting shall be by secret ballot, and each voting Faculty member shall vote for one member for each vacancy within the academic department. The academic department head shall, in writing, notify the academic dean of the college, chair of the college council, and the Secretary of the Faculty of the outcome of the election

Faculty Senate Committee on Rules
Response to Charge Thirteen
March 2, 2016

FACULTY SENATE CHARGE THIRTEEN

Charge: Incorporate the establishment of a standing senate committee on Benefits into the Bylaws as per the report from the Ad-Hoc Benefits Committee that was presented to Faculty Senate on 3 December 2015.

Rationale: The Senate approved the recommendation to create a standing Senate Committee on Benefits.

RULES PROCESS FOR CHARGE THIRTEEN

Findings and conclusions:

1. The language proposed by the ad hoc committee (see the attached committee report) would charge the Committee on Faculty Benefits with three distinct responsibilities:
 - (a) Maintain communications with the Office of Human Resources concerning current faculty benefits [paragraph (a)(aa) in the ad hoc committee report].
 - (b) Report annually to the Faculty Senate on the status of faculty benefits [paragraph (a)(dd) in the ad hoc committee report].
 - (c) Provide information and advice to all university faculty about their benefit options [paragraphs (a)(bb) and (a)(cc) in the ad hoc committee report].
2. The third one of these proposed responsibilities raises serious concerns:
 - (a) Providing information on benefits and election options is explicitly the responsibility of the Office of Human Resources. Employees in Human Resources have professional expertise in benefits, and it is unreasonable to expect that faculty members who serve on the Committee for Faculty Benefits would have comparable expertise.
 - (b) HR already provides detailed reports to faculty on their benefits options, via both email and printed documents mailed to home addresses, and provides multiple email reminders of the open enrollment period. It is not clear what value would be added by having a Senate committee duplicate this effort.
 - (c) Providing advice or recommendations about benefits options or elections would expose members of the Committee on Faculty Benefits to potential legal liabilities.
 - (d) Julie Dubinsky, Associate Director of Human Resources in charge of benefits, expressed the same concerns when shown this language. She is interested in increased dialog with the Faculty Senate with the goal of improving communication between HR and the university faculty. This seems like a more fruitful approach to improving communications about benefits.
 - (e) Faculty Senate committees report to the Senate. It would be unusual for a Senate committee to report directly to the University faculty.

3. The Committee on Faculty Benefits would be interacting closely with Human Resources. It therefore would make sense for Human Resources to be represented on the committee by an *ex officio*, non-voting member. Julie Dubinsky in HR agrees that this would aid in communications and will cooperate in identifying an appropriate *ex officio* member.
4. The process for selecting committee members that was proposed by the ad hoc Committee on Benefits (see attached report) seems impractical since it would require Faculty Senators to elect Committee members annually from a ballot containing the names of at least 45 candidates and their statements of interest and expertise. A process similar to that used by other standing committees and councils of the Senate, in which undergraduate colleges select representatives, seems more workable. We feel that obtaining broad representation is more important than ferreting out those individuals from across campus who possess the greatest expertise in benefits issues, especially in light of our recommendation that this committee should not be giving advice to individual faculty members.

Rules Recommendations:

1. Incorporate new language into the Bylaws, establishing the Committee on Faculty Benefits, as ART I, SEC 9B(9). No alterations to current language in Article I are required.
2. Update the table at <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm> to include the Committee on Faculty Benefits and to identify all entities in the same way that they are identified for CGEIP (and for most other standing committees).

Summary of Proposed Changes to the language generated by the ad hoc committee:

1. Strike items (bb) and (cc) under “Purpose”, thus removing the responsibility for communicating directly with the university faculty about benefits options.
2. Members consist of one faculty representative from each undergraduate college and one *ex officio* member from the Office of Human Resources. The protocol for selecting members is modeled after other standing committees and councils of the Faculty Senate.
3. All faculty members who are qualified to serve as Faculty Senators are also qualified to serve on the Committee on Faculty Benefits. This is consistent with changes that have been proposed for Faculty Concerns, CGEIP, and college councils in response to charge five.
4. The annual Committee report is due no later than the April session of the Senate.

PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGES FOR CHARGE THIRTEEN

**Proposed Additions
(additions bold, comments italicized)**

ART I FACULTY SENATE

SEC 9 Committees of the Faculty Senate

B Standing Committees [*Text for committees (1) – (8) omitted*]

(9) Committee on Faculty Benefits

(a) Purpose

- (aa) Shall maintain communication with personnel in the Office of Human Resources concerning current faculty benefits.**
- (bb) Shall prepare an annual report on the status of faculty benefits, to be submitted to the Faculty Senate during the Spring semester and presented no later than the April Session, that includes:**
 - (i) A comparative review of benefits provided or available to faculty at MSU and benefits offered to faculty at other state and peer institutions.**
 - (ii) A review of data from the Faculty Concerns survey addressing satisfaction with faculty benefits.**
 - (iii) A summary of feedback solicited from the faculty about current and desired benefits.**
 - (iv) A list of Committee recommendations, if any.**

(b) Membership

- (aa) The Committee on Faculty Benefits shall include one representative from each undergraduate college and one representative from each entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm>. Eligible college representatives include ranked faculty, as well as those instructors and clinical faculty who have served no less than two consecutive academic years at Missouri State University prior to the first Committee meeting during their term. The Associate Director of Human Resources in charge of Benefits, or a designee of the Associate Director, shall be an *ex officio* member without vote.**
- (bb) College representatives shall serve for a term of three (3) years and may be reelected indefinitely. Terms shall be staggered so that one-third of the membership is replaced each year.**

- (cc) **If a representative desires to serve an additional term on the Committee, the Chair of the College Council in the representative's college shall be so notified at the beginning of the spring semester in the final year of the representative's term. The College Council will determine, by majority vote, whether to appoint the representative for an additional term or to hold a full election for the vacant position as described in paragraph (dd) below.**
- (dd) **When a vacancy occurs in the Committee membership, the college whose representation has been lost shall elect a new representative as follows. At the beginning of the spring semester the eligible faculty in each academic department within the college shall elect one nominee for service on the Committee. Each nominee shall express in writing their degree of interest in serving on the Committee on Faculty Benefits, and the academic Department Head/Director shall forward the nominee's name and statement of interest to the Chair of their College Council. At the earliest possible session of the College Council in the spring semester, council members shall elect a new college representative to the Committee on Faculty Benefits from among the nominees submitted by the college departments. Voting shall be by secret ballot, and each voting council member shall vote for one college faculty member. The college faculty member receiving the most votes shall become the new representative to the Committee on Faculty Benefits. The remaining roster of departmental nominees shall serve as a replacement pool in case a vacancy occurs prior to the end of the representative's term. The College Council Chair shall, in writing, notify the newly elected representative and the Secretary of the Faculty of the outcome of the election.**
- (ee) **The Committee on Faculty Benefits shall elect a chair annually from among its members. The chair must either have served on the Committee the previous year or have past experience serving on the committee, unless no current member meets these criteria.**
- (ff) **When the Committee on Faculty Benefits is formed for the first time, the members shall first elect a chair who shall have a term length of three years. The initial terms of service for the remaining college representatives shall be determined by drawing lots so that initial terms of one (1), two (2), and three (3) years are each assigned to one-third of the representatives.**

Report

From Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Benefits

Charge 2 from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee:

This committee is charged with looking into the feasibility of establishing a standing senate committee on Employee/Faculty Benefits. The objective would be to (over time) build up a group of faculty on this campus who may be considered a valuable resource and experts on this topic such that senators and other faculty members would have a faculty resource, other than the Office of Human Resources in case they had questions or concerns related to benefits. This committee could be asked to present a current status of faculty benefits report to the senate on a regular basis similar to B&P and FCC.

