

REGULAR MEETING
Wednesday, January 14, 2026, 3:10 p.m.
AGENDA

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- III. MOTION NO. 25-11: APPROVAL OF MINUTES** for December 3, 2025.
- IV. PRESENTATIONS**
 - I. Career Champions Cat Team**—Rodrigo Renteria-Valencia
 - II. Course Schedule Plan**—Patrick Pease
- V. SENATE CHAIR REPORT**
- VI. ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT OF FACULTY SUCCESS**
- VII. FACULTY ISSUES**
- VIII. STUDENT REPORT**
- IX. REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS**

Senate Committees:

Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee

Motion No. 25-09: (third of three readings and vote): Recommend revisions to Faculty Code Appendix B: Distinguished Faculty Awards as outlined in Exhibit A.

Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee-Written report

General Education Committee- Written report

Faculty Legislative Representative - Written Report

- X. PROVOST**
- XI. CHAIR-ELECT**
- XII. NEW BUSINESS**
- XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

*****NEXT REGULAR SENATE MEETING: February 4, 2026**

Exhibit A

Distinguished Faculty Awards

Faculty Code Appendix B

Title of Sections:

Section II. Obligation OF Recipients

Section III. Initial Requirements

Section VI. Required Application Materials

- A. Materials for Distinguished Teaching Award
- B. Materials for Distinguished Service Award
- C. Materials for Distinguished Scholarship/Artistic Accomplishment Award
- D. Materials for Board of Trustees Distinguished Faculty Award

Revision and addition.

Summary of changes and/or additions:

Proposed changes to this appendix include the following: 1) self-nominations would be allowed, 2) recent Distinguished Faculty Award (DFA) recipients would not be able to nominate, 3) submission format and the media for sending the submission would be updated to reflect current process (single PDF file sent via email), 4) references to outdated formats (e.g. “newspaper clippings”) would be eliminated, 5) information for the BOT DFA would refer to lists above in order to reduce duplicate information.

Rationale for changes and/or additions:

1) Self nomination is proposed to encourage equity across departments, as some departments don't have time/capacity to nominate. Also, it is hoped that this will encourage more faculty to be involved. 2) Recent DFA recipients would be precluded from nominating colleagues in order to ensure they are eligible to serve on the DFA committee, 3) Updating language to reflect current processes ensures there is no confusion about the format of submission or how it will be sent (single PDF via email), 4) While outdated formats are accepted as part of a PDF submission via email, reference to them will not create confusion about the nature of what needs to be submitted (PDF via email instead of hard copy sent via campus mail), 5) Deleting duplicative information describing the BOT DFA and replacing it with a reference to lists above will make the appendix more concise and easier to read.

Appendix B: Distinguished Faculty Awards

Section I. Funding for Distinguished Faculty

Stipends and release time ~~is~~ are generously provided by the Office of the President and the CWU Foundation.

- A. ~~The~~ Recipients of the annual Distinguished Faculty Awards in teaching, scholarship, and service will receive a one-time \$2,500 stipend.
- B. ~~The~~ Recipients of the Board of Trustees (BOT) Distinguished Faculty Award will receive a \$5,000 stipend and one quarter release from teaching (12 WLU for tenured faculty and 15 WLU for Senior Lecturer faculty) the academic year following their award.

Section II. Obligation ~~o~~f Recipients

- A. All award recipients are expected to serve on at least two future selection committees within five years of receiving their award ~~at some time during their careers.~~
- B. Recipients must serve on the selection committee at least twice before they can nominate individuals for any Distinguished Faculty Award.
- C. Recipients of the ~~BOT~~ Board of Trustees Distinguished Faculty Award will use 4 of the released WLU specified in Appendix B: I.B. for the benefit of CWU through research or service. These 4 WLU will be utilized in a manner determined through negotiation between the awardee and the Office of the President.

Section III. Initial Requirements

- A. Due Dates
 - 1. Letters of nomination are due to the office of the Senate by December 1, or, if this date falls on a weekend, the first instructional day thereafter.
 - 2. ~~All materials supporting the nomination (i.e., nominees' notebooks) must be received by~~ Supporting materials must be compiled into a single PDFpdf document and submitted via email to the office of the Senate by February 1 or, if this date falls on a weekend, the first instructional day thereafter.
- B. Eligibility
 - 1. Distinguished Faculty Awards are limited to CWU faculty who have been at CWU for a minimum of six (6) years and have worked at least 135 WLU.
 - 2. ~~The BOT~~ Board of Trustees Distinguished Faculty Awards ~~is~~ are limited to active CWU faculty who have been at CWU a minimum of fifteen (15) years, and have performed the greater part of the activities for which they are nominated in connection with ~~the nominee's~~ their employment at CWU. Emerit, tenured, and Senior Lecturer faculty are eligible.

