

*Bylaws & Faculty Code Committee  
Minutes – April 20, 2018*

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

Absent: Stephen Robison (excused)

Guests: None

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Minutes of March 30, 2018 were approved as amended. Amy moved to add an update from EC to the agenda as new business; motion was approved.

*New Business*

a. EC Updates

Amy and Cody have been discussing potential changes to the approval process for changes to the Bylaws and changes to the Code. Right now Bylaws changes require two readings before a change can be approved, and Code changes require three readings. Amy and Cody would like to propose changing the required three readings to two, but this would have to go through three readings in order to be approved. Two readings is important because it's a way for senators to take issues or concerns back to their departments, but Amy and Cody are questioning if the third reading is really necessary. Senate discussion is not supposed to occur at the first reading, which typically means two more months pass before voting. Mary indicated some departments don't have regular meetings. Senators have to send communications and updates via email. It is then up to colleagues to talk with the senators, which could be a potential argument for keeping three readings.

Bret indicated he observed this in action in the State Legislature. A motion can be made for a suspension of the rules and to have the second reading considered as the third reading. In our situation, the first reading is a good thing since it gives faculty time to go back to their departments. The end of the second month might be the time to suspend the rules and vote.

Depending on the situation, the EC usually decides to do a survey before continuing with a change or a motion so we aren't bound by procedure. Lila questioned if the language in the Code is really so different from the language in the Bylaws to warrant the three readings vs. the two readings. Especially going into spring quarter, things do have the potential to get rushed, so changing the number of required Code readings could be a way to prevent that. As it is now, we end up shutting things down in April because we run out of time to have changes approved due to the required three readings. One possibility might be to do a trial period for a year and then if it goes well, make a change in the Code.

For now, BFCC recommends a trial period, over the next academic year, for two readings for Code changes. If this goes well and receives positive responses, it will be made part of the Code.

*Old Business*

a. Code Changes - Distinguished Faculty Awards

Amy discussed some additional comments from EC. The current distinguished faculty selection committee, who is anonymous, provided some feedback at a recent open EC meeting. Some of their feedback aligns with our changes to the policy, but some of the suggestions are new. Another concern is

that we need to create language for the BOT award. There are only two Senate meetings left, so we could try to suspend the rules and out through the Code changes we have already made, or we could wait and put everything through at the first meeting of Fall 2018 so that the language for the BOT award can be included. However, the changes would not be effective until the following academic year.

One concern from this year's selection committee is the use of the word "distinguished. The committee's interpretation is that "distinguished" means the award is intended to be a lifetime achievement award. In that regard, they have concerns about comparing someone who has been here for 6 years against someone who has been here for 25 years. However, it sounds as if there were mixed opinions on the issue among the committee members. The selection committee suggests that we consider making two types of awards, one for faculty early in their careers, and another for those later in their careers who could be considered "distinguished." Possibly "distinguished" could be used for the BOT award, and "excellence" for the others. In the Code, it's unclear what is being awarded. The selection committee also feels it's problematic if they pick someone who's done a lot in 6 years, rather than the three people who have been here 25 years, because that means the person who's been here only 6 years is "distinguished" for the rest of their career. Regarding the NTT award, the selection committee felt this award should be broader than just teaching, but we are addressing that. They suggested a lifetime achievement award for the NTT award, in two categories: one for someone who has been here consistently for 10-15 years, and a second, early-career category.

Lila indicated there are some 20-year binders that aren't as "distinguished" as 6-year binders. Another concern is that we've had this award for some time, and a number of people have received it. Considering that, can we really change it and call it something else? Other schools might have a "best early career recognition" but that could be more at the college-level rather than the university level. We may want to look at ways of increasing the selection committee. An ongoing problem is that the people on the selection committee often aren't familiar with the fields of the nominees.

Bret suggested working on what we already have and getting it through Faculty Senate so it can get into place for next year.

Changes to the policy language:

- in IV.B.2 - change "provost" to "President & BOT"
- in III.B.8 - change "provost" to "president"; and "Provost's Office" to "President's Office"
- IV.B.3.- change "provost" to "president"
- in IV.A.1 change "chosen" to "approved"

The BOT language will be done separately. Bret moved to accept changes and move the policy forward; Amy seconded. Motion approved.

Mary questioned if there can be overlap between categories comprising selection committee membership; for example, can an alumnus or retiree also be a winner of the award? Amy indicated the EC selections from the retirees. If the alumni association recommends someone, the EC would still have some oversight.

#### b. Reorganization Policy Code Changes

Amy incorporated changes from the president and the EC into one document. Bob Hickey sent some suggestions for changes as well. The president felt "academic units" were too narrowly defined

and suggested making it broader. Amy included most of Bob Hickey's changes as well. In section 1.B he suggested consulting UFC, and also suggested adding language to indicate the EC decides if proposals should go to Senate in the full proposal, as an information item only, or not go to the Senate. The consultation language already has similar options, so we can include Bob's suggestions if it seems necessary.

Bret suggested making a reference back to the Code and say that the "proposal will follow the procedure as listed in Section 1.D.2" This would require renumbering Section 1.D.1 and make paragraph "A" begin with "When...." Everything subsequently would also need to be renumbered so that a new paragraph "B" can be created.

Changes to policy language:

- in Appendix A, make a capital A and renumber the following items. Add a new B saying "upon receipt of the proposal the executive committee will proceed as outlined in Section 1.D.2."

- in Section 1, renumber 1.D.2. Change 3 to subsection 2; renumber 4 & 5, and change a. & b.

Changes were moved and approved.

Amy will make changes and email to everyone

c. Code Rewrite

Bret currently has the document. He will send it to Stephen when finished editing.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Next Meeting:

May 18, 2018

Grupe Center