

11-15-1972

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 11/15/1972

Esther Johnston

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

Recommended Citation

Johnston, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 11/15/1972" (1972). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 451.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/451>

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: Special Senate Meeting, 15 November 1972
Presiding Officer: David R. Anderson, Chairman
Recording Secretary: Esther Johnston

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All senators or their alternates were present except Lee Fisher, Owen Shadle, Bill Cooper and Jim Cushman.

Others Present: Bernard Martin, Robert Dean, Barney Erickson, E. E. Bilyeu, H. E. Sands, R. E. Converse, U. A. Eberhart, Courtney Jones, Calvin Johnson, Larry Lawrence, Beverly Heckart, E. J. Harrington, Paul Crookston, Ken Harsha and Dale Comstock.

AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman announced the following addition to the Agenda:

1. Under Reports add Personnel Committee Report.

The chairman asked if there were any further changes. There being none, the Agenda with the addition of the report was approved.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was received:

1. Letter from Edward J. Harrington, dated November 3, 1972. This letter has been directed to the Personnel Committee for a report today.

REPORTS

Personnel Committee--Gordon Leavitt reported to the Senate that the Committee considered Dr. Harrington's letter. He presented the rationale. The recommendation included:

For the present, since the duties of the former Dean of Arts and Sciences and Dean of Education, as outlined by the 1970 Faculty Code, are now shared with two additional Deans, the Committee on Promotions, Tenure, Special Increments and Reappointment should be composed of the following voting members or their designated representatives: Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Arts and Humanities, Dean of Professional Studies, Dean of Science and Mathematics, Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Dean of Graduate Studies.

Further, since the proposed Faculty Code "has been brought up to date and is in line with the recent academic reorganization" the Committee recommends:

The Senate should request that the Board of Trustees take action

regarding ratification of the Proposed Code in their December 1972 meeting and notify the Senate of their action according to the Faculty Code.

MOTION NO. 875: Catherine Sands moved, seconded by Louis Bovos, for the adoption of the Personnel Committee's Report. The motion was voted on and carried with Daryl Basler, Jerry Jones and Robert Jones opposing, and James Brooks abstaining.

OLD BUSINESS

The chairman announced that the Special Senate meeting had been called to discuss the Charter of the College Council presented by the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Reorganization of College Governance.

MOTION NO. 876: Ken Berry moved, seconded by John Purcell, that the assembly resolve itself into a "Committee of the Whole," to take under consideration the Charter of the College Council of Central Washington State College. The motion was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

The chairman then called upon Gordon Leavitt to take the chair and Mr. Anderson took a place as a member of the committee.

Mr. Leavitt asked Larry Lawrence to comment on the proposed Charter of the College Council and answer questions from the Senators that might be directed to him on the subject.

Mr. Keller asked if the Charter of the Council would be an amendment to the Faculty Code and if the Faculty Senate would enjoy all of the relationships to the Faculty Code that it now enjoys.

Mr. Lawrence said No, it wouldn't. It would necessitate some re-writing of the Code.

The question was asked if it is correct that the Faculty Senate is advisory to the Council but can ask for review.

Mr. Lawrence answered Yes.

Mr. Keller asked does this mean that the Council has authority with respect to all matters such as to the Faculty Code. Does this mean the faculty no longer has control over the Faculty Code?

Mr. Lawrence said, No. The amendments to the Code would still have to go through the same processes of amendment as at present. The amendments would have to be approved by the Faculty and the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Cocheba asked if there would be a new definition of faculty.

Mr. Lawrence answered that the College Council makes a distinction between faculty and supportive staff which does require a new definition of faculty.

Miss Hileman asked if there is going to be a total re-organization of Committees.

Mr. Lawrence said there were 7 policy committees suggested. All committees would have to be re-examined and reconstituted with some new ones created and some old ones done away with. This does not necessarily involve re-writing the Code.

Mr. Brooks said the new Council would involve more people, eliminate duplication, create better understanding, better college government. Each group must give up some authority to make it work. He expressed concern that we might be setting up, in effect, two college councils. On most other college campuses the council does take a strong role and does in many ways replace the Senate.