C. Nominations and Supporting Materials

1. Nominations may be made by faculty, students, alumni or others in a position to evaluate the achievements of a faculty member in any of the award categories. ~~Additionally, Self-~~ nominations are allowed ~~will not be accepted~~. ~~Nomination letters~~ Letters of nomination and supporting materials must be submitted to the Senate in accordance with Part A above.
2. ~~Nominations are presented by a Nominator. The Nominator writes the Letter~~s of nomination should include, providing a full description of the nominee's work that is deserving of the ~~respective~~ award; a short statement of nomination will not be sufficient. ~~The Nominator(s) may~~ shall also help the nominee to compile and order their supporting materials a notebook for the selection committee to substantiate the nomination, incorporating materials required and/or suggested in the accompanying criteria. No supporting materials may be submitted added to the notebook after the due date.
3. The selection committee is not an investigative body. Therefore, it is imperative that supportingve materials be complete, orderly, and self-explanatory.
4. During any academic year, n~~Nominators~~ may not only nominate ~~more than~~ one faculty member to for share the same each category award.
5. An individual may receive an award in more than one category, although not in the same year.
6. An individual may not receive an ~~individual~~ award more than once in the same category.
7. An unsuccessful nominee may be re-nominated.
8. Material-s from ~~of~~ award recipients shall be retained by the Senate for three years ~~in the office of the Senate~~.

9. Neither nominees nor nominators should attempt to contact the committee, the Senate office, or the President's Office about the process or outcome of the committee's deliberations. No information will be given out.
10. After reviewing submitted materials, the committee ~~, at its discretion,~~ may elect to not ~~to~~ recommend any recipients ~~nominee/s~~ for ~~of~~ one or more awards ~~in a given year~~.

Section IV. Selection Committee

A. Membership

1. Members of the selection committee are approved by the EC.
2. Committee membership is finalized by early February at the latest.
3. The committee will include six volunteer members:
 - a. Four must be past Distinguished Faculty Award winners representing each award category selected by the EC.
 - b. One must be an alum~~na~~^{us} selected by CWU Alumni relations.
 - c. One must be an individual selected by the EC from three names forwarded by the CWU Retiree Association to balance out the composition of the committee.
4. Emerit Distinguished Professors/Faculty are eligible to serve.

B. Award Selection Process

1. Nominees shall be considered for Distinguished Faculty Awards based on excellence of work and activities conducted solely while at CWU. Nominees shall only be considered for ~~the category of~~ the award for which they were nominated.

2. The selection committee makes the award choices and forwards those names and materials to the President with a brief summary statement describing each awardee.
3. The President forwards the awardee file for the ~~BOT~~Board of Trustees Distinguished Faculty Award to the BOT for approval at their spring meeting.

Section V. Notification ~~o~~Of Award

- A. The President will notify the award winners.
- B. After the award winners have been notified by the President, notification letters will go out to the other candidates informing them of the status of their nomination. The committee will not give individual feedback on the merit of applications or the selection process.
- C. The ~~Board of Trustees~~BOT Award will be awarded at their ~~ir Board of Trustees~~ spring meeting.

Section VI. Required Application Materials

- A. Materials for Distinguished Teaching Award:

The Distinguished Teaching Award nominee's ~~s materials~~ notebook should contain the following items, organized in the following order:

1. Letter of nomination ~~bearing the date stamp~~ of the Senate office verifying ~~submission~~ must be in PDF format emailed to senate@cwu.edu by December 1.
2. Supporting materials should be in a single pdf PDF file and emailed to the senate@cwu.edu by February 1. Supporting materials, with the exception of the vitae, should cover the last five years and be organized in the following order:
 - a. Original letter of nomination;

