

**FACULTY SENATE
ANNUAL
STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT**

*2021-2022 ACADEMIC YEAR
Prepared for the Central Washington University Faculty Senate*

Faculty Senate Committee: Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee (BFCC)

Committee Chair: Mary Radeke (report author)

Committee Representation:

- Members: Nathan White
- Ex Officio Members: Elvin Delgado (EC Representative 9/21/21 - 1/3/22), Mark Samples, (EC Representative 1/4/22 - 6/12/22).
- Student Representatives: None
- Guests: Gary Bartlett (10/4/21), Janet Shields (10/11/21), Greg Lyman (11/22/21), Warren Plugge (EAC Chair, 1/24/22).

Committee Charges:

The BFCC received the following charges from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on September 21, 2021.

BFCC21-22.01 Continue working and moving forward language for the CWUP and correlated language in Faculty Code that strengthen the code and shared governance and that would protect the Senate. **Timeline:** Fall Quarter

*Refer to the BFCC 20-21 year-end report for a description of last year's progress.
Also, Appendix A includes the latest revision of the draft policy and code language.*

The BFCC revised language from 2020 (language was originally passed in Senate during the 2020-2021 year) however it was not reviewed by President Gaudino and was added to the BFCC's charges this year. The BFCC presented revisions to EC and President Wohlpart for review, however it was determined that further changes needed to be made. EC recommended a slight revision as seen below. BFCC also discussed the inclusion of new language in CWUP 2-80 "Shared Governance". Because this would be an addition to CWUP, only one Senate reading is required.

Language approved by BFCC, EC and President for inclusion in CWUP 2-80 Shared Governance

Proposed change:

The Faculty Code describes the parameters of shared governance and consultation between the BOT, the administrative agents of the BOT and Faculty. The Faculty Code recognizes a shared responsibility in matters pertaining to the planning and development of university-wide policy

related to faculty that are not covered by the CBA. Effective collegial governance relies on open and effective communication between stakeholders: the Faculty Senate, faculty, the BOT, and the administration. Consultation assures that all parties are properly informed and included.

1. Violations of Faculty Code and failure to consult stakeholders will be investigated by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in conjunction with the President and then subsequently referred to the BOT or their appointed representative for resolution.
2. Any attempt to dissolve the Faculty Senate without the consent of a 3/4 actual majority of Faculty constitutes a violation of Faculty Code and CWUP.
3. CWUP 2-80 represents an exception to the CWUP and can only be amended with the joint approval of a 2/3 majority of the BOT, the office of the president, and a 2/3 majority of the Faculty Senate.

BFCC21-22.02 Consider changes to Bylaws, Section I.C.1 regarding senate representation for departments. **Timeline:** Fall Quarter

Section I.C.1 states that each academic department/library shall have Senate representation based on a prescribed number of FTEs. The first tier goes from 1-14 FTE. This can be problematic if an academic department/library only has 1 FTE, which based on the current language will give them the right to have a senator. Please evaluate the number of FTEs for each academic department/library in 2021-2022 AY and identify what unit has the lowest number of FTE with senate representation. Consider using that as a baseline for the lowest number of FTE allowed to have 1 senator.

See “Status Report for remaining charges” for this charge.

BFCC21-22.03 Consider strengthening language in Faculty Code, section II.G.1.i. regarding Senate jurisdiction in senate complaint policy and procedures. **Timeline:** Fall Quarter

Item “h”: Professionalism was deemed potentially problematic by the Assistant Attorney General as Senate does not define what professionalism is, which leaves subjectivity and is open to interpretation. Consider reviewing AAUP definitions of professionalism (or other) and attaching as another appendix.

[Senate Motion No. 21-13]: Recommends amending the Faculty Code Section IV.G.1 Complaint Policy and Procedures as outlined in Exhibit G. Passed 1/12/22.

Summary of changes: BFCC proposes removal of h) Professionalism from the i. Jurisdiction and renumbering/lettering of remaining items: “Jurisdiction: The purpose of the complaint policy and procedure is to provide a means by which (a) complainant(s) may pursue a complaint against a respondent(s) for alleged violations of the Code and policies that fall under the Faculty Senate purview. A complainant may file a complaint that asserts a violation of the following Code, policies and/or standards:”.

Justification of changes: Professionalism was deemed potentially problematic by the Assistant Attorney General as Senate does not define what professionalism is, which leaves subjectivity and is open to interpretation. Budget implications: None.

No budget implications.