Findings and Rationale

- The Faculty Handbook, 6.1.1, subscribes to faculty shared governance in the selection of faculty fringe benefits: "The faculty should participate in the selection of fringe benefit programs and in the periodic review of those programs."
- In addition, the FH, 6.1.1, invests faculty shared governance on fringe benefits in two committees: "The Fringe Benefits Committee (President's Committee) and Health Care Plans Review Committee (Vice President for Administrative and Information Services) have compositions that allow faculty input on benefits issues."
- However, The Fringe Benefits Committee has been inactive since at least 2009 and has currently been disbanded. According to the entry for the Fringe Benefits Committee in the University Committees Handbook, the "Committee will be formed as needed." The Health Care Plans Review Committee, once a subcommittee of the Fringe Benefits Committee, continues to be active. That committee has only 3 faculty members on the committee who are appointed, and has as its charge (University Committees Handbook), "To examine and make recommendations concerning the University's employee group health care plans."
- In reviewing standing committee structure at other institutions, we find that it is common to have a Faculty Senate committee that deals with faculty benefits.

Thus this Committee concludes that the current university level committee structure inadequately provides for faculty shared governance/input on issues of faculty benefits and recommends that a permanent standing committee of the Faculty Senate on Faculty Benefits be created.

(Please see next page)

Proposed Committee on Faculty Benefits

In response to Charge 2: We propose the formation of a Senate standing committee on faculty benefits with the following duties

Committee on Faculty Benefits

(a) Purpose

(aa) Shall maintain communication with personnel in the Office of Human Resources concerning current faculty benefits

(bb) Shall annually, no later than October of each year, communicate current and proposed benefits to faculty in order to enable informed participation during the open enrollment period.

(cc) Shall assist faculty members in understanding and/or obtaining benefits that are provided for or offered to faculty.

(dd) Shall annually submit a committee report on the status of faculty benefits to the Faculty Senate during the Spring semester that includes:

- a review of faculty benefits offered at other state and peer institutions
- an annual update of comparative data on the faculty benefits provided or available to faculty at MSU to that provided to faculty of state and peer institutions
- a review of data from Faculty Concerns Committee surveys concerning faculty satisfaction with fringe benefits
- a review of feedback solicited from the faculty in regard to current and desired benefits
- a listing of specific committee recommendations

(b) Membership

The Committee on Faculty Benefits of the Faculty Senate shall consist of six members. The members will be elected by the Faculty Senate from a list of tenured faculty compiled by the Secretary of the Faculty. Each Department/School shall send the name of a tenured faculty member who has expertise or interest in matters inherent to faculty benefits to the Secretary of the Faculty (a statement of expertise/interest should be included with the name of the nominee). Note: Greenwood Laboratory School may submit the name of a tenured faculty member for consideration. A ballot of all submitted names and statements of expertise/interests shall be prepared. To initially constitute the committee, Senators shall vote for six of the nominees. Terms of service shall be three years with the possibility of unlimited repeated terms. Following the constitution of the committee, each elected member shall draw for either a one, two, or three year term. Subsequently, each year, two members of the six members from those initially elected by the Senate shall either rotate off of the committee, per initial term expiration, or may be considered for re-election to a three year term. Annual elections shall be done in the same manner as the initial election, only selecting two committee members (or more if vacancies arise before term completion). The Committee shall elect the chair from among its elected members. The chair must have either served on the Committee the previous year or have past experience serving on the committee.

MARCH 2016 FACULTY SENATE CAW LINKS

New Interdisciplinary Program: **Environmental Education Certificate**

<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/createIDProgramProposal/302>

CGEIP Course Change: **SOC152 - Social Problems in the Community**

<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/edit/997>

CGEIP Program: **Change Latin American Studies**

<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/changeProgramProposal/341>

Program Deletion: **Religious Studies for the Professions-Graduate Certificate**

<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/deleteProgramProposal/360>

Program Deletion: **Planning/Tourism & Planning-BS**

<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/deleteProgramProposal/771>

New Program: **Forestry Minor**

<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/createProgramProposal/1438>