- b. ~~2-~~ Vitae of nominee, verifying that the nominee is a full-time member of the CWU faculty and has a minimum of six (6) years full-time service at CWU; ~~The vitae must bear the date stamp of the Senate office verifying submission of the notebook by February 1.~~
- c. ~~3-~~ Personal statement by nominee of philosophy, goals, and achievements in the area of teaching. This statement must not exceed 1000 words;
- d. ~~4-~~ ~~Evidence of teaching skills in the area of communication and methodology, —exemplified in the clarity of organization, and presentation of course materials, and of the challenge efforts to motivation of students— corroborated by the following:~~ Evidence of teaching skills which highlight the clarity and organization of teaching materials, as well as efforts to motivate students. This evidence should include the following:
 1. representative class syllabi;
 2. ~~if a video recordings~~ s, if included, should be no longer ~~is included in the file, please limit the length to~~ than 15 minutes;
 3. ~~E~~evidence of teaching that has been informed by scholarship, as demonstrated by activities such as:
 - a. participation in professional activities such as conferences, symposia, colloquia, exhibitions;
 - b. ~~ii-~~ membership in professional associations;
 - c. ~~iii-~~ peer-reviewed scholarship or juried presentation;

d. ~~iv.~~ continuing education in one's field or related fields;

e. ~~v.~~ efforts in the development of new courses to broaden and update CWU curriculum or other relevant evidence of continued scholarship.

4. f. ~~E if applicable, e~~ evidence of the extent of participation in student advisement.

~~Materials for Distinguished Service Award:~~

5.

B. Materials for Distinguished Service Award:

~~The Distinguished Service Award nominee's notebook materials should contain the following items organized in the following order:~~

1. Letter of nomination ~~bearing the date stamp~~ must be submitted emailed in PDF format emailed to senate@cwu.edu ~~of the Senate office verifying submission by December 1.~~

2. Supporting materials should be in a single ~~pdf~~ PDF file and emailed to the senate@cwu.edu by February 1. Supporting materials should be organized in the following order:

a. Vitae of nominee, verifying that the nominee is a full-time member of the CWU faculty and has a minimum of six (6) years full-time service at CWU. ~~The vitae must bear the date stamp of the Senate office verifying submission of the notebook be emailed in PDF format to senate@cwu.edu by February 1.~~

b. Personal statement by nominee of philosophy, goals, and achievements in the area of service. This statement must not exceed 1000 words.

c. Evidence of service ~~as exemplified by activities~~ in which the nominee has applied their academic expertise to the welfare of individuals, professional organizations, CWU, or ~~university groups, the community at large, or CWU~~, ~~with evidence of the magnitude of effort and level of commitment to the community in the service provided, all~~ should be corroborated supported by:

1. letters of recommendation, support, or corroboration from colleagues, associates, students, members of the community, or relevant others (20 maximum);
2. public acknowledgement, such as, ~~newspaper clippings~~ media recognition, testimonials, awards, etc.;
3. ~~chronological listing of service activities with or~~ concise summary of the nominee's service activities, indicating the ~~scope and impact~~. recipient group and/or geographical area benefits by the service. Chronological listing of service activities. Each activity should have a concise summary of its scope and impact.

C. Materials for Distinguished Scholarship/Artistic Accomplishment Award:

~~The Distinguished Scholarship/Artistic Accomplishment Award nominee's notebook~~ materials should contain the following items organized in the following order:

1. Letter of nomination ~~bearing the date stamp of the Senate office verifying submission~~ must be submitted emailed in PDF format to senate@cwu.edu by December 1.
2. Supporting materials should be in a single pdf file and emailed to the senate@cwu.edu by February 1. Supporting materials should be organized in the following order:
 - a. Vitae of nominee. The vitae should verify that the nominee is a full-time member of the CWU faculty and has a minimum of six (6) years full-time service at CWU. The vitae must be submitted in PDF format and emailed to senate@cwu.edu ~~bear the date stamp of the Senate office verifying submission of the notebook~~ by February 1.

- b. ~~-~~Personal statement by nominee of philosophy, goals and achievements in the area of scholarship/creative works ~~service~~. This statement must not exceed 1000 words.
- c. Evidence of scholarly ~~ship~~ or artistic achievement; should be supported ~~corroborated by~~:
 1. letters of recommendation, support ~~or~~ or corroboration from colleagues, associates, students ~~or~~ or relevant others emphasizing professional recognition, quality ~~and~~ and credibility of scholarly and/or artistic work ~~research or artistic accomplishment~~ (20 maximum);
 2. for ~~a~~Artistic achievement ~~Accomplishment~~ – reviews, newspaper clippings, media recognition, programs, reports, awards, acknowledgements, grants funded, or other primary evidence of artistic achievement to support the nomination etc.;
 3. for ~~s~~Scholarly ship achievement – ~~reprints of publications and a chronological list of research projects, publications, reports, performances, presentations, program participation, or other professional work; or a summary of a single research program for which nomination has been made.~~ a chronological list of research projects, publications, reports, performances, presentations, program participation, or other professional work; reprints of publications, summaries of research programs, or other primary evidence of scholarly achievement to support the nomination.