Faculty Code Section IV.G.1

G. External Senate Procedures for the Protection of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

1. Complaint Policy and Procedures

a. Obligations

The university recognizes the right of faculty to express differences of opinion and to see fair and timely resolutions of complaints. It is the policy of the university that such complaints shall first be attempted to be settled informally and that all persons have the obligation to participate in good faith in the informal complaint process before resorting to formal procedures. The university encourages open communication and resolution of such matters through the informal processes described herein. The university will not tolerate reprisals, retribution, harassment or discrimination against any person because of participation in this process. This section establishes an internal process to provide university faculty a prompt and efficient review and resolution of complaints. All university administrators shall be attentive to and counsel with faculty concerning disputes arising in areas over which the administrators have supervisory or other responsibilities, and shall to the best of their ability contribute to timely resolution of any dispute brought to them.

b. Definitions

- i. Complainant(s): An individual or group representative making the complaint.
- ii. Respondent(s): An individual or entity against whom the complaint is being made. A respondent could be an academic department, a member of the faculty, staff, an administrative unit, or a member of the administration.
- iii. Complaint: An allegation made by the complainant(s) that the respondent(s) has violated the Faculty Code or policies under the Faculty Senate purview.

c. Scope

- i. Jurisdiction: The purpose of the complaint policy and procedure is to provide a means by which (a) complainant(s) may pursue a complaint against a respondent(s) for alleged violations of the Code and policies that fall under the Faculty Senate purview. A complainant may file a complaint that asserts a violation of the following Code, policies and/or standards:
 - a) Faculty Code
 - b) Faculty Senate Bylaws

- c) Curriculum Policy and Procedures (CWUP 5-50 and CWUR 2-50)
- d) Academic Policies, Standards and Organizational Structures (CWUP 5-90 and CWUR 2-90)
- e) Evaluation and Assessment
- f) General Education (CWUP 5-100)
- g) Budget and Planning
- ~~h) Professionalism~~
- ⌘ h) Professional Ethics (Faculty Code Appendix

- ⌘ i) Scholarly Misconduct
 - 1. Complaints alleging fabrication falsification or plagiarism in research/scholarship are subject to CWUP 2-40-250. Both the Senate and CWUP processes will be conducted in parallel.

BFCC21-22.04 Consider additional language regarding benefits and privileges for Emeritus Faculty as outlined in Faculty Code, Section I.B.2.d. **Timeline:** Winter Quarter

Revisions to this language passed Senate last year, but has not been approved by the Board of Trustees. Please consider language additions that address budget responsibility and decisions.

The BOT requested that the BFCC identify specific department/program budgets responsible for covering the cost of emeritus privileges. The BFCC felt that budget information should not be identified in the Code. BFCC requested that the language passed in Senate during the 2020-2021 academic year be returned to the BOT for a vote. President Wohlpart requested that we modify the language to restrict the emeritus (change language from “shall” to “may” for the majority of the emeritus privileges). The EC felt that this would remove many of the privileges already granted to emeritus faculty and clearly stated in the code. EC and BFCC voted to keep the present language in the code unchanged. This maintains the current emeritus privileges (in the 2020 Code version). Charge will not be forwarded to 2022-2023 charges.

BFCC21-22.05 Consider additional language regarding the definition of full-time service for NTT faculty eligibility for emeritus status in Faculty Code, Section I.B.2.a.i. **Timeline:** Winter Quarter.

Senate Motion No. 21-22: Recommends amending the Faculty Code Section I.B.2.i. Emeritus Faculty Appointments as outlined in Exhibit B. Passed 3/2/22.

Summary of changes:

BFCC proposed addition of language to the Faculty Code, Emeritus Faculty Appointments to clarify the requirement of length of teaching service and employment status for NTT emeritus status eligibility.

Justification of Changes:

Currently, the Faculty Code does not stipulate the requirement for eligibility of NTT faculty for emeritus status, however, NTT faculty are eligible for nomination to emeritus status. The CBA outlines the minimum requirements for Senior Lecturer status as “A minimum of five (5) years’ faculty experience at the University, completion of at least one-hundred thirteen (113) workload units...” (CBA section 8.2.5). Additionally, this requirement is consistent with requirements for Senior Clinical Faculty (CBA section 8.2.8), and Senior Head Coach or Senior Assistant Coach, “A minimum of five (5) years’ experience coaching at least one-half time on an annualized basis at the University...” (CBA, section 8.2.11). One-hundred thirteen hours (113) is consistent with part-time (.5) service. The CBA also uses the similar requirements for NTT faculty to be eligible for multi-year contracts, “Senior Lecturers/Senior Clinical Faculty who have held senior status for four (4) or more years, and who have had an FTE of 0.50 or greater in a college for four (4) or more consecutive years, will be issued a contract with a minimum term of two (2) years.” (CBA section 10.1.3.a). The proposed Faculty Code language change is consistent with the CBA requirements for promotion.

Budget Implications:

Potential cost to department and college, exact cost unknown.

Communications:

Senator Erdman brought up a concern that departments have kept some NTT faculty below .5 (half-time) in order to avoid paying medical benefits. They could teach as many as 5 years at just below .5 and this is problematic for those faculty to receive Emeritus status. Should be at least ten years and 225 WLU.

Senator Amason noticed in language that they need to have excellent scholarly, service and teaching record. NTT faculty are not usually given service and scholarly workload.

