

Dear Members of the ASC and the ASC's *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty Affairs,

The A&S Dean's Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) has received from the ASC the most recent [proposed bylaws and accompanying FAQ file](#), dated February 15, 2021. Thank you for sharing this revised document with the SAC.

The SAC would first like to thank the ASC for incorporating aspects of the [SAC's feedback](#) (submitted to the ASC November 24, 2021) into this most recent version of the bylaws. In particular, the SAC appreciates the support of faculty and staff partnerships expressed in multiple articles of the revised bylaws, including the following:

Article IV. 7. ASFS maintaining a forum for the distribution of news, including to staff.

Article V. 2. ASFS's Grievance and Professional Affairs Committee addressing faculty-staff relations and considering "...the potential effects, including unintended consequences, of faculty governance decisions on other College constituencies, including staff."

Article V. 2. Including a clause that enables ASFS committees to invite administrators and staff "...to serve as non-voting members, in virtue of their expertise or knowledge base, or as visitors to consult on specific issues."

Article VIII. 2. Including as a function of the Faculty Governance Executive Committee to monitor "...the effects of faculty governance decisions on various stakeholders in the College, including staff."

Article IX. Encouraging the ASFS to cooperate and communicate with other bodies and constituencies, including the Staff Advisory Committee, as well as inviting the Staff Advisory Committee to regular presentations and discussions with the ASFS.

**As the ASC moves forward to finalize the bylaws, the SAC requests that the ASC reconsider the recommendations from SAC's original November 2020 feedback that were not incorporated:**

- 1) Articles VI and VII. That staff members be included as ex-officio members on the Divisional Council Budget committee, curriculum committee, as well as working groups on planning and proposals in an advisory capacity, unless the topic being discussed will impact the work completed or positions held by Staff, at which point the SAC propose that the SAC Chair be given voting privileges.
- 2) Article VIII. Proposing adding the Chair of the SAC as a non-voting ex-officio member of the ASFS Executive Committee to act in an advisory capacity, unless the topic being discussed will impact the work completed or positions held by Staff, at which point the SAC propose that the SAC Chair be given voting privileges.

**The SAC has also solicited feedback from A&S staff at-large, which we have included below. The SAC thanks the ASC for their further consideration of these recommendations.**

The SAC greatly appreciates the additions and revisions that the ASC has made to the faculty governance bylaws and the ASC's consideration of our additional feedback. The SAC looks forward to continuing to partner with the ASC, and in the future, the ASFS, to further the endeavors of the College of Arts and Sciences to the benefit of our college constituents and students.

Sincerely,

A&S Staff Advisory Committee  
February 19, 2021

### **Feedback from Staff Survey on the Proposed Bylaws for Faculty Governance**

#### **Preamble**

No feedback.

#### **Article I. Name**

No feedback.

#### **Article II. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences**

No feedback.

#### **Article III. Meeting and Voting Procedures of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences**

No feedback.

#### **Article IV. The Arts & Sciences Faculty Senate (ASFS)**

I strongly feel that the language should be revised in the Program Assistant section. The current language ("The College agrees to PROVIDE a Program Assistant..." [bold is mine]) sounds like they are providing office space or a piece of equipment, not a person. I would suggest something like, "The College agrees to allocate [a certain %/or # of hours]) of a Program Assistant's work duties to support the operation of faculty governance." In the same section, I question that the nominated Prog Asst is approved by a vote of the ASFS executive committee. My understanding is that a certain position in the dean's office has the duties to support faculty governance. If the exec committee did not vote to approve the nominated Prog Asst, would the dean's office re-structure multiple staff positions? This does not seem feasible. I don't know of staff support positions that are voted on by the faculty they support, so I don't see why this would be required here.

## **Article V. Committees of the ASFS**

Grievance and Professional Affairs Committee -- in my understanding, the current ASC grievance committee typically reviews grievances brought to the committee BY FACULTY, regarding salary or other issues. I do not understand how a similar committee would "address issues pertaining to professionalism (in, for instance, faculty-staff relations)." If an issue exists where a staff member feels that there is a lack of professionalism on the part of a faculty member (for example), is a STAFF member supposed to bring that to the ASFS grievance committee? Where there is no representation or voice by staff? Or will this committee only review issues of staff professionalism, brought to the committee by a faculty member? Similarly, I don't see how the newly described grievance committee will "consider the potential effects, including unintended consequences, of faculty governance decisions on other College constituencies, including staff." What will be the mechanism that these other constituencies may make these unintended consequences known to the ASFS, and will members of the constituencies be "invited" as non-voting members or "visitors" to be involved in these cases? Depending on the answers to these questions, it could actually be quite concerning and troubling that this committee reviews issues that involve staff. It seems that this committee and paragraph of the bylaws is the place where language on "staff" has been inserted, to signal some sort of inclusion of staff voice, but the document as a whole does not recognize the role of the staff voice in the faculty governance process.

## **Article VI. Divisional Councils**

No feedback.

## **VII. Divisional Committees**

No feedback.

## **VIII. Faculty Governance Executive Committee**

No feedback.

## **Article IX. Relation to Non-ASFS Constituencies**

While this section acknowledges cooperation with other governance bodies and student and staff constituencies, I don't think it strongly enough establishes a structural relationship, especially with the A&S Staff Advisory Committee, which is a COLLEGE-specific entity. With the existing language, the staff advisory committee and other groups could maybe get invited to an end of semester meeting every few years.

## **Article X. Parliamentary Procedures**

No feedback.

## **Article XI. Amendments to the Bylaws**

No feedback.

## **Additional Comments about the Bylaws or the Governance Recommendation Report**

No feedback.