D. Materials for ~~Board of Trustees~~BOT Distinguished Faculty Award:

1. Letter of nomination must be submitted in PDF format and emailed to senate@cwu.edu ~~bearing the date stamp of the Senate office verifying submission by~~ December 1.
2. Supporting materials should be in a single pdf file and emailed to senate@cwu.edu by February 1. Supporting materials should be organized in the following order:

- a. Vitae of nominee, verifying that the nominee is a member of the CWU faculty and has a minimum of fifteen (15) years of service at CWU. ~~The vitae must bear the date stamp of the Senate office verifying submission of the notebook by February 1.~~
- b. Personal statement by nominee of philosophy, goals, and achievements in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship/creative work. This statement must not exceed 3000 words.
- c. ~~The Board of Trustees Distinguished Faculty Award nominee's notebook~~ The supporting materials for this award ~~should contain all materials outlined in the previous sections (A, B, and C) to demonstrate excellence in teaching, service, and scholarship/artistic accomplishment.~~

The supporting materials for this award should contain all ~~items~~materials outlined in ~~the previous sections (VI.A.4, VI.B.4, and VI.C.4)~~ to demonstrate excellence in regarding teaching, service, and scholarly/artistic achievement.

- i. ~~letters of recommendation, support or corroboration from colleagues, associates, students or relevant others emphasizing professional recognition, quality and credibility of teaching, service and scholarship/artistic accomplishment (30 maximum);~~
- ii. b. a portfolio materials reflecting the full range of the nominee's teaching assignment, containing summary ies sheets for student evaluations of instruction for all courses, arranged chronologically, taught during the last five (5) years, including all available written comments;
- iii. c. representative class syllabi;
- 1. d. if a video recording is included in the file, please limit the length to fifteen (15) minutes.
- 2. e. Evidence of teaching that has been informed by scholarship, as demonstrated by activities such as:

- a. ~~i. participation in professional activities such as conferences, symposia, colloquia, exhibitions;~~
 - b. ~~ii. membership in professional associations;~~
 - c. ~~iii. peer reviewed scholarship or juried presentation;~~
 - d. ~~iv. continuing education in one's field or related fields;~~
 - e. ~~v. efforts in the development of new courses to broaden and update CWU curriculum or other relevant evidence of continued scholarship.~~
- iv. ~~f. Evidence of the extent of participation in student advisement.~~
- v. ~~g. public acknowledgement, such as, newspaper clippings media recognition, testimonials, awards, etc.~~
- vi. ~~h. chronological listing or concise summary of the nominee's service, indicating the recipient group and/or geographical area benefits by the service;~~
- vii. ~~i. for Artistic Accomplishment—reviews, newspaper clippings media recognition, programs, reports, awards, acknowledgements, grants funded, etc.;~~
- viii. ~~j. for Scholarship—reprints of publications and a chronological list of research projects, publications, reports, performances, presentations, program participation, or other professional work; or a summary of a single research program for which nomination has been made.~~

Report: Alignment of Faculty Code and the 2025 Shared Governance Document

January 14, 2026

Executive Summary

The Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee (BFCC) was charged with reviewing the CWU 2025 “Shared Governance Document” to determine if any changes were needed to the Faculty Code to align with the new document.¹ Our conclusion is that minimal changes to the Faculty Code are needed in order to align with the 2025 Shared Governance document.

We find that the Faculty Code and the 2025 Shared Governance Document are mostly aligned in terms of principles of shared governance.² A key distinction between these documents is the role of students and staff members. Students do have a small role in Faculty Code and the BFCC suggests that language supporting the ASWCU student Faculty Senate liaison be strengthened. CWU staff play a consultation role (for Faculty Senate, the Executive Committee, and standing committees), and their expertise should also be recognized in Faculty Code.

Where there are other differences between the Faculty Code and the 2025 Shared Governance document, we find that the former is better aligned with the 1966 AAUP, ACE, and AGB joint “Statement on the Government of Colleges and Universities.”³

Though BFCC concedes some minor changes to Faculty Code, we have grave concerns with the presumption that its contents should be overridden by the 2025 Shared Governance document. The development of the 2025 Shared Governance document did not follow the established process for consultation (found in Faculty Code II.D) that has been previously agreed upon by all parties (administration, faculty, and Board of Trustees).⁴ We are also concerned that faculty on the shared governance committee were not elected representatives of the faculty.⁵

¹ BFCC25-26.02 Review the Shared Governance document and collaborate with the Executive Committee to make recommendations for how to incorporate these ideals into Code. See [2025 – 2026 Charges](#) for BFCC.

