

Report and Recommendations

ad hoc Committee on College Constitutions

September 24, 2013

Introduction

In a series of email messages in April 2012, the chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), Professor Chris Cramer, and Provost Karen Hanson agreed on the appointment of an ad hoc committee on college constitutions. The general charge was to assemble and review the college constitutions, determine their status, identify the important elements that should be included in every constitution, seek an approval process at the central level, and develop an advisory set of minimum procedures or guidelines on what colleges should do to adopt and amend constitutions (e.g., what consultation should take place, who should participate) that the provost could then provide to the colleges. The recommendations should not dictate to the colleges what should be in the constitutions but might suggest best practices for college consideration. The ad hoc committee, appointed by FCC, consisted of Professor Russell Luepker (chair) and Professors Carol Chomsky, Nancy Ehlke, Michael Hancher, and Karen Miksch.

The committee reviewed all college constitutions and some sets of bylaws¹ and offers a set of recommendations below. We note at the outset that, despite the importance of college constitutions to the governance of colleges, faculty and other college constituents were often unaware of the existence or content of their college constitution and bylaws and, also that in some cases the constitution is not regularly followed. Constitutions represent a binding agreement between the administration and the faculty on how the college should be operated, so college administrations and faculty should adhere to constitutional provisions and should be held accountable for doing so. As long as the legitimately-adopted-and-approved constitution is consistent with University policy, decisions should be made in compliance with constitutional provisions (in substance and in process); the dean and faculty of the college and the provost all have a role in ensuring violations do not occur. Some of our recommendations relate to the processes surrounding adoption and implementation of college constitutions with the aim of ensuring the documents are known to and regularly used by college administrations and faculty.

Our recommendations are organized as advice directed to the provost about the approval and review process for constitutions (Part 1), advice to both the provost and the colleges as to what requirements should be mandatory for all constitutions (Part 2), and advice to the colleges on the approval process and content of their constitutions (Part 3). The Part 3 recommendations focus on identifying the issues that should be addressed in each constitution, leaving each college to decide the content of the provisions addressing those issues in keeping with their varying histories and cultures.

¹ It was surprisingly difficult to obtain the most current versions of constitutions because in some cases the colleges were not sure which version was current or approved, and we remain uncertain whether we ever received copies of all of the bylaws. These difficulties are indicative of the lack of awareness about college constitutions described in the text.

We note here one global recommendation for both the provost and the colleges, quoting with approval Vice President Shepherd's advice to the deans in 1971: "As you revise or prepare a constitution, may I request that you bear in mind the distinction between constitutions and by-laws. Bylaws usually present a more detailed set of procedures for operating under an approved constitution. They may change more frequently than the constitution itself as new procedures develop that appear to be more effective and that still are in conformity with the over-riding provision of the constitution." We found that indeed there is sometimes more in the constitutions than there should be, elements that would more appropriately be in the bylaws, so Vice President Shepherd's advice is still relevant.

Because the committee was created and charged by the Faculty Consultative Committee, the focus of the committee's report and recommendations is on the role of the faculty and its shared governance with the college administration. However, we note that most college constitutions were written before the University Senate was expanded to include P&A and Civil Service staff in governance, and we urge that colleges and the provost consider the appropriate roles for staff and students in college governance as they review constitution provisions.

The word "faculty" as used in college constitutions and elsewhere may refer to different kinds of faculty appointments ("regular," term, visiting, temporary, contract, etc.). We recommend that those drafting and amending constitutional provisions strive for clarity in defining who is encompassed by constitutional references to faculty. Special attention should be paid to the role of "Regular Faculty," a term this report uses according to the definition in section 3.2 of Board of Regents policy *Faculty Tenure*: "A regular appointment either is with indefinite tenure or is probationary, leading to a decision concerning indefinite tenure within a specified period of time." The role of the Regular Faculty is specified further in the Academic Unit Governance Policy, included in Appendix 3.

The report uses the term "college" to encompass every collegiate unit headed by a dean. We make use of the common abbreviations for the colleges.

The report contains several appendices providing additional information of significance in considering the college constitutions.

Appendix 1: 1971 Memo from Academic Administration Vice President William Shepherd to Provosts and Deans, "Guidelines for the development and review of college constitutions, with particular reference to the powers and duties of deans."

Appendix 2: Board of Regents' policy *College Constitutions*.

Appendix 3: *Academic Unit Governance* policy.

Appendix 4 contains a list of the college mission statements.

Appendix 5 comprises a list of the dates college constitutions were last approved or amended (or when the college believes it was last approved or amended).

Part 1

Recommendations to the Provost Regarding Process for Review and Approval of College Constitutions

The ad hoc committee makes the following recommendations to the provost.

1. That the provost establish and communicate to the colleges both a process for approval of college constitutions and the guidelines that the provost will use in evaluating the constitutions for approval. The process for approval should ensure appropriate consideration and approval by the faculty of the college before submission to the provost, and the policy might incorporate recommendations from this report that the provost chooses to adopt.

College constitutions establish the processes for governing the college. Because the faculty role in governance is central, the committee recommends that the provost require that (1) the faculty have primary responsibility and authority to draft constitutional provisions and amendments, and (2) the constitution be approved by the dean and at least an absolute majority of the Regular Faculty of the college. We also recommend that the provost require that constitutions establish the mechanism by which that faculty approval is obtained and that the colleges be permitted to require a super-majority of Regular Faculty for adopting or amending the constitution.

The provost might consider recommending the adoption of an administrative policy that would provide rules and standards for the approval of college constitutions.

We suggest that the provost's office develop a standard letter or form through which the provost would indicate provostal approval of college constitutions and amendments and that the provost's office establish timelines or deadlines for its own responses to proposed constitutions or amendments (e.g., 90 days from date of submission to the provost).

Although normally both the dean and faculty will approve the draft submitted to the provost, if disagreements or procedural hurdles prevent action by a college on its constitution or amendments, either the dean or the faculty acting alone should be able to submit to the provost a draft constitution or set of provisions. The provost would then choose whether to require response by the nonsubmitting party in considering the submitted draft constitution and would make the ultimate determination of content. The provost should weigh the faculty views heavily.