Final language change:

2. Emeritus Faculty Appointments

- a. Faculty, who are retiring from the university, may be retired with the honorary title of “emeritus” status ascribed to their highest attained rank or title. The emeritus status is recommended for faculty members who have an excellent teaching, scholarly, and service record consistent with their appointments.
 - i. The emeritus status is recommended for faculty members who have an excellent teaching, scholarly, and service record consistent with their appointments. A normal requirement for appointment to the emeritus faculty is ten (10) years of full-time service as a member of the teaching faculty. ~~For non-tenured faculty, an accumulation of ten (10) years of at least half-time service as a member of the teaching faculty.~~
 - ii. The emeritus status is recommended for non-tenured faculty members who have an excellent teaching record. A normal requirement for

eligibility to the emeritus faculty is for the faculty member to teach at least thirty (30) quarters over a minimum of ten (10) years and have an accumulated total of at least 200 ~~225~~ WLUs as a member of the teaching faculty.

- iii. Any eligible faculty member may be nominated, including self-nomination, for emeritus status to the department chair. Nominations shall include a current vita and may include letters of support.
- iv. A simple majority of the eligible faculty in a department as defined in I.B.1.a.iv must approve the recommendation of emeritus status. Departments must adhere to the simple majority vote.
- v. The BOT may grant emeritus status to any faculty member at their discretion.

BFCC21-22.06 Review and consider language in bylaws regarding rules for multiple members from one department serving on senate committees. **Timeline:** Spring Quarter.

Consider defining how many members from one department are appropriate for each senate committee if the situation arises.

Senate Motion No. 21-24: Recommends amending the Faculty Senate Bylaws Section III.A. as outlined in Exhibit E. Passed 3/2/22

Summary of changes:

BFCC proposed addition of language to the Faculty Bylaws, (Section III. Standing Committees) to restrict the number of representatives serving on a standing committee from department or group with senate representation to one member.

Justification of Changes:

The restriction of representatives from a department or group to one (1) per standing committee will encourage representation from multiple departments, provide diverse viewpoints, and expertise resulting in broader perspectives and campus wide representation. The proposed language allows more than one member from a department or group if approved by the EC. This language was removed from the CWU Faculty Bylaws (estimated in 2005), the BFCC is proposing the reinstatement of this language.

Budget Implications: Unknown.

PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR CWU FACULTY BYLAWS:

III. Senate Standing Committees

A. General Provisions

- 1. Rules concerning the creation of standing committees are set out in the Code, Section IV.D.2.
- 2. The powers and duties of the standing committees are set out in the Code, Section IV.D.1.

3. ~~a.~~ Each standing committee shall consist of no fewer than five (5) faculty members. The Executive Committee shall endeavor to appoint these members and have them ratified by the Senate at the February meeting.
4. ~~No more than one (1) committee member may come from any one (1) department or group with Senate representation unless approved by the EC.~~
5. ~~4.~~ No faculty member may serve on more than one standing committee at a time.
6. ~~5.~~ Members may be appointed from among the general faculty, with proportional balance sought between the colleges. At least one (1) member of each standing committee should have served on the committee the previous year.
7. ~~6.~~ Term appointments for standing committees shall run three (3) consecutive academic years. A partial term of two (2) years or more shall be treated as a full term, while a partial term of less than two (2) years shall not be counted.
 - a) Continuous service on standing committees (whether the same committee or two different committees) shall be limited to no more than two (2) consecutive full terms.
 - b) Once a faculty member has served two (2) consecutive full terms, a minimum of three (3) years shall lapse before said faculty member may serve again on any standing committee.
 - c) However, if a vacancy on a committee cannot be filled by an eligible candidate by February 15th, the pool of candidates may be widened by waiving the restrictions stated in 6.a and 6.b.
 - d) In situations where a college membership seat is vacant for more than sixty (60) days, the EC may nominate a member-at-large to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the academic year, subject to Senate ratification. If the college membership seat cannot be filled after two emergency appointments, the EC shall review the makeup of the membership structure and may charge the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee to restructure the committee membership.

BFCC21-22.07 Consider code revisions regarding frequency of assessments of academic administrators, Senate and Executive Committee. **Timeline:** Spring Quarter

BFCC21-22.07 Consider code revisions regarding frequency of assessments of academic administrators, Senate and Executive Committee. **Timeline:** Spring Quarter

Current code states that each group's assessments occur on a biennial basis, per code section IV.D.e. The Evaluation and Assessment Committee has suggested to change the academic administrators' assessments to yearly. Also, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee changes some personnel yearly, so potentially consider adjusting this to a yearly basis as well. Please consult with the Evaluation and Assessment Committee (EAC).

Senate Motion No. 21-37: Recommends amending the Faculty Code Section IV.D.1.e. as outlined in Exhibit C. Passed 5/4/2022

Summary of Changes:

The Evaluation and Assessment Committee (EAC) and the BFCC proposes a revised schedule of academic administrators' assessments to occur biennially on a rotating schedule. Existing language in the Faculty Code states that all academic administrators (President, Provost, Vice Provost, College Deans, Library Dean, and Dean of Undergraduate Studies) be evaluated on a biennial basis. Senate and EC assessments are to be evaluated on an annual basis. The proposed language would evaluate academic administrators on a rotating (even/odd years) biennial basis, Senate and EC assessments to remain on an annual review cycle.

