

6-3-2015

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 06/03/15

Janet Shields

Central Washington University, senate@cwu.edu

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

Recommended Citation

Shields, Janet, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 06/03/15" (2015). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 15.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/15>

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.

REGULAR MEETING
Wednesday, June 3, 2015, 3:10 p.m.
BARGE 412
Draft Minutes

ROLL CALL All senators or their alternates were present except: April Binder, Joe Brooks, Jason Dormady, Ben Glasgow, Ralf Greenwald, Eric Mayer, Cynthia Mitchell, and Danielle Neal

Guests: Naomi Petersen, Janet Finke, Barry Donahue, Ian Loverro, Jan Byers-Kirsch, and Jesse Nelson

CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Agenda was approved as presented.

MOTION NO. 14-69(Approved): APPROVAL OF MINUTES of May 6, 2015

Motion No 14-69a(Approved): Senator Bartlett moved to add a sentence to the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee report “We found that 2 complaints pointed out what we saw as clear to violations of Code. Senator Donahoe seconded.

COMMUNICATIONS – Letter from Student Academic Senate if available for review in the Faculty Senate office regarding concerns with online instruction. Jennifer Treadway indicated that the students don't want to make the impression this implies to all online classes. There were a number of students with concerns which is why the SAS is bringing it forward. Students do like using PowerPoint with voice over lecturers.

FACULTY ISSUES – Senator Bartlett reported that last Thursday around 2:00 p.m. was extremely noisy with music thumping somewhere on campus. Senator Bartlett asked if there are any rules in place dealing with noise levels on campus during classes. Senator Brown reported he had a near miss with a skateboarder. The painted signs on mall are on really rough surface and you have to really focus to read what it says. Anyone going 10+ mph can't read them. He suggested that speed bumps could possibly help. Senator Mitchell expressed a concern that even with the ability to get paid over 12 months; they are still taking summer benefits out of one pay check. Senator Mitchell asked if this could this should be spread out over the summer as well?

Timm Ormsby Award for Faculty Citizenship – James Huckabay gave a brief overview of the Timm Ormsby award. This award was started by the Council of Faculty Representatives to honor faculty across Washington State who are doing community service. Timm Ormsby has been a representative in the House since 2003 and one of the largest supporters and voice on behalf of higher education over the years. This year's recipient for CWU is Judith Hennessy, Associate Professor of Sociology. Judith serves on the advisory board of the Horizon Clubhouse associated with Comprehensive Mental Health in Ellensburg. She also serves on the advisory committee of the Kittitas County Board of Health and is the Director of Women's and Gender Studies at CWU. She serves as an Academic Service Learning Fellow and encourages service-learning activities at Central. She has integrated varied service learning opportunities into her classroom requiring students to participate in civic engagement through service to organizations such as Head Start, Kittitas-Yakima Valley Community Land Trust, Hope Source, FISH Food bank and Ellensburg Health Clinic. She has volunteered for Planned Parenthood by playing the role of a legislator to help prepare students and community members to speak with their elected representatives in Olympia on funding for women's health care. Her research is geared toward the needs of low-income women in the state of Washington and their efforts to raise children and provide for them financially. Other areas of research include family issues, gender and sexuality, public policy and work-life balance. This fall she helped organize a presentation on health care issues for LGBT community, at the invitation of Pacific Northwest University, to help inform future and current medical professionals to better serve the health care needs of LGBT persons.

Central WiFi – Greg Harvill – No presentation.

PRESIDENT: President Gaudino invited Senators to the President's Reception center for refreshments after the meeting. There has been no real progress on budget in Olympia. President has received budget recommendations from the Budget & Finance Committee (BFC). All departments will have loaded budgets for the next two years. However, they could change once the state budget is passed by the legislature. This has been an outstanding year and the university has accomplished a lot. Finishing the first year of activity based budget. We are still learning and adapting the process. There have been a number of modifications with some of the recommendations coming from Faculty Senate. CWU has hired two new Deans and currently have two Dean searches are going on. There have been a number of faculty and students winning national and state awards and honors this year. There has been a start to revamp the enrollment management systems. This year did a "Golden Ticket" competition for full ride scholarship. All the students who didn't get scholarships are coming to Central. The major fair in conjunction with Wildcat Weekend is really paying off. President Gaudino complemented the Executive Committee and Chair Whitcomb for handling the sensitive issues this year professionally and promptly.

PROVOST: Provost Levine reported there are four open searches. Hope to have two concluded by the end of the term. They are in the middle of the Graduate Dean search. There are four fabulous candidates. Shared governance goes up each year and Faculty Senate taking more control of faculty voice. The President will be picking a theme for next year. The budget process has been put in place.

OLD BUSINESS

Social Media – Chair-Elect Pederson reported there has been contact with Gail Farmer regarding the social media faculty issue that was brought forward. Gail is aware of the issue and the Executive Committee would like to speak with her further.

