Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

January 14, 2026, 3:10-5:00 PM
The Grupe Center, Zoom

Attendance:

Senators & Alternates: Alex Matheson; Amy Claridge; Ana Freire; Anne Cubilie; Anna Crosswhite; Bernadette Jungblut; Brita Williams; Carlo Smith; Chong Eun Ahn; Christopher Schedler; Cristina Bistricean; Eric Cheney; Eun Young Lee; Gabrielle McNeillie; Gary Bartlett; Gil Belofsky; Jim Johnson; John Bowen; John Durham; Julia Stringfellow; Kate (Kyung Hee) Im; Kathryn Stahl; Ke Zhong; Keith Lewis; Lila Harper; Mary Poulson; Mary Radeke; Natashia Lindsey; Nicole Lamartine; Nikki Jastremski; Peter Klosterman; Robert Pritchett; Ruthi Erdman; Tennecia Dacass; Timothy Englund; Timothy Hagen; Timothy Melbourne; Todd Weber; Trye Price; Upakar Bhatta; Wendie Castillo.

Guests: Arturo Torres; Aylin Parrazal-Bravo; Chris Redfearn; Christina Denison; David Zuckerman; Elizabeth Brown; Elvin Delgado; Erika Pazian; Heidi Perez; Hideki Takei; Hope Amason; Jared Dickinson; Joey Thornton; Joy Fuqua; Julie Baldwin; Kurt Kirstein; Marilyn Divine; Mars Foster; Michael Harrod; Mike Gimlin; Nicole Stendell-Hollis; Parker Wood; Patrick Pease; Philip DeRise; Sarah Feeney; Sathy Rajendran; Sydney Teresa Divine; Thompson; Tishra Beeson.

I. Call to Order, Roll Call, Agenda & Minutes

Chair Lindsey called the meeting to order and welcomed attendees both in person and via Zoom. Guests were asked to sign in, and Zoom participants were reminded of meeting protocols, including muting when not speaking and using the raise hand feature. Voting procedures were reviewed, noting that votes would be conducted verbally by ayes and nays without calling for abstentions. The meeting was noted as being recorded and live streamed.

Roll call was completed via QR code and in-room sign-in. The agenda, originally distributed January 5 and revised January 12, was approved without changes. The December 3, 2025 Faculty Senate meeting minutes were approved as presented.

II. Presentation – Career Champions CAT Team

Rodrigo Renteria Valencia presented on behalf of the Adaptive University Council regarding the Career Champions CAT Team. He explained that the team is charged with evaluating the feasibility of a Career Champions program at CWU aimed at equipping faculty, staff, and administrators with tools to support student career readiness. The program aligns with nationally recognized competencies identified by the National Association of Colleges and Employers, including professionalism, leadership, communication, equity and inclusion, teamwork, technology, critical thinking, and career development.

Rodrigo emphasized that this is a university-wide initiative involving both academic and cocurricular contexts. A campus survey, open January 12–23, was shared to gather broad input, with additional open forums planned for mid-February. Senators were encouraged to participate and share the survey widely.

III. Presentation – Course Schedule Plan

Provost Pease presented a proposed Course Schedule Plan intended to reduce course conflicts, improve student access to 15-credit schedules, support timely graduation, and enhance in-person opportunities for residential students. He reviewed data showing heavy clustering of courses during peak hours, overlapping start times, and increased use of longer one- and two-day class formats.

The plan proposes standardized scheduling patterns to reduce conflicts while allowing departmental control over scheduling. Provost Pease emphasized that the framework provides guidelines rather than mandates and includes flexibility for exceptions handled at the college level. Extensive consultation has occurred with associate deans, department chairs, the Registrar's Office, ADCO, and student leaders, with further revisions anticipated.