² See [2025 Shared Governance](#) document and [CWU Faculty Code, 2025 – 2026](#) for reference.

³ See American Association of University Professors (1966) [Statement on Shared Government of Colleges and Universities](#).

⁴ See [CWU Faculty Code, 2025-2026](#), pp. 10 – 11 for Part II section D, “Procedures for Faculty Consultation.”

⁵ The 1966 joint “[Statement on the Government of Colleges and Universities](#)” on. Pp. 123 notes that “Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.”

The 2025 document, which was developed outside of shared governance practice, moves the faculty role from shared partnership in university governance to that of employees answering hierarchically to administration.

Context

The **Faculty Code** and the Faculty Senate predate CWU, both originating in the 1960s (though there were earlier versions of these as far back as the 1940s).⁶ In 2006, the CWU Faculty Code was re-written to reflect changes that came with unionization. The BFCC views the Faculty Code as a living document, with language that has been negotiated and approved by hundreds of faculty members and administrators, along with dozens of trustees on the Board.

The **2025 Shared Governance document** was developed by a workgroup led by President Jim Wohlpart, which included administrators, faculty, staff, and students. When initially formed in early 2023, the group included only faculty and administrators, and the goal of the group was to engage in learning to deepen knowledge of shared governance. The group was expanded in 2024, and the goal of the group evolved into the development of the present document.⁷ The Shared Governance document was shared at a Faculty Senate meeting on March 5, 2025. Senators were asked to provide feedback at the meeting and were not given any opportunity to bring the document back to their departments. There was no communication with the Faculty Senate after that point, so it is unclear whether any faculty feedback was integrated into the version presented to the Board of Trustees for approval in May 2025.⁸ Between March 5, and May 16, 2025, Faculty senators had no opportunity to provide feedback from their constituents on the Shared Governance document prior to its approval.

The **1966 joint “Statement on the Government of Colleges and Universities”** was developed in collaboration between the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). Per the AAUP (2025), “This statement . . . calls for shared responsibility among the different components of institutional government and specifies areas of primary responsibility for governing boards, administrations, and faculties. It remains the Association's central policy document relating to academic governance.” This statement is referenced in the 2025 Shared Governance document and was presented as a foundational document in the shared governance committee’s learning process.

⁶ See the [Faculty Senate Archive](#), in CWU Archives and Special Collections at the James E. Brooks Library.

⁷ The background of this group is discussed in the minutes from the May 16, 2025, Board of Trustee’s meeting, which can be found in the meeting agenda of the [July 24-25, 2025, Board of Trustee’s Meeting](#), pp. 7 – 10.

⁸ See [March 5, 2025 Faculty Senate meeting agenda](#), pp. 3-7. See [Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda](#), May 15 – 16, 2025, Pp. 83 – 88.

1966 Joint Statement: How are these Principles Activated in each?

The BFCC evaluated the 2025 Shared Governance document and the Faculty Code using the principles set forth in the 1966 joint “Statement on the Government of Colleges and Universities.”

What is Shared? Faculty Code and the 2025 Shared Governance Document

Consistent with the 1966 joint statement on shared governance, both the Faculty Code and the 2025 Shared Governance document emphasize the following principles of shared governance:

- Shared governance is essential to the function of universities. Universities are complex, and joint efforts among faculty, administration, and the board of trustees are needed to make the best decisions.
- Shared governance requires effective communication.
- Joint efforts will take a variety of forms, depending on the issue or situation. The Faculty Code makes a distinction between areas of academic life which faculty are responsible for and those areas outside of faculty authority, but which require significant faculty consultation. The 2025 statement emphasizes that constituents will be involved in decision-making to varying degrees based on the issue at hand.
- Faculty should be involved in the development of, at least, the educational components of the university budget.
- Shared governance depends on trust, respect, and collaboration.
- Academic freedom is essential.
- Meaningful consultation should happen early on during formative stages of planning.

Differences: Faculty Code and the 2025 Shared Governance Document

We also find differences in descriptions of shared governance between the Faculty Code and the 2025 Shared Governance document. We then evaluated these differences using the principles articulated in the 1966 joint statement:

- **Systems of Shared Governance:** The Faculty Code states that shared governance requires “the creation and maintenance of mechanisms to allow for the allocation of time and resources to effectively carry out shared governance.”⁹ This reflects the 1966 joint statement, which asserts, “Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present.”¹⁰ This commitment to supporting and, importantly, maintaining sustainable systems of shared governance is not included in the 2025 statement.