Committee Summaries on EFC & LLSE complaint

Bylaws & Faculty Code – Senator Bartlett gave a brief overview of the recommendations on the complaint. The committee only heard one side of the story, but there are concerns of violations if the complaints are found to be true through further investigation. One recommendation will be to put language in the Faculty Code mandating thorough and accurate records of meetings and that they are made accessible. A second recommendation will be to put in language on what steps are taken if the Faculty Code section 1 is violated. The Faculty Code currently does not talk about consequences for violations, such as reprimands or censure.

Academic Affairs – Michael Whelan gave a brief overview of the committee recommendations. There are a lot of common threads between the three committee's recommendations. The committee recommends waiting to write or amend current policies and/or procedures until after further investigation is done.

Curriculum – Jeff Stinson reported the Curriculum Committee has five recommendations. #1 CTL develop and enforce policy and procedures. #2 CTL establish a regular meeting schedule. #3 Consultant should conduct a complete program review of all CWU teacher education programs for consistency and accreditation requirements. #4 CTL leadership should be de-layered. #5 Full documentation should travel with curriculum proposals as they move through the curriculum process.

Summary of EC: Chair Whitcomb expressed the Executive Committee's (EC) appreciation for the hard work that the committees put in on this. Faculty Senate office received a detailed complaint (Formal Complaint) from Education Foundations & Curriculum (EFC) and Language, Literacy & Special Education (LLSE) February 23, 2015. The Executive Committee charged the Academic Affairs (AAC), Bylaws & Faculty Code (BFCC) and Curriculum (CC) committees to

review the complaint and write an opinion specifically addressing the alleged policy and code violations. A second charge was given to the committees to recommend actions based on the "Formal Complaint" such as policy and procedure violations. The full reports from the three charged committees were received by the EC on April 22, April 28 and May 13. The reports offered considered opinions on each element of the complaint and recommended next steps in addressing the issues raised. The EC would like to underscore that all three charged committees found multiple points within the Formal Complaint to be well-founded and with merit, particularly concerning the allegations of behavior in violation of the Faculty Code specifically in the areas of faculty rights and responsibilities. There is consensus from the three committees that the events described in the submitted materials warrant great concern. The EC agrees that a senator's right of expression within a senate meeting has been challenged. The majority of the allegations in this dispute are against the Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL). The Dean of CEPS, Paul Ballard, stated on June 2 that CTL has been dissolved. While the EC concurred with the recommendations from the three Senate committees that a detailed review of the structure and membership of CLT take place, the dissolution of the CTL and the immediate plan for a new structure of governance for the teacher education programs have addressed some of the major concerns of the committees and created a potentially more transparent system of oversight and decision-making.

The EC supports the CC recommendation that new and improved teacher education policies be developed and consistently followed. That these policies fully align with Curriculum policies as established and administered by the Faculty Senate. The EC agrees that the Faculty Code should contain language mandating thorough and accurate records of meetings which concern areas of faculty responsibility. The Faculty Code should contain language describing the steps to be taken in the event that violations of Section I (Faculty Rights and Responsibilities) of the Faculty Code are alleged, and actions available to the Senate should violations be demonstrated. The EC is committed to drafting the suggested revisions to the Faculty Code for Senate review in Fall 2015.

Motion No. 14-77(Approved): Senate Resolution: The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, after reviewing the opinions of the Faculty Senate Bylaws & Faculty Code Committee, the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, and through their own evaluation of the "Joint Department Formal Complaint" submitted by the LLSE and EFC Departments at CWU, and with the support of documented evidence, find the former Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies, Connie Lambert, to have used intimidation in scolding LLSE faculty for appropriate expression in Faculty Senate.

WHEREAS, on November 15, 2015, at the regular Senate meeting, a faculty senator raised, under "Faculty Issues," a concern that a program change in Elementary Education was being initiated in top-down manner without appropriate consultation, and was subsequently reprimanded by Dean Connie Lambert via email for "unprofessional behavior."

WHEREAS, under Faculty Code Section I.B.1. all faculty members have the right to participate in faculty and university governance by means of system of elected faculty representatives on committees and councils at the departmental, college, university, and Senate levels;

WHEREAS, under Faculty Code Section I.B.3., all faculty members have the right to academic freedom is set forth in the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, American Associate of University Professors (AAUP) and Association of American Colleges and Universities AAC&U, with 1970 Interpretive Comments (AAUP) and the CBA;

WHEREAS, such a reprimand has a "chilling effect" upon faculty voice and academic freedom,

THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED, that such a reprimand is in violation of the Faculty Code Section I.B.1. and Faculty Code

Section I.B.3; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that Senators should categorically not be reprimanded for raising concerns in the context of Faculty Senate meetings, no matter their content or nature, and

THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate meeting is a protected environment in which faculty may engage in discourse without fear of reprisal or admonition by their supervisors or administration.

