



FACULTY SENATE Est. 1991

Michael Noll
President

James Archibald
President Elect/Vice President

linda pyscher jurczak
Secretary

Peggy Moch
Parliamentarian

Faculty Senate Agenda October 16, 2014; 3:30 pm University Center Magnolia Room

For the benefit of record keeping, we ask that senators and visitors please identify themselves when speaking to an issue during the meeting. Please use the microphones to assist with accurate recording. All senators must sign the roster in order to be counted present. If you have a senator's proxy, please place their name tag beside your name tag on the table in front of you.

Items in **bold print** are items that require action by the Faculty Senate. Other items are for information only.

1. Call to Order by Michael Noll, followed by a ten-minute session with President McKinney.
2. **Approval of the minutes of the September 18, 2014 meeting of the Faculty Senate.**
<http://ww2.valdosta.edu/facsen/meeting/minutes/index.shtml> (See link for minutes from September 18, 2014).
3. Old & Unfinished Business
 - a. Statutory Committee Reports
 - Academic Committee – (<http://www.valdosta.edu/academics/registrar/academic-committee.php>)
 - Committee on Committees - Diane Holliman
 - Faculty Affairs – Andy Ostapski
 - Faculty Grievance Committee - John Dunn
 - Institutional Planning Committee - Diane Wright
 - b. Standing Committee Reports
 - Academic Scheduling & Procedures - Tommy Crane
 - Academic Honors & Scholarships - Maren Clegg-Hyer
 - Athletics - Stacey Walters

Educational Policies - Jacob M. Jewusiak

Environmental Issues - Theresa J. Grove (Attachment A)

Faculty Scholarship & Research - Grazyna H. Walczak (**Attachment B**)

Internationalization and Globalization Committee - David Kuhlmeier (Attachment C)

Library Affairs - Rudo Tsemunhu

Minority & Diversity Issues - linda pysher jurczak

Student Activities & Services - James Archibald

Technology – Victoria Russell

c. Special and Ad Hoc Committees reports

i. Report from Ad Hoc Committee to Update and Improve VSU Faculty Handbook, Chair - linda jurczak

4. New Business

a. **Faculty Senate resolution on sexual assault and sexual harassment in connection with the Sigma Nu event and in support of the President's Special Committee on the Prevention of Sexual assault.**

b. Vice-President Andy Clark's presentation and Q & A session on the Faculty Salary Model that was circulated earlier this semester (Attachment D: received email and questions for VP Clark.).

c. *Kick Butts Day* and campaign at VSU to help make our campus smoke free

d. Summary of Parliamentary Procedures (Attachment E)

e. Faculty Social hosted by Senate on December 5

5. Discussion

6. Adjournment

Attachment A

To: Dr. Linda Jurczak

Executive Secretary, Faculty Senate

From: Theresa Grove

Chair, Environmental Issues Committee

Date: October 3, 2015

Re: Environmental Issues Committee Assessment of Charges and Goals, 2014-2015

Assessment of Charges

The charge of the Environmental Issues Committee (EIC) from the Bylaws and Statutes:

To review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to environmental issues as they relate to recycling, facilities use, campus beautification and stewardship, and traffic planning.

The specific standing subcommittees and their responsibilities:

* Campus Beautification and Stewardship is the body designated by the VSU Tree Preservation and Maintenance Policy that the administration is required to consult regarding any and all proposals for tree removals on campus. The subcommittee also works with Plant Operations (Grounds) to oversee, enforce and implement other aspects of the TPMP, including care, maintenance, and planning for new plantings and landscaping. The subcommittee is charged with approving expenditures from the Jewel Whitehead endowment for the purpose of campus beautification.

* Energy Conservation and Facilities is responsible for evaluating energy usage on campus in both internal and external environments and making recommendations for ways in which energy conservation can be attained. ECF will also work with the VSU Administration in overseeing and implementing the VSU Campus Outdoor Lighting Policy.

* Recycling is responsible for recommendations regarding institutional policies or improvements in the areas of recycling and pertinent maintenance practices. The subcommittee seeks to work closely with Plant Operations and other relevant administrative units to promote goals of recycling and waste reduction in support of a better environment.

* Traffic and Parking Planning is responsible for recommendations regarding institutional policies and improvements in the areas of planning for traffic and parking, specifically with regard to the campus and community environment.