Justification of Changes:

This proposed rotating biennial schedule will spread the assessments more evenly from year to year in order to reduce the biennial assessment fatigue that occurs with the current schedule.

Budget Implications:

No known budget implications.

Language change for Faculty Code:

Faculty Code Section IV.D.1.e.

The Evaluation and Assessment Committee shall be concerned with assessment tools affecting faculty or requiring faculty input. It shall receive, review, initiate, and make recommendations or proposals for assessment tools used for the biennial faculty assessment of academic administrators **on a rotating basis (even years: President, Vice Provost, Library Dean, and Dean of Graduate Studies; odd years: Provost, College Deans, Dean of Undergraduate Studies)** and the **annual**, ~~the biennial~~ Senate and EC ~~Executive Committee~~ assessments, and do such other similar things as charged by the EC ~~Executive Committee~~, coordinating its efforts with other individuals, groups or committees as necessary or appropriate.

BFCC21-22.08 Consider additional language in the Faculty Senate Bylaws to change the membership of Faculty Senate committees regarding ex-officio roles and guest guidelines.

Timeline: Spring Quarter

BFCC21-22.09 Consider additional language in Faculty Senate Bylaws and/or Faculty Code regarding Senate committee meeting formats. **Timeline:** Spring Quarter.

Consider defining options for when Senate committees are in open sessions versus closed sessions.

Senate Motion No. 21-25 (charge .08 and .09 combined): Recommends amending the Faculty Bylaws, Section III.B. as outlined in Exhibit F. Passed 3/2/22.

Summary of changes:

BFCC proposes the addition of language under Organization and Procedures in Faculty Bylaws for initial discussion of motions, subsequent discussion, and voting. The new language will appear as III.B.5, resulting in the renumbering of the following sections.

Justification of changes:

In order to allow committee members to freely cast their votes without any real or perceived influence from non-voting members, we propose that committee voting may take place in closed sessions of the committee. The timing of these closed sessions may occur during the meeting, after the meeting, or at some other date and time, but the decision on when to hold the closed session will be left to the discretion of the committee chair.

Budget implications: None.

Faculty Bylaws change:

III. Senate Standing Committees

B. Organization and Procedures

1. Each year, standing committees (with the exception of the General Education Committee (GEC) shall elect their own chairs from among the members of the committee. Each chair will serve as the liaison to the Executive Committee. If not a Senator, the chair becomes an ex officio member of the Senate without vote.
 - a. General Education Program Director will serve as the GEC Chair. All faculty members who have served on GEC at least one academic year within the last four years are eligible. Each program director will serve a three (3) year term, comprising one (1) year as program director-elect followed by two (2) years as program director. GEC will forward the program director-elect nomination to the Executive Committee for ratification at the January Faculty Senate meeting.
 - b. General Education Program Director-Elect duties will begin June 16.
2. Standing committees shall report on their activities at each full Senate meeting monthly to the Senate or as otherwise directed by the Executive Committee.
3. Standing committees shall normally concern themselves with policy matters. These committees may refer general policy questions or

issues relating to specific cases to the Executive Committee for consideration by any standing committee or committees or other interested groups or individuals. The committees will act on charges as presented by the Executive Committee. In addition, committees may initiate their own activities as desired, with approval by the Executive Committee.

4. Early in the fall quarter of each year, each standing committee, except Academic Affairs, Curriculum and General Education, shall determine its schedule of meetings for that entire academic year. The schedule may be determined either at the committee's first meeting, or via communication between the committee members prior to the first meeting. Once the year's meeting schedule is determined, the chair shall ensure that the schedule is forwarded to the Senate Office. Academic Affairs, Curriculum and General Education committees will meet according to the established meeting day and time. The first meeting of each committee shall ordinarily occur before October 31st.
5. **Once a motion has been made and seconded, discussion with the full committee, including non-voting members, may take place. Standing committees may then conduct further discussions in closed sessions with no guests, ex officio members, designees, or any other non-voting members present. After these discussions, voting committee members may conduct the vote in a closed session without any non-voting members present. At the committee chairperson's discretion, the final vote may be conducted via a secret vote.**
6. ~~5.~~ Any standing committee member who, in a single academic year, is absent for three (3) committee meetings, or for two (2) consecutive committee meetings, shall inform the committee chair of the reason for the absences. If the member in question does not provide such a reason, or if the chair deems the reason inadequate or if the member does not provide assurance that the absences will cease, the chair may ask the Executive Committee to move to have the member removed from the committee. Before making this request of the Executive Committee, the committee chair shall first endeavor to inform the member, in writing, of the chair's intention to request the removal of the member. The Executive Committee will inform the member of the decision to remove them from the committee. The member will have ten (10) working days to respond to the Executive Committee. If there is no resolution to restore the member to the committee, then the seat shall be declared vacant. The Senate chair shall then inform the member's department(s) in writing of their removal.
7. ~~6.~~ If the committee's work is blocked or impaired by a member, the committee may take a secret ballot vote to decide if removal is

recommended. This recommendation would be submitted in writing, with a detailed justification, to the Executive Committee for approval. In cases where the member in question is the committee chair or for reasons that would preclude a committee vote, any committee member may request the Executive Committee to investigate the situation and oversee a committee vote, if necessary. The Executive Committee will inform the member of the decision to remove them from the committee. The member will have ten (10) working days to respond to the Executive Committee. If there is no resolution to restore the member to the committee, then the seat shall be declared vacant. The Senate chair shall then inform the member's department(s) in writing of their removal.

