

Bylaws & Faculty Code Committee

Minutes

Oct 20, 2017

Present: Amy Claridge, Lila Harper, Mary Radeke

Absent: Bret Smith (excused)

Guests: none

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m. Agenda was approved.

Oct. 13, 2017 minutes were approved with the following changes:

- remove “in” from the last sentence of the new language, which reads: “committee work in determining new workload units...”
- reword the last sentence of the new language so that the clause from the end is moved to the beginning of the sentence.
- at the beginning of “Sept. 29, 2017 minutes” add “In” and place a colon after “minutes”.

Research Misconduct –

Amy reported that the EC agreed it would be good to have the memo to Kevin Archer, regarding Research Misconduct, come from them.

Drafts of the memo and policy were provided for review. Self-plagiarism should potentially be removed from the policy language because it is already mentioned in the WAC. Another issue is that some of the language and abbreviations used in the policy are not consistent with other CWU terms. The terms used in the policy are specific to some funding programs so clarification is needed as to who at Central will be fulfilling each role. Lila suggested creating a new #3 and linking the terms in question to CWU offices, such as “RIO” to Dean of Graduate Studies and “DO” to Provost. The current language is in H.3 of the policy but it should be made clear in 3.A.

Lila questioned the meaning of “violations of the policy” in the old #3 in the letter that is being sent out. The wording looks awkward. Amy indicated that it has to do with never seeking IRB approval after saying we will. It should be included in #2 and also in the definitions. Mary questioned research misconduct. Last week we discussed including something about misappropriation of research funding but it does not appear to be mentioned. Lila indicated that it appears to be vaguely included in G.3 but “misappropriation of funds” should be added to clarify. Mary suggested indicating something along the lines of “misappropriation of funds outside the funding agency’s guidelines” because it would really depend on what the funding agency says researchers allowed to do with the money they receive.

Distinguished Faculty Awards –

Amy reported that this is on the EC agenda for next week. Cody asked the BFCC to discuss it so that Amy can bring it back to the committee. Some of the biggest concerns are that the provost doesn't like how the Distinguished Faculty Selection Committee puts up the names of their selections in rank order and then she has to pick off of those rankings. It is also very difficult to find people to serve on the selection committee because you have to be a previous recipient of the award in order to serve.

Lila indicated that another problem of finding people for the committee is that there should be some sort of diversity. Reviewing the binders can also be problematic because they can't be removed from the Senate office so it can take a while. People want to put application materials online but the Senate office isn't able to do that. Amy mentioned that there is a problem with awards not being given consistently across colleges. CEPS is less likely to receive one because fewer people know their disciplines. Also, people complain about the secrecy surrounding the committee membership, but there are other issues if the membership is made public.

Mary questioned doing the submission process through Faculty180 since faculty are able to upload videos and articles. Lila indicated that access would be a problem. Amy suggested coming up with some other format that is more easily accessible. Lila mentioned the CAH awards, which had a website where people were able to put up letters of recommendation.

Mary suggested having distinguished faculty awards per each college to eliminate the problem of the awards always going to faculty in the same college, such as the research award always going to COTS. Lila indicated that would make it easier to link the award to the union's merit standards, especially for NTTs, but the NTT award has to be teaching only; Mary suggested having the same awards extend to NTTs in each college as well.

Amy indicated the need for stronger language to clarify that the selection committee makes the final decision. Lila suggested saying that the selection committee informs the provost of the decision. Mary indicated that if it goes to the colleges, then the committee would forward their decisions to the deans and the deans would notify the provost. Lila questioned what would happen to the existing college awards, such as the CAH award, if this award were to go to the colleges? Would it replace the existing college awards? The CAH award does not have the prestige of a university-wide award so how would these be more distinguished? Also the breakdown of scholarship, teaching, and service doesn't work at the college-level and would need to be something different. Amy indicated having one award from each college, plus one NTT award from each college, would make a total of eight awards, and also leaves the question of what to do about the library.

Meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

Next meeting - Nov. 3, 2017