During discussion, Senators raised concerns regarding consultation timelines, impacts on NTT faculty, field experiences, graduate and working-student programs, accreditation requirements, hybrid and studio/lab courses, final exam scheduling, and unintended consequences of time-block usage. Provost Pease and Registrar staff clarified that the plan primarily targets undergraduate residential courses and that hybrid, graduate, practicum, studio, and field-based courses would be treated as exceptions. The Provost acknowledged the complexity of the system and committed to continued refinement through consultation.

IV. Senate Chair Report

Chair Lindsey provided a detailed report addressing recent Faculty Senate activities, shared governance concerns, and a series of interconnected issues involving policy management, instructional modality definitions, Faculty Code revisions, and interactions with university leadership and the Board of Trustees.

She began by thanking Senators for their engagement following the December meeting, particularly those who remained afterward to share feedback with the Executive Committee. Chair Lindsey noted that faculty expressed feeling overextended, frustrated by ongoing hiring shortages, and concerned about the absence of a strong faculty advocate. She acknowledged concerns raised regarding how shared governance is currently being enacted, while also noting that many faculty continue to view Faculty Senate as a valuable and necessary forum. Faculty feedback also included appreciation for agendas being distributed two weeks in advance and for the availability of Senate Chair office hours, which would be announced again soon. A request for more opportunities for faculty to gather was also noted.

Chair Lindsey reported that the Executive Committee is planning to host multiple open forums during the quarter, including both in-person and online sessions at varying times, in order to provide equitable access for faculty participation and feedback.

She then addressed questions arising from the December Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee motion regarding the HyFlex instructional modality definition. Chair Lindsey explained that faculty were already utilizing HyFlex instruction and that it became necessary to establish a shared institutional definition for clarity. Early in the academic year, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee was charged with developing a definition, informed by existing multimodal research and consultation with faculty currently teaching HyFlex, as well as the Registrar's Office.

During this process, the committee learned that a HyFlex definition had already been posted online, raising questions about timing and procedure. Chair Lindsey reached out to Provost Pease, in his role as policy executive, to clarify how the definition had advanced and what steps were required moving forward. This situation revealed broader concerns regarding recent changes to policy management processes.

Chair Lindsey explained that under the new policy management system, Policy Proposal and Impact Statements (PPIS forms) are required before policy work begins. Although these forms had been shared earlier in the academic year, it was not fully clear at the time how critical they were to initiating policy revisions. Additionally, the new system lacks a defined consultation process for procedures, which can currently be revised by individuals or units and approved by the policy executive without formal faculty consultation. Because the HyFlex definition resides in procedure rather than policy, it advanced under this framework.

She further noted that areas traditionally understood to fall under Faculty Senate purview are no longer automatically treated as such, as the policy executive now determines authorship and revision authority. Chair Lindsey emphasized the need for clearer articulation of these processes and expressed the Executive Committee's interest in working collaboratively with the Provost and the Policy and Ethics Director to address these gaps.

Due to concerns about portions of the HyFlex definition included by the Provost, Chair Lindsey requested that the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee's version be brought to Senate for review and vote, which occurred in December. Following Senate approval, additional refinements were suggested through consultation with Deans and the Registrar. These recommendations were reviewed by both the Executive Committee and the Curriculum Committee. While some were accepted, others required clarification, resulting in the definition being returned to committee for further revision and future presentation to Senate.

Chair Lindsey noted that while instructional modality definitions fall under Senate purview, working conditions and compensation implications are subject to collective bargaining. Following publication of the HyFlex definition, the Faculty Union initiated bargaining discussions accordingly.

Chair Lindsey then discussed concerns related to CWU 001-01, the Policy Management policy. The Executive Committee had been invited to review draft revisions intended to clarify roles, including the role of Faculty Senate. Given the potential governance implications, the Executive Committee requested additional time to gather feedback. However, when the updated policy was reviewed at the December UPAC meeting, it became clear that revisions had already been approved and that references to Faculty Senate had been removed from the procedure. This raised significant concerns about the absence of a clearly articulated faculty consultation process. The Executive Committee communicated these concerns in a letter to the Provost and invited further discussion.