Academic Administrators Assessment

Faculty Concerns Committee Report 2015-16

Faculty Concerns Committee Members: Ching-Wen Chang, Kenneth Gillam, Shouchuan Hu, Joseph Hulgus, Joshua Lambert (Chair), Hui Liu, Alana Mantie-Kozlowski, Reed Olsen, Stevan Olson, Les Reid, Johnny Washington, Ashlea Cardin, Sarah Williams (Secretary)

Report compiled and written by: Joshua Lambert (Chair), Ashlea Cardin, Alana Mantie-Kozlowski, Reed Olsen

Introduction

The purpose of the Departmental Climate Conditions Survey is to inform the respective departments and the general University community of the current working climate at Missouri State University as viewed by faculty. This report describes the overall University climate as revealed through a mixed-methods survey.

Methods

This survey relied on a questionnaire that included 54 closed- and open-ended questions. Faculty were asked to respond to each question using a scale that ranged between 1 and 5, where 1 indicated “strongly disagree”; 2 was “disagree”; 3 was “neutral”; 4 was “agree”; and 5 was “strongly agree.” The survey was administered between 11/04/15 and 11/25/15. One hundred seventy eight (178) faculty members responded. A total of 72 males and 69 females responded; 27 preferred not to answer the question, and one self-identified as transgender. Of the respondents, 32 were tenure track, 107 were tenured, and 25 were non-tenure track. A total of 18 respondents were instructors, 35 were assistant professors, 36 were associate professors, and 67 were full professors.

Data Summaries

President

Faculty tended to see the president as a good ambassador for the university and believe he positively raises awareness about things that impact the university. Faculty tended to think the president generally does a good job. President Smart’s ratings this year are generally more positive than ratings from other surveys over the last nine years.

Faculty rated the president the lowest for the questions related to budget and research support. A question related to shared governance was the third lowest rating, and comments provided mentioned that there was a lack of shared governance. Respondents suggested the structure for shared governance is often in place, but feel it is a façade that administrators ignore when they can. Specific examples

included student-faculty disputes, lack of adherence to policies and the changing of policies without faculty input, and hiring of faculty.

Another concern that respondents had was related to funding. Faculty saw funding prioritized for sports and non-research based facilities, with little allocated toward research space, classrooms, parking, and faculty salaries. As one respondent wrote, "I feel like a second rate citizen in a purported community of scholars as virtually nothing has been done to support any of my teaching programs. Spending 16 million dollars on athletic field renovations and then bragging about a 1.8 % faculty raise are at diametric odds." The president is seen as a good ambassador to the state government, the local community, and to students, but not necessarily to faculty or for research.

Provost

Faculty ratings for the provost clustered between a mean of 3.83 and 3.49. The highest rated items dealt with supporting the long-term interests of MSU and doing "a good job." The lowest rated items involved budgeting, the strength of graduating students, improving academic programs, and shared governance.

Comments suggested that the provost has brought stability and trust to the provost office but that he has too low of a profile and too little control over colleges. As one commenter said, "The Provost office is accessible to faculty and interactions with the Provost and Associate Provosts are open without fear of negative reactions or retaliation in response to disagreements about policy or procedure. A stronger presence of the Provost office in oversight of deans might help to ensure this same level of integrity is maintained at the college level."

The quantitative ratings also support one of the qualitative themes from the comments: declining quality of programs and decreased rigor in classes. Faculty believe the administration, and the provost specifically, push for quantity over quality. This manifests itself in larger classes and more per-course instruction.

College and Department

Of 178 respondents, 110 specified which department they were from. Since the committee determined a respondent's college based off of department, only 110 people could be placed in their appropriate college. There was not enough information to provide definitive conclusions about departments nor to separate the data into distinct tables. From the responses, it is obvious that respondents were quite unhappy in some colleges and departments while others had more satisfied or less vocal faculty.

Ratings for the deans were between a mean of 3.17 and 3.94. That said, the overall data was not particularly useful since the mean was for all colleges combined. The qualitative data showed that there were personnel challenges in some colleges and departments. Descriptors such as retaliatory, harsh, superficial, unpredictable, privacy-violating, bullying, and publicly humiliating were used to describe actions of deans and department heads. Thematic analysis revealed the perception of being "managed" versus "lead." Triangulating results showed that such problems clustered in certain colleges/departments while others did not describe such problems.