2. That the provost's office establish a single repository on the provost's website that contains:

- a. all college constitutions;**
- b. all college bylaws; and**
- c. the letter or form indicating provostal approval of each constitution.**

This recommendation responds to the difficulty the committee had in obtaining constitutions from some colleges and the uncertainty over whether and when a particular constitution had been approved. Having a single repository will create more transparency. We suggest that colleges be asked to include a link from their home page to the provost's website that contains the college constitutions. We also inquire whether it would be possible to have a link from the Uwide Policy Library (<http://policy.umn.edu/>) website to college constitutions.

3. That a staff member in the provost's office be delegated responsibility for (1) reviewing the content of proposed constitutions and amendments to make sure they are consistent with regental and administrative policies and follow the provost's guidelines and (2) ensuring that college constitutions have been appropriately approved and placed on the provost's website.

4. That the provost clarify the role her or his office will play in ensuring that colleges adhere to the provisions of their constitutions.

Constitutions are not self-enforcing. We believe the provost must play a role in enforcing college constitutions and we urge the provost to make clear what that role will be. While it is the immediate responsibility of the dean and faculty of a college to ensure that constitutional provisions be followed, the provost should also consider that question in reviewing or advising on college actions. If a constitutional provision is not followed by a college (whether intentionally or because of oversight), the provost must decide the consequence: whether to reverse or reject a decision, send it back for reconsideration consistent with the constitution, or leave the decision in place because the violation is harmless error under the circumstances. If, for example, a college constitution calls for consultation with the faculty on a matter that comes to the provost, it would be appropriate for the provost's office to ascertain whether or not the prescribed consultation has occurred and determine whether further consultation is necessary before affirming the choice made.

In the case of disagreement between the faculty and administration of a college about interpretation of application of the college constitution, the provost should play a dispositive role in resolving the question if it cannot be resolved within the college.

5. That the provost direct that all new faculty members be provided information about and a link to their college constitution as part of the orientation process.

6. That the provost encourage each college to review its constitution and bylaws in light of the summaries and recommendations contained in Parts 2 and 3 of this report.

The colleges should not be required to rewrite their constitutions but they should be asked to review them in light of the information contained in this report. We also suggest that it would be good practice for a college to review its constitution every five years, both in order to ensure that it is up to date and to encourage both the faculty and administrators in the college to take notice of its provisions.

The committee recommends that the provost require of the deans that everyone in the college be informed about the existence and provisions of the college constitution. We suggest that she or he recommend but not require that the colleges appoint a faculty member who is specifically charged with overseeing the college constitution and ensuring that its provisions are adhered to in the conduct of college business (e.g., that elections duly take place, and that committees are duly appointed).

Part 2

Recommendations Regarding Mandatory Constraints on Constitutional Provisions

- 1. That the provost reaffirm the directive from Vice President Shepherd: "All Articles of College Constitutions must be compatible with the provisions of the . . . Senate Constitution" (see Appendix 1)**
- 2. That all college constitutions be consistent with all Board of Regents and University policies.**

Perhaps because of inattention by those drafting and reviewing constitutions, we found numerous examples of constitutional provisions that are not consistent with such policies. We have noted them in this report, but suggest that attention to this issue should be paid by the provost and the colleges to avoid such conflicts.

- 3. That the provost ensure that the constitutional provisions dealing with the role of faculty be consistent with Board of Regents policy *Faculty Tenure* and the Academic Unit Governance Policy (see Appendix 3).**
- 4. That colleges be advised that their constitutions must not include provisions specifying a provostal or presidential role in appointing any department chairs or heads nor should they include provisions about the provost or president serving as a member of the faculty of the college.**

It is the function—and prerogative—of colleges to appoint department chairs and heads and directors. Constitutional provisions should not deem the president and provost members of a college faculty; they are only members of the tenured faculty in their home departments.

- 5. That college constitutions be required to have a statement of mission or purpose for the college.**

As far as the committee can tell, all of the constitutions have some version of a mission or purpose statement. We suggest the provost ask the colleges to review the broad range of mission statements currently published by the colleges and consider revising theirs, if appropriate.

6. That the provost require that all college constitutions identify the manner in which members of the Faculty Senate are to be elected.

The key term is "elected," because the Faculty Senate constitution requires that they be elected.

7. That the provost require that all college constitutions specify responsibility for adopting policies related to "research policy, curricular policy and degree requirements, and academic personnel allocation for the college."

[From the Academic Unit Governance policy: "The Regular faculty, as defined in the Board of Regents policy on Faculty Tenure, shall hold the primary responsibility for governance in tenure-granting units. This responsibility shall include governance of the unit in research policy, curricular policy and degree requirements, and academic personnel allocation, in consultation with the dean, chair or head of the department. . . . Governance mechanisms that provide for participation by all appropriate groups in the decision-making processes of the unit shall be established, subject to the primary responsibility of the regular faculty within the unit with respect to the matters identified above."]

8. That the provost allow variations in provisions on college participation in dean selection for the college. Variations should include permitting a college to specify (1) that the search committee will have a majority of faculty representation, (2) that except under compelling circumstances a candidate will not be recommended to the provost over the objections of a majority of the faculty, and (3) that the faculty may vote on and present to the provost a nonbinding petition for removal of the dean.

The variations included in the recommendation are provisions that appear in one or more current college constitutions, and the committee recommends that those variations continue to be permitted.

9. That the provost require that all college constitutions include a provision permitting the faculty's executive body, or faculty assembly, or similar group recognized by the constitution, to meet independently of the dean and other members of the college administration, and that such a faculty body be permitted to determine its own agenda.

10. That the provost require that every constitution address questions of academic program change, including at a minimum the procedures by which academic departments, programs, or units are to be added, merged, or dissolved, and what the faculty role in those procedures is.

We note that section 12 of the Regents Policy *Faculty Tenure* addresses programmatic change, and that the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure is developing a set of procedures to accompany section 12.

Part 3

Recommendations to the Colleges Concerning their Constitutions (Process and Content)

In reviewing the college constitutions, we noted both similarities and variations (in issues addressed as well as content with respect to those issues). Based on that review, we identify in the sections below issues that we considered important for constitutions to address; we describe the variations that we observed in the treatment of those issues; and we make recommendations regarding whether and how those issues should or might be addressed. Where there are variations among the colleges, we have most often described those variations and suggest the colleges decide for themselves what choices make sense for the college and are consistent with local practice and culture.

1. Approval Mechanisms, Dates, Accreditation Constraints

Comment

A few constitutions specify an adoption process for the document itself. Most do not. Those that do address the question vary in how much they say about it.

