

Bylaws & Faculty Code Committee
Minutes - January 12, 2018

Present: All committee members were present.

Absent: None

Guests: None

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 p.m. The agenda was approved as written. Minutes of January 5, 2018 were approved as amended.

Distinguished Faculty Awards

A suggestion was made to change the new language in IV.A.3 to a drop-down list for better readability. The language now reads:

The committee will include six volunteer members:

- a. Four must be past Distinguished Faculty Award winners representing each college.
- b. An alumnus selected by CWU Alumni Relations
- c. Faculty Senate will select an individual from three names forwarded by the CWU Retiree Association to balance out the composition of the committee.

When considering the code rewrite, drop-down lists will be used for three or more items elsewhere in the code, but for more than five or six items use of a drop-down list should be reexamined for readability.

BOT Report

Progress on the report for the BOT was briefly discussed. Using different strategies to find consistency between the code and other university documents, such as the CBA, will be mentioned in the report. Consideration is being given to moving some material from the code into the bylaws, but this raises questions as to procedural issues and how changes can be passed through Senate. More readings and votes are required for code changes than for changes to bylaws.

Code Rewrite

Lila reported that the President has been indicating that we need more of a robust code but anything we do has to go past the BOT. Something to think about is whether procedural language should be bylaws. Changing language would be primarily clerical so it wouldn't have to go through the voting process, but separating the code and bylaws would have to go forward through the approval process. Bret indicated that separating the code and bylaws wouldn't require changing the content but just rearranging it. Amy will talk to Cody and Janet to find out about moving things in the code, and about voting and the possibility of something being lost. Lila suggested putting out a survey to faculty to find out what they think is missing from the code and bylaws and what they would like to see added.

Questions arose regarding how decisions are made as to what belongs in code and what belongs in bylaws. What goes in the code appendix and why? Bret suggested the code should be used for "bigger" things such as definitions and a guide for building a senate; the "how" should

be addressed in bylaws. Currently, our code contains a lot of the “how” type of procedural things and needs to be trimmed down. The code should also identify the faculty’s scope, what they do, and what they don’t do. Appendices should explain the committees and workload plans, but workload plans could be bylaws. Depending on the wording, the code preamble could be organized to provide an explanation of that.

One option for rewriting would be to extract things to the appendices and rearrange the rest of the code. A larger approach would involve moving things from code to bylaws, and an even bigger approach would be to compare the code, bylaws, and appendices. Possibly the CBA should also be compared for consistency. Amy questioned if other university policies should be compared to see how they align with the code. However, that might need to be done after the code changes are in place.

Lila indicated there are issues with inconsistencies in formatting and style in the code, so those will need to be identified and fixed. Some inconsistencies include use of drop-down lists, use of italics, capitalization and definition (“Faculty Senate” or “Senate”). Bold-face text should only be used for second-level headers, and all abbreviations used need to be defined. Wording is inconsistent with use of “must” and “shall.” Mary suggested having an entire section of definitions to clarify what we mean by faculty, emeritus, code, bylaws, etc., so that everyone is on the same page.

Definitions or clarifications are needed for: faculty, consultation, scholarship, research, and creative activity. A definition is also needed to clarify to whom the code applies. “Scholarship,” “research,” and “creative activity” are used interchangeably; either one of the terms needs to be used consistently, or clear definitions are needed for each of the three terms. Bret suggested defining “scholarship,” and what it includes, as it is defined in the CBA.

Issues arose last year surrounding use of the word “collegial” in the preamble so that should be removed. Lila suggested replacing “collegial” with “shared governance” throughout the preamble. Mary indicated that the disclaimer at the beginning should be moved so that it is actually part of the code. Starting with a disclaimer assumes that people will challenge something.

Bret will look for additional terms that need to be defined. Stephen will look at shared governance.

Other issues or concerns?

Mary questioned other charges for the year. Lila indicated the charges are to review and make changes to the Distinguished Faculty award process, which is underway; review changes to the research misconduct policy; investigate a potential change to workload units; and the comprehensive faculty code review, which we are working on now. The president and BOT have requested that the Senate review the code as a whole document.

Meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.