Faculty Hearing - Senator Benson spoke on behalf of EFC and LLSE departments. They appreciate Senates consideration

Motion No. 14-79(Approved paper ballot 35 yea, 6 nay, 6 abstentions): Senator Benson moved and Senator Erdman seconded that the Faculty Senate will proctor and conduct a formal vote among eligible voting faculty from the education departments of the College of Education and Professional Studies (i.e. Advanced Programs; Educational Foundations and Curriculum; Language, Literacy and Special Education; Physical Education, School and Public Health; and Teaching Elementary, Adolescent, and Young Children). The purpose of this vote will be to ascertain the "confidence" or "no confidence" those faculty have in Virginia Erion in her capacity as Associate Dean for Education in the College of Education and Professional Studies.

Further, the results of this vote of confidence will be made available to the faculty, Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies, Provost, and President.

Further this vote of confidence will be in a strict "confidence/no confidence" format as follows:

___ I have confidence in Virginia Erion in her capacity as Associate Dean of Education in the College of Education and Professional Studies.

___ I have no confidence in Virginia Erion in her capacity as Associate Dean of Education in the College of Education and Professional Studies.

Discussion: Senator Piacsek brought forward a concern whether Faculty Senate really has a role in this. Barry Donahue indicated that these issues have been going on for a long time. This creates a formal and fair way for faculty to have a voice. This is the only body on campus that can conduct a fair impartial vote. Senator Erdman asked the Faculty Senate honor the democratic process. Senator Sorey indicated this is a fair and impartial place to feel that it will be a safe vote and will not be tampered with.

Motion No. 14-80(Failed, 1 abstention): Senator Backlund move to table Motion No. 14-79. Senator Piacsek seconded.

Senator Hickey brought up that Faculty Senate is the only place that is authorized to do these types of things. Senate isn't being asked to make a decision beyond sponsoring the vote. Allow the faculty within those programs to make a content decision. Senator Harper indicated that this is the standard procedure of the Senate to respond to a petition of the faculty according to the Faculty Code. Senator Kaspari asked when the vote would take place. Chair Whitcomb indicated it would be conducted before the end of the academic year.

V. REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS

SENATE COMMITTEES:

Executive Committee

Motion No. 14-53 (Approved as amended): Amend the Faculty Code Section IV D.1.f to add the description for the Budget and Planning Committee as outlined in Exhibit A."

Motion No. 14-53a(Approved): Amend Motion No. 14-53 to add the language in blue as outlined in Exhibit A.

Motion No. 14-54 (Approved, 1 nay): Amend the Faculty Code Section IV. C & E as outlined in Exhibit B.

Motion No. 14-54a(Approved): Amend Motion 14-54 to add clarifying language in blue as outlined in Exhibit B.

Motion No. 14-70(Approved): Ratify Faculty Senate committee nominations as outlined in Exhibit C.

Motion No. 14-71(Written ballot 36 yea, 3 abstentions): Election of 2015-16 Faculty Senate Chair-Elect – Nomination: Sathy Rajendran

Motion No. 14-72(Written ballot 35 votes for Lene Pedersen, 1 write-in vote, 1 abstention): Election of Executive Committee Member-At-Large representative. Nomination – Lene Pedersen

Academic Affairs Committee – No report

Bylaw and Faculty Code Committee – No report

Curriculum Committee – Year-End Report available in Faculty Senate office

Motion No. 14-73(Approved): Amend CWUP 5-50-100 Programs policy as outlined in Exhibit D.

Motion No. 14-74(Approved): Amend CWUR 2-50-100 Programs procedure as outlined in Exhibit E.

Motion No. 14-75(Approved): Amend CWUP 5-50-060 Curriculum Rules for Implementation policy as outlined in Exhibit F.

Motion No. 14-76(Approved as amended): Amend CWUR 2-50-060 Curriculum Rules for Implementation procedure as outlined in Exhibit G.

Motion No. 14-81(Failed): Senator Brown moved and Senator Backlund seconded to amend Motion 14-76 section (B) 3. to delete the words “a graduate degree” and add “an MA (45 credit) degree. No more than 24 credits maybe applied to a MFA (90) degree”.

Motion No. 14-82(Approved, 3 nay): Senator Brown moved to amend Motion 14-75 Section (B) 3. to add the language “MFA is an exception to this procedure allowing for up to 24 credit hours”. Senator Spybrook seconded.

Evaluation and Assessment Committee

Motion No. 14-78(Delayed to Fall 2015): “Endorse the Evaluation of Scholarship and Service Proposal as outlined in Exhibit H.”

Motion No 14-83(Approved): Senator Pedersen moved that delay Motion 14-78 until Fall 2015. Senator Hickey seconded.

General Education Committee – Phil Backlund reported that the committee has been meeting to review proposals for Fall 2016. The committee hopes to have information to departments by the end of the quarter on their proposals.

Faculty Legislative Representative – Jim wanted to say thank you and it was a great honor to serve last two years. Standby for what will happen in Olympia.