A few constitutions record approval of the constitution by University administration; most do not incorporate a record of University approval.

Most of the constitutions specify, in an amendments section or some other section, that University-level approval is required to ratify any amendment of the document. Many of these passages call for approval by the Regents. Such provisions are at odds with the Regents' policy *College Constitutions* (March 12, 2010; http://regents.umn.edu/sites/default/files/policies/College_Constitutions.pdf), which specifies that "[t]he president or delegate shall approve collegiate constitutions and any subsequent amendments."

All of the college constitutions include a description of the procedure(s) to be followed to amend the constitution. While there is variation among the constitutions regarding the amendment procedure, the procedures are appropriately detailed in the documents. Many of the colleges have multiple avenues for introducing amendments to their constitutions, with many being vetted by a defined consultative or faculty committee. Most constitutions require a two-thirds majority of the eligible members of the college, but a few colleges require only a simple majority or do not provide explicit information on the required majority to pass an amendment (Law, CSE, HHH, Medical School, CFANS and CEHD). Many of the procedures for amending constitutions need to be updated to reflect the appropriate authority for final approval, which is currently the provost or her designee and not the Board of Regents.

In some colleges, accrediting agency requirements may affect how the college operates. Those constraints should be noted if they affect the governance of the college.

Recommendation

- 1. That all constitutions specify the approval mechanism within the college and that the provisions accord with Board of Regents policies. There are three important elements that must be contained in the mechanism: the college's internal adoption process, the amendment process, and (for both adoption and amendment) recording the date of approval.**
- 2. That all constitutions require a favorable vote of an absolute majority of the Regular Faculty to approve a constitution and amendments; the constitution may require a super-majority of the Regular Faculty for adoption and for the adoption of amendments.**
- 3. That colleges consider whether and how to include constituencies other than the Regular Faculty in reviewing and approving the constitution and amendments.**
- 4. That colleges specify any aspects of their constitutions that are affected by accreditation standards (and include references to the particular standards).**

2. Mission/Purpose Statements

Comment

All of the constitutions include a statement of "mission" or "purpose." These statements range from the highly general to the explicit. Appendix 4 contains the mission statements.

Recommendation on Mission/Purpose Statements

The college should periodically review the mission statement; the collection of mission statements in the Appendix may provide ideas regarding the possible scope and content.

3. The Dean

Comment on the Selection Process

The constitutions generally say that the dean is appointed by the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the president, though some say the provost makes the recommendation, and Public Health says the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences does so. Our understanding is that current practice is that all deans except the Dean of the Medical School (who is also Vice President for the Health Sciences) are appointed by the Board of Regents on recommendation of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. As noted below, we recommend that constitutions be amended to conform to University policy and practice in this respect.

There are variations regarding the process leading up to recommendation by the president/provost. Most specify some mechanism by which the college is involved in providing names to the appointing authority. Variations include:

- Membership of the search committee: Many of the variations in provisions on search committee membership reflect differences in college organization and constituent groups and a desire to include all relevant groups in the process. CFANS has a general provision requiring that faculty be a majority and that the committee is to include faculty from across departments as well as staff, students, and alumni. Humphrey says at least one-third of the search committee members are to be faculty members, appointed after consultation with the faculty of the School, and should include at least one Fellow or Senior Fellow and at least one student. CBS says the search committee should include representation from each department as well as staff and students; a majority shall be Regular Faculty. Nursing says the committee shall include faculty, student, and civil service staff representatives. Law says a majority of the search committee are members of the tenured/tenure-track faculty appointed by the President after consultation with the Law School FCC; the committee must include at least one member of the professional skills program and one student, each appointed after consultation with that constituency. CSE says the faculties are to be invited to submit nominations for search committee members and the majority of the committee must be Regular Faculty in CSE.
- Two constitutions say the president (not the provost) should charge the search committee. Some constitutions specify the number of names to be submitted.
- Some specify that the search process should provide faculty, staff, and students with an opportunity to meet with or hear from finalists.
- The Law School constitution provides for the search committee to consult with the entire faculty before submitting names and to report the vote of the faculty along with its own recommendation. The search committee is not to recommend a candidate over the objections of a majority of the faculty except "in rare cases and for compelling reasons." (The ABA accreditation standards have a similar requirement.)
- A few schools require that the dean be qualified to be a member of the Regular Faculty of the college.

Recommendations on the Selection Process

1. That the provisions be in compliance with University search specifications, including an accurate statement of who charges the search committee and who recommends the appointment to the Board of Regents; the provost should ensure that the colleges adhere to the University specifications. We included in Part 2 our recommendation to the provost that she allow variations in provisions on college participation in dean selection for the college; those permitted variations should include a college specifying (1) that the search committee will have a majority of faculty representation, (2) that except under compelling circumstances a candidate will not be recommended to the provost over the objections of a majority of the faculty, and (3) that the faculty may vote on and present to the provost a nonbinding petition for removal of the dean. Colleges should consider whether they want to include such provisions, as noted in particular recommendations below.

2. That the college consider including in the selection process faculty, staff, and students, plus any particular representation that seems appropriate in the individual unit.

3. **That colleges consider specifying a minimum percentage of faculty representation on the search committee;**
4. **That colleges consider allowing the entire faculty a role in specifying finalists;**
5. **That colleges consider whether they want to specify that the dean must be qualified to be a member of the Regular Faculty member of the college; and**
6. **That colleges include in their constitutions reference to any accreditation standards that affect the requirements for the selection process, including the date of the standards, vis-à-vis the dean.**

Comment on the Term of Office

Many constitutions specify an initial term length (3 years, 5 years, 7 years, "fixed term") and thereafter annually renewable appointments. Some recognize that under University policy the dean serves at the pleasure of the provost or president and Board of Regents, even within the initial term.

Recommendation on the Term of Office

That all constitutions be amended to reflect the Regents policy, which provides that all decanal appointments (though not any accompanying tenured faculty appointment) are "at will." The college may specify a "term" after which a specified evaluation process is to occur but it may not independently stipulate that the decanal appointment will be for a specified period of time.