Specific Assessment of Charges

EIC Committee:

- * Set regular meetings, establish subcommittee chairs, assess the charges of the EIC, and establish goals for the 2013-2014 academic year.
- * Respond to issues forwarded by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- * Revise Bylaws: ‘Article IV, c), 4. be reviewed concerning its fourth subcommittee charged with addressing parking and transportation issues—which is currently inactive—in lieu of a University Campus Parking & Transportation Committee, on which the EIC will have a voting member.
- * Schedule the walk-through for the Outdoor Lighting Policy.
- * Continue to work with President McKinney for the full implementation of the Campus Climate

Attachment B

INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

Scholarships in this category are designated specifically for those activities, materials, or equipment that focus on the development of a faculty member's skills, teaching methods, and/or techniques and strategies for the improvement of instructional effectiveness in the classroom. These grants do not usually fund travel to annual or general purpose meetings unless directly linked to pedagogical outcomes. They can fund travel to special or one-of-a-kind meetings that have a narrowly-defined pedagogical or curricular focus. They may also fund extra expenses incurred by faculty who wish to attend particularly relevant pre-convention or post-convention workshops.

To be considered for funding in this category, the applicant must:

- Provide a completed scholarship application form including your signature and signatures from your department head and dean.
- Provide a program or list of activities clearly and directly connected to the applicant's teaching field. Specific sessions to be attended should be clearly indicated.
- Provide the syllabi of the particular courses that are being improved by this activity with particular learning objectives impacted.
- Must be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs ten days prior to the FSRC meeting date.

Complete a final report within 30 days of travel.

*Effective July 1, 2011 resumes are no longer required.

** Please complete Faculty Scholarship travel authorizations after you receive your award letter that includes your award amount and the account number to be used.

For traveling by vehicle or flying, below are the steps to follow:

- Check to see if a university fleet vehicle is available at: <http://services.valdosta.edu/auxit/vehiclereservationform.aspx>.
- If fleet vehicle is not available, complete a Car Cost Comparison. If the car cost comparison shows it is cheaper to rent and you choose to drive your own vehicle you will be reimbursed at a reduced rate.
- If you are flying, please complete a Flight Comparison before purchasing your airfare. Make sure to click on the Compare Surrounding Flights button tool (or do a "screen shot") on the website you use so you will get a comparison. This is the page you should print and provide along with flight purchased receipt.

When completing expense reports refer to your faculty scholarship detailed award letter from Anita Bosch, Coordinator Faculty Scholarship.

** Original receipts and a printed copy of eReport must be submitted to all approving budget managers for which trip has been approved for a hand written signature. For example: if department funds and faculty scholarship award then you must have signature approval on the eReport from department head and VPAA office.

* GSA - Domestic Per Diem Rates

Examples of proposals the committee has funded:

(1) An Assistant Professor of Biology attends a National Science Foundation Seminar in Washington, D.C. to learn the latest strategies for engaging students in laboratory learning, which relates directly to a course the professor teaches, _____. The delivery of very detailed and difficult information will be modified based on strategies learned at the seminar, which are designed to now provide students with organizational tools for storing, retrieving, applying knowledge and techniques for laboratory applications and practice.

(2) An Associate Professor of History attends a Humanities Endowment Workshop in Atlanta to learn about methods of interpreting and synthesizing information from reports on Civil War battles fought in Georgia. The methods learned will help the instructor to communicate social and political contexts of the Civil War period more effectively and engage students in comparison with contemporary contexts.

(3) A music professor attends a conference where one of the sessions explores a new technique of performance. The professor explains how learning this new technique will enhance his/her teaching in the applied studio and beyond. The information in the session the professor will attend cannot be learned properly without physically being at the conference and learning first-hand from the presenter.

Examples of common mistakes which resulted in the committee not awarding a Scholarship:

(1) Objectives are weak. The applicant does not make direct connections between the request being funded and the courses taught. In addition the application is missing course numbers, titles, and syllabi for specific courses that will be enhanced by attending the conference.

(2) Weak or missing outcomes. A music professor wishes to attend a festival or conference of music in order to gain insight into new music practices or

performances. He/she does not have a specific purpose of how the conference will enhance his/her teaching techniques, methods, strategies or skills.

(3) Workshops, seminars, courses, etc. on the subject matter or skill development outlined in the request are offered through VSU.

(4) The application is not complete (Missing: Documentation of the event, itemized budget, syllabi etc.) or the applicant has submitted old outdated forms.

(5) Requests are being requested which are retroactive to the event.