CHAIR: Chair Whitcomb reported on the Ad Hoc committees that have been meeting this year. The Individual Studies Ad Hoc committee has met regularly to review proposed study plans for students who want to major in Individual Studies. The committee is working on a temporary pilot. A staff member in DHC will oversee a Canvas site and there will not be a 100 level course. The COACHE Ad Hoc committee is accessing the data and putting together projects for next year. The Budget Planning Task Force has been busy and would like to thank them for all their hard work. This has been a very active and busy year for Senate. Chair Whitcomb thanked Jim Huckabay, Phil Backlund, Michael Whelan and Gary Bartlett for their service to Faculty Senate. Teri Walker, Bret Smith and Marv Bouillon will not be returning to the Executive Committee next and would like to express thanks for their work. George Drake was elected as CAH representative to replace Bret Smith.

CHAIR-ELECT: A sub group of the Executive Committee will be working over the summer on drafting policies and procedures for areas that merit significant faculty consultation.

Motion No. 14-84(Approved): Chair-Elect Pedersen moved that following resolution and Senator Brown seconded.

WHEREAS, Katharine Whitcomb led the Faculty Senate with integrity and intelligence, working with the Executive Committee to enhance relationships with the administration and strengthen the ideals and practices of shared governance; and

WHEREAS, she promoted active involvement in faculty issues and sought to engage the university in cooperation toward quality academics; and

WHEREAS, she facilitated productive working relationships and fostered communication between the CWU Faculty Senate and the greater faculty at large, working persistently to represent the widely diverse concerns of the CWU faculty while also promoting faculty cohesiveness;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Central Washington University Faculty Senate is grateful and publically wishes to thank Katharine Whitcomb for her exemplary, thoughtful, diligent work and focus on faculty in the role of Chair of the Faculty Senate during the Academic Year 2014-2015.

STUDENT REPORT: None

NEW BUSINESS – President Guadino presented Chair-Elect Pedersen with her gavel.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Exhibit A

Faculty Code

Section IV Faculty Senate

D. Committees

1. f. The Budget and Planning Committee shall be concerned with the overall university budget, the implementation of and changes to the budgeting model, and the impact of the university budget on academics. The committee will facilitate a two-way flow of information between faculty at the department level and the University Budget and Finance Committee. This committee shall make budgetary recommendations on behalf of faculty and as representatives of the faculty to the University Budget and Finance Committee. Whenever possible, especially on matters of great importance, the committee's recommendation must be voted upon by the Faculty Senate.

Any Senator may make a motion to reject or amend a proposed recommendation by the Budget and Planning Committee. If the motion passes, the original recommendation shall be considered rejected or amended, and shall not be proposed by the Budget and Planning Committee to the University Budget and Finance Committee. In the case where an amendment to the recommendation is approved by the Senate, the Budget and Planning Committee may propose the amended recommendation to the University Budget and Finance Committee.

The Budget and Planning Committee shall perform other duties as assigned by Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Rationale: In the interest of increased shared governance, the creation of this standing committee formalizes faculty participation in the university budget and planning process down to the department level, particularly with the implementation of new budget models (RCM). The Faculty Senate has historically had a standing budget committee and would like to restore and secure the importance of faculty participation in university budget matters.

Exhibit B

Faculty Code Section IV Faculty Senate

C. Officers of the Senate

The faculty shall elect members of the Executive Committee, with such powers and duties as set forth in this document and transmitted by the Senate. The Senate shall elect the chair-elect of the Executive Committee, with such powers and duties as set forth in this document and transmitted by the Senate. The Senate chair shall be the presiding officer at all meetings of the Senate, at any faculty forum, and at general faculty members upon request of the president of the university. The chair shall serve as official representative and spokesperson of the faculty and the Senate in communication with the faculty, the BOT, the administration, the student body, and other groups regarding matters that are not mandatory subjects of bargaining. In this capacity, the chair shall have the right to ex-officio voting membership on any university committees and councils on which the Executive Committee deems that faculty ought to be represented. As chief executive officers of the Senate, the chair shall coordinate and expedite its business and committees.

~~The chair, chair-elect, and faculty legislative representative shall receive reassigned time to perform their duties according to Section IV.E. This reassigned time shall be 50% and 25% respectively, and a percentage for the faculty legislative representative to be determined by the president.~~

E. Assigned Time and Workload Units for Senate Offices and Activities

1. Workload unit associated with Senate offices and activities are based on: 30 hours of time spent in meetings and in preparation for meetings = 1 workload unit. It is acknowledged that units assigned reflect an annual average that faculty may reasonably expect over a three-year term.
2. Senate Chair
 - a. The Senate chair shall be relieved of ~~eighteen (18)~~ thirty-six (36) workload units of teaching for the academic year to perform their duties. The college department in which the chair teaches shall receive compensatory funds from the senate.
 - b. The chair assumes certain duties and responsibilities in the summer, for which a stipend is negotiated with the president.

3. Senate Chair-Elect

The Senate chair-elect shall be relieved of ~~nine (9)~~ eighteen (18) workload units of teaching for the academic year to perform their duties. The college department in which the chair-elect teaches shall receive compensatory funds from the senate.

