

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

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

**Charge #3 *Part B***

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

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

However, because the Senate Action has not been repealed, even though the CAW treats both kinds of proposals similarly, the distinction technically remains.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

**Recommendation by Committee**

The Committee recommends the following changes to the *Bylaws*.

## Current Language

### Constitution

#### ART X AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION

There are two classes of constitutional amendments: **substantive** and **non-substantive**. A **non-substantive** amendment includes only editorial and/or terminological changes that do not affect the intent of this Constitution. The rules governing **non-substantive** amendments to this Constitution are the same as those governing amendments to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. **Non-substantive** amendments are therefore voted upon only by the Faculty Senate. If there is any question as to whether a proposed amendment is **substantive**, it must be treated as **substantive**.

A **substantive** amendment to this Constitution may be proposed by the Faculty Senate or upon petition to the Faculty Senate by fifty (50) ranked faculty. A report, which must include the exact wording of the amendment and a rationale, shall be placed on the agenda of the next Faculty Senate session, unless that would place it on the May agenda, in which case it shall be placed on the September agenda. The report is for information and debate only: the constitutional amendment may not itself be amended in any way on the floor of the Senate, nor may it be withdrawn, nor is it voted upon by the Senate. The report shall be distributed electronically to the Faculty on the same day the report is presented to the Senate. **Substantive** amendments are voted upon electronically by the entire ranked faculty. The polls shall open on the first business day not less than thirty (30) days following the report, and shall remain open for a total of five (5) business days. An affirmative vote equal to a majority of the votes cast by the ranked faculty shall be necessary to make a proposed **substantive** amendment part of this Constitution.

(x10 times (10) / pg. 3 (8))

## **Bylaws**

### (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 inform the Faculty Senate of any substantive changes made to faculty benefits. Such a report should be made within two regularly scheduled Senate meetings of the changes being made. The report should address both the reasons for, and the implications of, the change. If the Committee deems an alternative solution would have better served the faculty, the report should outline their reasoning and recommendations.
- (cc) Shall prepare a biennial 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 of odd years, 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.

(x1 time (11) / pg. 22 (27))

## **ART III EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER COUNCIL**

### **SEC 3 Responsibilities of the Educator Preparation Provider Council**

- A Develops policy and makes recommendations concerning educator preparation programs.
- B Conducts on-going reviews of all educator preparation programs and participates in the preparation of accreditation reports.
- C Monitors changing regulations and accreditation standards and makes recommendations for program revisions to accommodate new requirements.
- D The EPPC reviews proposals for **substantive** changes to educator preparation programs and courses as described in Article VI of the Bylaws. A reviewed proposal is either rejected or recommended to the Senate for approval.
- E Promotes collaboration among and ensures professional development opportunities for members of the EPP and between EPP and the public schools to enhance the quality of educator preparation.
- F Ensures curricular coherence in educator preparation.
- G Develops quality control procedures for educator preparation programs.
- H Reviews student appeals concerning exceptions or waivers to any Teacher Education Program policy or requirement and makes recommendations.
- I Reviews and makes recommendations to the Head of the EPP to ensure that unit policies and practices are consistent with national, regional, state, and university standards and requirements.

(x1 time (12) / pg. 31 (36))

## ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

### SEC 2 Definitions and Structures in Curricular Process

- A For the purpose of this document, curricular proposals include proposals for:
- (1) New degree or certificate programs
  - (2) New options within an existing degree or certificate program
  - (3) New courses
  - (4) Changes in any of the above
  - (5) Changes to degree or certificate policies and requirements
  - (6) Changes to General Education program requirements
- B Curricular matters shall be acted upon by the following bodies including such internal structures of each named body as may be established for dealing with their specific curricular matters:
- (1) Academic departments or special academic programs
  - (2) College councils
  - (3) Academic deans
  - (4) Graduate council
  - (5) Educator Preparation Provider Council
  - (6) Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs
  - (7) Secretary of the Faculty
  - (8) Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
  - (9) Faculty Senate
  - (10) University administration
- C Proposals for **non-substantive** curricular changes (defined in Senate Action 11-93/94 adopted in December 1993) follow the same routing as **substantive** curricular proposals. For **non-substantive** changes the path is purely informational and requires no approval by the various bodies. However, the chair of any council that reviews the proposal, the Secretary of the Faculty, or the Senate Chair may challenge the designation of a proposed change as **non-substantive**, in which case the proposal must be re-submitted by the originator as a **substantive change**. **Non-substantive** changes are challengeable and follow the same challenge and appeal processes as **substantive changes**.

