



### **Rules, Practices and Policies Committee (RPP)**

Minutes of Meeting: 2/2/24

Circulated: 3/1/24

Approved: 3/8/24

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

Absent: David Potter, Michela Russo

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe, Luke McCarthy

**11:02am:** Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the January RPP meeting were approved.

#### **11:02am-11:17am: Article 1, Section 5**

Summary: The Chair introduced the section and opened discussion on the topic. Concern is raised regarding the 14 day deadline for submitting a motion for the University Senate. This timeline makes it logistically difficult for the Faculty Senate Office to invite guest speakers, and plan for other programming in a short time frame. Having a longer lead time is supported by several members. A suggestion is to make it 21 business days. Clarification on the requirements for bringing a motion from the floor within the 14 day deadline (including during the meeting) is discussed.

Action: Discussion

#### **11:17am-11:56am: Article 1, Section 6**

Summary: The Chair introduced the section and opened discussion on the topic. A question is asked about the point related to the examples where only tenure track faculty vote on issues dealing with tenure. Questions are raised about the necessity of the examples present in this section. Points are made for or against these examples. An email vote will be conducted following the meeting.

What if a non-tenure track faculty member is the SACUA Chair, and needs to decide on whether or not a motion is related to tenure? A point is made that they can still run the meeting, with the general sentiment being that colleagues are to be trusted. Adding the parliamentarian to the decision-making process for this is suggested. Who should be allowed to introduce motions related to tenure-track matters? Tenure-track only? Issues with this are raised.

A question is raised about making the terminology throughout the document gender neutral. Changing "professors" to members of the Faculty Senate is more appropriate in point 5.



The voting timeframe in point 6 is discussed. Extending the timeframe to up to two weeks is suggested. An example of when having a short time limit is provided, and there is general agreement that the timeframe should be extended.

A question is asked about who gets to vote. Should it be those in attendance of the meeting, or all those who are in the body? Support is given for all those in the body, rather than just those who attend meetings.

Action: Discussion

**11:56am:** Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe  
Faculty Governance Coordinator  
Faculty Senate Office