4. Senate Past Chair

The Senate past chair shall be relieved of eighteen (18) workload units of teaching for the academic year to perform their duties. The department in which the past-chair teaches shall receive compensatory funds from the senate.

5. Executive Committee Member

~~Workload units for the position of Executive Committee members are three (3) for the academic year.~~
Executive Committee members who are not chair, chair-elect or past-chair shall receive six (6) service workload units, three (3) of which comprised of service workload and 3 that will be shall be reimbursed by senate.

6. Faculty Legislative Representative (FLR)

- a. The FLR shall receive release time from teaching as well as a travel allowance, negotiated each year with the president.
- b. In the event that the FLR is also elected chair of the Council of Faculty Representatives (FLRs of Washington universities), more release time, a higher travel allowance, and a summer stipend shall also be negotiated.
- c. Past allocations for these items shall be available from the Senate Office.

Rationale: The teaching release time for the Senate Chair has not been updated since 1987, and

the challenges and responsibilities (increased number of committees to oversee, representation of the faculty in more levels of the university structure, increased frequency of internal meetings, time-sensitive demand for policy revisions, etc.) facing the Executive Committee have substantially increased in the ensuing 28 years.

The Executive Committee has the financial support of President Gaudino in paying for the workload increase so that the faculty on the Executive Committee can spend the time necessary to participate in shared governance effectively.

The Executive Committee leadership finds it crucial to form more of an overlapping team consisting of the past chair, current chair and chair-elect in order to reduce the learning curve for the new chair, to accommodate the increased demand for faculty representation, and to increase the time window for ongoing senate projects to be completed.

Exhibit C

Committee	Name	Department	Term
Academic Affairs Committee			
1 COTS vacancy	Vacant		6/15/15 – 6/14/18
1 CB vacancy	Vacant		6/15/15 – 6/14/18
Bylaws & Faculty Code			
1 Senator vacancy	Vacant		6/15/15 – 6/14/18
Curriculum Committee			
1 CAH vacancy	Vacant		6/15/15 – 6/14/18
Evaluation & Assessment Committee			
1 COTS vacancy	Vacant		6/15/15 – 6/14/18
General Education Committee			
1 COTS vacancy	Michael Braunstein	Physics	6/15/15 – 6/14/18
1 CB vacancy	Vacant		6/15/15 – 6/14/18

Exhibit D

CWUP 5-50-100 Programs

(1) Programs are clusters of courses and/or groupings of teaching and research faculty organized by academic interest.

(2) Interdisciplinary Programs

An interdisciplinary program is one in which the subject matter and faculty expertise is broader than any single discipline, and in which the core curriculum integrates knowledge from multiple fields. This discipline mix is typically reflected in curricula that emphasize upper division course work from several departments or programs and interdepartmental faculty collaboration.

(3) Program Residence

Interdisciplinary programs reside in the college in which the preponderance of instruction is situated. This is determined by the distribution of upper-division credits required by the program, assigned to each college on a pro rata basis.

(4) Program Discontinuation

(A) Purpose. The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines and standards for the discontinuation of academic programs.

(B) Definitions

1. Academic Program: A sequence of courses leading to a degree, a minor, and/or a certificate. Academic programs covered by this policy include undergraduate and graduate degree programs, minors, and credit and non-credit certificate programs.

2. Program discontinuation: The university is teaching-out a program. No additional majors can declare the program as their program of study. The program will end upon completion of the program by students enrolled at the time of the discontinuation decision and who remain continuously enrolled, or after two complete academic years. The program will be removed from the official CWU catalog as soon as the decision to discontinue is approved.

(C) Guidelines. Program discontinuation may be originated by that program's faculty, that college dean, faculty senate curriculum committee, provost, or president. A program may be discontinued by mutual agreement of the program faculty, the dean, the provost, and the faculty senate curriculum committee. An information notice would be moved from the faculty senate curriculum committee to the faculty senate. A discontinuation review is not necessary if all parties are in agreement. Should it be necessary to consider the discontinuation of an academic program and the parties are not in agreement, a determination will be based upon a discontinuation review of the following variables:

1. The significance and contribution of the program to the university's mission and vision.
2. The academic quality, rigor, and value of the program.
3. The student demand, student accessibility, and cost effectiveness of the program.