Comment on Evaluation and Review of the Dean

Some constitutions specify only that there will be some kind of review, governed by University policy. Others provide specifically for annual and periodic comprehensive review, and they may reference University policy or procedures. Many require a major review in the third year of the first appointment and every five (or three) years thereafter. The Law School specifies only that the review is before expiration of the term. Some note that the committee is appointed by the provost; a few mention the senior vice president for health sciences. A few notable provisions:

- A few constitutions provide that as part of the major periodic review, faculty will vote on whether the dean's term should be extended.
- Some provide for faculty representation on the review committee.
- CFANS specifies that although the sharing of information from a review requires authorization from the dean, a summary of the review is expected to be given to the College Leadership Council and college FCC. (It's not clear that such a report would be permitted by law.)

Recommendations on Evaluation and Review of the Dean

- 1. That the constitutions should be consistent with University policy and procedure on review of deans (see http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/hr/Performance/PAPERFORMANCE_PROC02.html).**
- 2. That the constitutions focus on the involvement of faculty or other college constituencies in the University-mandated reviews rather than specifying the timing of reviews, which is controlled centrally.**

Comment on Removal Procedures

Only some of the constitutions contain provisions regarding recall petitions. CFANS provides that any year after the first comprehensive review, the faculty may request that the provost not renew the dean's annual contract by filing a petition of no confidence by a majority vote. CBS says a recall is initiated by filing a petition with the provost signed by at least 30 percent of the Regular Faculty; a recommendation of removal requires a two-thirds vote. CSE has a similar provision but requires that the provost schedule a meeting of the faculty to discuss and vote on a motion of recall if a petition with 30% of the faculty signing is sent to the provost.

Recommendation on Removal Procedures

That colleges consider including a mechanism for faculty to express "no confidence" in the dean, but the language must make clear that it would be a recommendation of removal to the provost; the faculty do not have the authority to remove a dean.

Comment on Authority and Responsibilities of the Dean

There is a wide range of specificity with which the constitutions list the duties and authority of the dean.

- Most have general statements that the dean is the chief representative and executive officer of the college and has general administrative authority over college affairs.
- Some say the administrative authority of the dean is exercised within the scope of the educational policies adopted by the faculty.
- Many have a statement that the dean is responsible for formulating and implementing policies, encouraging the introduction and testing of educational ideas and proposals, and stimulating college discussion leading to improvement of the education and research programs.
- Many say the dean is responsible for interpreting the college program to others at the University and to the community.
- Many mention making recommendations regarding faculty appointment, promotion, tenure, termination, and salary adjustments.
- Some say the dean is responsible for reviewing college, department, and other programs.

- Some talk about the dean providing leadership in formulating policies, improving and strengthening the school's departments, divisions, and programs, and fostering innovative programs.
- Many have the statement that where action of the Board of Regents is requested or required, the dean shall make such recommendations as are necessary, including for appointment, promotion, tenure, and salary of faculty.
- Most specify that the dean has final authority over budgetary recommendations.
- Many specify that the dean may appoint assistant and associate deans and other administrators, and is responsible for reviewing their performance.
- One specifies the responsibility to establish effective mechanisms for faculty input and consultation.
- Some require the dean to report annually to the faculty on the state of the college.

Recommendations on Authority and Responsibility of the Dean

1. That colleges look at the last position description used to select the dean and consider which elements belong in the constitution, which belong in bylaws, and which belong in the job description that is developed for searches and performance reviews.

While it seems reasonable to have specifications about the authority and responsibility of the dean vary from constitution to constitution, we question the usefulness of the descriptions in many of the documents. Some of the statements seem more suitable for job descriptions or bylaws. We encourage the colleges to consider whether the constitution should be limited to specifying the general scope of responsibilities (e.g., acting as the chief representative and executive officer of the college and having general administrative authority over college affairs in consultation with the faculty and other constituencies) and constraints on the dean's authority, leaving more specific articulation to the bylaws and job description.

2. That the colleges consider specifying that the dean operates within the educational policies established by the faculty, as some constitutions say.

3. That the colleges consider specifying the dean has a duty to consult with faculty, staff, and students.

4. The Regular Faculty

Comment

Constitutions contain various definitions of faculty and faculty roles; the assignment of roles and responsibilities in the constitution must be consistent with University policies, including Board of Regents policy *Faculty Tenure* and must be consistent with University definitions and cognizant of differences among categories of faculty members.

Recommendations on the Role of the Regular Faculty

1. Constitutions should clarify the roles and responsibilities of Regular Faculty.

2. Constitutions should cite or incorporate the Academic Unit Governance policy language:

The regular faculty in tenure-granting units holds primary responsibility for governance, research policy, curricular policy and degree requirements, and academic personnel allocation within their academic units, in consultation with the dean or chair of the unit. . . . Governance mechanisms that provide for participation by all appropriate groups in the decision-making processes of the unit shall be established, subject to the primary responsibility of the regular faculty within the unit with respect to the matters identified above.

3. Constitutional provisions specifying voting rights must be consistent with Board of Regents policy *Faculty Tenure*.

4. Constitutions should include a provision that Regular Faculty will participate in advisory committees on the budget, hiring, recruitment, and other critical college functions.

5. Constitutions should include a provision that Regular Faculty have responsibility for service on college committees.

5. Term Faculty, Adjuncts, P&A, Civil Service, Bargaining Unit Staff and Students

Comment

The role of contract faculty, adjuncts, P&A employees, Civil Service/Bargaining Unit staff, and students in shared governance varies widely by college.

Some colleges provide voting rights on the college assembly and most committees to all members of the college community. For example, CFANS and the CEHD include all P&A and CS/BU staff as voting members on the college assembly. Students, P&A employees, and CS/BU staff also serve and vote on most college committees. (A notable exception is the promotion and tenure committee—only tenured faculty in a unit may serve on this committee.)

Some colleges include clinical and contract faculty within the definition of faculty and extend voting privileges. The School of Nursing, for example, includes clinical faculty as voting members of the faculty assembly. Other constituency groups serve on the SON consultative committee as non-voting members. Many college constitutions are silent on the role of contract faculty, or it is unclear whether "faculty" includes contract faculty.

Another approach found in several constitutions is to restrict voting rights to tenured and tenure-track faculty. For example, in CSE, "non-regular" faculty members do not have voting rights in the college assembly or at departmental meetings. However, the CSE consultative committee has elected representatives from all constituencies in the college, including P&A, CS/BU, plus one undergraduate and one graduate student. In addition, the "Regular" faculty

may extend voting rights on the college assembly to "non-Regular" faculty. Similarly, in the Carlson School of Management, the "Regular" faculty (tenured and tenure-track) is responsible for research and curricular policies, degree requirements, and academic personnel allocation. The faculty may extend voting privileges to other constituency groups. In addition, CSOM P&A instructors are allowed to vote on curricular policy and degree requirements (except as related to doctoral education).