8. ~~7.~~ If the Executive Committee recommends removal of the member in question, that member may appeal that removal to the full Senate. Senate may override the decision of the Executive Committee and restore membership.

BFCC21-22.10 Standardize language in Faculty Code and Bylaws regarding committee titles.

Timeline: Spring Quarter

*For example, some locations refer to "Executive Committee" and others as "EC".
This will maintain consistency and cleanliness of Code and Bylaws language*

BFCC completed a thorough review the Faculty Code and Bylaws for inconsistencies in committee titles, abbreviations and general clerical errors. Revisions were clerical in nature and did not require readings in Senate. Revisions were sent to EC for review.

BFCC21-22.11 Review committee procedures manual and update as required. **Timeline:**

Approve updated procedures manual by the last committee meeting of the year.

BFCC committee procedures were reviewed and changes were made to accurately reflect the purpose of the committee as per Faculty Code, the addition of detail with regard to committee responsibilities, and EC liaison responsibilities as stated in EC Policy and Procedures manual.

GEC and BFCC no charge number [Senate Motion No. 21-38]: Recommends amending the Faculty Code Section IV.E.8 & 9 as outlined in Exhibit D. [no charge number, added by GEC]. This motion will be presented for the second and final reading at the June Senate meeting.

Summary of changes: See below.

Justification of Changes: These changes reflect the current organization and procedures of the General Education Committee. Faculty Code language changes were approved by the GEC committee on 3/7/2022.

Budget Implications: Unknown

language change for Faculty Code:

IV. Faculty Senate Faculty Code Section IV E. Assigned Time and Workload for Senate Officers and Activities

8. Senate Committee Chair Workload units for the position of chair of a Senate committee are estimated at two to four (2-4) per academic year. When elected committee chairs configure their workload plans, they should contact the Senate Office to determine a specific estimate for the upcoming year.
9. Senate Committee Member (Non-Chair) Workload units for the positions of non-chair members of Senate committees are estimated at one to two (1-2) per academic year. When ratified committee members configure their workload plans, they should contact the Senate Office to determine a specific estimate for the upcoming year.

GED and BFCC no charge number [Senate Motion No 21-39]: Recommends amending the Faculty Senate Bylaws Section III.B.1.a & b, C.2 & 4 as outlined in Exhibit E. Passed 5/4/22

Summary of changes: See below.

Justification of Changes: These changes reflect the current organization and procedures of the General Education Committee. Bylaws language changes were approved by the GEC committee on 3/7/2022.

Budget Implications: Unknown.

language change for Faculty Senate Bylaws:

III. Senate Standing Committees

B. Organization and Procedures

1. Each year, standing committees shall elect their own chairs from among the members of the committee. Each chair will serve as the liaison to the Executive Committee. If not a Senator, the chair becomes an ex officio member of the Senate without vote.
2. Standing committees shall report on their activities at each full Senate meeting monthly to the Senate or as otherwise directed by the Executive Committee.
3. Standing committees shall normally concern themselves with policy matters. These committees may refer general policy questions or issues relating to specific cases to the Executive Committee for consideration by any standing committee or committees or other interested groups or individuals. The committees will act on charges as presented by the Executive Committee. In addition, committees may initiate their own activities as desired, with approval by the Executive Committee.

4. Early in the fall quarter of each year, each standing committee, except Academic Affairs, Curriculum and General Education, shall determine its schedule of meetings for that entire academic year. The schedule may be determined either at the committee's first meeting, or via communication between the committee members prior to the first meeting. Once the year's meeting schedule is determined, the chair shall ensure that the schedule is forwarded to the Senate Office. Academic Affairs, Curriculum and General Education committees will meet according to the established meeting day and time. The first meeting of each committee shall ordinarily occur before October 31st.
5. Any standing committee member who, in a single academic year, is absent for three (3) committee meetings, or for two (2) consecutive committee meetings, shall inform the committee chair of the reason for the absences. If the member in question does not provide such a reason, or if the chair deems the reason inadequate or if the member does not provide assurance that the absences will cease, the chair may ask the Executive Committee to move to have the member removed from the committee. Before making this request of the Executive Committee, the committee chair shall first endeavor to inform the member, in writing, of the chair's intention to request the removal of the member. The Executive Committee will inform the member of the decision to remove them from the committee. The member will have ten (10) working days to respond to the Executive Committee. If there is no resolution to restore the member to the committee, then the seat shall be declared vacant. The Senate chair shall then inform the member's department(s) in writing of their removal.
6. If the committee's work is blocked or impaired by a member, the committee may take a secret ballot vote to decide if removal is recommended. This recommendation would be submitted in writing, with a detailed justification, to the Executive Committee for approval. In cases where the member in question is the committee chair or for reasons that would preclude a committee vote, any committee member may request the Executive Committee to investigate the situation and oversee a committee vote, if necessary. The Executive Committee will inform the member of the decision to remove them from the committee. The member will have ten (10) working days to respond to the Executive Committee. If there is no resolution to restore the member to the committee, then the seat shall be declared vacant. The Senate chair shall then inform the member's department(s) in writing of their removal.
7. If the Executive Committee recommends removal of the member in

