University Committee on Academic Governance
Draft Minutes
March 1, 2007

Present: Katherine Corby, Christina DeJong, Eric Hinojosa, Michael McAlpine, Edmund Rosser, Cameron Starr; Others: Julie Harrison, Jacqueline Wright, June Youatt.
Absent: Phyllis Floyd, Pamela Fraker, Ved Gossain, Jeffrey Johnson, Hilde Lindemann

1. The Agenda for March 1, 2007 was approved.

2. Minutes for the February 1, 2007 meeting approved.

3. Chairperson’s Remarks:

   - Christina DeJong discussed the recent ECAC meeting. They have decided to have a presentation of the Faculty Voice Task Force I report at a special meeting of Faculty Council to be held March 27th.
   
   - Lyman Briggs would like to be granted College status. This proposal raises the issue that small colleges have a particularly difficult time filling their academic governance responsibilities; there are many positions and few faculty to fill them. It has been suggested that smaller colleges might want to group together and pool representation duties, but of course that means that they would have to be content not to have a representative on some committees. The Provost will write to the potentially affected colleges and share the communication with UCAG so that we will have the necessary information should bylaws changes eventually be requested.

4. Emeriti Faculty - Possible Bylaw

   - Representatives of the emeriti faculty group seeking representation will meet with UCAG in April to answer questions.

5. Participation in Academic Governance (Attached to Agenda)

   - UCAG has been asked to consider how the University might encourage additional participation in academic governance. There was a spirited discussion of why governance is not more of a priority for faculty. In the end the committee decided to table the issue until after the Task Force I presentation later this month.

6. Review of Osteopathic Medicine Bylaws (Attached to Agenda)

   Our first concern with these bylaws was in the area of definitions, particularly of faculty groups. The COM Bylaws refer to faculty groups that are not the standard groups as defined in University Bylaws. This was probably necessary in the past, but now the University seems to have adequate definitions to cover most of the needed groupings and we would encourage the COM to consider moving to these more generally understood terms. In particular we would encourage them to define “Fixed Term Faculty” in line with recently passed bylaws.
Other noted problems: 1.3 refers to "clinical faculty" and "term limited faculty"--groups that are not defined. 1.3.3 refers to "nonvoting members of departments of the COM." We were not sure who this group would be. In 6.9.1 we encountered the phrase "non HP fixed term faculty" a group not previously encountered and not defined. Similarly, we thought the opening phrase of section 1.3, "All faculty," might actually be clearer if it delineated the groups included, as defined in the section 1.1 above.

Beyond the definitions issue there were several other points. Some of them rising only to the level of typo, others more serious.

1.2 College Advisory College should probably read College Advisory Council

2.3.2 Format of the extant sentence makes meetings of the Assembly appear entirely optional, when in fact we suspect that only the summer semester meeting was meant to be optional.

2.3.4 This sentence is unclear. Final words, after the word "meeting," seem unnecessary.

2.3.7 There is no quantitative threshold to define a quorum for a body with responsibility for the approval of Bylaws. Minimum numbers for quorums are delineated in Robert’s Rules of Order and those need to be followed.

2.3.8 Here a timeline is advisable; minutes should be available at least prior to the next meeting.

4.2.1 Usual practice at MSU would call for a listing of departments by name in this section.

5.1 Use of the word "promptly" to define a timeframe for calling a new election is imprecise, should be accomplished before the next meeting of the CAC.

5.2.3 Wanted to be sure the intention was to limit nominations to those names put forward by the nominating committee, i.e. no self nomination.

5.3 In discussing the appointment of a secretary, the word "committee" is used, where we expected "Council."

5.4 Frequency of meetings is again unclear, either calling for one meeting per year to take place during either fall or spring semester, or more likely, two meetings, one each during fall and spring semesters.

5.4 and 6.1.7 Differences in quorum levels for the two groups. A simple majority for standing committees, but only a third of members for the CAC was a surprise. Wanted to call it to everyone's attention.
5.5 More detail might be better here. Where and by what method would be useful information?

6.2.1 Appears to be a minor typo in the sentence starting "Four student members..." should be "at least one each from the first..."

6.4 The Admissions Committee is a wholly appointed body. This is a surprise, would have expected this to be an elected group. Wanted to call the matter to everyone's attention.

7. **Review of Human Medicine Bylaws** (Attached to Agenda)

2.1.2 and 2.2.2. In spite of the emergency nature of these meetings, some form of time frame should be specified in the bylaws for distribution of agenda (24 hours)—Need to conform with University Bylaws.

2.3.1. “For purposes of conducting business, a quorum will be defined as those voting faculty members of the college present at a meeting. Passage of any measure will require a simple majority of the votes of the eligible faculty members present at a meeting with the exception of amendments to or revision of these bylaws (7.2.).” There should be a minimum quorum designated.

4.1.4.15. The College Advisory Council shall [oversee grievance procedures consistent with 6.6.1.] have shared responsibility with the dean for prescribing procedures for the hearing and resolution of significant and serious complaints from faculty [and students who have pursued complaints without satisfaction at the unit level. [Grievance procedure should reference University Grievance Policy.] [see 6.3. for students. 6.3.1. would be clearer if it stated how the pool is selected.]

5.2.1.2. “The second function of the faculty members of the Admissions Executive Sub-Committee is to recommend to the dean specific individuals for admission to the College of Human Medicine.”

However, the LCME Standard MS-4 reads as follows: “The final responsibility for selecting students to be admitted for medical study must reside with a duly constituted faculty committee. So since 5.2.1.2. gives the power of admissions to the dean on the recommendation of the committee, the dean’s role on the committee violates MS-4. It is suggested that the sentence in 5.2.1.2. be amended to use the LCME language: “The second function of the faculty members of the Admissions Executive Sub-Committee is to select students to be admitted to the College of Human Medicine.”

5.2.5.1. “The Curriculum Committee will consist of a parent committee and four subsidiary committees (representing Blocks I, II, III of the curriculum and the Prematriculation Program).” [clarify or define—do not know what Blocks I, II, etc. are.]
5.2.8.1. “The Dean’s Student Advisory Committee is comprised of elected student representatives from years 1 and 2, and year 3 and 4 representatives from each of the communities.” [clarify and specify. Not clear how many individuals are being selected or what groups they are coming from. Communities not otherwise defined.]

8. Other Business

- The committee received a memo from ECAC regarding instituting a procedure to select the MSU representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). The committee felt that this should be someone who has had experience on the Athletic Council, though not necessarily a current member. In future years we might want to handle this selection as part of the regular selection and ballot preparation process. There is not enough time to do that this year, if the University is to have a representative at the May 18-20 meeting at Stanford. We could gather a pool by email this year if desired. Christina DeJong will draft a memo to go to ECAC detailing this discussion and information about the costs of sending a representative that she prepared at the Provost’s request.

- Jacqueline Wright asked about the ballots for the at-large candidates for ECAC. We are not yet ready to implement electronic ballots but she would like to send out the biographical information electronically to save paper. The committee agreed that this was a good idea.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine Corby
Acting Secretary