Summary of Key Parts of Preliminary Draft of SAS Bylaws

1. Providing a School Policy-making Body.
At present, the school faculty does not have a means of formulating school policy in areas in which it has primary responsibility (see footnote 4 in Article I.B); the present Advisory Committee serves only to advise the Dean. **As drafted, the bylaws would establish two policy-making bodies involving faculty:**

A. **In Articles I and IX - SAS Faculty:** This body consists of all faculty with appointments in departments in SAS. Full-time faculty appointed on permanent lines (professorial or CCE) may set school policy via a vote. (On carrying out votes of the Faculty, see 7 below.) Prior to any vote, a matter would be presented and discussed at a meeting of the school (see Article VIII), allowing voice for all parts of the school on that issue.

B. **In Article III - The SAS Executive Committee:** This committee consists of all SAS Dept chairs plus the Dean, and is administered by a 5-member Steering Committee consisting of 4 chairs plus the Dean (see III.E). As the chief administrative officer of the school, the Dean has a vote on the Executive Committee and its Steering Committee. Program heads and directors may attend with voice but without vote. The drafting committee thought that providing program heads and directors a vote could result in the interests of programs being overrepresented on an issue (there are 7 SAS programs and 26 SAS departments) and could also result in the views of a department being doubly represented in a vote, depending on who was the head of a program. Thus, the best arrangement seemed to be one that provided programs a direct voice, but had program representation in a vote be done via the chairs of the departments with program-affiliated faculty. Representatives of other parts of the school, including HEO, CLT, and non-HEO administrative staff, as well as student government reps, may also attend meetings with voice (but no vote).

Whether a school policy issue is to be decided by the Executive Committee or the SAS faculty is addressed in Article IX.A: a matter shall be brought to a school faculty vote if the Dean wants that, or the Executive Committee, or 20% of the voting faculty. Otherwise, policy issues would be approved by a vote of the Executive Committee (see Article III.C.1).

2. Formalizing governance for review and approval of courses and courses of study.
Article VI – SAS Curriculum Committee: While the Hunter Governance Charter (HGC) specifies a SAS Curriculum Committee and its membership (see HGC Article VIII.3.E, on Senate website), for many years, in practice, the school has used three faculty subcommittees that met jointly as a whole only in special circumstances. This draft tries to formalize that structure in a way that is consistent with the HGC. Student and interdisciplinary program representatives are also added to make the structure consistent with the HGC.

3. Formalizing procedures for changes in the P&B committees.
Article V - SAS P&B Committees: These committees were established by the CUNY BoT to mirror the prior existing divisions that were merged when the school was established. The bylaws draft formalizes how changes in membership or structure of these committees would be governed. In some cases, this will require departmental voting and approval by a SAS faculty committee (as well as by the BoT), see Article V.A.2-3.

4. Formalizing the Council of Chairs as an SAS Advisory body.
Article IV – SAS Council of Chairs: The bylaws draft formalizes the Council of Chairs as a school faculty advisory body. This committee provides the opportunity for direct communication between department chairs and program heads and directors, as well as a forum in which they can deliberate about school issues and make recommendations to other committees and offices where appropriate.

5. Formalizing governance of the development and offering of courses with special school codes.
Article VII. This states how these courses are to be governed by standard personnel and curriculum governance norms and procedures.

6. Formalizing procedures and structures to support the mission and role of SAS as a school.
A. The bylaws draft provides a forum for the School to meet as a body and for all constituencies to have voice, see Article VIII – Meetings of SAS.

B. The draft also provides mechanisms for transparency and school-level awareness and discussion of activities and developments going on in SAS departments and programs. In particular, in addition to Meetings of SAS, in this draft, the Executive Committee is a place for such school-level transparency and awareness, see Articles III.C.1 & 7, V.2 & 3, VI.C.5, and VII.C.

7. Voting of the school faculty.
There are three cases in which SAS Faculty voting could occur:
i) an action of the school (Article IX),
ii) the ratification of the bylaws, and
iii) revising the bylaws (Article X).

In all three cases, in this draft:
a) This is to be done by a direct vote of the faculty to be carried out by secret ballot.

b) A process involving paper ballots is specified. For votes of the school (other than the bylaws ratification vote), we allow the Executive Committee to stipulate a process, but we also specify a concrete process in case none is given by the Executive Committee, see Article IX.B.

c) Departments would facilitate the collection of ballots and their transportation to a committee that would count them. The drafting committee thought that the most reliable means of contacting faculty is through departments.

d) Approval requires the assent of a majority of eligible voters (i.e., a majority of SAS faculty on permanent lines). An alternative (not in this draft) would be to have approval require the assent of a majority of those voting with at least 70% (or some other super majority) of eligible voters voting.