Mr. Anderson mentioned that in the proposed Code there is a hearing and grievance procedure and asked the relation of such a procedure to the Council.

Mr. Lawrence said it could be incorporated into the Charter.

Mr. Brooks asked whether the Faculty Senate or the new College Council would maintain and receive reports of a hearing and grievance procedure.

Robert Jones asked about the membership roster of the Library.

Larry Lawrence said the Library was represented by an elected member. The Dean of Library was not included as an ex-officio member since he is functioning almost as a Department Chairman.

Mr. Purcell said he was reporting for the Long Range Planning Committee. The Committee supports the College Council, but feels it is too large. He wondered if the College Council had been put in the position of College Administrators. He would like to see a distinction between kinds of decisions to be made.

Larry Lawrence said the point is an important one. The Council must see that policy is carried out, but not go into the business of making every little decision.

Mr. Purcell said there should be some judicial part of the governing system--this is just congressional part.

Mr. Keller mentioned that last Spring a straw vote was taken on the proposal which contained representation from each school. Why did the Committee change that?

Mr. Lawrence said Mr. Keller is right. Departmental representation could be retained, but a large Council might be the result.

Mr. Keller said the College exists primarily for instruction and research. The faculty makes this possible and gives continuity within the departments. For this reason the representation of the faculty should be by departments.

Mr. Anderson said the Committee of the Whole should have a motion on the floor so the Committee could report some specific action to the Senate.

MOTION NO. 1 (COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE): Mr. Anderson moved, seconded by Charles McGehee, that the Committee of the Whole adopt the proposal.

MOTION NO. 2 (COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE): Robert Jones moved, seconded by David Canzler, to amend the Charter so that the membership roster includes the Dean of Library Services as an ex-officio member.

Mr. McGehee said this was difficult to handle on the committee floor.

Mr. Vifian said he felt this is not the time for specific amendments, that the Charter needs more consideration.

Mr. Brooks agreed. He thought we are meeting to have the opportunity to talk about the Charter.

There was considerable discussion as to how the Committee of the Whole should proceed.

Mr. Jones withdrew his Motion No. 2 and Mr. Canzler withdrew his second to the motion.

Mr. Leavitt said that they were back to the original motion by Mr. Anderson.

Mr. McGehee suggested the Committee of the Whole receive and recommend to the Senate that the report be referred to the Senate to take and work in conference with the student government representatives and achieve a document mutually satisfactory.

Mr. Anderson withdrew Motion No. 1.

MOTION NO. 3 (COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE): Mr. Jacobs moved, seconded by Mr. Cocheba, that the Committee "rise and report." The motion was voted on and carried with a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Anderson resumed the chair and asked if there was a report of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Leavitt announced that the Committee of the Whole had a short report: no formal action has been taken.

Mr. Lawrence said when this committee presented this report to the Senate, the committee had done the best that can be done at this time. The Senate should refer the proposal to the Code Committee to be put into the proper form as an amendment with changes which make the proposal acceptable to this body.

The chairman suggested that it might be useful to have a preliminary vote of the faculty to determine whether they approve of the concept of the College Council.

Mr. Purcell said that Mr. Lawrence is suggesting the Faculty Senate needs to review the document. Some mechanism has to be devised and they need to come up with a document in final form. There is no point in sending anything out to the faculty not in final form.

Mr. Jacobs said it would be an error to refer this matter to another committee. He said the Code Committee could spend another 2½ years on it. He feels the Senators can write their own amendments.

MOTION NO. 877: Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Mr. McGehee, that the Charter of the College Council be referred to the Code Committee.

The chairman asked whether the motion would require them to draft amendments to the Charter.

Mr. Vifian said they should come back with suggestions.

Mr. Leavitt said he would prefer to see the Executive Committee appoint a committee to consider changes that need to be made prior to action by the Senate.

MOTION NO. 878: Mr. Leavitt moved, seconded by Mr. Goodey, that the Senate Executive Committee appoint a committee to consider additional changes that need to be made prior to formal action by the Senate on the Charter of the College Council of Central Washington State College.