(x7 times (19) / pg. 45 (50))

## SEC 13 Origination of Curricular Proposals

The primary responsibility for developing and revising curriculum resides with the faculty, and the initial formal stages of any such process should be accomplished at the lowest levels of organization within the faculty. Therefore, the curricular development and review process shall be reaffirmed and amplified as follows:

Any new academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate must originate with the formal sponsorship of one or more academic departments. Any new interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate which is to be administered from outside the structure of a single academic department must originate with the formal sponsorship of two or more academic departments/schools, including every academic department whose courses will constitute either nine or more credit hours or 30% or more of the total credit hours listed as requirements and/or options. All such required sponsorship at the academic department level must be obtained before the proposed new academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate can be formally considered by any higher level of the faculty governance structure (College Council, Graduate Council, CGEIP, EPPC, Faculty Senate). (As a courtesy, each academic department that will have one or more courses included in a proposed new degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate should be consulted to determine that they intend to continue offering the course(s) in question and that they will be able to accommodate the anticipated increase in demand. However, in the case of an interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary program, formal sponsorship is not required unless the number of courses reaches the nine-hour or 30% threshold, and in the case of a non-interdisciplinary program (i.e., a program to be administered from within the structure of a single academic department), formal sponsorship by outside academic departments is not required regardless of the number of their courses included.)

Any **substantive** change to an existing academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate must originate with the formal sponsorship of the academic unit responsible for overseeing that program, major, minor, option, or certificate. In the case of a degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate offered through an individual academic department, the relevant academic unit would be that department. In the case of each “Special Academic Program,” any interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate offered outside the structure of a single academic department, the relevant academic unit would be the faculty committee charged with overseeing the program, major, minor, option, or certificate in question; references to “academic department” within these Bylaws related to the curricular process shall be understood to apply to the faculty committee. Such formal sponsorship by the relevant academic unit must be obtained before the proposed **substantive** change can be formally considered by any higher level of the faculty governance structure (College Council, Graduate Council, CGEIP, EPPC, Faculty Senate).

Under no circumstance should a proposal for a new academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate, or a proposal for a **substantive** change to an existing academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate formally originate from one of the academic college councils, the Graduate Council, CGEIP, the EPPC, or any other higher-level body within the

faculty governance structure. Likewise, under no circumstances should a proposal for a new academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate, or a proposal for a substantive change to an existing academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate formally originate from the administration of one of the academic colleges, the Graduate College, or any other unit of the administration. Ideas for new curriculum or substantive changes to existing curriculum are always welcome, regardless of where they originate, but such ideas should be communicated to the relevant groups of faculty members as efficiently as possible so that the process of developing or revising the curriculum in question can formally begin at the lowest level of the faculty governance structure.

(x5 (24) times / pg. 51 (56))

### **1. Length and Number of Speeches in Debate**

In the absence of an explicit limit, speeches in debate may be at most three minutes long, and there is no limit on the number of speeches. Prior to taking up an item of business on the agenda, the Chair may order a limit on the length and/or number of speeches as if by a motion to Limit Debate; the order must be accompanied by a brief verbal rationale. A senator may Appeal the order before substantive debate begins, interrupting the current speaker if necessary. Once debate has begun, the chair may not further restrict it, but may ask for a motion to Limit Debate or for the Previous Question.

(x1 (25) times / pg. 58 (63))

### **3. Lack of Representation for a Curricular Proposal**

It is preferred but not mandatory that representatives of the academic unit(s) sponsoring a curricular proposal be present for its consideration by the Senate. Therefore any speech or motion against a curricular proposal (including a motion to Postpone) is out of order if it is made only because no representative is present. However, if there are substantive questions or concerns about a proposal that none present can address satisfactorily, then the Senate may act as it sees fit, including postponing or voting down the proposal.

