

Staff Council Standing Committee Minutes

Committee Name: Rules and Elections

Meeting Date and Place: Hokona Hall, 4/9/19, 3:30-4:30pm

Members Present: Tracy Wenzl, Nancy Shane, Amie Ortiz, Mark Reynolds

Ex-Officio Members Present: Adam Hathaway, Amy Hawkins

Members Excused: David Pallozzi,

Members Absent:

**Guests Present:** Ryan Gregg

Minutes submitted by: Nancy Shane

	Subject	Notes	Follow-Up
1	Approve Agenda		Approved with the removal of constituent comments.
2	Approve Minutes		n/a
3	Current Business		
3 4		Hearing for Election Challenges	The group considered the elections of two presumed election winners on the basis of being employed at the University less than the requisite 6 months.  Evidence considered (Exhibit by N Shane):  The Staff Council Administrator had communicated in the all-staff email encouraging nomination to the election mentioned the 6-month rule.  Article III, Section 1 of the Staff Council Constitution defines the 6-month law thusly 'and who has worked at the University for at least six months is eligible both to run for membership on the Staff Council and vote for staff councilors'  Sec 2B of the the Election Code states that 'The nomination period shall close at 5pm on March 7th, or at 5pm on the following work day'  Sec 2F states that 'Electronic balloting shall cease at 5pm on the Friday following the Monday on which ballots were distributed.'  Sec 3C1 states that 'Listing of candidates in the order previously determined, followed by a space or spaces for write-in candidates, not to exceed the number of candidates being elected from the grade or precinct.'  The group determined therefore that the latest date from which to calculate the 6-month rule should be the last day of voting, in this case 3/29/19, since a person could write-in a candidate on that date (and no later).  Based on that determination, both challenged candidates were determined to have not been employed the requisite six months. Amy as SC Administrator agreed to contact the contested candidates with the
			decision that they were ineligible to run. She also notified the two candidates with the next-highest number of votes to let they know they had won Staff Council seats.

	the corrected winning candidates only.  We also determined we would not now pursue any change in language to any governing document. Instead, we would attempt to avert future such mishaps by 1) better communicating the restrictions in the invitations to run, and 2) request HR limit the list of employees to those who are eligible to run. [We also considered the complication that we only receive one list of employees from HR. While employees with less than 6 month of work history in UNM are ineligible to run, they should be considered in the list of constituents that determines precincts and grades. In other words, the list of constituents does not equal eligible voters/councilors. Amy agreed to request two different lists from HR.]
	We also discussed the handling of this challenge, in that one of the Councilors who had brought forth the challenge 1) had wanted the matter dealt with procedurally (without a hearing), rather than through a formal challenge; and 2) considered the ramifications of the challenged candidate learning the identity of the challenger to be unfair to himself as the challenger, as he had presented the challenge without ill will and without knowing the challenged candidate. The R&E chair shared that she had conferred with other members of the committee; and brought forth the hearing because the date for determining the 6-month rule was not explicitly cited in any governing document.
Consideration of Signing Staff Council Ethics Code	We determined the proposed requirement to sign the Staff Council Ethics Code to be unwarranted, as the SC Election Code Art II, Sec 4C2 reads, 'The Installing Officer shall read the University of New Mexico Staff Council Code of Ethics and will ask if they agree to abide by the Staff Council Code of Ethics. The Installing Officer will then proclaim them installed.