Recommendation on term and adjunct faculty, P&A, Civil Service,
and Bargaining Unit staff, and Students

Colleges should review the provisions concerning the governance role of the term and adjunct faculty and P&A and CS/BU staff. In addition, some constitutions are silent regarding students. The role, if any, played by these constituents should be clearly articulated in the constitution or accompanying bylaws.

6. Governance and Committees

Comment

Important parts of any constitution plus bylaws are the committee structures for the governance and organization of college activities in teaching, research and service. Colleges have different committee structures based on their size, individual needs, and historical events. However, most colleges have defined committee structures and rules surrounding those committees to ensure their functionality.

A number of committees are found in various colleges and schools. A nonexhaustive list of examples includes:

1. A faculty assembly which may contain only faculty with Regular Faculty or Regular Faculty plus adjunct faculty, P&A and others.
2. Education Policy Committee: This committee, usually composed of Regular Faculty, has oversight in curricular matters.
3. Education Implementation Committee: This committee is responsible for oversight of scheduling and assuring the curriculum is implemented.
4. Admissions Committee: Usually composed of faculty, this committee decides on students to be admitted.
5. Faculty Consultative Committee: This committee is constituted from among Regular Faculty and others as designated to advise the dean on college matters.
6. Student Affairs Committee: This committee has oversight of issues related to student progress and conduct.

7. Budget Committee: This committee usually serves as advisory to the dean on college's annual budget.
8. Administrative Committee: This committee usually is constituted from department chairs, assistants and associate deans.
9. Research Committee: This committee reviews the research program in the college and recommends policy.
10. Technology Committee: This committee has responsibility for assuring computing, communication and teaching technology is appropriate and up-to-date.

Recommendations on Governance and Committees

1. The constitution or bylaws should clearly state whether members of college committees have voting privileges on the committee or serve ex officio. Each constitution should include a clear statement that only tenured faculty are allowed to vote on promotion and tenure of tenured and tenure-track faculty. We make no recommendation regarding voting authority on other college committees; rather, we encourage all colleges to define the role of each committee, the membership, selection process, and voting rules. If this information exists in bylaws, these bylaws should be appended to the college constitution and both documents should be readily available online. The constitution should state what role, if any, contract faculty (that is, faculty who hold "Term Appointments" as defined in the Regents' tenure policy, section 3.3) play in governance or specify that the Regular Faculty determine the role and responsibilities of the contract faculty, P&A staff, civil service staff, and students.

2. Roles and responsibilities: The constitution and bylaws should describe the goals and responsibilities of each committee.

3. Specifications for committees should include:

a. size and membership of the committee, including categories of membership (e.g., tenure-track faculty, faculty who hold term appointments, P&A staff, students) and the number from each category;

b. the selection process for committees, including the source of nominations, if appropriate, who appoints or elects the members and the process for doing so, and the role of the Regular Faculty in confirming the membership;

c. length of service on committees;

d. to whom the committees report;

e. committee leadership (how is the chair of the committee chosen? what is the term of appointment?)

4. Of special importance is specification of eligibility for and procedures for election to University Senate or Faculty Senate.

5. As we noted in section (3)(4)(1) of this report, the Regular Faculty must retain control over the process for determining policies in the categories of curriculum/teaching/degrees, research, and budget and allocation of personnel, so the charges to committees that deal with these matters should be in the constitution. While it is up to the college to decide on the mechanisms for determining college policy on these matters, the Regular Faculty must determine if a policy matter falls into one of these three categories.

7. Bylaws

Comment

Most of the constitutions have procedures for amending and implementing bylaws. When the constitution has these procedures, it recognizes that the bylaws are necessary and dictates the implementation of the college constitution. Three colleges (Law, Design and Public Health) do not have procedures outlined in their constitution for introducing and/or amending bylaws. Public Health is the only one of these three colleges that has bylaws attached to the constitution.

Recommendation on the Bylaws

The constitution should stipulate the procedures for adopting bylaws and who is eligible to vote for them.

Appendices

Appendix 1

October 12, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO: Provosts and Deans

FROM: William G. Shepherd, Vice-President, Academic Administration

The attached Guidelines for the Development and Review of College Constitutions, with Particular Reference to the Powers and Duties of Deans was discussed in the October 4, 1971, meeting of the Administrative Committee and recommended by that Committee to the Board of Regents for its approval. The Board approved the Guidelines on October 8, 1971.

Inasmuch as this document is now in effect and available for your use, may I ask each of you to initiate the consultative procedures appropriate for your unit to review your constitution for each of the articles listed in the Guidelines. Units that do not now have a constitution are strongly urged to prepare such a document using the attached articles as a guide to insure minimum necessary content in the new document. When revised constitutions or new constitutions have been approved at the campus or collegiate level, they should be forwarded to my office for review and presentation to the Board of Regents for its final approval.

As you revise or prepare a constitution, may I request that you bear in mind the distinction between constitutions and by-laws. By-laws usually present a more detailed set of procedures for operating under an approved constitution. They may change more frequently than the constitution itself as new procedures develop that appear to be more effective and that still are in conformity with the over-riding provision of the constitution. Regents' approval is required for collegiate constitutions, not for by-laws.

It is my hope that the revision of all existing constitutions and the approval of new constitutions can be accomplished throughout the University by the beginning of the Fall Quarter, 1972.

WGS: ska
Attachment

September 17, 1971

GUIDELINES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW OF COLLEGE
CONSTITUTIONS, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE POWERS AND DUTIES
OF DEANS

Articles

Article I

The first Article in a College Constitution must state that the powers a College exercises are delegated by the Board of Regents in accordance with the Constitution of the University Senate which stipulates that such powers are extended by the Regents to the President, the University Senate, and the several faculties. This Article should also state that these powers may be modified by subsequent action of the Board of Regents.

The purposes of the College should be described or stated either in a preamble to the Constitution, or in Article I of the Constitution.

