



Rules, Practices and Policies Committee (RPP) Minutes for 11/14/25 Meeting

Meeting information:

Circulated: 12/16/25

Approved: 12/19/25

Members present: Mitchel Sollenberger, Heather O'Malley (SACUA), Nick Montgomery, Audrey Bennett, Jonathan Brennan (Chair), James Gulvas, Howard Bromberg

Members absent: Ken Alfano, Sun-Yung Bak, Lynette Hoelter, Neil Marsh, David Potter

Faculty Senate Office staff present: Eric Vandenberghe, Luke McCarthy

Minutes:

10:01am-10:08am: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the October RPP meeting are approved.

10:08am-10:38am: Faculty Senate conflict resolution

Summary: The FSO Director provides the committee with context for this charge item. In the current Faculty Senate rules there is no guidance for dealing with faculty conflict within faculty governance. In the absence of any established rules, Robert's Rules of Order applies. There are no written measures by which a faculty member can be removed from a committee.

Robert's Rules of Order provides guidance for disciplinary procedures both during a meeting, as well as outside of a meeting. In a meeting, members can be called to order. Penalties can range from requiring an apology, to expulsion from the committee. Outside of a meeting, a disciplinary process can be initiated by a resolution. The process can involve an investigation, report, trial, and determination of penalty. This would likely involve the Senate Assembly. A committee on discipline is something also mentioned that could be considered.

The trial in the Senate Assembly is discussed and may not be the right fit for faculty governance at UM. It would limit the work that the Assembly could conduct, as a trial would likely take place at one of the monthly meetings. A member suggests creating and sharing guidelines of conduct prior to meetings. A member asks if there is a code of conduct in place. There is none currently.

A member discusses the power of the committee chair and the need for checks and balances. They suggest SACUA or some other committee, such as the RPP, be able to intervene as necessary. SACUA has a heavy workload, so it may be better to have this responsibility on the RPP or another designated committee. SACUA could be the responsible committee should an issue arise on the designated committee. The standing judicial committee is also mentioned as a possible committee that could undertake this duty.



The Chair summarizes the ideas formulated during this meeting. The first is to formalize a code of conduct that is shared with members of faculty governance as they enter service. The second is to designate a committee with the responsibility of formally addressing conflict within faculty governance. It is suggested that these recommendations could be shared with SACUA as the next step.

Action: Discussion

10:38am-10:58am: SACUA nominations committee

Summary: The FSO Director provides an overview of the duties and context for this committee. He reads from the portion of the University Senate Rules that creates this committee. Discussion ensues on this committee. There was a time when it was more difficult to find candidates to run for SACUA. In recent years there have been many candidates who run. Earlier this committee would need to invite members to run, but now they primarily review the existing slate of candidates to review for eligibility.

The committee discusses on what grounds the committee may reject candidates, if any. The committee discusses the possibility of the committee being dissolved. A member suggests that the full Senate Assembly can serve the same function. The Faculty Senate Office can review eligibility issues.

The Chair summarizes the discussion the committee had. The primary point that the committee determined was that there may be a need to dissolve this committee.

Action: Discussion

10:58am: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Faculty Senate Office