Other Observations

There are some demographic-related patterns worth pointing out as well. Tenured faculty consistently rated the president, provost, deans, and department heads worse than tenure track and non-tenured faculty. For president and provost, assistant professors rated higher than associate professors, who rated higher than full professors. For deans and department heads, this distinction no longer held true. Regarding responses by gender, females generally rated the president and provost higher than males. For deans and department heads, they no longer rated them consistently higher.

Comparing this year's data (Table 6) with other years', the president generally rated better than he has in the past and better than past presidents. The provost, on the other hand, is was rated lower than his past years but better than years 2009 and 2007. Looking at longitudinal data, past surveys have not consistently collected information on colleges and departments. Compared to the one other year of departmental data (2011), scores this year rated lower, and sometimes significantly lower.

Please see Faculty Concerns Committee Attachment 4 in a separate Excel document.

The data in the Excel file is included under 6 separate tabs. Please be sure to click on each tab to view all included information.

FACULTY HANDBOOK REVISION COMMITTEE

Update regarding the FHRC proposal to Faculty Senate January 2016 regarding per course faculty.

In December 2014, a faculty member had submitted to the FHRC a concern regarding per course faculty. Specifically, a desire for the committee to address the possibility of increasing the workload policy from its current 12 credit hours during any 12-month period to 15 credits. This item became a carry-over agenda item for 2016. The committee submitted a proposal to this effect to Faculty Senate in January with the intent of gathering feedback. The feedback was gathered and discussed during the February FHRC meeting on February 9th 2016. In addition, the committee also sought feedback from other faculty. The outcome of these discussions is that the FHRC recommends no action of this issue right now. The Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs and the current Faculty Senate Chair Elect have agreed to collaborate with the incoming Faculty Senate Executive Committee to investigate current per course faculty workload and any potential impact that an increase in hours might have on full-time faculty, course availability, productivity, and quality of instruction. Once they have concluded their work, they will bring the charge back to FHRC for further consideration and perfection.

FHRC Two Proposals to Faculty Senate February 2016

1. Faculty Handbook 7.2.1. Sabbatical Leave For Faculty

The FHRC submitted to Faculty Senate a proposal in January regarding sabbatical leave with the intent of gathering feedback. Based on the feedback and further discussions during the committee's February 9th 2016 meeting, the FHRC is submitting the following recommendation to the Faculty Handbook.

Current FH language;

Only ranked faculty members (but not including ranked faculty members who are serving as Department Heads, School Directors, Associate Deans, Deans, or Associate Provosts) are eligible for sabbatical leave. Eligibility is established by completing 12 semesters of service to Missouri State University (summer teaching excepted). A faculty member granted a sabbatical leave will be entitled to University support amounting to full pay for a half year's leave and no less than onehalf pay for a full year's leave. Faculty will participate in the retirement program and will have their benefits paid by the University. The Provost may approve up to three-fourths pay for a full year's leave. Faculty are encouraged to apply for external grants to supplement their funding. Their sabbatical pay will not be decreased if they secure such funding, except, however, that faculty cannot receive more than one hundred per cent of their twelve-month equivalent salary while on sabbatical. Funds provided for travel, housing, and other living expenses are not considered to be "Salary".

Proposed FH Language:

Only ranked faculty members (but not including ranked faculty members who are serving as Department Heads, School Directors, Associate Deans, Deans, or Associate Provosts) are eligible for sabbatical leave. Eligibility is established by completing 12 semesters of service to Missouri State University (summer teaching excepted). A faculty member granted a sabbatical leave will

be entitled to University support amounting to full pay for a half year's leave and no less than one-half pay for a full year's leave. A faculty member on sabbatical leave is still considered a full-time employee. Faculty will participate in the retirement program and will have their benefits paid by the University. The Provost may approve up to three-fourths pay for a full year's leave. Faculty are encouraged to apply for external grants to supplement their funding. Their sabbatical pay will not be decreased if they secure such funding, except, however, that faculty cannot receive more than one hundred per cent of their twelve-month equivalent salary while on sabbatical. Funds provided for travel, housing, and other living expenses are not considered to be "Salary". Since faculty on sabbatical leave are considered full-time employees, faculty are required to adhere to section ten of the Faculty Handbook as it pertains to outside activities and conflict of interest while on sabbatical leave.