⁹ See [Faculty Code 2025 – 2026](#), p. 3

¹⁰ See [“Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities”](#) 1966, p. 123.

- **Faculty Role in Institutional Planning:** The Faculty Code states that “faculty should be a critical part in discussions surrounding themes central to CWU’s mission. These themes include student outcomes, university revenue models, and campus capacity.”¹¹ This is echoed in the 1966 joint statement, which emphasizes that effective planning efforts, such as mission stewardship, require “the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion.”¹² The 2025 document confines faculty role to the “educational mission” of CWU.¹³
- **Aspects of Student Life Related to Education:** The Faculty Code defines the principal areas of faculty responsibility as, “academic policies and academic standards for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status (as defined in the CBA), and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.”¹⁴ The 1966 joint statement similarly states, “The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.” The 1966 joint statement also extends faculty’s role in shared governance to “. . . decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources . . . buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.”¹⁵ In contrast, the 2025 statement defines faculty primary authority much more narrowly, as limited to, “specific aspects including curriculum, research and creative activity, and faculty status.”¹⁶
- **Faculty Evaluations of Administration:** The Faculty Code states, “the Code and Senate help guarantee administrative quality through meaningful evaluations of CWU administration. Such evaluations include regular evaluation periods, publication of results (in the form of data) to pertinent stakeholders, and clear statements on the use of evaluations of administrators by the BOT and its administrative agents.”¹⁷ While faculty evaluations of administration are not explicitly called for in the 1966 joint statement, the statement does outline certain responsibilities that a President has to the faculty, such as presenting faculty views (even dissenting ones) to the governing board.¹⁸ These responsibilities cannot be jointly evaluated unless faculty are included in that evaluation process. The 2025 document, on the other hand, indicates that the Board will “determine

¹¹ See [Faculty Code 2025 – 2026](#), p. 3

¹² See “[Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities](#)” 1966, p. 121.

¹³ See the [2025 Shared Governance](#) document under “Faculty.”

¹⁴ See [Faculty Code, 2025 – 2026](#), part II, section B, “Faculty Responsibilities,” Pp. 9

¹⁵ See “[Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities](#)” 1966, p. 121.

¹⁶ See the [2025 Shared Governance](#) document under “Faculty.”

¹⁷ See [Faculty Code 2025 – 2026](#), p. 4

¹⁸ See “[Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities](#)” 1966, p. 122.

and communicate appropriate methods for participation” of faculty in areas such as evaluation of the President.¹⁹

- **Faculty Senate Represents the Whole Faculty:** The Faculty Code asserts, “The Senate serves as the broadest representation of faculty at which the administration is present, and consultation with a quorum of the Senate functions as the most basic level of meaningful consultation between the Faculty and the Administration.”²⁰ This is reflective of the 1966 joint statement, which asserts, “An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the components of the institution.”²¹ The Faculty Senate, which was formed decades ago and has traditionally been the means through which the view of the whole faculty is represented, is such an “agency.” Similarly, the collective bargaining agreement names the Faculty Senate as the established body for faculty governance on issues of “academic matters and issues relating to the intellectual life of the University.”²² Moreover, the 1966 joint statement notes that “Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.”²³ The 2025 document does not distinguish Faculty Senate among a list of other faculty governance groups (Academic Department Chairs Organization [ADCO], United Faculty of Central [UFC]), which are presumed to be equally appropriate for participation in shared governance as Senate. While the Faculty Code names ADCO and UFC as important consultative partners when issues require faculty consultation, neither ADCO nor the UFC are formed with the intention of serving as a representative or deliberative body for the entire faculty.²⁴
- **The Role of Students and Staff in Faculty Code:** While the Faculty Code does establish a role for a student liaison, there are no statements clarifying the role and relationship with staff.²⁵ This is likely due to the 1966 joint statement, which neglects any mention of staff and which also cautions that the participation of students in shared governance should be limited, given their transitory time at an institution as well as the “inescapable fact that other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the student.”²⁶ The 2025 statement includes students and staff as key participants in the shared governance of the institution.²⁷

¹⁹ See [2025 Shared Governance](#) document under “Board of Trustees.”

²⁰ See [Faculty Code](#) 2025 – 2026, p. 4

²¹ See “[Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities](#)” 1966, p. 123.