In considering whether to discontinue a program, no one category is more crucial than any other. A decision to discontinue a program is based on a holistic assessment of the program in terms of quantitative and qualitative assessment of all decision variables, within a process that is broadly consultative.

a. Importance to the University. A program's importance to the university will be determined by the following criteria:

- i. The extent to which the program promotes the mission and vision of the university.
- ii. The extent to which the program is central to the curriculum of the university
- iii. The extent to which the program provides a service to the surrounding community and the changing needs of the State of Washington.

b. Quality of the Program. Program quality shall be assessed by program review, external review, and/or accreditation review and shall determine to what extent the quality of the program justifies continuance in its present form. The evaluation of program quality shall include:

- i. Demonstrated ability of the faculty to offer and maintain a current and rigorous curriculum.
- ii. Access to resources adequate to develop sufficient breadth, depth, and coherence of the program.
- iii. Demonstrated ability to attract and retain well-qualified faculty.
- iv. The quality of the program's faculty as demonstrated by participation in appropriate scholarly, creative and/or professional activity.
- v. The extent to which the program's excellence and standing in its discipline enhances the reputation of the university.
- vi. Demonstrated ability to attract, retain, and graduate students in a timely manner that leads to student success.

c. Cost Effectiveness and Demand for the Program. A program's cost-effectiveness shall be determined relative to disciplinary norms and compared to similar programs at comparable institutions. The quality indicators and metrics presented shall include (1) student-

faculty ratio; (2) numbers of tenured/tenure-track faculty and lecturers' (3) total cost-effectiveness of staff and facility allotment; (4) total cost-effectiveness per FTEF; and (5) total cost-effectiveness per FTES. Other discipline-specific variables may also be used. Student demand for the program may be measured by one or more of the following:

- i. The number of completed applications for admission.
- ii. The FTES generated in lower division, upper division, and/or graduate level courses.
- iii. The number of students who complete the program in a timely manner.
- iv. The anticipated need for graduates of the program.

(D) Teach-Out. For discontinued programs, a teach-out plan in compliance with the Higher Education Opportunity Act and the requirements of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) shall be implemented.

(E) Program Discontinuation Procedures. For undergraduate and graduate degrees, minors, and/or certificates, the process for program discontinuation shall include that program's faculty, that college dean, the faculty senate curriculum committee, the faculty senate and the provost. The procedures for program discontinuation are presented in the accompanying curriculum procedures.

[07/2009; Responsibility: Faculty Senate; Authority: Marilyn A. Levine, Provost/VP for Academic & Student Life; Reviewed/Endorsed by Provost's Council 04-29-2014; Cabinet/UPAC; Review/Effective Date: 06/04/2014; Approved by: James L. Gaudino, President]

Rationale: Add language to current policy regarding the discontinuation of programs. Currently, there is not language in policy.

Exhibit E

CWUR 2-50-100 Programs

(1) No procedures

(2) No procedures

(3) No procedures

(4) Program Discontinuation Procedures

(A) Program Discontinuation. For undergraduate and graduate degrees, minors, and credit and non-credit certificate programs, the process for program discontinuance shall include that program's faculty, the college dean, the provost, the faculty senate curriculum committee, and the faculty senate. This process shall be completed within one academic year from receipt of the initial discontinuation recommendation.

(B) Originating Program Discontinuation. The program's department chair, college dean, the faculty senate curriculum committee, the provost, or the president may originate program discontinuation.

1. Discontinuation by Mutual Agreement. A program may be discontinued by mutual agreement of that program's faculty, the college dean, the provost, and faculty senate curriculum committee. A letter documenting this agreement will be forwarded from the department and the dean, to the faculty senate curriculum committee, from the faculty senate curriculum committee to the faculty senate, and from the faculty senate to the provost. A discontinuation review is not necessary if the parties are in agreement.

2. Originating the Program Discontinuation Review. Should it be necessary to consider the discontinuation of an academic program and the parties are not in agreement, a determination will be based upon a discontinuation review. This is a review of an academic program conducted for the purpose of determining whether or not program discontinuation is warranted.

A written request for a discontinuation review of an academic program may be originated by any of the following:

- a. The program's department chair, when the chair has the written approval of a majority of the program faculty, subject to departmental voting procedures in effect;
- b. A majority vote of the faculty senate curriculum committee;
- c. The dean of the college;
- d. The provost;
- e. The president;

Such a request shall be submitted in writing to the provost and copied to:

- a. The faculty of the program;
- b. The dean of the college; and
- c. The chair of the faculty senate curriculum committee.

The letter making this request must clearly indicate the specific reasons for the suggested program discontinuance. If within 21 calendar days of receipt of this letter by the provost, none of the individuals or parties listed above has objected to the proposed discontinuance in writing to the provost, a recommendation for discontinuance will be sent to the faculty senate curriculum committee. If within 21 calendar days of receipt of the letter requesting program discontinuance any one of those parties has objected to discontinuance, the procedures outlined in section C of this policy must be followed before a recommendation for program discontinuance can be made.

(C) General Program Discontinuation Procedures

1. Review by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. Within 14 calendar days of receipt of a letter objecting to proposed program discontinuance from one of the parties listed in section B of this procedure, the faculty senate curriculum committee will begin a special program review focused on issues related to potential discontinuance.

2. Responsibilities of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. The variables to be examined in the discontinuation review and the criteria for each variable are stated in the program discontinuance policy.

The faculty senate curriculum committee will decide to what extent to involve appropriate constituencies such as additional program faculty, representative students of the program, etc.