In the same correspondence, the Executive Committee invited Provost Pease to present the Course Schedule Plan to the Senate, and Chair Lindsey expressed appreciation for his willingness to engage in consultation through today's presentation.

Chair Lindsey next addressed discussions with the Board of Trustees. She summarized a November meeting with Trustee Jeff Charbonneau regarding Faculty Code revisions and the possible use of a consultant. Her December Chair Report reflected her understanding of that meeting and notes taken by the Chief of Staff. Subsequent clarification from Trustee Charbonneau indicated that the Board values faculty voices and expects collaboration among faculty, staff, students, and administration. However, a miscommunication became apparent regarding the Board's role in Faculty Code approval. While Chair Lindsey believed the Board would remain removed from detailed review while administration engaged in consultation, revised notes indicated that Faculty Code approval authority may shift to the President or designee. This change was not discussed during the meeting and raised concerns given the Code's historic role in shared governance.

Chair Lindsey reported that she requested time to reflect on this miscommunication and emphasized the need for a clear, transparent, and mutually agreed-upon process for any Code revisions.

She then described a January 9 meeting with faculty leadership from UFC, ADCO, and Senate, along with the President and Provost, where budget impacts and Faculty Code revisions were discussed. During that meeting, the President proposed revising the Faculty Code using a group of three faculty and three administrators, mirroring a structure used during the 2006 post-unionization reorganization. Chair Lindsey noted that a similar structure had been proposed previously when aligning the Code with the Shared Governance document, alignment work that had already been completed by the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee.

Despite this, the President continued to advocate for a process outside of Senate. Chair Lindsey emphasized that the Faculty Code defines the role, scope, and authority of Faculty Senate, as well as faculty rights, responsibilities, consultation processes, awards, hearings, and votes of no confidence. She expressed concern that revising the Code outside Senate could substantially reduce Senate size and authority and alter committee structures.

Chair Lindsey reported that faculty leadership was asked to publicly endorse this proposed process within a very short timeframe by adding their names to an email that would be sent to the entire faculty body. The Executive Committee requested additional time to allow for meaningful consultation, noting that it would be inappropriate to endorse such a proposal without first gathering constituent input.

She concluded by stating that after reports and action items, the Senate would begin discussion during new business to gather initial reactions and establish a consultation plan. Following constituent engagement, the Executive Committee will communicate the Senate's majority position to the President.

Chair Lindsey closed by acknowledging the significant external and institutional challenges facing the university and reaffirmed the Executive Committee's commitment to shared governance, transparency, accountability, mutual respect, and trust. She thanked Senators for their service and encouraged faculty to care for their own wellbeing during these challenging times.

V. Faculty Issue

Chair Lindsey addressed several faculty issues that had been raised since the previous meeting, noting that some required additional research and consultation with administrative offices. She thanked the Executive Committee for assisting with follow-up and indicated that additional issues would be addressed in future meetings.

First, Senator Lamartine raised concerns regarding NTT faculty on annual contracts who must contact Parking Services directly in order to establish automatic payroll deductions for parking passes. Chair Lindsey reported that she followed up with Parking Services and learned that the payroll system only allows automatic deductions for employees coded as full-time. While Parking Services can temporarily adjust an employee's status so the option appears, the system automatically reverts the employee's classification overnight. Parking Services does not have the authority to override this limitation, which exists due to the variability of hours worked by part-time employees and the potential financial complications that can result.

Second, Senator Lamartine raised concerns regarding eligibility for faculty development funds, noting that current language limits access to senior lecturers and full-time NTT faculty. Chair Lindsey reported that she consulted with the Faculty Union President, who clarified that eligibility criteria for faculty development funds are governed by the collective bargaining agreement. Any changes to eligibility would therefore require formal bargaining. The union acknowledged the growing number of NTT faculty working at less than 1.0 FTE and noted that this issue has been identified as an area needing future attention during negotiations.