question, that member may appeal that removal to the full Senate. Senate may override the decision of the Executive Committee and restore membership.

C. Membership

1. Executive Committee Membership on Faculty Senate committees shall be as follows:
 - a. An Executive Committee member may not be a member of any other standing committee aside from the one with which they liaise.
 - b. Standing committees may not have more than one Executive Committee member at any given time unless specified in the Faculty Senate Bylaws.
 - c. Once a senator is elected to the EC, that senator shall step-down from any Faculty Senate standing committees on which they serve.
 - i. If the loss of a member negatively impacts the standing committee, the Executive Committee Chair will work with the standing committee chair to mitigate the impact.
2. The membership of the General Education Committee shall consist of:
 - a. two (2) faculty members from each academic college and one(1) faculty member from the library;
 - b. one (1) student selected by ASCWU, non-voting; and
 - c. Provost designee, ex officio, non-voting.
 - d. Registrar designee, ex officio, non-voting
3. The membership of the Academic Affairs Committee shall consist of:
 - a. two (2) faculty from each college with the exception of the Library,
 - b. one (1) student selected by ASCWU,
 - c. one (1) ex officio non-voting representative of the provost, and
 - d. one (1) ex officio non-voting representative of the registrar, and
 - e. the chair of the Academic Department Chairs Organization (ADCO) as an ex officio non-voting member.
4. The membership of the Curriculum Committee shall consist of:
 - a. two (2) faculty from each college,
 - b. one (1) faculty from the Library,
 - c. one (1) student selected by ASCWU,
 - d. Provost designee, ex officio, non-voting,
 - e. the Registrar (or a designee), ex officio, non-voting, and
 - f. the Dean or Associate Dean from CAH, COB, CEPS, COTS and the Library, ex officio, non-voting.

5. The membership of the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee shall consist of five (5) senators or alternates, as follows:
 - a. the chair of the committee shall be a current senator;
 - b. one member (but not the chair) shall be the Senate chair-elect; and
 - c. each of the other three (3) members shall be either a current senator, a current alternate, or a faculty member who has been a senator or alternate within the previous ten years. Alternates should comment on their level of involvement in Faculty Senate when they apply.
6. The membership of the Evaluation and Assessment Committee shall consist of five (5) faculty members (one from each college plus one from the library), nominated and ratified to staggered terms. One (1) student selected by ASCWU, non-voting.
7. The membership of the Budget and Planning Committee shall consist of:
 - a. two (2) faculty each from CAH, COTS, CEPS, CB,
 - b. one (1) faculty from the Library,
 - c. one (1) senior lecturer faculty member,
 - d. two (2) Academic Department Chairs Organization (ADCO) representatives as ex officio voting members, and
 - e. two (2) Faculty Senate Executive Committee representatives as ex officio voting members.

Report on the Activities of the Committee:

Virtual (Zoom) Meeting Dates and Times:

- Fall 2021 Quarter Meetings: Time - 3:30pm - 5:00pm. Dates - 9/27, 10/4, 10/11, 10/18, , 10/25, 11/1, 11/8, 11/22, 12/6.
- Winter 2021 Quarter Meetings: Time - 3:30pm - 5:00pm. Dates - 1/10, 1/24, 1/31, 2/7, 2/14, 2/28, 3/14,
- Spring 2021 Quarter Meetings: Time - 3:30pm - 5:00pm. Dates - 4/4, 4/18, 5/2, 5/16, 5/30 (TBA).

Status Report for remaining charges:

BFCC21-22.02 Consider changes to Bylaws, Section I.C.1 regarding senate representation for departments. **Timeline:** Fall Quarter

Section I.C.1 states that each academic department/library shall have Senate representation based on a prescribed number of FTEs. The first tier goes from 1-14 FTE. This can be problematic if an academic department/library only has 1 FTE,

which based on the current language will give them the right to have a senator. Please evaluate the number of FTEs for each academic department/library in 2021-2022 AY and identify what unit has the lowest number of FTE with senate representation. Consider using that as a baseline for the lowest number of FTE allowed to have 1 senator.

BFCC received a summary of all department FTEs and current senator allocations and discussed the minimum number of FTE for allocation of one senator. It was determined that before moving forward with this Bylaws change, BFCC would need a definition of “department”. The minimum FTE per department may alter the minimum senator allocation. EC also agreed and sent the request to the Provost for a definition. As of 4/18/22 BFCC is waiting on the definition. Due to the required two readings in Senate, this charge will be added to the 2022-2023 list of charges.