Article II

The second Article in a College Constitution should define the role, authority and the responsibilities of the Dean of the College. This Article should state that the Dean of the College shall be appointed by the Board of Regents upon the recommendation of the President of the University. The Constitution should specify what search and consultative procedures will be used to nominate candidates to the President. The appointment of Deans of Colleges shall henceforth be for stipulated terms of office (which may differ depending upon the circumstances in the given College) with the possibility of reappointment following a review initiated by the President near the end of the stipulated term. (The President has the power, of course, to initiate an earlier review if he deems it advisable.)

This second Article should further state that the Dean is the Chief Executive Officer of the College, that he shall have general administrative authority over College affairs, and that he shall make recommendations to the President on all faculty appointments, promotion, tenure and salary adjustments following established consultative procedures in the College. The Constitution should specify or describe these procedures .

The second Article should make it clear that the Dean of the College shall provide leadership for formulating policies, introducing and testing educational ideas and proposals, stimulating College discussions leading to improvement of the educational program of the College. These responsibilities include both the strengthening of the College and its program and the interpretation of that program to the University and the community. This Article should also include provision for a system which will ensure review of departments at periodic intervals.

Finally, this Article should include a statement which makes explicit the fact that the Dean, as Chief Executive Officer of the College, shall have final authority to make budgetary recommendations to the President, after completion of established consultative procedures within the College.

Subsequent Articles in College Constitutions may and likely will specify further and more specific powers, duties and responsibilities of the Dean of the College, as for example the manner of appointment of standing and ad hoc college committees. The relationship of the Dean to the faculty of the College will also likely be further explicated in later Articles of the Constitution. However, each College Constitution must include the substantive points enumerated above as a minimum definition of the powers and duties of Deans.

Articles Relating to Other Aspects of Collegiate Governance

These Articles should cover the definition of the faculty of the College, should make clear the voting rights of faculty and their responsibilities. These responsibilities have been recognized by the faculty in the Senate statement of December 3, 1970, Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The Articles should also indicate that procedures for removal of faculty for cause will be followed as outlined in the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure.

These Articles should stipulate the procedures to be followed in identifying, nominating and recommending the appointments of chairmen or heads of departments within the collegiate unit. The Articles should provide for stipulated terms of office for chairmen or heads, periodic reviews and the possibility of reappointment. These Articles should define the structure, function and composition of standing College committees, and state the procedures for governance within the College. The latter statement or statements should cover grievance and appeals procedures within the College.

These Articles should provide guidelines for student participation in the Amendment of existing College Constitutions. It is assumed that students will be participants in the development of new College Constitutions. These Articles should also make clear how students relate to the committee structures, the governance procedures, and the grievance and appeal procedures within the College.

Articles Dealing with External Relationships of the College to the University

It is essential to include in the Articles of the Constitution statements that define the relationship of the College and its faculty to all-University and Campus governing bodies, e.g., the University Senate and the Campus Assemblies. All Articles of College Constitutions must be compatible with the provisions of the appropriate Assembly Constitution and the Senate Constitution.

Variation in the College Constitutions

The Articles of the collegiate Constitutions will necessarily reflect the variations in the missions, site and complexity of the collegiate units. Hence, a complete model Constitution cannot be developed, but the foregoing should delineate the essential features of any collegiate Constitution.

Appendix 2

Board of Regents Policy "College Constitutions" (Adopted April 8, 1994, Amended July 12, 2006; March 12, 2010)

This policy governs the creation and review of college constitutions, which, with other University policies, guide educational and administrative actions within a college.

Subd. 1. Guiding Principle. College constitutions establish the internal governance structure and embody the authority of colleges to govern their own educational and administrative affairs.

Subd. 2. Definition. For the purposes of this policy, *college* shall mean an academic unit that is:

- (a) directly responsible for recruiting and hiring faculty and recommending them for promotion and tenure;
- (b) regarded by its faculty as their primary academic appointment home, either in one of the college's departments or directly within the college itself;
- (c) organized around a discipline or group of related disciplines; and
- (d) directly responsible for providing instruction for students that leads to an undergraduate, graduate, or professional degree or certificate.

Subd. 3. Delegation of Authority. The president or delegate shall approve collegiate constitutions and any subsequent amendments.

Subd. 4. Consistency with Board of Regents Policies and Other University Policies. College constitutions must be consistent with all Board of Regents (Board) and other University policies and procedures. To the extent that any provision of a college constitution conflicts with a Board or other University policy or procedure, the Board or other University policy or procedure shall govern.

Subd. 5. Relationship to Employment Contracts. College constitutions are not intended to be and are not part of the contract terms or the conditions of employment for any University employee.

Appendix 3

Academic Unit Governance policy (Approved by the University Senate - February 20, 2003, by the Administration - March 22, 2005)

1. The Regular faculty, as defined in the Board of Regents policy on Faculty Tenure, shall hold the primary responsibility for governance in tenure-granting units. This responsibility shall include governance of the unit in research policy, curricular policy and degree requirements, and academic personnel allocation, in consultation with the dean, chair or head of the department.
2. It is understood that faculty governance is primarily consultative and this policy operates with the limits established by the Board of Regents policy Reservation and Delegation of Authority.
3. Governance mechanisms that provide for participation by all appropriate groups in the decision-making processes of the unit shall be established, subject to the primary responsibility of the Regular faculty within the unit with respect to the matters identified above. It is expected that the Regular faculty would exercise this primary responsibility in consultation with the dean separate from the ordinary departmental governance structures only rarely, and as a last resort, if a department is divided over a fundamental issue or unable to reach a decision about the issue through the use of its normal processes.
4. Only members of the tenured faculty may formally participate/vote in tenure decisions. Only Regular faculty members at higher ranks may formally participate/vote in promotion decisions. (Non-Regular faculty in the Medical School who hold full time appointments involving teaching, research and service at affiliated hospitals may be permitted to participate in promotion decisions, but not in tenure decisions.) Recommendation by vote of the Regular faculty is required prior to hiring Regular faculty for that unit.
5. Individuals in all non-tenured/non-tenure-track appointment classes who Regularly fulfill the requirements for Regular faculty status are eligible to apply and compete for through a search process appointment as Regular faculty members as available and posted at the University of Minnesota.
6. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost in consultation with the deans will ensure that each collegiate unit and department conforms to these requirements. The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Professionals and Administrators Consultative Committee when professional and administrative staff are involved, will review and monitor adherence to this policy, and advise the Senior Vice President and Provost, as necessary.

