

Feedback, questions and summary regarding Open Forum
Classified Staff Advisory Council Bylaws

Administrative Liaison:

There was discussion about the role of the administrative liaison –whether we need one or not. The role was explained as someone who is not a “watch dog” for the administration but rather a person who guides the council through the process of how to accomplish things and to act as a resource. This person may attend all of some of the meetings at the pleasure of the council. The liaison would also provide assistance between a classified staff wanting to provide service to the campus and a supervisor who may not be supportive. They serve in an advisory capacity with no vote.

A comment was made that the discussion and involvement by Carmen as the liaison proves the need for this resource.

Additional Comments and Questions:

The question was asked what other kinds of administrators may be involved with the Advisory council? The answer was that they can involve people such as Bob Hetzel, Chair of the Faculty Senate, Chairs of Search & Screens and possibly a Regent when visiting. It offers the classified staff a voice in the campus community and an opportunity to share what we are doing on campus.

It was suggested that we review the membership numbers and their representation periodically. The figures used in the bylaws are from 2008-2009 – we need to update them to ensure everyone has the appropriate amount of representation. The figures were provided by Human Resources. The ByLaws committee would be responsible for the annual review and updating of the bylaws.

A question was raised about not having a treasurer but having committees on fund raising. The answer was that there is no point in having a treasurer until a committee exists which will provide grant monies or raise monies for professional development.

Joe Gow volunteered to inform the campus about the possibility of forming the advisory council at his all-university address.

The question regarding who represents those persons in the miscellaneous category was answered by Cyndi Taylor – it represents people in the trades or others who do not fit in the typical categories.

Regarding the CSDAD Committee - Carmen anticipates that the funding source for the previously named Classified Breakfast will remain the same unless Bob Hetzel notifies Carmen of a change. The main purpose behind the change is to provide additional assistance to Kathy Ring and Carmen Wilson who have done an exemplary job in organizing this event in the past.

Comments were made that the reason for the By-Laws committee is for review and revisions of the bylaws as the council progresses. The draft has never been intended to be a final, inclusive document. Revisions will need to be made.

A question was asked that if there was a problem between a classified employee who wishes to participate on one of these committees and they were unable to come to a positive conclusion with the supervisor, what options would they have? The suggestion was that they could utilize the Campus Climate office, or that this would be another example of how the administrative liaison could be a resource.

Comment was made and seconded by several persons that the council will be only as good as the leadership and those who volunteer. The council is our voice to the campus community.

Comment was made that we might consider limiting the number of committee one can serve on – using the Faculty Senate as a model – one can serve on only one committee.

There is no article IX – we need to renumber the articles.

Regarding the OPA award – the Awards & Recognition committee will need to develop the award criteria and then the criteria would be approved by the Council Executive Committee. The Chancellor makes the final selection.

Discussion was centered around whether there had been a decision on ratification of whether we want a council or not on campus? The answer is that we are still developing a system and suggestions were solicited. Suggestions were: a ratification of 51% of those voting.

Discussion also centered around how we wanted to vote for our membership – did we want to stay in categories or vote broadly over all the categories. The input, by show of hands, was nearly evenly divided.

Suggestions were that we need to market the council more actively around campus because there are some who are confused and do not understand the motive for the council. There may be some suspicions but they are unfounded – the entire intent of the council is to provide a campus voice in an advisory capacity, represented all the classified staff, to the chancellor.

Regarding selection for search & screen committees – should this be something routed through labor management rather than a committee? The answer is that the committee can make the recommendations from among the classified staff.

Suggested changes:

1. We delete the description of where the liaison should be chosen from, e.g. from among the ranks of the faculty, academic staff, or administrative staff. This would open the door for unrepresented HR persons to become involved.
2. Article I – change the word and sentence of “communication among” to read “between all classified employees and the broader University community. And, “a spirit of collegiality between” members of the University community, etc.
3. Review instances when the council is referred to as “committee” – it should read council to be clearer.
4. Dates of election reflect the fiscal year – July 1 – June 30.
5. Under Committee on Committees: a) Remove the paragraph that begins ... members of CSAC will give reports up until the sentence Committee on Committee shall consist of up to five members. B) The first sentence should read the COC will find nominees for openings on CSAC Committees instead of university committees to make it clearer.
6. Article VII: Officers – change (3) to read immediate past-Chair (who serves as CSDA chair).
7. Article VIII: Election of Officers – remove the word treasurer after CSAC Secretary....

Ratification/voting:

Discussion centered about suggestions on how to ratify the council on campus:

- Should ratification be 51% of the eligible voters, or
- 51% of those who voted
- Voting will be done via an IT ballot
- Before the actual balloting takes place for membership the ratification of the council will need to be done.
- Carmen will send out a brief summary of the meeting as well as the question as to how the staff would like to vote – e.g. within the categories of the units, or broad voting across all categories.

Editorial Changes per Sue Lee:

Article II: Name – change – Classified staff Advisory (Council or CSAC).

Article IV: third paragraph – CSAC members. Next paragraph – self-nominated
Change 2008-09 chart to 2009-2010 and update membership categories

Article VI: last sentence – type out three to four year term.

Article VII: Officers - spell out Classified Staff Development and Appreciation Day and move before acronym (CSDAD)

Article X: Should now be Article IX: Meetings

Article XI: – Should be Article X: Standing Committees

Article XII:– Should be Article XI: Amending the BYLAWS