~~(6) Honoraria for guest lecturers or guest performers are outside the purview of these funds.~~

Attachment C

To: Dr. Linda Jureczak
Executive Secretary, Faculty Senate

From: David B. Kuhlmeier
Chair, Internationalization & Globalization Committee

Date: September 29, 2014

Re: Internationalization & Globalization Committee Assessment of Charges and Goals, 2014-2015

Assessment of Charges

The charge of the Internationalization & Globalization Committee (IGC) from the Bylaws and Statutes:

The Internationalization and Globalization Committee is a Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate (Senate Bylaws, Art. II, Sec. 3 (i)1) with the responsibility of initiating, developing and/or reviewing policies and procedures to strengthen the institution's internationalization and globalization efforts, interacting with other statutory and standing committees when such issues overlap their charge.

The specific standing subcommittees and their responsibilities:

1. The VSU Study Abroad Subcommittee is responsible for promoting all current VS study abroad programs; development of more support, both financial and staffing, for VSU study abroad programs; and the exploration and development of international internships and experiences for VSU students.
2. The Curriculum and Faculty Internationalization Subcommittee is responsible for exploring possibilities to offer more courses at VSU with international perspectives; the development of internationally oriented minors; promoting the hiring of more faculty and staff who are internationally experienced; development of collaborative efforts with other university campuses around the world; and the development of programs outside the USA for VSU faculty members.
To address such issues as:
3. The International Efforts on Campus Subcommittee is responsible for attracting more international students and faculty to VSU.
4. The Campus Inter-cultural Efforts Subcommittee is responsible for the development and promotion of more cultural and international events on campus to promote cultural diversity.

Specific Assessment of Charges

IGC Committee:

- Set regular meetings, establish subcommittee chairs, assess the charges of the IGC, and establish goals for the 2014-2015 academic year.
 - The IGC held its inaugural meeting on Wed., Sept. 10. It was then decided for the IGC to meet again in November 2014 to finalize the Subcommittee membership and chairs and to establish the meeting schedule for the remaining of 2014-2015.

- Respond to issues forwarded by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- initiate, develop and/or review policies and procedures to strengthen the institution's internationalization and globalization efforts
- Communicate and coordinate with other VSU organizations and committees to assure efficiency of VSU internationalization & globalization efforts by eliminating any duplication of efforts.

IGC Subcommittees:

As the Internationalization & Globalization Committee (IGC) is a newly formed committee of the Faculty Senate and, consequently, has had its inaugural meeting on Wed., Sept. 10, 2014, its subcommittees have not met to determine their respective chairs and specific goals for 2014-2015. This information will be forwarded as soon as it is determined.

- VSU Study Abroad Subcommittee
- Curriculum and Faculty Internationalization Subcommittee
- International Efforts on Campus Subcommittee
- Campus Inter-cultural Efforts Subcommittee

Respectfully submitted by David B. Kuhlmeier

Attachment D

From: Krishnendu Roy

Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 2:48 PM

To: Peggy L Moch; ...

Subject: Re: Faculty Salary Study

Hello Peggy,

I have some concerns about this study and want to share that with you and other senators from our department. If you get a chance, please raise them during the next Senate meeting.

Concern 1:

The second of the five notes on the first page of the salary study pdf file states

"Compression rate is calculated at 0.50% of the 85% of the average. For the compression amount, the compression rate was then times the number of years as of August 1, 2013 a faculty member has been in their current job title. If a faculty member was promoted, the number years for compression was reset to zero."

The last part, resetting the number of years for promoted faculty to zero is what bothers me. This might cause salary-inversions. Following are some examples on how that might happen for a hypothetical salary of \$70,000, and hypothetical CUPA average of \$75,000:

Two faculties with the same starting salary who started a year apart:

Year	Faculty A	Faculty B	Comments
2010	\$70,000.00		A started working
2011	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	B started working
2012	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2013	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2014	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	A gets promoted and tenured, everyone gets a salary increase by (0.05% of 85% of average CUPA salary) x # of years served at current rank — assuming the CUPA average is \$75,000
2015	\$74,000.00	\$71,275.00	
2016	\$74,000.00	\$75,275.00	B gets promoted and tenured
2017	\$74,000.00	\$75,275.00	

Two faculties with the same starting salary who started at the same time:

Year	Faculty A	Faculty B	Comments
2010	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	A and B Started working
2011	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2012	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2013	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2014	\$74,000.00	\$71,275.00	A gets promoted and tenured, everyone gets a salary increase by (0.05% of 85% of average CUPA salary) x # of years served at current rank — assuming the CUPA average is \$75,000
2015	\$74,000.00	\$75,275.00	A gets tenured, B gets promoted and tenured
2016	\$74,000.00	\$75,275.00	
2017	\$74,000.00	\$75,275.00	

I think these scenarios are unfair. There can be various ways to address this. For example, instead of resetting the clock to zero for promoted faculties, giving them credit for the years served in the previous rank. I want to know the Faculty Senate's thoughts on this and how do they plan to interface with the administration about this.