At the end of the review, the faculty senate curriculum committee shall report its recommendation to the faculty senate. In keeping with section A of this policy, the faculty senate curriculum committee shall submit this report within one calendar year from the date of the initial recommendation for discontinuation.

3. Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee Recommendation to the Faculty Senate. The recommendation of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee and the action of the senate to recommend program discontinuance will be forwarded to the provost.

4. Faculty Senate Review of Recommendation. The faculty senate will review the recommendation of the faculty senate curriculum committee. The faculty senate may ask for additional data and consultation for review. The faculty senate will forward its decision to the provost.

5. Board of Trustees Notification. Following the faculty senate's decision to discontinue a program, written notification of the decision will be sent to the provost, dean and department chair. The program will be removed from the catalog and university web sites by the registrar's office.

6. Responsibilities of the Department. If the program is discontinued, currently enrolled students will be able to complete their course of study at CWU.

The "teach out" will be implemented and monitored by the department chair in accordance with the policies of the NWCCU and shall include the following:

a. The department chair will query an official list of students enrolled in the program at the time of the discontinuation decision;

b. Departmental notification by email and hard copy to all students on the list of the following:

i. The decision to discontinue the program and the commitment of the university to "teach out" the program to all currently enrolled students who are making adequate progress to degree and who remain continuously enrolled. The program must be offered until all such students have graduated, or two full academic years have been completed, whichever occurs first.

ii. Students will be graduating under degree requirements stated in the catalog the year they began the program, or the year the program discontinuation was made.

iii. Students who withdraw or take a leave of absence will be removed from the list of students completing this program.

iv. Other programs offered by the university to which students may wish to transfer, and/or similar programs offered by nearby institutions.

v. The faculty advisor working with students during the "teach out" of this program.

c. Conscientious academic advising of all students as they complete the program.

Rationale: Add procedure to outline the process for discontinued programs.

Exhibit F

CWUP 5-50-060 Curriculum Rules for Implementation

(1) Cooperative Education

Cooperative education (X90) is an individualized contracted field experience where the student is actively engaged in hands-on learning with business, industry, government, or social service agencies. This contractual arrangement involves a student learning plan, cooperating employer supervision, and faculty coordination.

(2) Credit Hour Allocation to Courses

Credit Hour Allocation to Courses - Academic credit provides the basis for measuring the amount of engaged learning time expected of a typical student enrolled not only in traditional classroom settings but also laboratories, studios, internships and other experiential learning, distance, correspondence, and competency-based education.

(A) Traditional, Seat-Time-Based Courses - A minimum of one class work hour (approximately 50-60 minutes of instruction) and an additional two hours of out-of-class student work each week for one credit hour during a 10-week quarter. If the learning experience is offered in a different time frame (e.g., six-week summer session), the student time required to complete the course should reasonably approximate 30 hours of combined direct instruction and student work per credit. If direct instruction is not the principal mode of learning for an academic experience (e.g., laboratory courses, ~~internships~~, studio work, some on-line courses), the student time required to complete the course should reasonably approximate 30 hours of student work per credit.

(B) Hybrid or Online Courses - The credit hours awarded for a given course or academic experience must be reasonably equivalent to the standard of 3 hours of combined classroom instruction and student work per credit hour for a 10 week quarter. These hours may consist of course activities including, but not limited to:

- Face-to-face course meetings
- Virtual course meetings or student-instructor and student-student interactions
- Time to read/view assigned texts or other assigned materials
- Experiential learning activities consistent with the learning objectives of the course
- Synthesis/processing/reflection time and activities (may be used for writing or production of creative work which may take many forms including but not limited to journals, formal papers, projects, blogs, art, music, etc.)

(C) Alternative Outcome-Based Courses - Credit may be awarded for an amount of learning equivalent to learning in a seat-time-based course as documented by student attainment of learning outcomes as verified by assessment of student achievement by the appropriate academic department. Students completing competency-based courses would be awarded the same credit equivalent to learning in the same seat-time-based course.

Rationale: Remove internships from the 30 hour Traditional, Seat-Timed-Based courses to follow current practice and department need.

Exhibit G

CWUR 2-50-060 Curriculum Rules for Implementation

(2) Cooperative Education

(A) Minimum Requirements (departments may have additional requirements):

1. The student is in good academic standing (~~above 2.0~~).
2. The contracted field experience is directly related to the student's major field of study and/or career goal.
3. The student has completed the appropriate prerequisite courses and possesses the required skills and knowledge.
4. The student must have a departmental faculty cooperative education (co-op) advisor.
5. The student must complete at least 45 credits prior to enrolling in a 290 including at least 15 credits at CWU.
6. The student must complete a minimum of 90 total credit hours with 10 or more credits in his/her major to enroll in 490.

