MINUTES
Classified Staff Congressional Bylaws Committee

4.7.15


Members Absent: D. Zeps (EXCUSED).

Others Present: None.

At 11:00am Chair Hommen called the meeting to order.

Chair Hommen paused for public comments. None sought recognition.

Mr. Popp moved, seconded by Ms. Dorman, to approve the Minutes of the previous meeting. All in Favor. MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Hommen opened conversation on the Draft Bylaws document, returning to the beginning to pose questions that arouse regarding the draft to Jacob Smith, who was not present at the previous meeting.

Question was raised regarding the appropriateness of a sentence in the preamble regarding the right of the Congress to rescind any action taken by CSEC. Reply came that while there could be instances of contradictory motions, that would not warrant removing the Congress as the final authority, which has already been established in practice.

Discussion was heard that the Classified Staff Congress is not easily compared to the Faculty Senate or the Academic Assembly as those are “more mature bodies” of shared governance. Reply came that that was not viewed as a good argument and bylaws should be drafted as they should be and Congress will have to educate itself as to the role of the bylaws and proper procedure.

Ms. Rosas arrived.

Concern was expressed that confusion regarding parliamentary procedure remains a Congressional problem.

Reply came that the pros outweigh the cons when using the current language in the bylaws draft as it relates to the Congressional ability to alter, amend, or rescind CSEC actions.

Question was raised if the placement of Regent Policy 20-20 was appropriate in the draft. Reply came that Regent Policy 20-20 is the document that provides classified staff with shared governance.

Question was raised if the draft would benefit from a ‘definitions’ section. Reply came that such a section could be included if requested.

Discussion was heard regarding Congressional Districting and if a ‘districting committee’ should be formed to handle questions related to criteria and size of districts. Replacing phrase “professional
interest” with “diversity of job categories” was suggested. Question of changing “professional unit” to “divisional unit” was heard. Parliamentarian replied that he was prepared to draft a list of standing committees.

Discussion was heard regarding the election process. Suggested that “permanent in class appointment” replace the phrase “paid appointment”.

Discussion was heard on the pros and cons of self-nominating versus allowing others to nominate candidates in congressional elections.

Discussion on elections included possibly altering “96 hours” to read “five business days”.

Discussion was heard that it might be useful to form a Congressional focus group to examine the bylaws draft after the committee has completed its work, but before it is sent to the full Congress.

General agreement heard that the next meeting be scheduled for 29 April.

At 12:00pm, Ms. Dorman moved, seconded by Mr. Popp, to adjourn the meeting. All in Favor. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes prepared and submitted by: J. Lease / Secretary