(x1 (26) times / pg. 58 (63))

**Proposed Changes to the Bylaws**  
(**bold** indicates additions & ~~strike through~~ indicates deletions)

**Constitution**

**ART X AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION**

There are two classes of constitutional amendments: substantive and non-substantive. A non-substantive amendment includes only editorial and/or terminological changes that do not affect the intent of this Constitution. The rules governing non-substantive amendments to this Constitution are the same as those governing amendments to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. Non-substantive amendments are therefore voted upon only by the Faculty Senate. If there is any question as to whether a proposed amendment is substantive, it must be treated as substantive.

A substantive amendment to this Constitution may be proposed by the Faculty Senate or upon petition to the Faculty Senate by fifty (50) ranked faculty. A report, which must include the exact wording of the amendment and a rationale, shall be placed on the agenda of the next Faculty Senate session, unless that would place it on the May agenda, in which case it shall be placed on the September agenda. The report is for information and debate only: the constitutional amendment may not itself be amended in any way on the floor of the Senate, nor may it be withdrawn, nor is it voted upon by the Senate. The report shall be distributed electronically to the Faculty on the same day the report is presented to the Senate. Substantive amendments are voted upon electronically by the entire ranked faculty. The polls shall open on the first business day not less than thirty (30) days following the report, and shall remain open for a total of five (5) business days. An affirmative vote equal to a majority of the votes cast by the ranked faculty shall be necessary to make a proposed substantive amendment part of this Constitution.



## **Bylaws**

### (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 inform the Faculty Senate of any substantive changes made to faculty benefits. Such a report should be made within two regularly scheduled Senate meetings of the changes being made. The report should address both the reasons for, and the implications of, the change. If the Committee deems an alternative solution would have better served the faculty, the report should outline their reasoning and recommendations.
- (cc) Shall prepare a biennial 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 of odd years, 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.

## **ART III EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER COUNCIL**

### **SEC 3 Responsibilities of the Educator Preparation Provider Council**

- A Develops policy and makes recommendations concerning educator preparation programs.
- B Conducts on-going reviews of all educator preparation programs and participates in the preparation of accreditation reports.
- C Monitors changing regulations and accreditation standards and makes recommendations for program revisions to accommodate new requirements.
- D The EPPC reviews proposals for **substantive-curricular** changes to educator preparation programs and courses as described in Article VI of the Bylaws. A reviewed proposal is either rejected or recommended to the Senate for approval.
- E Promotes collaboration among and ensures professional development opportunities for members of the EPP and between EPP and the public schools to enhance the quality of educator preparation.
- F Ensures curricular coherence in educator preparation.
- G Develops quality control procedures for educator preparation programs.
- H Reviews student appeals concerning exceptions or waivers to any Teacher Education Program policy or requirement and makes recommendations.
- I Reviews and makes recommendations to the Head of the EPP to ensure that unit policies and practices are consistent with national, regional, state, and university standards and requirements.

## ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

### SEC 2 Definitions and Structures in Curricular Process

- A For the purpose of this document, curricular proposals include proposals for:
- (1) New degree or certificate programs
  - (2) New options within an existing degree or certificate program
  - (3) New courses
  - (4) Changes in any of the above
  - (5) Changes to degree or certificate policies and requirements
  - (6) Changes to General Education program requirements
- B Curricular matters shall be acted upon by the following bodies including such internal structures of each named body as may be established for dealing with their specific curricular matters:
- (1) Academic departments or special academic programs
  - (2) College councils
  - (3) Academic deans
  - (4) Graduate council
  - (5) Educator Preparation Provider Council
  - (6) Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs
  - (7) Secretary of the Faculty
  - (8) Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
  - (9) Faculty Senate
  - (10) University administration
- ~~C — Proposals for non-substantive curricular changes (defined in Senate Action 11-93/94 adopted in December 1993) follow the same routing as substantive curricular proposals. For non-substantive changes the path is purely informational and requires no approval by the various bodies. However, the chair of any council that reviews the proposal, the Secretary of the Faculty, or the Senate Chair may challenge the designation of a proposed change as non-substantive, in which case the proposal must be re-submitted by the originator as a substantive change. Non-substantive changes are challengeable and follow the same challenge and appeal processes as substantive changes.~~

