MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE
(UCAG)
APPROVED AGENDA
OCTOBER 11, 2018 3:15 PM
W-1 OWEN GRADUATE HALL (GARDEN LEVEL)

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. Approval of Agenda for October 11, 2018
3. Approval of Draft Minutes for September 13, 2018
4. Chairperson’s Remarks: Dr. Amanda Tickner
5. Associate Provost for Academic Services Remarks: Dr. John Gaboury
6. Secretary for Academic Governance Remarks: Dr. Gary Hoppenstand
7. NEW BUSINESS
   7.1. Continued Discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee on Bylaw Reform’s Recommendations
   7.2. Continued Discussion on College Bylaw Reviews
8. Consideration of the Statement by University Committee on Faculty Affairs Regarding Faculty Dismissal Policy: Dr. Amanda Tickner
9. Other Business
10. ADJOURNMENT

Directions once inside Owen Hall:
From the Owen Hall front desk, proceed to the left towards the cafeteria. On the far left, there are a set of double doors to the West Wing (next to the ATM). Go through the doors, pass the elevators and enter the West Wing. Proceed to the end of the long hallway and just before the hallway turns there is another gray door to a stairway on the right hand side. Go down two small flights of stairs to the garden level. Open door, turn right and proceed to room W-1 on the right hand side of the hall.
John Gaboury, Lorraine Sordillo-Gandy, and Rand Spiro attempted to join the meeting remotely but were unable to do so due to technical difficulties. Ruth Waddell Smith and Fredric Manfredsson successfully joined the meeting remotely during the course of the meeting.
• Volunteers were sought to serve as Secretary. Hoppenstand nominated Silvestri as Secretary. Silvestri seconded the nomination. Silvestri was approved as Secretary, 12-0-0.

III. Remarks
• Associate Provost
  ○ None
• Secretary for Academic Governance
  ○ Hoppenstand noted that members of the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams and Academic Specialists have been approved through the Bylaws procedure to serve on Faculty Senate, but there is a problem insofar as the process for their selection has not been outlined. Hoppenstand noted that the Committee’s first task be to develop language to that effect consistent with fixed-term faculty selection. Hoppenstand also noted that the FRIB and Academic Specialists have already selected their representatives for two-year appointments, but he emphasized that there should be a specified procedure.

• UCAG Chair:
  ○ Tickner followed up on Hoppenstand’s remarks by pointing out that as the non-college faculty representative, she is theoretically responsible for representing FRIB and Academic Specialists on UCAG. Tickner was concerned because she had no way of contacting these constituencies and proposed giving them seats on UCAG. At this point, there was consensus within UCAG to take it up as an action item.

IV. Addressing FRIB and Academic Specialist Representation
• Ajit Srivastava pointed out that as a unit, FRIB has its own Bylaws and should be responsible for dealing with this issue.
• Silvestri noted that while the process of selecting their representatives should be determined with by the units, adding seats to UCAG or any other standing committees would require a change in the Bylaws for Academic Governance, which is within UCAG's purview.
• Srivastava agreed and proposed asking the units to submit proposed procedures.
• Worden raised the issue of James Madison College, Lyman Briggs College, the College of Law, and the Residential College in the Arts & Humanities consolidating their voting seats on UCAG into one representative. Worden questioned the appropriateness of FRIB and Academic Specialists having individual seats given the size of the constituencies relative to those consolidated colleges.
• Tickner agreed with Srivastava’s suggestion and moved to request that FRIB and Academic Specialists submit a proposal to develop or amend their Bylaws to include specifications for electing for their own representation on academic governance bodies.
• Hoppenstand clarified that this motion, if passed, would go to Steering Committee and then to Faculty Senate. Hoppenstand noted that University Council is mostly an informational body and that 80-90% of the action items go through Faculty Senate.
• Worden seconded Tickner’s motion. The motion passed 12-0-0.
V. Discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee on Bylaws Reform’s Recommendations

- Silvestri outlined the Ad Hoc Committee on Bylaws Reform’s work, and made clear that its goal was to amend the Bylaws for Academic Governance and the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees to increase shared governance. Silvestri summarized the Committee’s work over the summer and noted that UCAG members Laura Dilley and Dylan Westrin were also on the Committee. Silvestri gave a brief summary of the documents that had been sent to UCAG prior to this meeting and noted that the Ad Hoc Committee’s members all indicated a willingness to consult with any academic governance body seeking clarification.