Items of interest

Chair Reports presented at Faculty Senate

10/6/22 Chair Report Summary:

Currently, the committee is reviewing language for the CWUP and correlating Faculty Code language will strengthen the Code and shared governance and would protect the Senate. This language was originally approved by the BFCC during the 2020-2021 academic year; however, it was suggested that further review of the language and minor adjustments were warranted. This charge was reviewed in our 9/27/21 meeting and we hope to finalize this charge during fall quarter. Additionally, the committee is working on our second charge which concerns potential changes to Bylaws (Section I.C.1 Senate Representation for Departments/Library). The BFCC is in the process of reviewing the allocation of senators per FTE which includes a review of the current total FTE and the current senator allocation per department.

12/2/22 Chair Report Summary:

BFCC21-22.01 CWUP and correlated language in Faculty Code that strengthen the code and shared governance and that would protect the Senate. **Timeline:** Fall Quarter

Progress: This language was originally approved by the BFCC during the 2020-2021 academic year and was reviewed by the Senate Executive Committee. As the original purpose of this language was to strengthen the Code and shared governance and protect the Senate, it was felt that the scope and format required attention. The BFCC is continuing a review of the language and where the language should reside in CWUP.

BFCC21-22.02 Consider changes to Bylaws, Section I.C.1 regarding senate representation for departments. **Timeline:** Fall Quarter

Progress: The BFCC is continuing to work with the EC to identify the number of FTE and senate representation in Faculty Senate. A consensus for the minimum FTE for Senate representation, as well as a minimum number of FTE per the definition of ‘department’ is currently being discussed.

BFCC21-22.04 Consider additional language regarding benefits and privileges for Emeritus Faculty as outlined in Faculty Code, Section I.B.2.d. **Timeline:** Winter Quarter

Progress: This language was passed in Senate during the 2020-2021 academic year and was to go before the BOT. It was requested that the BFCC review the addition of language regarding benefits and privileges for Emeritus Faculty, specifically budget responsibility and decisions (FC I.B.2.d.). The BFCC has requested that the BOT review the language to be included in the Faculty Code as passed by the Faculty Senate without addition of language regarding budget responsibility.

BFCC21-22.05 Consider additional language regarding the definition of full-time service for NTT faculty eligibility for emeritus status in Faculty Code, Section I.B.2.a.i. **Timeline:** Winter Quarter.

Progress: The BFCC has identified the requirements for NTT promotion from the CBA and this language will be presented to Faculty Senate in during Winter quarter, 2022.

BFCC21-22.06 Review and consider language in bylaws regarding rules for multiple members from one department serving on senate committees. **Timeline:** Spring Quarter.

Progress: The BFCC has reviewed the current and past language from previous versions of the Bylaws and is in the process of constructing language for Bylaws to be presented to Faculty Senate during Winter quarter, 2022.

2/2/22 Chair Report Summary:

During the months of December and January, the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee continued to work on a number of charges, a summary of these charges and our progress as well as those items presented to the Faculty Senate for vote and status are listed below:

BFCC21-22.01 CWUP and correlated language in Faculty Code that strengthen the code and shared governance and that would protect the Senate. **Timeline:** Fall Quarter

Progress: The committee is in the process of finalizing the revised language for this charge, we are hopeful the proposed CWUP section will be presented to Faculty Senate at the March Senate meeting.

BFCC21-22.04 Consider additional language regarding benefits and privileges for Emeritus Faculty as outlined in Faculty Code, Section I.B.2.d. **Timeline:** Winter Quarter

Progress: No new updates on this charge.

BFCC21-22.05 Consider additional language regarding the definition of full-time service for NTT faculty eligibility for emeritus status in Faculty Code, Section I.B.2.a.i. **Timeline:** Winter Quarter.

Progress: The BFCC has identified the requirements for NTT promotion from the CBA as a basis for clarification of the requirements for eligibility of emeritus status. This motion was presented for the first of three readings to Faculty Senate on January 19th, 2022. Communication from various Faculty Senators resulted in adjustment of the language to include the minimum number of WLU, exclusion of the term “half-time”, and separating the requirements to appear in a separate section to identify the teaching requirement and excluding the requirements of service and scholarship for NTT faculty.

BFCC21-22.06 Review and consider language in bylaws regarding rules for multiple members from one department serving on senate committees. **Timeline:** Spring Quarter.

Progress: The BFCC has reviewed the current and past language from previous versions of the Bylaws and noted that, at one time, the Bylaws did include a statement that limited the number of committee members from the same department to one (1) unless approved by the Executive Committee. The BFCC will propose adding this language back into the Bylaws at the Faculty Senate meeting on February 2nd Senate meeting (first of two readings).