Third, Senator Peterson raised concerns about fumes and air quality in Black Hall related to ongoing renovation work. Chair Lindsey reported that she contacted Capital Planning and Projects, where she was informed that the majority of fume-producing work had been completed over winter break. The concern has been noted, and the director committed to continued coordination with contractors to reduce disruptions and address health concerns for faculty and staff working in the building.

Chair Lindsey concluded by inviting Senators to raise additional faculty issues, reminding attendees of the three-minute time limit per issue and encouraging faculty to follow up individually via email, office hours, or Executive Committee forums for matters requiring more extensive discussion.

During new faculty issues, Senator Schedler raised concerns regarding immigration enforcement actions occurring nationally and the potential impact on CWU students and faculty. He noted that CWU currently has an interim policy on immigration enforcement on campus (CWU 20320), which is set to expire at the end of January 2026. Questions were raised regarding whether the policy would be extended or formalized. Additionally, faculty requested guidance and resources to support students who may be affected by immigration enforcement actions, as well as support for instructors responding to student and faculty trauma related to these events.

VI. ASCWU Student Report

ASCWU representatives reported on discussions with the Provost regarding academic changes, student leadership shadowing opportunities, upcoming events, legislative advocacy efforts, and record participation in lobby day. Updates were also shared regarding student representation at the state level and efforts to revise WSA bylaws.

VII. Reports and Action Items

Motion No. 2509 from the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee, recommending revisions to Appendix B (Distinguished Faculty Awards), was presented for its third reading. Questions were raised regarding service requirements and rationale for the changes. Following discussion, the motion passed.

Written reports from standing committees and the Faculty Legislative Representative were submitted. The Provost Report followed, providing updates on the budget outlook, Financial Value Transparency regulations, program-level impacts, Adaptive University initiatives, and upcoming faculty community events.

VIII. New Business

The Senate voted to use the remaining meeting time to discuss the President’s proposal to establish a committee composed of three administrators and three faculty to revise the Faculty Code. Chair Lindsey explained that the President had requested Senate endorsement of this process and that the Executive Committee sought guidance from Senators before responding.

Senators raised significant concerns regarding both the necessity and urgency of revising the Faculty Code, noting that recent work by the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee found no substantial misalignment between the Faculty Code and the 2025 Shared Governance document. Several Senators questioned why a revision was being pursued outside established Senate processes and expressed concern that the proposal bypassed the Faculty Senate’s historic role in Code revision.

Multiple Senators emphasized the importance of institutional memory, noting that long-serving faculty possess critical historical knowledge of prior governance challenges, including votes of no confidence and previous restructuring efforts. Concerns were raised that administrative turnover, combined with an expedited revision process, could result in the loss of important context and unintended consequences for shared governance.

Senators also expressed concern that the proposed process could diminish faculty voice, Senate authority, and faculty autonomy, particularly if approval authority for the Faculty Code were shifted away from the Board of Trustees and toward the President. Several speakers warned that asking faculty to participate in or endorse such a process could give the appearance of consent to a reduction in shared governance, even if faculty fundamentally disagreed.

Additional concerns were raised regarding faculty vulnerability, particularly for NTT and junior faculty. Senators stressed the need for safe mechanisms to collect feedback, including anonymous or confidential input, to ensure that faculty could express honest concerns without fear of retaliation.

Suggestions were made to ensure a clear and consistent consultation process, including the development of shared talking points for Senators to use with constituents, explicit inclusion of multiple response options (including the option to decline participation in the proposed process), and sufficient time for departments to meet and discuss the issue meaningfully.

Chair Lindsey and the Executive Committee outlined a proposed path forward, which included gathering initial reactions during the meeting, asking Senators to consult their constituents using shared questions, and distributing a survey to facilitate an online Senate vote prior to the next regularly scheduled meeting. The goal of this process is to ensure that any response to the President reflects the collective position of the Senate and the faculty it represents.

IX. Adjournment

The next Faculty Senate meeting was announced for February 4, 2026. The meeting was adjourned.