

The Manager Question

As anticipated, there are a range of opinions vis a vis managers. The term “manager” seems to be a nebulous term, the delineation between middle and upper management should be drawn.

There are repeated references to “middle management” not having a true voice at the university. There is a leadership council but it does not necessarily function the way that a senate does. Managers also have the same fears as staff ~~affair page 10 only~~ when they have criticism of their leadership. The.9 (h)ith3 r4[(,)12.98w

Because Staff Senate will serve as representatives of professional or clerical staff members may feel that they will not be able to freely voice a concern if their manager is present, particularly if the relationship is already strained. There is also the belief that managers already have access to upper management in a way that staff do not. However, as mentioned above, the access is through leadership council, an already problematic model.

One comment in favor of middle management membership in Staff Senate offered this compromise:

I think Assistant Dean, Associate and Director level staff, who are not governed by a bargaining unit (AKA "middle-management") can hold membership in staff senate, but not positions of leadership.

That suggestion is close to the verbiage we have in Article V, but likely needs to be more clearly expressed.

Morale and Flexible Work

Comments not about managers were mostly about morale and flexible work schedules. There are references to the many incentives staff have had taken away from them (Fridays off in the summer, Black Friday as a paid day off (though I am not sure if that ever was a thing)). One commenter suggested we explicitly state flexible work as a part of Article III.

Morale also spills over in the discussion of Article V. The ~~custody~~ hostility in some offices and divisions make speaking up for anyone, manager or not, difficult or impossible without threats (perceived or real) to employment.