

**Report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Bulletins**  
**University Senate Rules and Elections Committee**  
**July 27, 2007**

***Background and purpose of the subcommittee.*** This Subcommittee was authorized by the University Senate Rules and Elections Committee on May 8, 2007. While trying to codify Senate actions from the 2006-07 academic year, the Rules and Elections Committee found inconsistencies, overlaps and gaps between and among the Senate Rules and the various “bulletins” or “catalogs” which collect academic information and upon which students, faculty and administrators rely. The Subcommittee’s charge was to review the consistency of senate rules with the University Bulletin and the Graduate Bulletin, and other similar publications, and to make suggestions for modifications of any of them to promote consistency and uniformity.

The subcommittee was comprised of Committee members Doug Michael, Connie Wood and Kaveh Tagavi; Brian Jackson, Senior Associate Dean of the Graduate School; Bruce Manley, Associate Registrar, and Matt Patterson, Publications Production Assistant Manager and Web Support, Registrar’s Office. The subcommittee met four times over the summer.

***Overall conclusions.*** We believe that the Senate Rules should not duplicate information relating to academic affairs which appears in “official academic publications,” by this we mean the University Bulletin, the Graduate School Bulletin, the bulletins of the Professional Colleges, and the Code of Student Conduct. We believe there are several advantages to eliminating this duplication. These official publications are more comprehensive than the Senate Rules and the partial overlap between these publications may give a reader – whether student, faculty, or administrator – the misleading impression that the Senate Rules constitute a complete catalogue of such rules. The official publications are also more carefully maintained, more widely publicized and more widely read than the Senate Rules, and are thus likely more widely regarded by members of the university community as the actual rules. Finally, having duplication of these rules without coordination will result in inconsistency.

Although we believe that the inconsistent and duplicate rules should be eliminated, we do not believe that the basic role of the University Senate in approval of these rules should be changed. The Senate should continue to have jurisdiction over and approve, disapprove, or modify, rules of the University relating to admission, evaluation, retention, conduct, promotion and graduation.

In reaching our conclusions, we reaffirm the basic approach of Rule 1.1.0(A) which states in part:

Each department faculty (or faculty of a Center/Institute) has jurisdiction and primary responsibility over its internal educational policies, within the limits of the educational policies of its school faculty of which it is a part (if applicable), and of its respective college faculty, all of which are subject to the broad academic policies prescribed in these University Senate Rules.

We also reaffirm Rule 1.1.0(B) which states in part that, insofar as the Senate Rules relate to matters other than internal Senate procedures, they “describe broad academic policies for the University and procedures for their implementation.”

***Specific recommendations.***

1. Pursuant to Senate Rule 1.1.0, Senate rules should be confined to matters relating to the Senate’s operations and to “broad academic policies for the University,” and the faculties of colleges and schools should have jurisdiction and primary responsibility over educational policies.
2. Senate rules should be compared with existing rules in official academic publications. The Senate should repeal duplicate rules. As examples, we believe that most of the rules governing admission, probation and suspension in specific colleges (rules in the following series: 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.5, 5.3.2 and 5.3.3) should be repealed.
3. College or faculty rules regarding admission, retention, conduct, evaluation, promotion and graduation of students should be approved by the Senate. Upon approval, these rules should be published in an official university publication made available to all students, being one of the following: the University Bulletin, the Graduate School Bulletin, the bulletins of the Professional Colleges, and the Code of Student Conduct. The Senate should adopt procedures to assure that the individuals responsible for updating official university publications are made aware of Senate actions potentially affecting the rules which they publish.
4. The official university publications referred to in recommendation 3 should be updated annually on a coordinated schedule. Changes made by school or college faculty or by the Senate between publication dates should be publicized as broadly as possible, to assure that all affected members of the university community have adequate notice of a rule or change in rule before it takes effect.
5. Deans, department heads and program chairs should regularly review their published academic rules to assure that they have been approved by the Senate and published in accordance with recommendations 3 and 4.