

Bylaws and Faculty Code
October 11, 2021
3:15pm
Minutes
Approved 10/18/21

Members present: Mary Radeke, Nathan White, Elvin Delgado
Guests: Janet Shields

1. Meeting called to order at 3:20pm

2. approval of Oct 4th minutes is delayed until Elvin has a chance to add EC updates to the minutes. Approval will be voted on at the next BFCC meeting (10/18/21).

3. Chair Updates

Mary summarized the email communication with Janet regarding the FTE calculation clarification. Janet reported that the original decision to exclude NTT faculty from FTE/senator allotment was made based the recommendation by the EC at the time the CBA came into existence. There was never a definition, or statement regarding exclusion of faculty if less than 1/6th workload but was never included in Bylaws or Code.

Committee discussion:

If we don't count less than 1/6th workload (or .166 FTE) toward department, why are they currently counted toward total FTE for departments on document sent by Janet?
Janet stated that some of these may have been missed on the document and we can make the decision to include them or not in the FTE calculations for Senator allotment. The committee discussed the potential impact this may have on department FTE and it was determined that loss of FTE (due to removal of all lingering .166 FTE) toward Senator allocation will not change current senator allotment. If we decide to add back in all removed FTE less than .166, this could impact senator allotment (increase allotment) for some departments. BFCC is leaning toward inclusion of all FTE, regardless of amount. Since the charge is to identify the minimum FTE needed for allocation of senators, this will not impact our charge.

4. EC Updates

- Update from EC regarding shared governance Code language and corresponding CWUP language.
- No update to report.
- Update regarding definition of department (FTE minimum, majors minimum, etc.)
- EC chair spoke to Provost about language in CWU policy (this is under Provost jurisdiction). Minimum number was identified as 3 needed for department designation. Provost will consider policy language for CWUP, as this will require the provost to consult with deans.
- Elvin stated that Greg gave proxy for approval of minutes from last BFCC meeting in the spring. Elvin will provide email note of proxy. Minutes from May 17, 2021 approved.

5. Discussion of charge or BFCC21-22.02 as per feedback from Janet/Charlene/Greg and EC.

The problem with adjusting the minimum number of FTE to 5 (or 3 as per designation of “department) without having CWUP that states this is that if the BFCC brings this adjustment to the Senate for a vote, there is no justification for why lowest FTE to be eligible for senator is 5 (or 3). BFCC needs CWU Policy in place before proposing the change to Senate. Additionally, a definition of FTE is needed. Elvin will bring this to Greg L. on Wednesday at EC meeting.

Janet Shields stated that the original use of 1/6th full time came from community college rule that probably no longer exists. Elvin will propose to EC that we get rid of this and use all FTE even if it falls below 1/6th rule.

Additionally, noting recorded (in CBA, Code, Bylaws, CWUP) regarding the cutoff of 1/6th workload for NTT to count toward department FTE. We either need to get rid of that rule or clearly state it (maybe needs to be stated in CBA?). Elvin stated that probably not CBA. Elvin will talk with Gary (union) regarding coming up with a definition of FTE. Nathan will begin drafting FTE definition language, committee will review and discuss next BFCC meeting and then we will have union give feedback.

Lastly, NTT gets 2 senators, even though they are also counted in department FTE (essentially, they are counted twice). Shouldn't Graduate School receive a senator? They are currently not represented.

6. Discussion of 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.

BFCC identified that this labeling/numbering of code is incorrect. The correct section in Code is Section III.G.1.c.i.h. BFCC moved to simply strike h) Professionalism from the code rather than define in appendix. Other areas where “professionalism” is used are in Appendix A “professional ethics” and definition is not needed for this use. BFCC voted and agreed to strike “professionalism”.

7. Adjourned at 5:00pm

Next meeting: October 18, 2021, 3:15pm.