Rationale:

The purpose of a sabbatical is to free a faculty member up to do research that might otherwise be difficult to do in a regular workload situation.

2. Faculty Handbook 8.4. Consensual Sexual or Romantic Relationships Policy

A recently convened University Hearing Panel (UHP) came up with the working definition of "supervision" as it relates to a faculty member and student. Because this working definition has possible implications for section 8.4 of the faculty handbook, the FHRC was asked to look into this. The definition of supervision that the UHP set forth was as follows "Advising, mentoring, or directing student development even if that student is not formally enrolled in one of your courses". The FHRC discussed this and would like to propose the Faculty Handbook be revised accordingly.

Current Language (2nd paragraph of 8.4 reads)

A consensual sexual or romantic relationship between a faculty member and a student is generally wrong when the faculty member has professional responsibility, such as grading or advising, for the student. Such a situation increases the chance for abuse of power. The University will view it as unethical if faculty members engage in consensual sexual or romantic relationships with students enrolled in their classes or subject to their supervision. The behavior is, in most cases, unethical even when the relationship is consensual (i.e., both parties have consented), because the voluntary consent of the student is in doubt, given the power imbalance in the student-faculty relationship. Even if consent were to be shown, a clear conflict of interest would still exist which might create the appearance of discrimination or favoritism in grading or access to educational opportunities.

Proposed Language

*A consensual sexual or romantic relationship between a faculty member and a student is generally wrong when the faculty member has professional responsibility, such as grading, **advising, mentoring, or directing student development, even if that student is not formally enrolled in one of the faculty member's courses.** Such a situation increases the chance for abuse of power. The University will view it as unethical if faculty members engage in consensual sexual or romantic relationships with students enrolled in their classes or subject to their supervision. The behavior is, in most cases, unethical even when the relationship is consensual (i.e., both parties have consented), because the voluntary consent of the student is in doubt, given the power imbalance in the student-faculty relationship. Even if consent*

were to be shown, a clear conflict of interest would still exist which might create the appearance of discrimination or favoritism in grading or access to educational opportunities.

Senate Resolution
Condense Spring Calendar

WHEREAS, the Spring semester at Missouri State University is 1-week longer than the Fall semester*;

WHEREAS, the Spring semester has 10-days off while the Fall semester has 7-days off*;

WHEREAS, days off extend the calendar and interfere with scheduling of classes and laboratories;

WHEREAS, an analysis of Universities within the state of Missouri and an analysis of Benchmark Institutions indicate that the majority of institutions do not take as many holidays and breaks as MSU** (i.e., average 6.8-days off for Missouri Institutions and 6.2-days off for Benchmark institutions);

WHEREAS, reducing the Spring semester to 16-weeks from 17-weeks has the potential to reduce energy consumption, saving the University resources and helping achieve the goal of making MSU more sustainable***;

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate at Missouri State University recommends that the Spring semester be condensed from 17- to 16-weeks;

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate requests that the administration of Missouri State University charge the Calendar Committee with considering condensing the Spring semester calendar to make both Fall and Spring semesters equivalent.

*Please see Attachment 6.1.

**Please see Attachment 6.2.

***Please see Attachment 6.3.

Attachment 6.1

The following analysis indicates that eliminating or condensing breaks and holidays will allow the Spring semester to be shortened from 17-weeks to 16-weeks, and bring it more in line with Fall semester.