Concern 2:

Compression is calculated as 0.50% of 85% of CUPA average. What is the justification behind that 85%? Why is it 85% and not 90% (or 80% for that matter)? While I do not have any problem with 85%, if possible, I would like to know the justification of using that number.

Thanks
Krishnendu
Krishnendu Roy
Associate Professor
Dept. of Math/CS
Valdosta State University
229-259-2041
kroy@valdosta.edu
www.valdosta.edu/~kroy

Additional Faculty Salary Study Questions (received 10-06-14 from Theresa Grove and Jason Allard)

1. On the worksheet labeled "STUDY DETAIL NO PAYGRADE" (in the Salary Model 12-13 Benchmarking and Compression Excel file sent out by James Archibald to faculty senators on August 26th), only 57 out of 414 employees received a salary adjustment to reach 85% of the CUPA mean (column Y). This is ~13.8% of employees included on the worksheet. Only 9.9% of these employees received more than a \$1000 adjustment to their salaries to reach 85% of the CUPA mean. **From this column it appears that a small percentage of total faculty salaries were adjusted; therefore, did this market adjustment successfully address the low pay of VSU employees?**

2.a. **Why was 0.05% of 85% of the CUPA average used for compression adjustments? Why not use 0.05% of each employee's actual salary?** About 14% (from Question 1) received a salary adjustment, which means that ~86% of faculty earned greater than 85% of the CUPA average. Therefore, ~86% of faculty received a compression adjustment that was calculated from an average that was less than their own salary.

2.b. **What is the justification behind that 85% of the CUPA average? Why is it 85% and not 90% (or 80% for that matter)?** Was it the percentage that enabled the Administration to reach a particular number (i.e. the administration wanted to come up with an equation that reached \$2 million and the 85% gave them that amount [as opposed to 87%, 83%, etc.]).

3.a. While it may just be a heading issue, in the "CUPA National Salaries for Salary Equity and Compression" PDF (sent out by James Archibald to faculty senators on August 26th), the comparison group is: "2010 VSU Comparison Group." The announcement that a salary study was being conducted was made during the 2012-2013 academic year (and noted in the PDF with "Year: 2012-2013"), and salary adjustments took effect August 2013. **At the point of the salary adjustments, were the data used already 3 years old? Or were the data current and only the peer institutions determined in 2010?**

3.b. **Related to Question 3.a., were the average salaries used for the implemented study actually the numbers from a previous study that Kristina Cragg, former Assistant to the President for Strategic Research and Analysis, developed?** Did you develop the current model, independent of Cragg's study? Or, what components did you develop and what components came from her model? If the study and the data came from Cragg, then could this mean the data were collected for the 2010 study, and that the data were perhaps more than 3 years outdated (i.e., from ~2009)?

4.a. What is the rationale for selecting non-collective bargaining institutions? The President has previously answered this question by stating that VSU is a non-collective bargaining institution, which is why non-collective bargaining institutions were used. However, VSU is a “comprehensive university” and seeks to attract national faculty (and keep faculty from leaving). **Are the standards of VSU only tied to those of non-collective bargaining universities and not all Masters L Universities? Are the standards of collective bargaining institutions completely dissimilar to non-collective bargaining institutions?**

4.b. The selected peer institutions cluster in the South and Southeast US, and the selected peer institutions are amongst the lower paying of Masters L Universities when compared to all Masters L Universities. For example, the VSU’s selected peer institutions can pay ~\$10,000 less than national average for associate professors (at least in Arts & Sciences). Having data provided by the administration for all (national) Masters L Universities (collective and non-collective bargaining institutions) would be very illuminating regarding the potentially large pay differences between non-collective bargaining institutions and all Masters L Universities. **The selection of the peer institutions used in the salary adjustments can have a very significant impact on the CUPA mean. Can the Administration provide CUPA mean salaries for all Masters L Universities, and not just those for non-collective bargaining institutions?**

5.a. **Does the Administration realize that the formula used has the potential to remove merit based raises? Will this be taken into account in future models?**

Example Scenario:

If a faculty member received merit raises during their time at VSU, then this individual could be slightly below (or above) 85% (or 90% or whatever the goal is) of the CUPA average and would receive a small (or no) market adjustment to reach the 85% (or 90%, etc.) target. A faculty member who has been at VSU for the same amount of time, but did not earn any merit raises would likely be farther below the 85% (or 90%, etc.) target. This less-productive faculty member would now be brought up to the same target salary as the more-productive faculty member, thus negating any prior merit raises. Such a formula removes incentives to be productive because marginal productivity can achieve the same salary adjustments to those individuals that were more productive.

