Bylaws & Faculty Code Meeting
February 19, 2019

Present: Jason Dormady, Mary Radeke, Stephen Robison, Bret Smith, Walter Szeliga
Absent: None
Guests: Amy Claridge

Meeting was called to order at 3:34 p.m. Minutes of February 5, 2019 were approved as written.

Chair Updates

No updates. At the last meeting, we worked on some language to go into policy and discussed some corresponding language for the code, which essentially addresses Goal 1. Goal 2 addresses shared governance. Over the next two weeks, we will individually go through the CBA and identify places where it is misaligned with the code and bylaws.

EC Updates

Amy attended the meeting to provide some background information on the budget language proposed for code. BPC has been talking about adding language to the code since last year. Amy provided a first draft of language from BPC for initial review by BFCC.

Code Rewrite

a. BPC code language

BPC has always been viewing this as a situation where faculty should be involved at the committee level, but the president is thinking of faculty being involved at the departmental level. Concerns were addressed about potentially increasing the amount of service required, especially for faculty in smaller departments. Smaller departments may end up being combined to lighten the service load. While the proposed language is not referring to anything happening right now, but there are issues with service currently. Due to the growing number of committees, it can be difficult to find people who are able or willing to service. The ability for faculty to have roles on many committees has increased within the last five years, partly due to the work of Faculty Senate. However, larger issues appear to be workload, and faculty feeling overburdened with service. Specifying workload would be more difficult for the proposed language. Workload is a union issue, but workload for senate committees is written into the code. This new language is proposing a college budget committee, but there is a fine line between if it is or isn't a senate committee. One suggestion is to include a clause stating that shared governance applies to everything in the code and should be fairly compensated.

Some changes were suggested for "Responsibilities" section. Numbers 1 and 5 seem redundant, as do numbers 2 and 4. Another concerns is that the wording could allow for deans and/or associate deans to be voting members. Language needs to be added to clarify the composition of the committee, and to clarify that voting members should only be members of the college. At least 1/3 of the committee must be college administrative staff and/or deans. Other concerns related to protections for tenure-track and NTT faculty. CEPS has the School of Education, which involves many people who are not

faculty. They spend a lot of money and are thinking about progressively increasing their required student fees per quarter. They are dealing with student teaching, teacher certification, and tracking of students in teacher certification. A consideration may need to be made for including someone on the committee to represent the School of Education.

Amy will take all feedback to BPC.

b. Other code changes

Overlap exists between the code and CBA. The code indicates communication should be though the president, but the CBA doesn't mention that. If that is removed, the code would be better aligned with the CBA, which says communication must be through the BOT or its designee. Another option is to use the same language in the code to make it stronger. This change would give a direct route to communication with the BOT. The CBA should be referenced in the code wherever possible. The CBA changes every 2 years but references can be made to sections that wouldn't be likely to change (e.g. academic freedom). This change would make the code stronger. It may be possible to add a statement about the faculty and administration working together to preserve academic freedom. There are some topics, such as workplace conditions, that have to be addressed in the CBA. Other topics, such as sexual harassment, are neither for senate nor for the CBA to address, but are HR issues.

Inconsistencies were identified between the CBA section 12.3.1.c and the code section A.1.e, in terms of election of department chairs. The code refers to a simple majority vote of eligible faculty, but it's problematic to have the language in both places because the CBA can change. Instead, language about the role of department chairs in shared governance needs to be added to the code. Also, evaluation of administration is neither in CBA nor in code. Another suggestion is to add language addressing the consequences of breaking the code.

Next steps will be to write definitive shared language and rework shared governance language in the preamble. We will also make an outline for should be in the finished code, and for reorganizing what is already there.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Next Meeting:
March 5, 2019
Barge 410