Appendix 4

CBS Mission statement:

The purposes of the College of Biological Sciences are: (I) to afford to students seeking a liberal education an opportunity to develop an understanding of living systems and the place of humans in the biosphere; (ii) to provide basic instruction in biology for all units of the University that require it in dispatching their mission; (iii) to provide undergraduate pre-professional training in the biological sciences; (iv) to develop and maintain excellence in graduate education and research in biology with recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of the subject; and (v) to disseminate information about biology to the general community.

The mission of the College of Biological Sciences (CBS) is to provide outstanding educational opportunities to undergraduate and advanced students and to carry out world-class research in areas of modern biology from the molecular to the ecosystem level. To accomplish this mission it is necessary to integrate a strong basic research program with both traditional and innovative classroom teaching and with intensive interactions with students at all levels.

As part of its mission, the College is dedicated to providing basic biological science education and to sharing expertise with students and colleagues in other disciplines at the University of Minnesota, such as agriculture, engineering, health sciences, and liberal arts. The College provides the majority of the instruction in undergraduate biology at the University and shares graduate programs with a variety of other life science units around the campus.

The College is committed to outreach to the general community and cooperation with other educational institutions. Members of the College actively participate in the scientific community and in the leadership of professional organizations, and they contribute to the administration and governance of the University.

CEHD

Mission statement:

The College of Education and Human Development is a world leader in discovering, creating, sharing, and applying principles and practices of multiculturalism and multidisciplinary scholarship to advance teaching and learning and to enhance the psychological, physical, and social development of children, youth, and adults across the lifespan in families, organizations, and communities. Congruent with this mission, the College plays a significant role in sustaining the University's commitment to the egalitarian principles critical to its vitality as an urban, land grant research institution.

CFANS

Mission statement:

The College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences (CFANS), a collegiate unit of the University of Minnesota, is dedicated to education and scholarship in supporting food and nutrition systems, agriculture, environment and natural resources. The purpose of these educational programs is to offer instruction and degree programs at the undergraduate, graduate and continuing education levels. It is equally the responsibility of CFANS to encourage and maintain disciplinary and interdisciplinary research and service activities which will enlarge these bodies of knowledge and serve society.

CLA

Mission statement:

The College of Liberal Arts adopts this Constitution to facilitate the achievement of the following goals: to provide its students with a capacity to respond with intelligence and integrity to an ever-changing world through a broad liberal education, to help each student develop a solid foundation for a career or further education, to foster significant scholarly activity by the Faculty and to serve the well-being of the community, state and region.

Approval:

"Revised May 2008." No mention of approval by provost. However, "This Constitution shall become effective immediately after its adoption by a two-thirds majority of the current voting membership of the College Assembly and approval by the Board of Regents."

CSE

Mission statement:

The College of Science and Engineering (CSE), a collegiate unit of the University of Minnesota, is dedicated to education and scholarship in engineering, the physical sciences and mathematics. The purpose of these educational programs is to offer instruction and degree programs at the undergraduate, graduate and continuing education levels. It is equally CSE's responsibility to encourage and maintain research and service activities which will enlarge these bodies of knowledge and serve society.

Approval:

"Adopted: November 1992

"Amended: February 1998, December 2011"

No mention of approval by provost. However, any "amendment to the Constitution will become effective when approved by the executive vice president and provost."

CSOM

Mission statement:

The faculty of the Carlson School of Management (the School) herein states those Articles which establish the internal governance structure and embody the authority of the School to facilitate its mission to discover transformative knowledge about the issues faced by organizations and managers in a dynamic global economy and to create exceptional learning and career opportunities by facilitating an engaged and integrated community of scholars, students, and practitioners.

Dentistry

Mission statement:

"The School of Dentistry is committed to educate students, to advance the frontiers of knowledge, to pursue academic excellence and to serve the profession and the people of the State."

Design

Mission statement:

The College of Design is the home for academic disciplines related to design thinking, planning, and action at the University of Minnesota. Informed by the arts, humanities, and sciences, the discipline of design endeavors to manifest functionality, beauty, and meaning within the objects and experiences of its creation. The faculty, staff, and students of the college strive to advance

the quality and value of the natural, designed, and social environments, with a focus on the interactions of people and their world.

The purpose of the college is to advance knowledge through teaching and learning, scholarship, outreach, and service. The culture of the college embraces diverse and creative approaches to research, innovative pedagogical methods, interdisciplinary collaborations, and civic engagement. The college recognizes that design is guided by the values of the individual, group, community, society and humanity, with the ultimate goal of improving the quality of life.

Law

Mission statement:

"Purpose. The Law School of the University of Minnesota is committed to teaching, scholarship and service in law and related disciplines."

Medical School

Mission statement:

The Mission of the Medical School is to be a leader in enhancing the health of people through the education of skilled, compassionate and socially responsible physicians. With two campuses serving diverse populations in rural and urban Minnesota the Medical School is dedicated to preeminence in primary care medicine, exemplary specialty care and innovative research.

.....
The Medical School is responsible for the professional educational program leading to the degree Doctor of Medicine; for certain undergraduate courses presented for students registered in other colleges; for graduate instruction in the basic medical sciences in cooperation with the Graduate School; for graduate medical education; for continuing medical education; and for certain other professional or baccalaureate degree programs.

Nursing

Mission statement:

The School of Nursing has three purposes: to provide education in the discipline and practice of nursing; to promote and conduct research in nursing; and to serve as a resource in the promotion of excellence in nursing to the community at large.

Pharmacy

Mission statement:

Mission: The College of Pharmacy inspires and educates current and future pharmacists and scientists, engages in cutting-edge research and leads practice development to improve the health of the people of Minnesota and the world.

Vision: The College of Pharmacy will be a world leader in outstanding pharmacy education and research and in improving health by:

Providing a dynamic educational experience to a high-achieving, high-potential, diverse student body, thus empowering them to become leaders in patient-centered, interprofessional care.

Leading in innovative research in pharmaceutical sciences and practice while embracing the value of interdisciplinary work.

Establishing relationships with patients, decision makers and practitioners to meet changing needs, model patient-centered care and shape the evolving health care system.

Preparing graduate students, residents and post-doctoral fellows to become the next generation of scientists, advanced practitioners and educators.

Attracting and retaining outstanding and diverse faculty and staff.

Public Affairs

Mission statement:

The Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs inspires, educates, and supports innovative leaders to advance the common good in a diverse world.

