STAFF CONGRESS

Special Meeting - January 29, 1982

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Floor Discussion - Constitution and By-Laws

III. Role Call Vote (Tentative)
1) Constitution
2) By-Laws

IV. Adjournment

STAFF CONGRESS MINUTES
January 29, 1982

A special meeting of the Staff Congress was held on Friday, January 29, 1982 for discussion and voting on the Constitution and By-laws. This meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. Role was taken and a quorum was present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Terry Andrews, Tom Barlow, Bob Barnes, Dan Bayes, Gail Cato, Pat Coleman, Cindy Dunaway, Gary Eith, Shirley Gallicchio, Don Gammon, Dorinda Giles, Jerry Groeschen, Carol Guthier, Barb Herald, Dan Hoskins, Patti Jeffries, Mary Kelm, Bonnie King, Bill Lamb, Joyce Maegly, Greg Muench, Nancy Perry, Steve Priestle, Ken Ramey, Linda Sanders, Pamm Taylor, Dolores Thelen, and Nancy Utz.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mike Baker and Bob Riffe.

Dorinda Giles opened the floor for discussion or questions on the Constitution.

Pat Coleman asked if the Constitution would be taken by articles or as a whole. Dorinda Giles answered that since everyone was given a copy of the Constitution and should have read it, the discussion should just be on specific questions or points.

Nancy Utz asked if the Constitution would be ratified article by article. Dorinda Giles said that the vote will be taken at the end of discussion of the entire Constitution.

Preamble or introduction - no discussion.

Article I - no discussion.

Article II - no discussion.

Article III - Pat Coleman asked for an explanation of the phrase "probationary period as determined by the Office of Personnel Services." Gregg Schulte said that the standard probationary period is three months or ninety days, but that some personnel fail to successfully complete probation in that period of time, thereby requiring an extension of the probationary period. Don Gammon also said that it is possible that in the future the Personnel Services Office may change the length of probation from three to four months. The phrasing as it stands will allow for flexibility in these types of situations.

Article IV, Section 1 - no discussion.

Article IV, Section 2 - Linda Sanders asked why the total membership of the Staff Congress was limited to a maximum of thirty. She said that with the possibility of additional employment catagories being included in the future, it would be easier to change the By-laws than the Constitution. Bill Lamb responded, saying that the committee wanted to set a number that would give representation to all staff, but would not be too large to be effective. Linda Sanders then moved to strike the part of the sentence reading "the total membership of the Staff Congress shall consist of not more than thirty Representatives." Shirley Gallicchio seconded the motion. The vote was taken by voice, and was not approved.

Greg Muench asked that for future votes taken in this meeting a hand count be used.

Article IV, Section 3 - no discussion.

Article IV, Section 4 - no discussion.

Article IV, Section 5 - Nancy Utz questioned what "one vote only" meant. Bill Lamb explained that this meant that no matter how many staff personnel each member represented, they would still only have one vote per issue. This means that all votes are equal. Gary Eith pointed out that this eliminates proxy votes.

Ken Ramey asked if a representative can succeed himself. Bill Lamb said there is nothing in the Constitution that prohibits this.

Article V, Section 1 - no discussion.

Article V, Section 2 - no discussion.

Article V, Section 3 - no discussion.

Article V, Section 4 - no discussion.

Article V, Section 5 - no discussion.

Pamm Taylor asked if there should be any mention in this Article of the paid secretarial position. Gregg Schulte said that this position is not considered a part of the Staff Congress, that it is considered an aid or reference position.

Nancy Utz asked if the Parliamentarian is an officer. Bill Lamb said that it is not considered an officer's position since it is an appointed and not elected position.

Article VI - no dicussion.

Article VII - no discussion.

Article VIII - no discussion.

Article IX, Section 1 - no discussion.

Article IX, Section 2 - no discussion.

Article IX, Section 3 - no discussion.

Article X - no discussion.

Article XI - no discussion.

Bill Lamb proudly recommends that the Constitution be submitted to the entire support staff for ratification. Joyce Maegly seconded this. Gary Eith suggested that Bill include in his motion that the Constitution be approved by the Staff Congress and then be submitted to the support staff for ratification. The authors agreed to the suggested amendment.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion and it was unanimously approved by all members present.

Dorinda Giles then opened the floor for discussion or questions on the By-laws.

Article I, Section 1 - no discussion.

Article I, Section 2 - no discussion.

Article I, Section 3 - Jerry Groeschen said that he felt that we should describe in the By-laws what we are electing before we describe the election process. He moved to change Article I, Section 3 to read Article I, Section 2 and to change Article I, Section 2 to read Article I, Section 3. Nancy Utz seconded the motion, which was approved.

Article I, Section 2, Item d) - Shirley Gallicchio asked about having two representatives per employment catagory, as some catagories are larger than others. Terry Andrews said that since this catagorization has already be established and used for this year, discussion at this meeting would not accomplish much. She said that the standing committee for the Constitution and By-laws, or even the Credentials and Elections Committee should address this point in depth. No motion was made.

Article I, Section 4 - no discussion.

