

Bylaws and Faculty Code
January 24th, 2022
Minutes
Approved 1/31/22

Committee members present: Mary Radeke, Mark Samples, Nathan White
Guests: Warren Plugge (EAC Chair)

1. Meeting called to order at 3:35pm
2. January 10th approval of minutes - motion seconded by Mark, all approved.
3. Mary proposed an amendment to the agenda: Discussion of BFCC21-22.07 to come before Chair updates and EC updates. All approved.

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

Mary introduced email from Terry Wilson (2020-2021 EAC Chair) addressing concerns regarding timing of administrator/faculty feedback surveys. The issue concerns survey fatigue (six surveys in one quarter). Warren reported that the EAC had a proposed schedule for alternating surveys on a biennial basis (President, Provost, Vice Provost, College Deans, Library Deans). Odd years, one group, even years the next year (on a biennial basis). For groups that require yearly surveys (Faculty senators, Faculty Senate Executive Committee), schedule would remain same.

Mary asked about the possibility of moving some of the evaluations to Fall, rather than Spring. Warren stated that this would be problematic since it would not capture the current year and the issue of the long summer break (difficulty recalling events and leadership from the previous two years).

Warren will send a proposed biennial schedule to BFCC, and EAC will need to agree on the schedule and BFCC will then build language then share with the assessment committee before sending it to EC. Mark stated that this would be appropriate (less work for EC).

Mark brought up Terry's mention of new people (new hires, such as incoming Provost, Deans, etc.) being evaluated the year they begin the new position. In the email, Terry proposed to wait until the next year to evaluate these new hires and the evaluation would be based on a short period of time for the person in the position. Mark wondered if we should just keep the schedule as is (new hires evaluated either the year they are hired or wait and evaluate based on the biennial schedule). Mark also proposed that this would keep the schedule the same from year-to-year. Also Mark stated that the schedule would be designed logically such that the Provost and President would not be evaluated in the same year. Warren stated that it would be a very good idea to evaluate the new hire, at the end of their first term, regardless of the biennial schedule because this would give valuable feedback to the new hire. This would mean that admin might be evaluated two years in a row until the biennial schedule came into effect. Warren proposed that the BFCC construct language for the policy and then add language later for new hires.

BFCC discussed concerns about building the language in two separate stages and the potential difficulty of getting this language passed by Senate in two stages (evaluating new hires after their first year and then biennially). BFCC agreed that a schedule should be set and then regardless of the biennial schedule, evaluate either the first new term (year) or second term. This will be up to the EAC, Mary will send an email to Warren with our thoughts on setting a biennial schedule to reduce survey fatigue.

3. Chair Updates

- Communications from EC re: charge .06, .08/.09 - These charges will be presented to Senate in the Feb. 2nd Faculty Senate meeting. See below.
- Communication from Ruthi Erdman and Hope A. re: Charge .05 - communication discussed with the charge below.
- Mary announced that she may not be able to attend the Feb. second meeting. Mark agreed to present the motions if Mary is unable to attend.

4. EC Updates

- Support from EC regarding charges that will go forward at next Senate meeting.
- Discussed charge .01 with EC Chair (Greg). See notes below under charge .01.

5. Discussion of charges

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

- Discussed earlier in meeting with EAC Chair, Warren Plugge.

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.

Mary shared email communication from Ruthi Erdman and Hope Amason

Ruthi Erdman expressed concern about the 10-year requirement. BFCC's proposed language makes the requirement sound like the 10-year period at ½ half time teaching must be consecutive. If NTT faculty teaches for 9 years and then in the 10th year only teaches at .49 time, the NTT faculty would not be eligible for Emeritus status. BFCC will propose language that will address this by stating the following:

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 accumulation of thirty (30) quarters within a minimum of ten (10) years at least half-time service or 225 WLU 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.

BFCC21-22.01 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

- Committee discussed a bit of the history behind this charge and the EC Chair’s thoughts on where this new language should “live” in CWUP. It was suggested that the language be placed in CWUP 2-10-220 (new section -220). CWUP 2-10 included such things as “Career Services”, “Contracting”, “Printing, Duplicating, etc.”, and “Reporting Financial Irregularities”. The committee agreed that this seems like an odd place for this in the new language and that it might get lost. The committee agreed that a better location would be to put the new language under a new section; 2-80. It is likely that this would not be a decision for BFCC but possibly we can recommend the location.
- The committee looked closely at the existing language and made the decision to rework the language as follows:

In original communications, it was indicated that this should live in new section of CWUP **2-80 (new section) “Shared Governance”**

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 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 1-80-060 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.

BFCC21-22.10 Standardize language in Faculty Code and Bylaws regarding committee titles. **Timeline:** Spring Quarter

- Nathan reviewed both the Faculty Code and Bylaws for the use of EC/Executive Committee and noted where this needs to be changed. Nathan will do an additional search for inconsistencies in additional committee titles.
- BFCC agreed to table discussion on this until the next meeting.

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 will address this in later meetings.

7. Additional business

- Nathan will only be able to meet from 3:30-4pm on 1/31/22 - we will briefly discuss Charge .1 (CWUP language).

6. Adjourned at 5:05pm.

Status Update

Nathan
Mark
Mary

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

- BFCC edited the original language and committee is reviewing this language before sending to EC chair. Once committee members review, Mary will send to EC chair.

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

- Waiting for definition of “department” from Provost.
- Mark will ask Greg to offer a gentle reminder to the Provost of this request.

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

- **Motion passed** in Faculty Senate on Jan. 19, 2022. Senate voted to remove “professionalism” from this section in Faculty Code.

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

- Mary sent statement to EC for review, EC will then send statement on to BOT.
- Waiting to hear about this.

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.

- Motion presented at 1/19/22 Faculty Senate meeting for first of three readings.
- BFCC received comments from R. Erdman and H. Ameson regarding concerns about timeline (10 years) and clarification of language regarding how NTT are assessed (teaching only).
- New language sent to BFCC members for review to make sure this is the language agreed on during the meeting.
Second of three readings will take place at 2/2/22 Faculty Senate meeting.

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

- New language in the motion will be presented at Faculty Senate meeting for first of two readings on 2/2/22.

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

- BFCC met with Warren Plugge (EAC Chair) on 1/24/22 to discuss the EAC's concerns and how they would like to restructure yearly/biennial assessments/reviews. Warren will send a proposed schedule to BFCC and will discuss final schedule with EAC.

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.

- Motion (charge .08 and .09 combined) to add new language to Bylaws will go before Faculty Senate on 2/2/22.