5.b. Will the Administration develop a new salary adjustment study that retains the merit raises earned by individual faculty? A well-thought out plan should be developed, and one method may be a two-step calculation:

Step 1: Calculate everyone’s “adjusted” salary based on a percentage of the target average CUPA salary (e.g., 90% of CUPA average). All individuals receive this salary adjustment.

Step 2: Calculate additional salary adjustments that account for merit raises by multiplying the merit raise percentage earned by the faculty member by the average CUPA salary when the merit raise was earned (e.g., if the faculty earned a 3.5% merit raise when they were an associate professor and 90% CUPA average of an associate professor is 65000, then $0.035 \times 65000 = \$2275$). This, additional merit-based salary adjustment would get added onto the 90% CUPA average salary of this individual. If a person has not earned any merit raises, then they will earn no additional merit-based salary adjustment. However, if a faculty member has earned merit raises, these will be taken into account and faculty who earned merit-based increases will earn a higher salary.

6. Similarly, depending on when faculty are hired and go up for promotion, there can be a faculty member who has been here for a shorter period, but has a higher salary after promotion. **Is the Administration aware of this?**

Example Scenario 1:

During the year of the salary adjustment study, Faculty A submitted his/her promotion material after 5 years of being an assistant professor and was approved for promotion and tenure. At the start of the 2013-2014 academic year, this faculty would receive a \$4,000 salary increase from the promotion, but 0% from the compression adjustment.

Faculty B was hired one year after Faculty A, and has been an assistant professor for 4 years. As a result of the compression adjustment, this person earned $4 \text{ years} \times 0.5\%/\text{year} = 2\%$ increase. During the 2013-2014 academic year, Faculty B goes through the promotion and tenure process and is successful (both faculty members spent 5 years in rank as assistant professor). At the start of the Fall 2014-2015 academic year this faculty will also earn the \$4,000 salary increase due to the promotion.

Summary:

Faculty A: $50,000 \text{ (salary)} + 0 \text{ (compression adjustment)} + 4,000 \text{ (promotion)} = \$54,000$

Faculty B: $50,000 \text{ (salary)} + 1,000 \text{ (compression adjustment } 2\% \text{ of } 50,000) + 4,000 \text{ (promotion)} = \$55,000$

So, despite have one year more of experience at VSU and all other things being equal (since this wasn't a merit raise) Faculty A will earn \$1,000 less than Faculty B.

The following are other examples of how resetting the number of years for promoted faculty to zero might cause salary-inversions. The examples use hypothetical starting salaries of \$70,000, and a hypothetical CUPA average of \$75,000:

Example Scenario 2:

Two faculty with the same starting salary who started a year apart:

Year	Faculty A	Faculty B	Comments
2010	\$70,000.00		'A' started working
2011	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	'B' started working
2012	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2013	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2014	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2015	\$74,000.00	\$71,275.00	'A' gets promoted and tenured, everyone gets a salary increase by $(0.05\% \text{ of } 85\% \text{ of average CUPA salary}) \times \# \text{ of years served at current rank}$ — assuming the CUPA average is \$75,000
2016	\$74,000.00	\$75,275.00	'B' gets promoted and tenured
2017	\$74,000.00	\$75,275.00	

Example Scenario 3:

Two faculty with the same starting salary who started at the same time:

Year	Faculty A	Faculty B	Comments
2010	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	A and B Started working
2011	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2012	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2013	\$70,000.00	\$70,000.00	
2014	\$74,000.00	\$71,275.00	A gets promoted, everyone gets a salary increase by (0.05% of 85% of average CUPA salary) x # of years served at current rank — assuming the CUPA average is \$75,000
2015	\$74,000.00	\$75,275.00	A gets tenured, B gets promoted and tenured
2016	\$74,000.00	\$75,275.00	
2017	\$74,000.00	\$75,275.00	

These scenarios are unfair. There can be various ways to address this. For example, instead of resetting the clock to zero for promoted faculties, giving them credit for the years served in the previous rank. I want to know the Faculty Senate's thoughts on this and how do they plan to interface with the administration about this.

Attachment E

TABLE OF PARLIAMENTARY MOTIONS¹

I. PRIVILEGED

	<u>Sec'd</u>	<u>Amend</u>	<u>Debate</u>	<u>Vote RQ</u>	<u>Recons</u>	<u>Interrupt</u>
1. Fix Time To Adj(ord)	Y	Y	N	MAJ	Y	N
2. Adjourn	Y	N	N	MAJ	N	N
3. Recess (business pending)	Y	Y	N	MAJ	N	N
4. Question of Privilege	N	N	N	CHR	N	Y (only if unavoidable)
5. Orders of Day	N	N	N	N	N	Y

II. SUBSIDIARY

	<u>Sec'd</u>	<u>Amend</u>	<u>Debate</u>	<u>Vote RQ</u>	<u>Recons</u>	<u>Interrupt</u>
6. Lay On The Table	Y	N	N	MAJ	N	N
7. Previous Question	Y	N	N	2/3	***	N
8. Limit or Extend Debate	Y	Y	N	2/3	**	N
9. Postpone to Def Time	Y	Y	Y*	MAJ**	Y	N
10. Commit (or Refer)	Y	Y	Y*	MAJ	Y**	N
11. Amend	Y	Y	Y**	MAJ	Y	N
12. Postpone Indefinitely	Y	N	Y	MAJ	Y**	N

III. MAIN MOTIONS

	<u>Sec'd</u>	<u>Amend</u>	<u>Debate</u>	<u>Vote RQ</u>	<u>Recons</u>	<u>Interrupt</u>
	Y	Y	Y	MAJ	Y	N

IV. INCIDENTAL

	<u>Sec'd</u>	<u>Amend</u>	<u>Debate</u>	<u>Vote RQ</u>	<u>Recons</u>	<u>Interrupt</u>
Point of Order	N	N	N	CHR	N	Y
Appeal	Y	N	**	MAJ	Y	Y
Suspend Rules	Y	N	N	2/3	N	N
Objection to Consideration	N	N	N	2/3	Y	Y
Division of Question	Y	Y	N	MAJ	N	N
Consideration by Paragraph	Y	Y	N	MAJ	N	N
Division of Assembly	N	N	N	NONE	N	Y

V. RESTORATIVE: INCIDENTAL MAIN MOTIONS CLASSED W/ MOTIONS THAT BRING A ? AGAIN BEFORE THE ASSEMBLY

	<u>Sec'd</u>	<u>Amend</u>	<u>Debate</u>	<u>Vote RQ</u>	<u>Recons</u>	<u>Interrupt</u>
Take from the Table	Y	N	N	MAJ	N	Y**
Rescind; amend prev. adopted	Y	Y	Y	**	Y (neg)	N
Discharge a Committee	Y	Y	Y	**	y**	N
Reconsider	Y	N	Y**	MAJ	N	Y

* Debate On Merits Only

** Special Rules Apply

*** Negative Vote Only

REF: PARLTABL RLJuddRev8

¹Based on Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised, 11th edition, Henry M. Robert, III et. al. editors. Da Capo Press (Perseus Books Group), Philadelphia, (2011).

SALIENT FEATURES OF ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER, REVISED²

"Where there is no law, but every man does what is right in his own eyes, there is the least of real liberty."

-Henry M. Robert

RULES OF DEBATE

Each member has the right to speak twice on the same question on the same day (except on an appeal), but cannot make a second speech on the same question as long as any member who has not spoken on that question desires the floor.

No one can speak longer than ten minutes at a time without permission of the assembly.

Debate must be limited to the merits of the immediately pending question - that is, the last question stated by the Chairman.

Speakers must address their remarks to the presiding officer, be courteous in their language and deportment, and avoid all personalities, never alluding to the officers of other members by name, where possible to avoid, nor to the motives of members.

RULES RELATING TO MOTIONS

1. ADJOUR

N:

- Undebatable.
- Cannot be amended.
- Cannot be reconsidered.
- Must be seconded.
- Requires a majority vote.
- Out of order when another has the floor.

2. ADOPT A REPORT:

- Debatable.
- Debate confined to pending question.
- Can be amended.
- Can be reconsidered.
- Requires a majority vote.
- Must be seconded.
- Out of order when another has the floor.

3. ADOPT BYLAWS:

- Debatable.
- Can be amended.
- Majority vote needed.
- A Bylaw may be presented and voted upon at the same meeting (not an amendment to adopted bylaws).

4. AMEND:

Debatable except when the motion to be amended is unbeatable.

Can be amended.

Can be reconsidered.

A 2/3 vote is required for an amendment to Bylaws. All other amendments require a majority vote, even though the question to be amended requires a 2/3 vote.

An amendment may be made by inserting or adding words or paragraphs; by striking out words or paragraphs, by striking out and inserting words; by substituting one or more paragraphs; for others or an entire resolution for another on the same subject.

5. AMEND AN AMENDMENT:

Debatable; undebatable when the motion to be amended is undebatable.

Cannot be amended.

Can be reconsidered.

Requires a majority vote.

6. APPEAL OF THE CHAIR:

Debatable (Each person speaks once. Chairman speaks at the beginning and end.).

Must be seconded.

Debate confined to pending matter.

Cannot be amended.

Requires a majority vote.

In order when another has the floor.

An appeal may be made from any decision of the chair, but it can be made only at the time the ruling is made. If any debate has intervened, it is too late to appeal. An answer to a parliamentary inquiry is not a decision, therefore cannot be appealed.

While an appeal is pending, a question of order may be raised which the Chair decides. Peremptorily, there being no appeal from this decision. But the question as to the correctness of the ruling can be brought up afterwards when no other business is pending.

7. COMMIT, REFER, RECOMMIT:

Debatable but only as to the propriety of committing the main question.

Can be amended.

Cannot be reconsidered after the committee has taken up the subject.

Requires a majority vote.

Must be seconded.

Out of order when another has the floor.

Takes precedence over the motions to amend or to postpone indefinitely.

Cannot be applied to any subsidiary motion.

If the question has already been before a standing or special committee, the motion becomes the motion to recommit.

Object of the Motion:

The object of the motion to refer is usually to enable a question to be more carefully investigated and put into better shape for the assembly to consider than can be done in the assembly itself.

8. TO CLOSE, LIMIT, OR EXTEND DEBATE:

No one may speak longer than ten minutes without permission of this assembly.

May be applied to any debatable motion or series of motions.

Undebatable.

Requires a 2/3 vote for adoption.

Takes precedence over any debatable motion.

Can be reconsidered.

9. DIVISION OF THE ASSEMBLY:

Undebatable.

Cannot be amended.

Cannot be reconsidered.

Does not need a second.

In order when another has the floor.

Object of the Motion:

Used when a vote that was taken by a show of hands is doubted. The Chairman proceeds to take the vote again, this time by having the affirmative rise and then when they are seated, having the negative rise.

10. DIVISION OF THE QUESTION:

0

Undebatable.

Will be done automatically when a motion contains two separate thoughts.

11. LAY ON THE TABLE:

1

Undebatable.

Cannot be amended.

Cannot be reconsidered.

Requires a majority vote.

May be applied to any main motion.

Object of the Motion:

To enable the assembly, in order to attend to more urgent business, to lay aside the pending question in such a way that its consideration may be resumed at the will of the assembly as easily as if it were a new question, in preference to new questions competing with it for consideration.

1 MAIN MOTION OR QUESTION:

2

Must be seconded
Debatable.
Debate confined to pending question.
Can be amended.
Can be reconsidered.
Requires a majority vote.
Out of order when another has the floor.

1 OBJECTION TO CONSIDERATION OF A QUESTION

3

Undebatable.
Cannot be amended.
Does not need a second.
The objection can be made only when the question is first introduced before the debate.
A 2/3 vote must be opposed to the consideration in order to sustain the objection.

Object of the Motion:

Object is not to cut off debate, but to enable the assembly to avoid altogether, any question that it may deem irrelevant, unprofitable, or contentious.

1 CALL FOR ORDERS OF THE DAY:

4

This is a demand that the assembly conform to its program or order of business.
It requires no second and is in order when another has the floor, even though it interrupts a speech, as a single member has a right to demand that the order of business be conformed to.
It is out of order to call for the orders of the day when there is not variation from the order of business.
Thus, the orders of the day cannot be called for when another question is pending, provided there are not special orders made for that time, as general orders cannot interrupt a question actually under consideration.

REQUESTS GROWING OUT OF THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING

1 PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY:

5

Undebatable.
Cannot be amended.
Cannot be reconsidered.
Does not need a second.
In order when another has the floor.

Purpose: When a member is in doubt as to what motion to make on pending business, he may ask the Chairman.

May be made while another has the floor.

1 REQUEST FOR INFORMATION:

6

Must relate to pending business.

Must be directed to the Chair or through the Chair to another speaker.

The Chairman inquires if the speaker is willing to be interrupted, and if he consents, he directs the inquirer to proceed. If the speaker consents to the interruption the time consumed is taken out of this minute limit.

1 POSTPONE DEFINITELY OR TO A CERTAIN TIME:

7

Requires second.

Debatable on merits only.

Amendable as to time of postponement.

Majority vote, except as noted below.

Can be reconsidered.

The effect of this motion, which requires a majority vote, is to make it an order of the day for time to which it was postponed.

Postponing a question to a certain hour does not make it a special order unless to specified in the motion.

A special order requires a 2/3 vote, as it suspends all rules that interfere with its consideration at the specified time, except those relating to adjournment, recess, or privilege.

1 POSTPONE INDEFINITELY:

8

Requires second

Opens the main question to debate.

Majority vote.

Can be applied to only main questions.

A negative vote on this cannot be reconsidered.

Object of the Motion:

The object of the motion is not to postpone, but to reject, the main motion without incurring the risk of a direct vote on it, and it is made only by the enemies of the main motion when they are in doubt as to their being in the majority.

1 MOVE THE PREVIOUS QUESTION:

9

- Undebatable.
- Cannot be amended.
- Needs a 2/3 vote.
- Out of order when another has the floor.

Object: The object of this motion is to bring the assembly to an immediate vote on a pending question. May be moved on one or all questions. This motion must be seconded.

2 QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE:

0

- Relate to the rights and privileges of the assembly or to any of its members.
- If a question is one requiring immediate action, it may interrupt a member's speech (for example, if a report which is being read cannot be heard). But if it is not of such urgency, it should not interrupt a member until after he has commenced speaking.
- Questions of privilege must relate to one as a member of the assembly or else relate to charges against his character; freedom from noise or disturbance; conduct of its officers or members; disorderly conduct or other offense; conduct of reporters for the press or to the accuracy of published reports or proceedings.

2 RECONSIDERATION:

1

- Must be brought up by one on the prevailing side.
- Any member may second it.
- Can be made only on the day the vote to be reconsidered was taken or on the next succeeding day.
- No question can be recommended twice unless it was materially amended after its first reconsideration.
- A reconsideration requires a majority vote regardless of the vote necessary to adopt the motion to be reconsidered.
- Undebatable when the motion to be reconsidered is undebatable.
- Not amendable
- Debatable when main question is debatable.
- Requires majority vote *regardless of the vote necessary to adopt the motion reconsidered.*
- Cannot be reconsidered.

Effect: The effect of making this motion is to suspend all action that the original motion would have required until the reconsideration is acted upon.

The effect of the adoption of this motion is to place before the assembly the original question in the exact position it occupied before it was voted upon. See tinted pp. 47-48 of Robert's' for motion that cannot be reconsidered.

2 **RESCIND OR REPEAL:**

2

Must be seconded.

To rescind is identical with the motion to amend something previously adopted.

It is a main motion without any privilege and therefore can be introduced only when there is nothing else before the assembly.

It cannot be made if the question can be reached by reconsideration.

With exceptions, any action or unexecuted part of an order may be rescinded by a majority vote, provided notice has been given at the previous meeting or in the call for this meeting, or it may be rescinded without notice by a 2/3 vote, or by a vote of the majority of the entire membership.

2 **SUSPEND THE RULES**

3

Undebatable.

Cannot be amended or reconsidered.

A motion to suspend the rules for the same purpose cannot be made at the same meeting except by unanimous consent.

Purpose: When the assembly wishes to do something that cannot be done without violating its own rules, and yet is not in conflict with its Constitution or Bylaws or with the fundamental principles of parliamentary law, it "suspends the rules that interfere with the proposed action."

A motion to suspend the rules may be made at any time when no question is pending, or while a question is pending, provided it is for a purpose connected with that question.

2 **TO TAKE FROM THE TABLE:**

4

Undebatable.

No subsidiary motion can be applied to it.

It is not in order unless some business has been transacted since it was lost.

Requires a majority vote.

When taken up, the question, with everything adhering to it, is before the assembly exactly as it was when laid on the table.

REF:PARLIAM RLJUDD

Rev 9 18 14