Fall Semester

- 16-weeks long; fifteen regular weeks plus finals week. The total does not include Thanksgiving week.
- Day's off during Fall semester include:
 - Labor Day (1 day)
 - Thanksgiving week (5 days)
 - Study Day (1 day)
- Seven days off leaves 73 active classroom/laboratory days for instruction (using 16-weeks x 5 days per week).

Spring Semester

- 17-weeks long; sixteen regular weeks plus finals week. This total does not include Spring break week.
- Day's off during Spring semester include:
 - Martin Luther King, Jr., Day (1 day)
 - President's Day (1 day)
 - Spring Break week (5 days)
 - Spring Holiday (2 days)
 - Study Day (1 Day)
- Ten days off leaves 75 active classroom/laboratory days for instruction (17-weeks x 5 days per week).

Shortening the spring semester by one week should make both semesters (roughly) equivalent.

Attachment 6.2

Institutions in Missouri

Listed below are calendar data for MSU and 6-public universities within Missouri. All six universities have a 1-week Spring break but none observe President's Day. Also, only one lists an equivalent to MSU's Spring Holiday and only two have an equivalent to MSU's Study Day.

While MSU has 10-days off during the Spring semester, the other universities have between 6- and 8-, with an average of 6.8-days off for the other state institutions.

Clearly, MSU takes an inordinate number of holidays and breaks during the Spring semester. Eliminating and/or combining some of these breaks should result in a more efficient use of the Spring Semester.

<i>MSU</i>	<i>MLK Holiday (1 Day)</i> <i>President's Day (1 Day)</i> <i>Spring Break (5 Days)</i> <i>Spring Holiday (2 Days)</i> <i>Study Day (1 Day)</i>
University of Missouri Columbia	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Break (5 Days) Reading Day (1 Day)
Truman State University	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Mid Term Break (5 Days) Spring Break (1 Day) Reading Day (1 Day)

University of Central Missouri	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Break (5 Days)
Missouri Southern State University	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Break (5 Days)
Northwest Missouri State University	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Break (5 Days)
Southeast Missouri State University	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Recess (5 Days) Designated Holiday (1 Day)

Attachment 6.2 Continued

Benchmark Institutions

Listed below are calendar data for MSU and the 11 Benchmark Institutions. Ten of the institutions have a 1-week Spring break. Louisiana Tech is something of an outlier among the institutions since it is on the quarter, not semester, system making their calendar slightly different.

Only one of the institutions observes President's Day, two have an equivalent to MSU's study day, and one lists an equivalent to MSU's Spring Holiday.

While MSU has 10-days off during the Spring semester, the Benchmark Institutions have between 5- and 8-, with an average of 6.2-days off.

Again, MSU takes an inordinate number of holidays and breaks during the Spring semester. Eliminating and/or combining some of these breaks should result in a more efficient use of the Spring Semester.

<i>MSU</i>	<i>MLK Holiday (1 Day)</i> <i>President's Day (1 Day)</i> <i>Spring Break (5 Days)</i> <i>Spring Holiday (2 Days)</i> <i>Study Day (1 Day)</i>
Ball State University	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Break (5 Days)
Grand Valley State University	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Break (5 Days)
Illinois State University	Spring Break (5 Days)
James Madison University	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Break (5 Days)

Louisiana Tech University (quarter, not semester, system)	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Mardi Gras (3 Days) Easter (3 Days)
Towson University	Spring Break (5 Days)
University of Montana – Missoula	President’s Day (1 Day) Spring Break (5 Days)
University of North Carolina – Charlotte	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Recess (5 Days) Spring Weekend (1 Day) Reading Day (1 Day)
University of Northern Iowa	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Break (5 Days)
University of Texas – Arlington	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Vacation (5 Days)
Wichita State University	MLK Holiday (1 Day) Spring Break (5 Days) Study Day (1 Day)

Attachment 6.3

Each time that MSU is in break (academic classes) it saves approx. \$16,740 per week (average of the last two years). This is a reduction of 16% per week in academic buildings. Data provided by Ms. Pilar Karlen, Energy Manager, Missouri State University.

MSU will reduce the emission of 363,534 lbs of Carbon Dioxide equivalent, similar to:

