

3-10-1982

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 03/10/1982

Esther Peterson

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Peterson, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 03/10/1982" (1982). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 721.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/721>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

MINUTES: Regular Faculty Senate Meeting, 10 March 1982
Presiding Officer: Rosco Tolman, Chairman
Recording Secretary: Esther Peterson

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Fran Bovos, William Craig, Clair Lillard and Eric Thurston.

Visitors Present: Dale Comstock, Don Schliesman, Phil Backlund, Malcolm Alexander and Phyllis Lellman.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

1. Add to "Communications"

E. Letter from Roger Garrett, dated March 4.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Without objection, the minutes of the meeting of February 24, 1982 were approved as distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Letter from President Garrity, dated February 25, referring to the fact that CWU is going to be paid an official visit by President Ichiro Yamada of Shimane University, Matsue, Japan, on March 25 through March 28. President Yamada will tour the campus on Friday, March 26, and that afternoon faculty will have an opportunity to hear him discuss his university and a chance to discuss opportunities for faculty and student exchanges and involvement. It is anticipated that the sister-university agreement will be formalized at that time.
- B. Letter from Robert Carlton, dated February 25, informing the Senate that Donald Black was elected to replace Frank Carlson as Senate representative, effective Spring Quarter of this year.
- C. Letter from Robert Carlton, dated February 25, notifying the Senate that Calvin Greetsinger was re-elected as Senate alternate for Don Black.
- D. Letter from Don Schliesman, dated February 26, transmitting proposed revision of policies and procedures for review of academic programs. He urges the Faculty Senate's early approval of these statements.

The Academic Affairs Committee will present a report on the revision later in the meeting.

- E. Letter from Roger Garrett, requesting a matter be referred to the Senate Code Committee for clarification. A request was made by Dean Williams to have Philip Backlund placed on a tenure track appointment. This request was denied with the justification given that the Code, Section 3.48, A., 7, precludes such shifts prior to the faculty member in question having served six years in a non-tenured status.

This has been referred to the Senate Code Committee for interpretation and clarification.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

- A. University Curriculum Committee proposals, page 615--

POLITICAL SCIENCE -- COURSE ADDITION

POSC 375. The Middle East and International Politics. (5)

MOTION NO. 2106: Mr. Brunner moved, seconded by Ms. Schactler, that the above course proposal be approved. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

REPORTS

- A. Chairman--Mr. Tolman reviewed the following items:

- 1) Nuclear Technology Program--CWU has submitted a bid to WPPSS to offer a Nuclear Technology Program. Other universities have also submitted bids. If our bid is accepted, curriculum will go through normal procedures and channels, with the entire cost borne by the Washington Public Power Supply System and it will be offered off-campus.
- 2) Communication and Mass Media Department--No Senate action is necessary regarding the joining of Communication and Mass Media.
- 3) Budget--It appears at this time that the university's budget will not be cut more than an additional 1%, which would be under \$500,000.

It is possible that the university will be given the option of using the "merit pool," which also funds professional growth steps, in order to offset a portion of the cut, thereby saving faculty positions. Also, the limited use of the four-quarter plan might be a possibility.

- 4) Tuition--The latest word received is that House Bill 784, concerning tuition, probably will not pass.
- 5) Salary Increase--There seems to be no hope for state employees to receive the 7% salary increase.

B. Executive Committee--no report.

C. Standing Committees--no report.

1. Academic Affairs Committee--no report. An item will be presented under New Business.
2. Budget Committee--no report.
3. Code Committee--Larry Lawrence presented a written report, which was distributed at this meeting. In response to a formal request from President Garrity for an interpretation of the Faculty Code, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 0.10 A.(8) of that Code, the Code Committee submitted the following ruling to the President and the Board of Trustees:

The language of the Faculty Code (September, 1981) does not "allow programmatic division within what we recognize as a department" nor "permit program differentiation within departments for the purpose of arraying the list of faculty" in determining lay-off.

It is therefore the conclusion of the Code Committee that the current Lay-off Policy does not permit programmatic subdivision within a department for purposes of determining lay-off priorities.

Chairman Tolman noted this was an information only item for interpretation of the Code. At a later date, it is probable that the President will communicate to the Senate a request to begin a process of review and consideration of a slight modification that, in effect, would allow the university to identify programmatic division within departments as appropriate. Mr. Tolman emphasized that no one at any level is making an effort to do away with seniority.

A request was made for an explanation of the rationale behind seniority. Mr. Tolman responded that a discussion of this matter will be more appropriate if and when a Code amendment is considered.

4. Curriculum Committee--no report.
5. Personnel Committee--no report.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed Policy and Procedure for Review of Academic Programs--Corwin King presented a written report which was distributed to Senators at this meeting. He noted all academic areas are subject to review by the Program Review and Evaluation Committee every five years. The purpose of such review is three-fold: 1) to encourage and assist in the

systematic assessment of programmatic success relative to identified academic goals;
2) to inform the University community of the results of such assessment efforts; and
3) to furnish corroborative support for state and national accreditation of departments and programs. The reviews are under the jurisdiction of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and are administered by the Program Review and Evaluation Committee.

MOTION NO. 2107: Mr. King moved, seconded by Mr. Gries, for the adoption of the report, which excludes any reference to a schedule. The schedule would be the responsibility of the committee and should not be a part of the Academic Plan.

Discussion ensued, and there was some objection to the written report not having been presented sooner to enable it to be reviewed more thoroughly before discussion and adoption.

MOTION NO. 2108: Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Mr. Lapen, to table the motion until the next Senate meeting. Passed by a majority voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

The next Senate meeting will be April 7, 1982, at 3:10 p.m. in SUB 204-205.

A G E N D A
- - - - - -

REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, March 10, 1982
SUB 204-205

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of February 24, 1982
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
 - A. Letter from President Garrity, dated February 25
 - B. Letter from Robert Carlton, dated February 25
 - C. Letter from Robert Carlton, dated February 25
 - D. Letter from Don Schliesman, dated February 26
- V. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
 - A. University Curriculum Committee proposals, page 615
- VI. REPORTS
 - A. Chairman
 - B. Executive Committee
 - C. Standing Committees
 - 1. Academic Affairs
 - 2. Budget Committee
 - 3. Code Committee
 - 4. Curriculum Committee
 - 5. Personnel Committee
 - D. CFR
 - E. President's Report
- VII. OLD BUSINESS
- VIII. NEW BUSINESS
- IX. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF
ROLL CALLMarch 10SENATOR

☒ Bovos, Fran
☒ Briggs, Kenneth
☒ Brunner, Gerald
☒ ~~Craig, William~~
☒ ~~Candler, Lillian~~
☒ Carlson, Frank
☒ Day, Chris
☒ Dean, Robert
☒ Dugan, John
☒ Duncan, Clint

☒ Eickhoff, Henry
☒ Evans, Betty

☒ Fouts, Roger

☒ Gries, Peter
☒ Grossman, George

☒ Hinthorne, James

☒ Jones, Robert

☒ Kaatz, Martin
☒ Kerr, Tom
☒ King, Corwin
☒ Klemin, V. Wayne

☒ Lapen, Robert
☒ Lawrence, Larry
☒ Lillard, Clair
☒ Morris, Kathleen
☒ Nylander, Jim

☒ Pratz, Owen

☒ Ramsdell, Daniel

☒ Sands, Catherine
☒ Schactler, Carolyn
☒ Stillman, George
☒ Thurston, Eric
☒ Tolman, Rosco

☒ Utzinger, John

☒ Vifian, John

☒ ~~Vlcek, Charles~~ *Wm Craig*

☒ ~~Wald, Larry~~

☒ Worsley, Stephen

ALTERNATE

☒ Trudy Rodine
☒ Karen Jenison
☒ Galer Beed
☒ ~~Larry Wald~~
☒ Calvin Greatsinger

☒ Barney Erickson
☒ David Kaufman
☒ ~~John Meany~~ *Don Dietrich*

☒ Ray Wheeler
☒ Jim Hawkins
☒ Patrick O'Shaughnessy
☒ Larry Sparks

☒ Sidney Nesselroad
☒ Jan Reinhartsen

☒ Don Ringe

☒ Makiko Doi

☒ Ken Hammond
☒ Robert Jacobs
☒ Roger Garrett
☒ ~~Gonnie Roberts~~ *Charles Guatney*

☒ John Carr
☒ Keith Rinehart
☒ Richard Mack
☒ Wells McInelly
☒ Stan Sorenson

☒ Max ~~Zwainger~~ *Zwainger*

☒ Larry Lowther

☒ Marco Bicchieri
☒ David Gee
☒ Kenneth Cory

☒ Patrick O'Shaughnessy
☒ Nancy Lester

☒ Peter Burkholder

☒ Thomas Blanton
☒ ~~William Craig~~

☒ Ed Golden

Central
Washington
University



Office of the President

Bouillon 208
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-2111

February 25, 1982

RECEIVED

MAR 1 1982

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. Rosco Tolman, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Campus

Dear Rosco:

I write to you and the Faculty Senate to share with you that I have heard from President Ichiro Yamada of Shimane University, Matsue, Japan. He informs me that he wishes to pay an official visit to our university March 25 - 28. ✓

As you know, I visited President Yamada and Shimane University in October and began discussions regarding the potential for relationships between our universities. Shimane University, with unanimous concurrence, has indicated the desire to establish a sister-university relationship with us.

Shimane University is a national university with an array of programs similar to our own with the exception that they have a college of agriculture. The Japanese Ministry of Education has approved and is very supportive of this move. They are supporting President Yamada's visit.

The timing of his visit is awkward for us, but it is the period between their first-term commencement and the beginning of the second term of their academic year.

On Friday, March 26, President Yamada will tour the campus. In the afternoon we will have an opportunity to hear him discuss his university and a chance to discuss opportunities for faculty and student exchanges and involvement. Finally, I anticipate that we will formalize the sister-university agreement that afternoon. ✓

I solicit the interest and support of the Faculty Senate and the faculty as a whole in this additional international connection. I invite any faculty member who is interested in meeting President Yamada to join us on Friday, March 26. ✓

Every dean has a booklet describing Shimane University and I encourage faculty to familiarize themselves with the university.

Dr. Rosco Tolman
February 25, 1982
Page 2

A sister-university relationship with Shimane University along with our student exchange agreement with Kyoto University of Foreign Studies, our developing connections with Kanazawa University, Kobe City University of Foreign Studies and Tsukuba University offer the promise of connections with Japan that can have significant consequences for us. These, added to our existing sister-university relationship with Anhui University, Peoples Republic of China, and our programs in Mexico, France, Germany and England begin to build the international dimension so essential to a university.

I hope that you feel as I do that these are important developments for the future of our university.

Sincerely yours,



Donald L. Garrity
President

gc



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity/Title IX

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

February 25, 1982

RECEIVED
MAR 2 1982
FACULTY SENATE

Dr. Roscoe Tolman, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Edison Hall
Campus

Paraphrase

Dear Dr. Tolman,

At the February 10, 1982 meeting of the Department of Education,
Dr. Calvin Greatsiner was re-elected as Senate alternate for Dr. Don Black.

Sincerely,

Robert K. Carlton
Chairman

RKC:skd



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity/Title IX

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

✓

February 25, 1982

RECEIVED

MAR 2 1982

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. Roscoe Tolman, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Edison Hall
Campus

Paraphrase

Dear Dr. Tolman,

At the February 10, 1982 meeting of the Department of Education, Dr. Donald Black was elected to replace Dr. Frank Carlson as Senate representative. Dr. Carlson thoughtfully resigned early enough to allow the Department to replace him with sufficient time to allow for involvement of his replacement on Senate committees for the 1982-83 academic year.

I believe that the Senate should commend Dr. Carlson for his past dedication and performance as a Senate member and as a Senate officer. He has served the University in a most commendable and unselfish capacity as a representative of the Senate for many years. I am certain that Dr. Black will represent faculty interests with the same professional intensity.

Sincerely,

Robert K. Carlton
Chairman

RKC:skd

Central
Washington
University



Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Bouillon 207 J
Ellensburg, Washington 98926
(509) 963-1403

3

February 26, 1982

RECEIVED
MAR 2 1982
FACULTY SENATE

Rosco N. Tolman
Chair Faculty Senate
CWU
Campus

Dear Dr. Tolman:

Vice President Harrington asked me to transmit the attached proposed revision of policies and procedures for review of academic programs. The statements reflect a significant revision to the present policies and the procedures have been considerably streamlined. I urge the Faculty Senate's early approval of these statements.

Professor Malcolm Alexander, Chairman of the University Program Review and Evaluation Committee, and I are very willing to meet with the Senate, or any of its standing committees, for the purpose of explaining or answering questions about the attached document.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

DMS:rd

Attachment

cc: Vice President Harrington

P_R_O_P_O_S_E_D

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

All academic areas are subject to review by the Program Review and Evaluation Committee every five years. The purpose of such reviews is three-fold: 1) to encourage and assist in the systematic assessment of programmatic success relative to identified academic goals; 2) to inform the University community of the results of such assessment efforts; and 3) to furnish corroborative support for state and national accreditation of departments and programs.

The reviews are under the jurisdiction of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and are administered by the Program Review and Evaluation Committee.

Procedures

The PREC, in consultation with the departments and academic deans, will create a schedule for the review of all academic programs. Upon notification of a review by the Academic Vice President, in consultation with and upon the recommendations of the PREC, departments or programs should, within three months, prepare a self-review statement (6 to 8 pages) that is then submitted to the PREC. This draft document will then be made available by the PREC to both an Internal Review Committee (IRC) and one or more External Consultants. The External Consultants, selected by the PREC and appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs with advice and approval by the department and academic deans, will provide broad, expert judgment on the quality of the program under review in the form of an independent report based upon the information in the self-review statement and their own opportunities to examine the program.

The External Consultant's report will go to the PREC, the IRC, the department and academic deans. At the request of the Department, the PREC may accept a National Accreditation Report as a part or all of the Final Review Document.

The Internal Review Committees are appointed by the PREC, subject to approval by the department and the academic deans. The IRC's are composed of tenured faculty members drawn from within Central Washington University other than the departments being reviewed. A member of the PREC will be appointed to serve as liaison between that committee and each IRC. Such liaison people will serve in an ex-officio capacity on the IRC for a department; they are not to serve as chairman for an IRC.

The IRC is charged with the responsibility of determining that the self-review statement submitted by the department adequately meets the criteria for such documents. Where questions exist the IRC may consult with the faculty in the academic program or make use of such other sources of information as are readily at hand (e.g., the University Catalog, the Office of Institutional Studies, Academic Advising Center). It is the responsibility of the IRC to create a draft review document that incorporates the information in the department's review statement, the reports of the External Consultant(s) and the Survey of Recent Graduates (discussed below) that is then submitted to the PREC and circulated to the department and school dean(s) for comment. One month will be set aside for comments and other responses by the department and school dean(s) and revision of the draft document into a final document to be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for whatever formal action its recommendations might make appropriate for consideration. The final review document will also be made available to the faculty for their information and better understanding of the status and objectives of the university's academic programs.

Staff work for the Program Review and Evaluation Committee is provided by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Funds necessary to cover expenses of the reviews, e.g., staff work, honoraria and expenses for External Consultants, postage and printing, etc., are provided by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Survey of Recent Graduates

At the request of the PREC, a Survey of Recent Graduates will be accomplished by Testing and Evaluation Services, unless an appropriate survey has recently been completed. It should be undertaken as soon as possible after the time of notification of the start of the review process. A semi-standard format suitable for eliciting student opinion in various areas has been developed for use in such surveys. However, departments may wish to suggest particular questions or other modifications to more adequately survey their graduates. Survey results will be distributed in the same manner as the External Consultant reports.

The Self-Review Statement/Review Document

The Self-Review Statement/Review Document should set forth a statement of the purpose of the department (or program) as well as its goals and methods for achieving them. Judgments of the adequacy and merits of the academic program, with supporting documentation furnished in the areas indicated in parentheses, should be furnished for the following areas: (1) faculty (faculty vitae); (2) degree programs (degree requirements, admission policies, program options); (3) curriculum (course offerings with indication of frequency of scheduling, e.g., copies of recent quarterly schedules); (4) facilities (description of facilities, existing as well as needed to adequately serve the academic program); (5) special needs for research, performance, rehearsals, laboratories; (6) library holdings (brief listing of

holdings in various categories of books, journals, films, etc.); (7) budget to support both program and faculty needs (recent budget figures); (8) experience of students in the program (indications of student satisfaction with the program, placement records available, and Survey of Recent Graduates--2nd and final drafts only); (9) advising procedures; (10) comparisons with four or five other programs at comparable institutions for items one through seven above (comparison data received from other institutions).

March 9, 1982

Central
Washington
University



Office of the President
Central Washington University
P.O. Box 31000

March 4, 1982

RECEIVED
MAR 5 1982
FACULTY SENATE

#4

Dr. Rosco Tolman
Chairman, Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Campus

Dear Dr. Tolman:

I would like to request that a matter be referred to the Senate Code Committee for clarification. A request was made by the Dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, Dr. Burton Williams, to have Dr. Philip Backlund placed on a tenure track appointment. This request was denied with the justification given that the Code, Section 3.48, A., precludes such shifts prior to the faculty member in question having served six years in a non-tenured status.

We have written questioning this interpretation of the Code (copy of letter to Dean Williams enclosed). Since this could affect many other faculty if this interpretation is accepted in this and future cases, we would respectfully request that the Senate Code Committee make clear the intended meaning of this particular provision of the Code.

Sincerely yours,

Roger L. Garrett
Chairman

RG/lm

Enclosure

cc: Dean Williams



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity/Title IX

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

PHONE (509) 963-1066

December 18, 1981

Dr. Burton Williams
Dean, College of Letters, Arts
and Sciences
Campus

Dear Dr. Williams:

I thought I should write, confirming our discussion earlier today, concerning the provision of the Code, Section 3.48, A., 7, as it might affect the request to have Dr. Backlund placed on a regular, tenure track appointment. I am happy that we agree that there is no stipulation that a faculty member must serve six years before being placed on a tenure track appointment. All that the Code states is that a faculty member who is not on such appointment and later receives one (presumably through action of the Board of Trustees--though this is not specified) may petition to have their previous service counted toward their probationary period.

If anything, the Code seems to state, by implication at least, that shifts from non-tenure to tenure track appointment will occur and at any time. For example, a faculty member who receives an appointment full time in an emergency situation (e.g., Dr. Dina Wills) might well receive a regular, tenure track appointment following this period of emergency service. Another case might be an individual who was not given a tenure track appointment because they lacked the doctoral degree and later receives it, making them eligible for a tenure track appointment.

In short, we seem to be in exactly the situation we assumed was the case at the time of our discussion November 24th, when a letter recommending that Dr. Backlund be given a tenure track appointment had been sent to Dr. Harrington on November 20th.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We will be looking forward to learning how the Board responds to the request to have Dr. Backlund placed on a tenure track appointment.

Sincere regards,

Roger L. Garrett
Chairman

c: Dr. Backlund

FEBRUARY 18, 1982
CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY
THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
AND FORWARDED TO THE SENATE

PAGE 615

POLITICAL SCIENCE
COURSE ADDITION

POSC 375. The Middle East and International Politics. (5). Sp.

In response to a formal request from President Garrity (February 9, 1982) for interpretation of the Faculty Code, and in accordance with the provisions of section 0.10.A (8) of that Code, the Code Committee submits the following ruling to the President and the Board of Trustees:

The language of the Faculty Code (September, 1981) does not "allow programmatic division within what we recognize as a department" nor "permit program differentiation within departments for the purpose of arraying the list of faculty" in determining lay-off.

The Lay-off Policy of Section 3.78, as initially drafted by President Garrity in 1979 and formally adopted by the faculty and Board on May 8, 1981, clearly and consistently equates "program" with "department" in every instance (six of them) where the two terms occur, other than the one cited by the President, where "other academic unit" is added to "particular department, program, or" Even in this exception "department" and "program" are presented as alternatives in administrative structure, of the same class, distinct from each other but of relatively equal magnitude and importance. And this, of course, is the purpose and effect of the conjunction "or" linking "department or program" in every other case: logically and grammatically they are to be interpreted as mutually exclusive but equivalent alternatives, rather than as a whole and a part of that whole.

Furthermore, the Reduction in Force Policy (Section 3.78 of the June 20, 1980, Faculty Code) superseded by the recently adopted Lay-off Policy did indeed permit, even require, programmatic division within departments; but therein carefully distinguished this use of the term "program" by using the plural form or modifying it by "instructional offerings," and by explicitly identifying it as an internal sub-unit of a department. That this feature of the previous policy was not carried over into or reproduced in the current Lay-off Policy is significant, and must be construed as a matter of intention, particularly in light of the fact that such subdivision was rejected, on legal and pragmatic grounds, in the implementation of that policy in 1973.

It is therefore the conclusion of the Code Committee that the current Lay-off Policy does not permit programmatic subdivision within a department for purposes of determining lay-off priorities.

Central
Washington
University



Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Bouillon 207 I
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-4403

February 26, 1982

RECEIVED

MAR 2 1982

FACULTY SENATE

Rosco N. Tolman
Chair Faculty Senate
CWU
Campus

Dear Dr. Tolman:

Vice President Harrington asked me to transmit the attached proposed revision of policies and procedures for review of academic programs. The statements reflect a significant revision to the present policies and the procedures have been considerably streamlined. I urge the Faculty Senate's early approval of these statements.

Professor Malcolm Alexander, Chairman of the University Program Review and Evaluation Committee, and I are very willing to meet with the Senate, or any of its standing committees, for the purpose of explaining or answering questions about the attached document.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

DMS:rd

Attachment

cc: Vice President Harrington