## SEC 13 Origination of Curricular Proposals

The primary responsibility for developing and revising curriculum resides with the faculty, and the initial formal stages of any such process should be accomplished at the lowest levels of organization within the faculty. Therefore, the curricular development and review process shall be reaffirmed and amplified as follows:

Any new academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate must originate with the formal sponsorship of one or more academic departments. Any new interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate which is to be administered from outside the structure of a single academic department must originate with the formal sponsorship of two or more academic departments/schools, including every academic department whose courses will constitute either nine or more credit hours or 30% or more of the total credit hours listed as requirements and/or options. All such required sponsorship at the academic department level must be obtained before the proposed new academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate can be formally considered by any higher level of the faculty governance structure (College Council, Graduate Council, CGEIP, EPPC, Faculty Senate). (As a courtesy, each academic department that will have one or more courses included in a proposed new degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate should be consulted to determine that they intend to continue offering the course(s) in question and that they will be able to accommodate the anticipated increase in demand. However, in the case of an interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary program, formal sponsorship is not required unless the number of courses reaches the nine-hour or 30% threshold, and in the case of a non-interdisciplinary program (i.e., a program to be administered from within the structure of a single academic department), formal sponsorship by outside academic departments is not required regardless of the number of their courses included.)

Any ~~substantive~~ change to an existing academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate must originate with the formal sponsorship of the academic unit responsible for overseeing that program, major, minor, option, or certificate. In the case of a degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate offered through an individual academic department, the relevant academic unit would be that department. In the case of each “Special Academic Program,” any interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate offered outside the structure of a single academic department, the relevant academic unit would be the faculty committee charged with overseeing the program, major, minor, option, or certificate in question; references to “academic department” within these Bylaws related to the curricular process shall be understood to apply to the faculty committee. Such formal sponsorship by the relevant academic unit must be obtained before the proposed ~~substantive~~ change can be formally considered by any higher level of the faculty governance structure (College Council, Graduate Council, CGEIP, EPPC, Faculty Senate).

Under no circumstance should a proposal for a new academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate, or a proposal for a ~~substantive~~ change to an existing academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate formally originate from one of the academic college councils, the Graduate Council, CGEIP, the EPPC, or any other higher-level body within the

faculty governance structure. Likewise, under no circumstances should a proposal for a new academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate, or a proposal for a ~~substantive~~ change to an existing academic degree program, major, minor, option, or certificate formally originate from the administration of one of the academic colleges, the Graduate College, or any other unit of the administration. Ideas for new curriculum or ~~substantive~~ changes to existing curriculum are always welcome, regardless of where they originate, but such ideas should be communicated to the relevant groups of faculty members as efficiently as possible so that the process of developing or revising the curriculum in question can formally begin at the lowest level of the faculty governance structure.

### **1. Length and Number of Speeches in Debate**

In the absence of an explicit limit, speeches in debate may be at most three minutes long, and there is no limit on the number of speeches. Prior to taking up an item of business on the agenda, the Chair may order a limit on the length and/or number of speeches as if by a motion to Limit Debate; the order must be accompanied by a brief verbal rationale. A senator may Appeal the order before substantive debate begins, interrupting the current speaker if necessary. Once debate has begun, the chair may not further restrict it, but may ask for a motion to Limit Debate or for the Previous Question.

### **3. Lack of Representation for a Curricular Proposal**

It is preferred but not mandatory that representatives of the academic unit(s) sponsoring a curricular proposal be present for its consideration by the Senate. Therefore any speech or motion against a curricular proposal (including a motion to Postpone) is out of order if it is made only because no representative is present. However, if there are substantive questions or concerns about a proposal that none present can address satisfactorily, then the Senate may act as it sees fit, including postponing or voting down the proposal.