²² See [Central Washington University and United Faculty of Central Agreement 2023 – 2029](#), Article 5, p.5

²³ *ibid.*

²⁴ See [2025 Shared Governance](#) document under the list of “Shared Governance Constituencies,” which names each of these shared governance units.

²⁵ See [Faculty Code](#) 2025 – 2026, p. 12

²⁶ See “[Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities](#)” 1966, p. 123.

²⁷ See [2025 Shared Governance](#) document, under sections “Exempt and Classified Staff” and “Students.”

Recommendations

In conclusion, the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee finds the Faculty Code to be in alignment with the principles of shared governance outlined in the new 2025 Shared Governance document. Further, we find the Faculty Code better reflects the national standards for shared governance, as outlined in the 1966 joint “Statement on the Government of Colleges and Universities.” As such, we offer the following recommendations:

- **Integrate the Role of Staff and Students into Code:** The Faculty Code requires only minimal revisions, including integration of students and staff, where appropriate.
- **Acknowledge Faculty Code as a Model for Shared Governance:** Faculty Code outlines agreed mechanisms of shared governance processes. Given the lack of meaningful consultation and opportunity for feedback in the development of the 2025 Shared Governance document, as outlined in Faculty Code processes, the Faculty Code should be treated as superseding the new document. Further, a process should be established for revising the 2025 Shared Governance document that involves meaningful consultation with faculty.
- **Recognize That Faculty Senate Represents the Entire Faculty:** The Faculty Senate should be considered the faculty representative body responsible for “academic matters and issues relating to the intellectual life of the University” as outlined in the collective bargaining agreement (Article 5), and consultation with faculty should follow the process outlined in the Faculty Code Section II.D. This is based on principles outlined in the 1966 joint statement, which state, “An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty.”²⁸
- **Codify Existing Workload Negotiations:** Workload allocations stated in the Faculty Code have historically been the result of negotiations between the Faculty Senate and the administration and are subject to CBA requirements. Although administration has final authority related to the budget, the 1966 joint statement notes that faculty should be able to actively participate in matters related to salary. The BFCC recognizes that the Code does not reflect the existing practice of faculty-administration negotiation of workload. Thus, we recommend developing code that indicates the negotiable state of workloads established in Faculty Code.
- **Follow the Faculty Consultation Process:** Where there are changes that the administration would like to see in the Faculty Code, administrators should follow established and agreed-upon processes to amend the Code: The administration should notify the Faculty Senate

²⁸ See “[Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities](#)” 1966, p. 123.

Executive Committee to provide specific information about the suggested changes, and the EC will collaborate with the administration to charge the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee with considering the changes. Given the important roles the Board of Trustees, administration, and faculty play in shared governance, it is important that the Code continues to be approved by the Board of Trustees.

**GEC Committee Report
01.05.26**

Charge #	Timeline	Charge/task	Progress	Action
EAC22– 23.01 If task and not charge put n/a here	Fall	<i>Copy and paste charge or write up task here</i>	Details of committee progress on charge/task	<i>Choose one:</i> Not started In progress Submitted Approved at FS Date
GEC25- 26.01	Ongoing	Review Gen Ed assessment reports in collaboration with the General Education CAT Team. Make recommendations to the CAT Team as necessary.		Ongoing
GEC25- 26.02	Ongoing	Collaborate with the First Year Experience Cat Team as necessary.		Ongoing
GEC25- 26.03	Ongoing	Collaborate with the Global Literacy ad hoc committee as necessary.		Ongoing

GEC25-26.04	Fall	Investigate bottleneck concerns with Academic Writing. Make recommendations for possible solutions based on this research.	This is a larger issue, which will require continued investigation and collaboration throughout the entire academic year, and possibly beyond.	Ongoing
GEC25-26.05	Winter	Review changes made to the Gen. Ed. Framework. • We received many complaints that the GE framework was too difficult for students to understand. Since we removed pathways, 184s, and made some other changes, is the framework clearer? • In mid to late Winter, Consult with Advisors and the Academic Advising Council (led by Tishra) about how students are navigating the new, simplified Gen. Ed. • Draft a written report/update to Senate about this.	The GEC will liase with the advising staff to investigate the changes that were implemented in Fall 2025 (ie: elimination of PADstones, Culminating Experience, as well as changes to Pathways/Themes).	Not Started

