



The University of Michigan

---

Senate Assembly Rules Committee

John Riebesell, Ph.D.  
Chair

6052 Fleming Building  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1340  
Telephone: (734) 764-0303  
ecology@umich.edu

Memo to: Stan Berent, Chair, SACUA and Senate Assembly  
From: John Riebesell, Chair, Rules Committee  
Subject: Recommended Revisions to Regents Bylaws and Senate Rules  
Date: 18 March 2005

The Rules Committee has prepared the attached set of recommended changes to the Regents Bylaws and Senate Rules ([March2005ProposedChanges-Bylaws&Rules](#)) in response to requests from SACUA (1 December 2003) and Senate Assembly (December 2004).

The Committee's efforts have focused on three areas:

- **Conflicts between the Senate Rules and Regents Bylaws.** In order to identify such conflicts, we prepared a side-by-side comparison ([Rules-Bylaws](#)) which identifies (a) portions of the Senate Rules that are based on the Regents Bylaws and (b) substantive differences in wording between the two documents (red text). Our recommendations address all of the substantive differences.
- **Issues related to Senate Assembly reapportionment.** Our recommendations address all the problems presented in the attached document entitled "[Reapportionment of Senate Assembly - Issues for Discussion](#)".
- **"Housekeeping" changes.** We have identified a number of minor problems, such as outdated references to the "campus mail room," ambiguities between "calendar days" and "working days" (Senate Rule I.5.(3) has both a 14-day deadline - suggesting calendar days - and a 10-day deadline - suggesting working days), and conflicts between current procedures and Robert's Rules of Order.

An attached document ([Analysis of Changes Recommended](#)) indicates the recommendations that are associated with each focus area.

The Rules Committee has attempted to propose changes in the Regents Bylaws that will allow SACUA, Senate Assembly, and the University Senate to function for a number of years without further requests for Regental amendments. We anticipate that the Senate Rules will need additional evolutionary modifications in order to address issues that the Rules Committee has not yet examined. Some future changes might include the University Senate quorum (see our comment to Senate Rule I.4.(3)) and the overall organization of the Rules. (For example, is it better to include the SACUA election procedures in the "Senate Assembly" article - as in the Regents Bylaws - or in the "SACUA article" - as in the current Rules.)

Most of the Committee's recommendations are severable: They can be considered independently of each other. However, there are a few cases, where a change in one section necessitates a corresponding change elsewhere. In most cases, we present two alternatives: (a) the current phrasing and (b) the recommended phrasing. In three instances (Regents Bylaw 4.06 and Senate Rules II.1.(4) and III.4), a third alternative appears in the "comments" column. Because of the number of permutations of the recommended changes, we have not attempted to present "supporting arguments" and "opposing arguments," other than the entries in the "comments column." The Committee members are willing to attend meetings of SACUA and Senate Assembly if further explanation is needed.