(B) Program Enrollment

1. The student must complete and submit the learning agreement form for registration.
2. Students may register for cooperative education courses numbered 290, 490 and 590. Credits are variable: 1-5 for 290, 1-12 for 490, and ~~4-8~~ 1-12 for 590 level courses; as approved by academic department.
3. The student may count 20 credits toward graduation of which 10 may be at the 290 level and/or transfer credits. No more than ~~8~~ 12 credits may be applied to a graduate degree. MFA is an exception to this procedure allowing for up to 24 credit hours.
4. Courses may be repeated when objectives and activities are different.
5. Student must complete an internship release form including a sexual harassment training certificate.

(C) Awarding of Credits

1. A minimum of 40 hours of field experience is required for each credit.
2. A means of evaluation is established between the student, the employer, and the faculty co-op advisor. Grading is S/U ~~letter grade is optional if approved by the faculty co-op advisor.~~
3. If the field experience is terminated by the employer or academic department or student, credit will not be awarded.
4. Credit will not be given for field or work-study experience completed prior to registration.
5. The contracted field experience may or may not be a paid position.
6. The cooperative education program should provide affected departments with evaluations from employers, faculty, and students on a quarterly basis along with a review of field placement sites.

(D) Student Supervision and Coordination

1. The employer/supervisor is identified on the learning agreement form.
2. The faculty co-op advisor must contact the employer/supervisor and the student at least twice each quarter.

Rationale: Update procedure language to follow current practice.

Exhibit H

Proposal to the Faculty Senate
FS Evaluation and Assessment Committee
June 3, 2015

In response to charge EAC14-15.04

“Continue work on comprehensive look at evaluation of faculty scholarship and service that could be used as part of every department’s retention, tenure and promotion guidelines.”

The Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee recommend that colleges and departments consider the following general guidelines for the evaluation of Scholarship and Service:

Evaluation of scholarship and service should be expressed in terms of the following parameters:

1. Guidelines for Evaluating *Scholarship*

A. The **nature** of the activity:

- Definition of the activity: presentation, performance, or publication (print, audio, video)
- Description of the context of the activity:
 - Role of the individual in the activity/product
 - Circumstances/selectivity/review process of presentation/publication, e.g., by invitation, application, competitive application, or independent means

B. The **results** of the activity:

- Assessment of contribution to body of knowledge and/or its application to course pedagogy and assignments, including providing documentation or evidence of effectiveness in the classroom environment (peer review)
- Assessment of actual or potential impact/influence, e.g., international, national, regional, or local; peer-evaluation, published reviews, letters of support, number of citations, etc.
- Assessment of potential for, or evidence of, continued activity (i.e., more presentations, performances, articles, or additional research)
- Assessment of evidence of impact on individual, department, or university reputation at the appropriate level

C. The **scope and audience** of the activity:

- Venue or publisher and nature of dissemination (print, electronic, etc.) at the appropriate level
- Audience—professionals, students, general public, local, regional, national, international

Guidelines for Evaluating Service

A. Institutional Guidelines/Responsibility:

- Relative weight/scrutiny of Service compared with Teaching and Scholarly/Creative Activity (see note below)
- Credibility of evaluation process/scrutiny of Service compared with Teaching and Scholarly/Creative Activity

B. Specific Guidelines:

1. The nature of the activity:

- Definition of activity
- Description of context/reach/community to which the activity is directed— field/professionals, institution (faculty, students, university at-large), general public; local, regional, national, international
- Role of the individual in the activity (chair, member), description of connection to expertise/teaching assignment.

2. The results of the activity:

- Assessment of contribution to community in question, with documentation/evidence of quality (peer review)
- Assessment of actual or potential impact/influence, e.g., international, national, regional, or local; peer evaluation, published reviews, letters of support
- Assessment of evidence of impact on individual, department, or university reputation at the appropriate level
- Assessment of potential for or evidence of continued activity, contribution to teaching/scholarship/etc. associated with university work duties

A Note Concerning the Proportion of Scrutiny Given to Scholarship and Service

While research, scholarly activity and service should be essential duties required of university faculty, because CWU is primarily a teaching institution, the concentration on these activities (or hours spend on them) by faculty are substantially less than those spent on teaching. However, the ratio of workload in these three categories varies somewhat from College to College. For most schools it is 35 units for Teaching, 6 for Scholarship, and 3 for Service (80%, ~13%, and ~7%) but requirements vary as much as 6 workload units, to 30 units for Teaching, 10 for Scholarship, and 5 for Service (67%, ~23%, and ~10%). In addition to these inconsistencies, faculty may be called upon during certain years to spend more than the expected energy and time in any one of these three duties. CWU is not an exception among institutions of higher education in such varying requirements, but all universities emphasize the need for equity when evaluating faculty along with what can be varying standards. In other words, there should exist multiple pathways with deserved equity in fulfilling the duties of a faculty member.

Pertinent to Scholarship and Service, the faculty member is expected to engage on different levels that also vary among CWU's colleges: for scholarship both A and B level publications; for service it is by community such as college, regional, state, national, international and by professional vs. informal. Again, it is suggested that these differences among colleges and departments allow equitable variations that considers multiple pathways in fulfilling duties in scholarship and service.