BFCC21-22.07 Consider code revisions regarding frequency of assessments of academic administrators, Senate and Executive Committee. **Timeline:** Spring Quarter

Progress: The BFCC is currently working with the Evaluation and Assessment Committee (EAC) to revise the language in the faculty code concerning the biennial schedule for Faculty Assessment of Academic Administrators, and Senate and Executive Committee Assessments, with the intention of reducing survey/assessment fatigue by alternating the biennial assessment schedule. The BFCC is hopeful that this revised language will be presented to Faculty Senate at the March Senate meeting.

BFCC21-22.08 Consider additional language in the Faculty Senate Bylaws to change the membership of Faculty Senate committees regarding ex-officio roles and guest guidelines. **Timeline:** Spring Quarter

BFCC21-22.09 Consider additional language in Faculty Senate Bylaws and/or Faculty Code regarding Senate committee meeting formats. **Timeline:** Spring Quarter.

Progress: The BFCC identified the ex-officio roles and guest guidelines as well as Senate committee meeting formats and created a separate section to be included in Senate Bylaws (Section III.B.5). This new section provides recommendations for the initial discussion of motions and voting procedures. Charges 21-22.08 and .09 are combined under one motion presented to Faculty Senate on February 2, 2022, for the first of two readings.

4/6/22 Chair Report Summary:

During the months of February and March, the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee continued to work on a number of charges, a summary of these charges and our progress as well as those items presented to the Faculty Senate for vote and status are listed below:

BFCC21-22.07 Consider code revisions regarding frequency of assessments of academic administrators, Senate and Executive Committee.

The BFCC and EAC are presenting revised language at the April 6th Senate meeting. This revised language from the EAC concerns the biennial schedule for Faculty Assessment of Academic Administrators, and Senate and Executive Committee Assessments, with the intention of reducing survey/assessment fatigue by alternating the biennial assessment schedule.

In addition to the BFCC motion (above) presented at the April 6th meeting, the General Education Committee, in conjunction with the BFCC is proposing changes in language for

the Faculty Code and Bylaws that reflects the current organization and procedures of the General Education Committee.

Successes:

The BFCC worked efficiently despite only having three of the required five members (absence of one member in a committee of three would have resulted in loss of quorum). The committee met weekly during Fall and Winter quarters and every-other-week during Spring quarter. All charges were addressed in this timeframe as well as two additional charges during Spring quarter.

Charges that were unable to be presented at Senate were due to lack of information requested from administration (or discontinuation of a charge) and not due to the lack of effort on behalf of the BFCC. Additionally, charge .01 which was the inclusion of shared governance language to the CWUP was finally passed, with a few changes. This language was originally constructed in 2020 and its inclusion into CWUP under a new section 2-80 titled, “Shared Governance” is a major accomplishment for all who originally worked on the language and for the BFCC and EC this year. All motions presented at Senate passed. I am extremely proud of the work put forth by the members of this committee.

Recommendations for future charges:

1) **Revisit BFCC21-22.02** Consider changes to Bylaws, Section I.C.1 regarding senate representation for departments. **Timeline:** Fall Quarter

Section I.C.1 states that each academic department/library shall have Senate representation based on a prescribed number of FTEs. The first tier goes from 1-14 FTE. This can be problematic if an academic department/library only has 1 FTE, which based on the current language will give them the right to have a senator. Please evaluate the number of FTEs for each academic department/library in 2021-2022 AY and identify what unit has the lowest number of FTE with senate representation. Consider using that as a baseline for the lowest number of FTE allowed to have 1 senator.

In order for this charge to move forward, the BFCC needs a definition of “department” from the Provost. This definition could potentially influence the minimum number of FTE for department designation and thus the minimum FTE for senators representing departments.

2) Clarify Code language concerning the role of EAC in scheduling and administering assessments. Currently the Code language only states that the EAC, “...shall be concerned with assessment tools affecting faculty or requiring faculty input. It shall receive, review, initiate, and make recommendations or proposals for assessment tools used for the...”. The EAC is actually responsible for administering of these assessments.

Section 1V.D.1.e.

The Evaluation and Assessment Committee shall be concerned with assessment tools affecting faculty or requiring faculty input. It shall receive, review, initiate, and make recommendations or proposals for assessment tools used for the biennial Faculty Assessment of Academic Administrators, the biennial Senate and Executive Committee Assessments, and do such other similar things as charged by the Executive Committee,

coordinating its efforts with other individuals, groups or committees as necessary or appropriate.

- 3) Review the Code and Bylaws for “gendered” language (his/her, etc.). For example the term “emeritus” is masculine. Chris Schedler suggested that we consider changing this to “emerit”, a more gender-neutral term. Chris Schedler recommended the following article for consideration: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/02/02/push-oregon-gender-neutral-retired-faculty-titles>.

Some gendered language has been identified in the Faculty Code and Bylaws (refer edited versions of the Code and Bylaws form charge **BFCC21-22.10**).

- 4) Review Code and Bylaws for wording issues discovered when reviewing code this year for inconsistent committee titles. These changes went beyond the clerical changes the BFCC was charged with, and while too numerous to name here, include addressing vague language and will serve to clarify the Code and Bylaws.