

*Bylaws & Faculty Code Committee*  
*Minutes – February 16, 2018*

Present: Amy Claridge, Lila Harper, Mary Radeke, Stephen Robison, Bret Smith

Absent: None

Guests: Julie Guggino

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Agenda was amended to move discussion of Scholarly Misconduct Policy before approval of Jan. 12 meeting minutes. Amy added a new charge of modifying the code so that language about reorganization of academic units is included. This item was added to the agenda before the Code Rewrite. The modified agenda was approved.

*Scholarly Misconduct Policy*

Julie Guggino from Graduate Studies & Research, and adaptor of the Scholarly Misconduct Policy, attended to discuss the policy and address concerns. Julie also provided some background information as to why the policy is written as it is and addressed concerns over definitions and language used. “Scholarly” and “research” are interchangeable terms. “Research” is discipline-specific and often used in the sciences; “scholarly” is used in the arts & humanities. PHS (Public Health Service) is concerned only with three types of misconduct (fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism) but there is a wide range of other types that can occur. The university can accuse someone of scholarly misconduct in situations where it might not really be misconduct, but can rise to that level. When that happens, the ORI (Office of Research Integrity) has to investigate eventually. The ORI is very specific. When accepting federal funds, multiple documents have to be submitted. Last year CWU did not have a specific policy on scholarly misconduct that was acceptable, so Julie worked on putting something together quickly. Faculty Senate looked at what she put together and responded to certain items.

Amy indicated the EC feels there is a difference between “scholarly” misconduct and “research” misconduct and it’s more about professionalism. Our faculty code is really trying to address something different than what is defined in the policy. Julie suggested that, with regard to “research” misconduct, one way to look at it is the contribution of intellectual conduct. Was it stolen, made up, or were the facts changed? Anything that does not fall under plagiarism, fabrication, or falsification would go through the Faculty Senate process.

Mary questioned HSRC violations, which were discussed at an earlier time and did not belong in this document. Misappropriation of research funds falls outside this policy document, but does it also fall outside the other document? Julie addressed the HSRC violations in the changes, and indicated that misappropriation of funds is covered in state policies. Misuse of funds isn’t “misconduct” but fraud; the State considers it that way, too.

Amy indicated the need for clarification as to what goes through the process in this policy, and what goes through the Faculty Code process. We also need to clarify in the Faculty

Code what is meant by “scholarly misconduct.” Lila suggested having some kind of reference or mapping for when to refer to each document. Julie suggested making a crosswalk that covers what is in which document in order to help alleviate confusion if people think the university and federal policies are two competing documents when they are really complimentary. Lila indicated that some language would need to be added, and then the code modified to match up.

Bret questioned the RIO (Research Integrity Officer). Who is this? Julie indicated the RIO is the dean of Graduate Studies & Research and covers undergraduate research as well as the entire university. In cases where the RIO and DO (Deciding Official) decide a case of plagiarism doesn’t meet the federal threshold, it can be dealt with at the university level, independent of ORI, and based on the Faculty Code.

Lila moved to add Julie’s language to Faculty Code Section 5. Bret seconded; motion approved. Julie suggested a motion to approve other changes so she can send the policy to UPAC and it can go forward. Lila moved to accept the changes to Faculty Code Section 2 as outlined. Motion approved.

January 12, 2018 minutes were approved as written.

#### *Distinguished Faculty awards*

The following changes were made to Faculty Code Section 3.B.2:

“The selection committee makes the award choices, and forwards those names and materials to the provost.”

Lila moved to forward the language to EC for consultation with the president. Amy seconded; motion approved.

#### *Code Changes - Reorganization Policy*

Amy discussed the policy on reorganization of academic units. The policy came through two years ago and then last year came through from AAC, but never made it past Provost Council. Now there are two recommendations for how the policy should be written. EC prefers the version requiring faculty consultation. The president asked Cody to move forward with this, but put it into the code instead of moving forward as a university policy. This means that it would not go to UPAC but just to the president.

Consideration needs to be given as to where in the code this language should be placed, for example, in the restructuring or the faculty consultation parts. It’s important that faculty have a voice in the process. Lila questioned if it could be done as an appendix to the code, which might be better than putting it right in the middle.

Discussion will resume next week after everyone has reviewed the policy and looked over the code.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.