Minutes of Meeting: 10/3/23
Circulated: 10/27/23
Approved: 11/3/23

Present: Audrey Bennett, Jonathan Brennan, Howard Bromberg, Bruce Maxim, Dinesh Pal (Chair), Sergio Villalobos-Ruminott, Heather O’Malley (SACUA Liaison)

Absent: Neil Marsh, David Potter, Michela Russo

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe, Luke McCarthy

1:00pm-1:04pm: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, introductions

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the April RPP meeting will be considered at the next meeting. The group provided brief introductions of their background to the rest of the committee.

1:04pm-1:07pm: Discussion of Committee Charge

Summary: The Charge of the committee was introduced and discussed. The Senate rules will be thoroughly reviewed this year by the committee.

Action: Discussion

1:07pm-1:59pm: Review of University Senate Rules: Article 1, Section 1 – 3

Summary: A review of Section 1 of the University Senate Rules ensued. The first paragraph comes directly from the Regent’s Bylaws. In order to change that particular paragraph, or any Regent’s bylaw, the formal process will have to be completed. This is a much more cumbersome process that includes public comment, and Regential approval. It is better to first address the portions of the rules that are not bylaws, as they will be simpler to change. If deemed necessary, the Regent’s bylaws can be recommended to be altered.

This committee creates recommendations that go to SACUA, and then to Senate Assembly.

The Chair provided clarified language that could be used to update the section.

The University Senate shall consist of:
- All Faculty members on the tenure-track, the executive officers of the University, and the dean of each school or college.
- Research Faculty with a primary research rank in the Research Professor Track or the Research Scientist Track.
- Faculty who have a regular, primary appointment of at least 50% on the Clinical Track.
- Faculty who have a regular, primary appointment of at least 50% as a Librarian, Archivist, or Curator of any rank shall be designated as members of the University Senate.
The committee continued to raise points about this section. A case was made for making the language consistent when describing the different Senate groups. A suggestion is made for having a rhetorical paragraph that identifies the bylaws added; this could also be identified by utilizing footnotes.

The Senate Rules for the sections discussed will be placed in a Google doc for the committee to review. This will be completed by the Faculty Senate Office and sent to the committee members.

The “revised” dates should be updated. It may be necessary to include “pending revisions” or something along those lines to avoid confusion.

A distinction between the Faculty Senate and University Senate. There are two ways of looking at it. The first is that the Faculty Senate is the entity in which SACUA, the Senate Assembly, and the University Senate reside. The second is that the Faculty Senate and the University Senate are synonymous. After discussion, it was posited that University Senate would be more inclusive given the recent expansion, and may be a more accurate name. It was brought up that considering Faculty Senate and University Senate synonymous would be a simple solution to this issue.

A question was raised regarding whether or not the Senate Chair should be hold the Senate Assembly Chair and SACUA Chair roles, or if they should be separate individuals. Should the chairs of each of the 3 bodies be the same person? Should they be different people? A point was made that there should be one person otherwise more conflict can arise.

A point of clarification is made on how the faculty senate agenda is formed.

A suggestion is made to have a definitions section at the beginning of the Senate Rules.

Section 1 and section 2 are reviewed during the meeting, with discussion started on 3, and to be continued next time.

Action: Discussion

1:59pm: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Faculty Senate Office