GEC25-26.06	Spring	Monitor how General Education course changes affect students' Academic Requirements reports and the issues that arise. Timeline: Spring Consult with Advisors, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the Registrar to see if there are any issues arising.		Not Started
GEC25-26.07	Spring	Collaborate as needed with the Dean of Undergraduate Studies on collecting data for the General Education assessment plan.	Tishra Beeson is an ex-officio member of the GEC.	Ongoing
GEC25-26.08	Ongoing	Review student petitions for General Education courses.	1 petition submitted and completed thus far.	Ongoing
GEC25-26.09	Fall	Review and approve proposals to add courses to or remove courses from the General Education program.	6 course proposals submitted and reviewed. Changes to the Framework are ready to be forwarded.	Completed

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee; Faculty Senate

FROM: Matt Altman, Faculty Legislative Representative

DATE: January 14, 2026

RE: Faculty Legislative Representative Report

Preparing for the legislative session

On December 10, 2025, the Council of Faculty met again virtually. We discussed several issues, especially the state budget (see below), and concluded with the following three legislative priorities (which I mentioned in my Senate report for 11/5):

1. Continue to build awareness among legislators of the fund split and its impact on university budgets.
2. Discuss the abuse of the Public Records Act by people who are using it to harass faculty or institutions of higher education more broadly. (WWU is being especially inundated with politically motivated records requests.)
3. Find ways to encourage high school students to complete the FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid), which will make the transition to college smoother.

On December 15, I met with Steve DuPont, Central's Director of Government Relations, and the ASCWU students who will be working on legislative issues. Steve thinks that the most important goal during this session will be to explain to legislators – repeatedly – the value that public institutions have for the state. We need to explain how additional budget cuts would negatively impact our core mission: to serve students. For his part, Steve does not think it is wise to raise concerns about public records requests. It is not a big issue for Central, and it picks an unnecessary fight with the press, which supports Washington's strict sunshine laws.

Budget challenges

The fiscal situation in Washington is bad, with revenues down from what was projected in the previous biannual budget. Revenue is up a little, but expenditures are way up (due to inflation, reduced federal funding, etc.). The state anticipates a \$1.6 billion shortfall. This will have negative effects on both this year's supplemental budget and the next biennial budget. Higher ed is considered "discretionary" spending – that is, not part of the 60% of the budget that is considered to be necessary for the state to run – so higher ed will be disproportionately hit.

Washington's 2025-27 biennial budget included a 3% funding cut to Central.

Governor Ferguson released his proposed supplemental budget on December 23, 2025. It includes additional cuts of 3% to the University of Washington and Washington State University, and 1.5% to other public institutions, including Central. (For us, that amounts to \$1.399 million less funding.) This number is just the starting point, however. The legislature may make this better or worse in its final budget.

Higher Education Funding Redesign Project

The Washington Roundtable – “a nonprofit organization comprised of senior executives of major private sector employers in Washington state” – is proposing a higher education funding model. The goal is to have a clear standard against which to judge public institutions in awarding funding. They want to encourage the production of more credentialed students to meet the needs of Washington employers. Currently, 40% of students obtain a credential by age 26; the goal is 70%. They talk in terms of “return on investment” of state resources.

There are concerns that this would reward institutions that are already doing well and penalize those that serve first-generation students and other populations that require more of an investment of time and resources.

It is unclear whether this will get anywhere. Melissa Beard, Director of Legislative Affairs for the Council of Presidents, says it’s “dead in the water” because it’s opposed by all the Presidents of the state universities. If you’d like to see the PowerPoint presentation that the Roundtable representatives shared with me, please let me know.

Upcoming legislative session

The 2026 legislative session, which is a short (60-day) session this year, begins on January 12.

Meeting times for the higher education committees have not yet been posted, although they will be by the time of the Faculty Senate meeting on 1/14. These two are especially important:

- House Postsecondary Education & Workforce Committee
- Senate Higher Education & Workforce Development Committee

Members of the Council of Faculty often testify at these committee meetings.

On Wednesday, January 14, I will have my first meetings with the Washington Student Association (WSA) and the Council of Presidents. I’ll also have my first in-person meeting with the Council of Faculty, which is composed of the FLRs from the other public four-year institutions.

A proposed bill was “pre-filed” in the Senate on December 17, and it’s pretty lousy: *SB 5909 – Reviewing and discontinuing low-enrollment undergraduate programs at public baccalaureate institutions*. It outlines a process for Washington’s public universities to review and discontinue “low-enrollment undergraduate programs” that graduate fewer than ten students annually over five years. It’s proposed by Senator Matt A. Boehnke (R). I imagine that it will die in committee.

Please email me (matthew.altman@cwu.edu or philosopher.altman@gmail.com) if you have questions or concerns.