The Institute pursues its mission by using its resources and those of the University to integrate: Preparation of students for leadership in public affairs

The bridging of disciplines across the University and larger community to advance public affairs scholarship; and

Public engagement and scholarship to address important issues and to solve problems facing Minnesota, the nation, and the world in a non-partisan setting.

Public Health

Mission statement:

The School of Public Health is dedicated to education, search for knowledge, academic excellence, and service to the profession and to the people of the State, the Nation, and the world. It is the purpose of this Constitution to foster an active, informed faculty, and to promote open communication among all members of the community of the School of Public Health.

Toward this end, the Constitution provides a democratic framework in which are defined the roles of the Dean, the faculty, academic professional and administrative staff, civil service/bargaining unit staff and students in initiating recommendations, formulating decisions, and communicating the basis for decisions to those affected.

Section 1. Purpose

Mission: The mission of the School of Public Health is to preserve and enhance the health of the public through education, research, and service programs designed to discover and transmit new knowledge aimed at the prevention of disease and disability, the improvement of health, and the planning, analysis, management, evaluation, and improvement of systems for the delivery of health services.

Goals:

a. Education: It is a goal of the School of Public Health to educate students to serve more effectively the health needs of communities. The School will provide suitable educational opportunities to augment the students' knowledge of public health principles and to assist them in developing appropriate skills and attitudes. The School shall participate in the continuing education of health professionals and in the education of the citizens of the State, the Nation, and the world.

b. Research: It is a goal of the School of Public Health to conduct research and to stimulate scholarly activity, with the aim of enhancing the well-being of the public.

c. Service: It is a goal of the School of Public Health to provide a broad range of consultative and direct services to organizations in support of the School's educational and research programs. It will respond, as appropriate, to community and individual health needs through publications and faculty participation in educational and research endeavors.

Veterinary Medicine

Mission statement:

The College of Veterinary Medicine of the University of Minnesota is dedicated to education in the art and science of veterinary medicine, the search for knowledge, academic excellence, and service to the veterinary medical profession and the people of the state.

Appendix 5

CBS

"Approved by Faculty 12/20/95

"Approved by Provost 11/97"

CEHD

Approval:

Document is dated 4/7/08, but no approval is noted. However, such approval is provided for in Article IX: "This constitution shall be in effect immediately upon approval by a simple majority of all votes cast by voting members of the College. Subsequent approval by the President and the Board of Regents will affirm the document."

CFANS

Approval:

"ARTICLE X. Effective Date of Constitution.

"X.1.1. This Constitution shall take effect following its approval by the CFANS Assembly.

"Approved: (May 13, 2008), Amended: (May 26, 2012)"

No mention of approval by provost. However, section X.1.3 contemplates approval of any amendment "by the College Assembly and the University's executive vice president and provost."

CSOM

Approval:

"Approved May 16, 2008; Amended January 7, 2009; By-law added on January 22, 2009"

No mention of approval by provost.

Dentistry

Approval:

"March, 2001; Revised April 2002 and December 2003

"Approved by School of Dentistry Council of Faculty on January 21, 2004

"Approved by Frank Cerra, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences on March 3, 2004"

In his approval letter Cerra notes that he is forwarding the constitution to "the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for her review." No mention of the outcome.

Design

Approval:

"Final May, 2008

"Diversity Committee Language approved October 2010

"Constitution distributed and approved via electronic ballot May, 2008"

No mention of approval by provost. However: "VI.1.1 This Constitution shall become effective immediately following its adoption by the faculty of the college and its approval by the Board of Regents."

Law

Approval:

"As amended to February 24, 2012"

Article X. Ratification

10.1. Effective Date. The Constitution will take effect when approved by the Faculty and by the Board of Regents.

This Constitution was approved by the Faculty, February 27, 1979 and March 6, 1979, and by the Board of Regents, July 13, 1979.

Amendments have been included, as follows:

| Section | Faculty Action | University Approval |
|---------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 3.3 | May 22 and May 29, 1979 | July 13, 1979 |
| 5.1 | January 17 and February 3, 1981 | June 12, 1981 |
| 4.2 | October 25 and November 8, 1983 | February 10, 1984 |
| Various | January 24 and February 21, 2012 | |

Medical School

Approval:

"Approved by the Regents January 10, 1986

"Amended May 1998

"Amended June 2002

"Amended May 2008

"Amended June 2011"

No mention of approval of amendments by provost. However, "Amendments shall be effective upon approval by the Board of Regents."

Nursing

Approval:

"Approved by the General Assembly 1/23/78

"Approved by Board of Regents 8/78

"Amended 2/80; 6/80, 6/86, 6/06

"Amended by Faculty 6/08

"Approved by Provost 2/12"

Pharmacy

Approval:

Dated August 20, 2009.

"July 28, 1989 Ratified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"June 21, 1990 Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"April 19, 1991 Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"April 17, 1992 Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"July 15, 1998 Constitution and Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"August 5, 1998 Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"September 2, 1998 Constitution and Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"October 9, 1998 Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"May 16, 2001 Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"June 25, 2001 Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"July 8, 2002 Constitution and Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"November 4, 2002 Constitution and Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty

"January 8, 2004 Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty
"September 7, 2004 Constitution and Bylaws modified by College of Pharmacy Faculty
"April 26, 2005 Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty
"April 13, 2006 Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty
"August 20, 2009 Bylaws Modified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty"
No mention of approval by the provost. However, "The amendment(s) to the Constitution will become effective when approved by the appropriate University authorities."

Public Affairs

Approval:

Dated September 4, 2007. No mention of approval by provost or Regents—although section 7.1 provides for submitting any amendment to the Board of Regents for approval.

Public Health

Approval:

"Revised Constitution

"Approved and Ratified by the School of Public Health Faculty June 12, 1995

"Change in APT Membership – Bylaws, Article IV, Committees Approved by School of Public Health Faculty May 25, 1999

"Titles, Unit Designation and Academic Calendar References Updated
August 20, 1999"

No mention of approval by provost. However, "Proposed amendments to the Constitution, duly approved and ratified by the voting faculty of the School of Public Health in accord with Section 1. above, shall be submitted to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences for transmission to the President of the University and Board of Regents for final approval. They shall be in effect as of the day following approval by the Board of Regents."

Veterinary Medicine

Approval:

Dated November 23, 2009. "The Constitution and its Bylaws shall become an official document following its acceptance by the President of the University or his/her designee." No evidence of such approval.