Article I, Section 5 - Pat Coleman asked for a definition of vacancies, and wanted to know if a permanent vacancy was created when a transfer out of a constituency is made. After discussion of this point, Gary Eith moved that in Article I, Section 5, Item a), the words "or is transferred out of their constituency." be striken. Pat Coleman seconded the motion. Vote was taken and the motion was approved. Pamm Taylor asked to have discussion on motions before the vote is taken, and abstained from voting on this motion as she had not had a chance to discuss certain points.

Jerry Groeschen asked for a clarification on sickness, leaves of absence, or in Nancy Utz's case, maternity. Bill Lamb referred to Article I, Section 5, Item d) which says the Executive Council has the authority to recommend replacements with the approval of the Staff Congress. This item could be used for situations such as these. Linda Sanders, Greg Muench, and Pamm Taylor expressed the opinion that the word "permanent" should not be used in connection with these type of absences. Terry Andrews, Dan Bayes, and Bob Barnes expressed the opinion that as elected representatives, members of the Staff Congress have a responsibility to attend the meetings.

At this point, Tom Barlow moved to go to formal procedures. Gary Eith seconded the motion, adding that it was simply to expedite procedures for the meeting. Bill Lamb asked if there was already a motion on the floor, which there was not. Dolores Thelen asked if this motion would exclude questions, and Gary Eith said that it would not. Vote was called and the motion was unanimously approved.

Pamm Taylor then moved to scratch the word "permanent" from all Items in Section 5 of Article I. Gary Eith seconded, saying that he felt it would make it easier to work with. The vote was taken and the results were 14 for and 11 against. Motion carried.

Jerry Groeschen moved that in all future votes there should be a yes, no, or abstention vote. Linda Sanders seconded. Bill Lamb asked if those not voting were admitting to their constituents that they were not being represented. Linda Sanders asked to respond to this, saying that she did not feel she should vote when she did not agree with the wording of the motion. Dolores Thelen said that when an abstention vote is given, the person normally states the reason for doing so. Vote was called and the results were 3 for and 22 against. Motion not passed.

Mary Kelm moved that the first charge of the Standing Committee for the By-Laws would be to study this article and bring further recommendations to the Staff Congress. Bill Lamb seconded. Vote was taken and the results were 26 for and 0 against. Motion was approved.

Article II - no discussion.

Article III - Nancy Utz asked why the Parliamentarian is not considered an officer in the Constitution, but is carried in this Article under the by-laws. Bill Lamb said again that it is not an elected position, it is an appointed position and in some circumstances does perform officer's duties.

Article IV - Pat Coleman referred to Section 6 and asked why prior arrangements must be made before non-members of the Staff Congress are recognized by the President. Bill Lamb said that representatives are elected and serve on the Congress to give voice to constituencies. Since they are there for that purpose, it should not be necessary for non-members to speak up. However, if a special occasion should arise, the President can recognize non-members if prior arrangements have been made.

Article V - Pamm Taylor referred to Section 3 and asked why 51% is considered a quorum. Bill Lamb said that this is the standard according to Robert's Rules of Order. Nancy Utz asked that if 51% is the quorum, what constitutes a voting majority. Gary Eith said 51% of those present and voting.

Article VI - Bill Lamb moved that the word "Senate" in the title line be removed and the word "Congress" be inserted. Gail Cato seconded, and it was unanimously approved. Bill also commented that other standing committees may be added as needed.

Article VII - no discussion.

Article VIII - no discussion.

Article IX - Pat Coleman moved that the by-laws be approved by the entire support staff members of Northern Kentucky University. Pamm Taylor seconded. Bill Lamb said that the by-laws are used to employ the Constitution, and that we should be trusted to approve a document that will be effective. Gary Eith said that it could cause problems with flexibility and could tie our hands if the motion is approved. Gail Cato said that the by-laws should be the method of operation as agreed upon by the members of Staff Congress. The vote was called and the results were 1 for and the remainder against. Motion failed.

Gregg Schulte asked where in the Constitution or By-laws does it indicate how the by-laws are to be initially approved. Bill Lamb said that it is the duty of the President to call for a vote of acceptance as was done with the Constitution.

Nancy Utz made a motion to add Article X, titled Ratification, which addresses how the by-laws are initially approved. Shirley Gallicchio seconded the motion. Gary Eith proposed to the authors that they amend the motion to include the method to be used for approving the by-laws. Dan Bayes said that this creates a paradox by having Article IX, which deals with amendments, before Article X, which deals with ratification. After more discussion from the floor, Gary Eith called the question. The vote was taken and the results were 12 for and 14 against. The motion failed.

Bill Lamb moved that the By-laws of Northern Kentucky University's Staff Congress be approved, and approval be recorded in the minutes in accordance with all amendments made. Greg Muench seconded the motion. Gary Eith said that the document proposed to the body is a workable one and if there are any problems with it, any representative can take it up with the appropriate committee. Roll call vote was taken and all members present voted yes to accept.

Pat Coleman asked what the timetable is for getting the Constitution to the support staff for their ratification. Dorinda Giles said we will address this in the next regular meeting on February 5, 1982.

Ken Ramey made a motion to adjourn. Tom Barlow seconded the motion at 11:45 a.m. and it was unanimously approved.