- Dilley inquired as to the timeline these recommendations should be addressed. Hoppenstand recommended that UCAG prepare a recommendation to the Steering Committee within the next one to two meetings.

- Dilley pointed out that substantial discussion occurred at the Ad Hoc Committee’s meetings and recommended that such debate not happen again at UCAG. Dilley argued that the presumption should be that the Ad Hoc Committee’s work is an improvement on the status quo and that holding it up within UCAG would be a disservice to the broader University community, as the challenging things within the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendations require broad input.

- Ruth Waddell Smith joined remotely.

- Worden expressed that his understanding was that the Ad Hoc Committee conducted extensive research and encouraged UCAG to defer to the Committee’s conclusions.

- Gabor Francies asked whether there were any particular recommendations that deserved particular attention. Silvestri cited the Committee on Administrator Review and the procedures for calling special meetings of the Faculty Senate.

- Worden pointed out that there are some ambiguities within the language that may not be clear to those who were not members of the Ad Hoc Committee. The three members of the Ad Hoc Committee agreed.

- Tickner said that all members of UCAG are expected to have thoroughly read over the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendations by the next meeting and be prepared to vote on them.

VI. Nominations to the University-wide Naming Committee

- Due to the removal for cause of Dr. Annemiek Schilder of the College of Natural Science, UCAG was required to nominate two nominees and an alternate to the University-wide Naming Committee. A list of the twenty-eight applicants was distributed.

- Tickner noted that while much attention is often given to the college from which applicants apply, more emphasis should be given to their expertise.

- Tickner moved to nominate Katherine Weessies. Tickner emphasized that as Director of the Map Library, Weessies has extensive knowledge about campus buildings. Worden seconded the nomination. Weessies was nominated 13-0-0.
• Silvestri moved to nominate Ruben Martinez. Silvestri noted that he served on the Ad Hoc Committee with Martinez and believed Martinez to be a thoughtful and serious person. Worden seconded the motion, which was approved 13-0-0.

• Fredric Manfredsson joined remotely.

• Xia Gao moved to nominate Tian Zhou as the alternate nominee. Dilley seconded the motion. The motion carried 13-0-0.

VII. Review of College Bylaws

• Hoppenstand noted that the review of college bylaws is a typical function of UCAG. Due to extenuating circumstances last year, UCAG held off on conducting them. In light of the Presidential search being underway, Hoppenstand suggested that UCAG may want to suspend them for another year, emphasizing that it was UCAG’s choice.

• Westrin questioned what work UCAG would do if the reviews were suspended. Hoppenstand said that it was unclear but that it may be wise to leave some agenda space open to address whatever may come out of academic governance in a fairly contentious year.

• Srivastava expressed that he believed the Presidential search should impact the reviews.

• Dilley wondered if UCAG would need to re-do any work it did on this front if the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendations were to go into effect.

• Srivastava said that UCAG should “strike while the iron is hot” and noted that bylaws are always “a living document.” Dilley said she was persuaded. Hoppenstand noted that UCAG becomes very busy come election time. Dilley suggested potentially dividing up the work and addressing them as they come up.

• Silvestri pointed out that 4.3.5. of the Bylaws for Academic Governance requires UCAG to review each college’s bylaws every five years. He inquired as to whether suspending the review would make UCAG out of compliance with that requirement for any individual college. Hoppenstand responded that none would be out of compliance, but some are close. Srivastava requested that a list of such colleges be provided, and Hoppenstand agreed to compile one.

• Jacobs asked what the scope of these reviews are. Hoppenstand cited consistency with other college’s bylaws and the Bylaws for Academic Governance. Worden also pointed out that internal inconsistency is sometimes an issue.

• Dilley noted that if UCAG were to “dig into the spirit” of the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendations, UCAG would have a better lens from which to review bylaws.

• Katherine Dontje cautioned against pushing too much work onto next year’s UCAG.

• There was consensus that the discussion would continue at the next meeting.

VIII. Approval of the April UCAG Minutes

• Worden moved to approve the draft minutes from the April meeting of UCAG. Dilley seconded the motion. The minutes were approved 14-0-0.

IX. Adjournment

• Tickner moved to adjourn. Worden seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.