Mr. Vifian suggested a Senate meeting could be held the third week in January.

Mr. Leavitt said he had no intent to slow up anything and feels just the opposite will happen if the Charter is referred to a committee.

Mr. Brooks said he favors Mr. Leavitt's suggestion. There is no problem to tie the Charter to the present Code.

Mr. Keller said he would like the Senate to meet several more times and discuss it more.

Motion No. 878 was voted on and carried with Mr. Keller, Miss Douce', Mr. McQuarrie, Mr. Farkas, Mr. Bentley, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Canzler, Mr. Vifian, Miss Hileman and Mr. Bovos opposed and Mr. Anderson abstaining.

The chairman called for a vote on the original motion as amended. The motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

AGENDA
SPECIAL FACULTY SENATE MEETING
4 p.m., Wednesday, November 15, 1972
Room 123, Hertz Hall

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL
- III. COMMUNICATIONS
 - A. Letter from Edward J. Harrington
- IV. REPORTS
- V. OLD BUSINESS
 - A. Proposed College Council
- VI. NEW BUSINESS
- VII. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF Nov. 15, 1972

ROLL CALL

- Anderson, David
- Willberg, Calvin
- Applegate, Jim
- Basler, Daryl
- Berry, Kenneth
- Bovos, Louis
- Brooks, James
- Canzler, David
- Chrismer, John
- Richard Fairbanks
- Farkas, Steven
- Fisher, Lee
- Gillam, Cornelius
- Goodey, Darwin
- Hileman, Betty
- Jacobs, Robert
- Jones, Jerry
- Jones, Robert
- Keller, Chester
- Kramar, Zolton
- Ladd, Arthur
- Leavitt, Gordon
- McGehee, Charles
- McQuarrie, Duncan
- Nylander, James
- Owens, B. Dean
- Purcell, John
- Osborn, Lynn
- Sands, Catherine
- Shadle, Owen
- Thelen, Thomas
- Tolman, Rosco
- Trout, Betty
- Vifian, John

- Cooper, Bill
- Cushman, Jim
- Ferguson, Roger

- Frederick Lister
- Otto Jakubek
- Frank Carlson
- Art Keith
- Raymond Wiman
- James Hollister
- Edward Harrington
- Richard Johnson
- Marie Madison
- Richard Fairbanks
- Robert Bentley
- John Allen
- Donald Cocheba
- James Klahn

- Charles Stastny
- David Lygre
- Charles Vlcek
- Jay Bachrach
- Gordon Warren
- Willard Sperry
- John DeMerchant
- William Benson
- Frank Nelson
- John Pearson
- Eileen Calkins
- John Foster
- Milo Smith
- Marco Bicchieri
- Pete Martinez
- Glen Clark
- Nancy Lester
- Pearl Douce
- Bruce Teets

- Carl Olson

Philip Koch

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

Bernard L. Harting

Robert Y. Dean

Barnes L. Erickson

E. G. Bilyeu

J. E. Sands

R. E. Lowman

U. G. Eberhart

Courtney S. Jones

Calvin H. Johnson

Ray L. Lawrence

~~Earl Duce~~

Beverly Heckart

E. J. Harrington

Paul Crookston

Ken Hardie

Dale Comstock

Last person signing please return to the Recording Secretary.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE REPORT
November 15, 1972

In response to a charge from the Executive Committee to consider Dr. Harrington's letter asking for an interpretation or clarification of who is to sit on the Committee on Promotions, Tenure, Special Increments and Reappointment, the Senate Personnel Committee believes:

- (1) The Faculty Code (1970) is clear and needs no interpretation as to who shall sit on the Committee on Promotions, Tenure, Special Increment and Reappointment.
- (2) The Revised Code (1971-72) that has been ratified by the Faculty and awaits consideration and action by the Board of Trustees, has been brought up to date and is in line with the recent academic reorganization. Likewise, the Revised Code needs no interpretation on this matter as it states that "...voting members: Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Humanities and Arts, Dean of Professional Studies, Dean of Science and Mathematics, Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and, during ..." (2.30 (2) line 6).
- (3) The Senate should request that the Board of Trustees take action regarding ratification of the Proposed Code in their December 1972 meeting and notify the Senate of their action according to the Faculty Code.
- (4) For the present, since the duties of the former Dean of Arts and Sciences and Dean of Education, as outlined by the 1970 Faculty Code, are now shared with two additional Deans, the Committee on Promotions, Tenure, Special Increments, and Reappointment should be composed of the following voting members or their designated representatives: Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Arts and Humanities, Dean of Professional Studies, Dean of Science and Mathematics, Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Dean of Graduate Studies.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE REPORT
November 15, 1972

In response to a charge from the Executive Committee to consider Dr. Haxington's letter asking for an interpretation or clarification of who is to sit on the Committee on Promotions, Tenure, Special Increments and Reappointment, the Senate Personnel Committee believes:

- (1) The Faculty Code (1970) is clear and needs no interpretation as to who shall sit on the Committee on Promotions, Tenure, Special Increment and Reappointment.
- (2) The Revised Code (1971-72) that has been ratified by the faculty and awaits consideration and action by the Board of Trustees, has been brought up to date and is in line with the recent academic reorganization. Likewise, the Revised Code needs no interpretation on this matter as it states that "...voting members: Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Humanities and Arts, Dean of Professional Studies, Dean of Science and Mathematics, Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and, during ..." (2.30 (2) Line 6).
- (3) The Senate should request that the Board of Trustees take action regarding ratification of the Proposed Code in their December 1972 meeting and notify the Senate of their action according to the Faculty Code.
- (4) For the present, since the duties of the former Dean of Arts and Sciences and Dean of Education, as outlined by the 1970 Faculty Code, are now shared with two additional Deans, the Committee on Promotions, Tenure, Special Increments, and Reappointment should be composed of the following voting members or their designated representatives: Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Arts and Humanities, Dean of Professional Studies, Dean of Science and Mathematics, Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Dean of Graduate Studies.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLensburg, WASHINGTON
99242

November 3, 1972

Dr. David R. Anderson
Chairman, Faculty Senate
CWSC, Campus

Dear Dr. Anderson:

The Faculty Code, Section V. D. 2 states (underlining mine):

Normally, promotions in rank shall be determined annually. The Committee on Promotions, Tenure, Special Increments, and Reappointment shall submit to the President a priority list of faculty members recommended for promotion. The Committee shall be composed of the following voting members or their designated representatives: Vice President, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Dean of Education, Dean of Graduate Studies, and the Chairman of the department under consideration. Each department under consideration may elect or designate one non-voting member to the Committee. Recommendations for promotion shall be based primarily on the following: ..

Section C. PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION OF REAPPOINTMENT states (underlining mine):

At the time of determination of reappointment, all faculty members in the candidate's department shall submit a statement, using forms provided, to the appropriate Dean. Departments are encouraged to use whatever committee procedures they desire to determine recommendations. For whatever procedures are used, the Department Chairman shall submit independent recommendations to the Dean. The Vice President and Appointing Board, using data provided from the department members, the Department Chairman and other faculty members under consideration, shall submit a priority list of recommendations to the President.

David E. Anderson

11/5/72

- 2 -

Now that we have four schools Section V. D. 2 poses a problem. Instead of a Dean of Arts and Sciences and a Dean of Education, we have Deans of Arts and Humanities, Natural Science and Mathematics, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Professional Studies. Can these four deans now sit on the Committee in place of the two deans previously designated?

Also, section V. A. refers to the "Vice President and Academic Deans." I would consider "Academic Deans" to include the four above mentioned school deans plus the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and the Dean of Library Services.

Obviously, we need a clarification of who is to sit on the Committee on Promotions, Tenure, Special Increments and Reappointment.

Will you please ask the Code Committee to provide an interpretation for the Faculty Senate's consideration at its next meeting.

Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington
Vice President for Academic Affairs

jm