

Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee
October 10, 2022
Minutes approved on October 17th, 2022.

Members present: Mary Radeke, Nathan White, Andrea Eklund, Melissa Shiel
Guests: none.

1. Meeting called to order at 4:01pm
2. Minutes from 10/3/22 approved (motion Nathan, second Melissa, all approved).

3. Chair updates

Mary reported that she communicated with Mark Samples (Chair, EC) about extending Charge .04 to include additional sections of the CBA (Section 12.3.1 Election of Department Chairs, .2 Removal or Replacement of Department Chairs, and .3 Filling Temporary Chair Vacancies). Mark would like us to cover all sections that of the CBA with regard to Section 12.3 that are inconsistent with the Faculty Code. Mary also requested information for acquiring the AAUP Redbook, Mark provided some resources.

4. EC updates

None.

5. Discussion of Charges

BFCC22–23.01 Continue working and moving forward language for the **CWUP** policy language that strengthens the code and shared governance and that would protect the Senate. **Timeline:** Fall Quarter.

CWUP language - from the 10/3 meeting Nathan was tasked with reviewing the AAUP documentation for the role of BOT/Board of Regents/governing boards, Mary was tasked with reviewing various colleges and the role of BOT/governing boards in shared governance.

Nathan's report:

AAUP theme - governing boards should be the final decision-making authority, no mention of how governing boards work with how boards work with faculty. AAUP's statement on governance reiterates the role of the governing board and the final decision-making entity.

Mary's report:

Investigated different universities - Almost every university reviewed pointed to the BOT/governing bodies as final say in governing universities (regardless of the faculty codes as advisory or recommending document). Different types of shared governance (equal rights to governance, consultation, rules of engagement, etc.) resulted in somewhat different levels of authority for BOT/governing bodies. Basic take-away was that BOTs are the final say and can't be left out of the equation. RCW states clearly what the BOT should do with regard to governing colleges and universities with regard faculty and faculty code.

Melissa asked for clarification as to what the purpose is to rework the CWUP language - is the goal to remove undue power of the governing body (remove hierarchy in the language? It seems that this the rationale. Andrea said that the goal is to have more of a balance in control.

Possibly replace BOT with “governing bodies”. EC would be okay with removing the entire first sentence - difficult to know how to reword the document with removal of BOT.

Removal of BOT from document possibly puts in danger of having the BOT override decisions in shared governance (and potential dissolving Faculty Code).

Committee agreed that it would be helpful to have Mark join us at our next meeting.

BFCC22–23.04 Compare CBA and **Code** language regarding department chair elections and make recommendations for bringing them into alignment. **Timeline:** By the end of Winter Quarter. *The language in Code needs to be updated to align with the CBA.*

BFCC will compare Section 12.3 of CBA (pg. 16) with Section 1.B.1,a,b, and c in Faculty Code.

Each committee member will take a section and compare for inconsistencies:

Mary and Andrea - Election of Department Chairs (Faculty Code I.B.1.a)

Melissa - Removal of Department Chairs (b)

Nathan - Filling Temporary Chair Vacancies (c)

All members should read all sections of CBA and Code so that we can vote in our next meeting on the changes.

Members will report inconsistencies at next meeting.

BFCC22–23.05 Review the process for departments to conduct elections for senators and make recommendations for updates as appropriate. **Timeline:** By the end of Winter Quarter. *For example, Senior Lecturers can currently vote for department chairs, but not department senators. Explore why this is currently the rule, and if Senior Lecturers should be added to senator elections. Departments are using several different methods, and votes may not be anonymous.*

Melissa recommended that the committee should review department handbook for senator elections, Andrea recommended we begin with reviewing each college handbook/procedures - who can vote (NTT/senior lectures), and ballot procedures (anonymous).

Andrea - CEPS

Melissa - CAH

Nathan - COTS

Mary - CB

Committee members will report findings from college handbook/procedures and will bring findings for review at next meeting. Depending on findings, contacting department secretaries may be the next step.

BFCC22–23.07 Consider revising the Budget and Planning Committee description in **Code** to improve clarity. **Timeline:** Winter quarter.

The following language is unclear and may need to be altered or removed: “If the motion passes, the original recommendation shall be considered rejected or amended, and shall not be proposed by the Budget and Planning Committee to the PBAC.”

Charge 7 should be the next charge to address - Mary will contact Budget and Planning Committee to see how that committee feels about clarifying description in the Code.

Next meeting: October 17, 2022.

6. Meeting adjourned at 4:51pm.

Status Update

BFCC22–23.01 Continue working and moving forward language for the CWUP policy language that strengthens the code and shared governance and that would protect the Senate.

Timeline: Fall Quarter.

Refer to the BFCC 21–22 year-end report for a description of last year’s progress. Review draft language in regard to the role of the BOT in the process.

Anticipate meeting on 10/17 will include EC Chair (Mark Samples) to offer guidance on rationale for the charge. BFCC as some options for alternative language for the code.

BFCC22–23.04 Compare CBA and Code language regarding department chair elections and make recommendations for bringing them into alignment. **Timeline:** By the end of Winter Quarter.

The language in Code needs to be updated to align with the CBA.

BFCC members have been assigned sections of CBA/Code to review and will provide reports at 10/17/22 meeting.

BFCC22–23.05 Review the process for departments to conduct elections for senators and make recommendations for updates as appropriate. **Timeline:** By the end of Winter Quarter.

For example, Senior Lecturers can currently vote for department chairs, but not department senators. Explore why this is currently the rule, and if Senior Lecturers should be added to senator elections.

Departments are using several different methods, and votes may not be anonymous.

BFCC members have been assigned colleges policy/handbooks to review for involvement of NTT in senator elections. Members will report findings at 10/17/22 meeting. Based on findings, next step may be to contact department secretaries for more details on vote/ballot.

BFCC22–23.07 Consider revising the Budget and Planning Committee description in Code to improve clarity. **Timeline:** Winter quarter.

The following language is unclear and may need to be altered or removed: “If the motion passes, the original recommendation shall be considered rejected or amended, and shall not be proposed by the Budget and Planning Committee to the PBAC.”

Mary will contact BPC to find out if this language needs to be removed from description or removed and places elsewhere.