

5-20-1998

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/20/1998

Marsha Brandt

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

Recommended Citation

Brandt, Marsha, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/20/1998" (1998). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 548.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/548>

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

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING: MAY 20, 1998

Home Page: <http://www.cwu.edu/Faculty/Staff/Student> > Faculty Senate

Audio Cassette available in Faculty Senate Office until the end of Spring Quarter

Presiding Officer: Robert H. Perkins
Recording Secretary: Marsha Brandt

Meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Don Cocheba, Patrick O'Shaughnessy, Amy Russell

Visitors: Robert Blackett, David Dauwalder, Barney Erickson, James Eubanks, Gail Goss, Beverly Heckart, Charles McGehee, Barbara Radke, Clara Richardson

CHANGES TO AGENDA: Add to New Business: Motion from John Alsoszatai-Petheo

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the May 6, 1998, Faculty Senate meeting were approved with the following change: Lynn Richmond was represented by his alternate, Wendy Mustain was present.

COMMUNICATIONS: Dauwalder: 5/12/98, Re: Appointment to University Committees
Douglas: 5/13/98, Re: Summer Thesis for Faculty
Richmond: 5/13/98, Re: Advise re Hybrid ATA Degrees
Gamon/Garrison: 5/18/98, Re: Bargaining Issues Forum (6/1, SUB 208, 4:00)
Clark (WSU): 5/20/98, Re: Faculty Input to the 2020 Commission

REPORTS:

A. ACTION ITEMS:

1. **CODE COMMITTEE:** Code Committee Chair Heckart reported that, in making these proposals, the Code Committee held two public hearings, received and considered written responses, consulted with the Budget Committee, and held discussion with the President and Provost.

MOTION NO. 3154 Beverly Heckart moved approval of changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure as follows:

ISSUE OF MERIT AWARDS (with the added wording: "or multiples thereof" in 8.40 C.1.)

8.40 Yearly Salary Adjustments

The salary of a faculty member may be changed as a result of any one or a combination of three (3) types of action. Subject to the availability of funds during any biennium and to the mandates of the State Legislature and/or the Governor, the following descending order of priority for the three (3) types of actions shall be observed as yearly salary increases are considered, ~~provided that normally up to twenty (20) percent of all available funds may be designated by the Board of Trustees in any year for merit increases; the Faculty Senate may consent to the expenditure of more than twenty (20) percent for merit.~~

- A. Promotions in rank, provided that a faculty member promoted during any given biennium shall receive at least a salary increase of two (2) full steps on the salary scale and simultaneously attain at least the current minimum salary step for the new rank even if such increase exceeds two (2) full steps; provided further that if the promotion comes at a time of a scale adjustment, the faculty member shall benefit from the scale adjustment.
- B. ~~An across-the-board scale adjustment, defined as a specific sum or percentage which corresponds to the increase in the cost of living (e.g., as measured by the federal Consumer Price Index) since the last adjustment.~~
- C. Merit increase. Merit increases may be given ~~in any step amount~~ to faculty members to reward them for outstanding service to the university.

1. Such merit increases shall be given in increments, or multiples thereof, of one or two sub-shares of the full steps in the published salary scale according to the number of merit levels awarded faculty members at the time of a merit distribution (e.g. Merit Level I corresponds to one sub-share of a full step; Merit Level II corresponds to two sub-shares of a full step; a Level II award at step 9.b. would move a faculty member to step 10. a.). The minimum criteria established by the Faculty Senate for the award of Merit Levels I and II shall be published annually together with the salary scale. (See Section 8.15).
2. ~~Such m~~ Merit increases, which are permanent, are separate from special salary awards or adjustments identified elsewhere in this code, such as in Sections 4.55 and 8.46. Faculty members newly hired or promoted are eligible for only four full merit steps above the step into which they are hired or promoted if such advancement exceeds the ceiling for their rank. Faculty members who participate in the conversion to the new salary schedule in 1991 shall also be eligible to advance four full steps on the scale even though such advancement exceeds the ceiling for their rank. No faculty member may receive a salary exceeding the top step on the salary scale. Faculty members receiving promotion are not eligible to receive merit awards in the same year.

8.75 Merit

B. Merit - Procedure

3. The dean, after consultation with department chairs, shall submit his or her recommendations ~~in priority sequence by unit (college, school or library)~~ to the provost/vice president for academic affairs.
4. The provost/vice president for academic affairs will prepare a final ~~priority~~ list for the university for submission to the president after consulting with the appropriate deans.
9. In years when funds exist for merit awards, ~~Every year~~ recommendations for merit shall be made by departments and a ~~priority~~ list established by deans and the provost/vice president for academic affairs.

Rationale: The Faculty Senate budget and code committees worked jointly on producing the merit proposals that accompany code changes proposed above. The code changes would be made only if the merit proposals are accepted by the Faculty Senate.

1. The faculty scale would contain the current thirty (30) full steps with two (2) sub-shares, or multiples thereof. The two committees propose that having only two (2) as opposed to five (5) sub-shares (as contained in the scale as of July 1, 1997) would correspond better to the two proposed levels of merit and would make the award of those two levels in monetary terms more meaningful to the recipients. Sub-share a. represents the current sub-share b. that went into effect as of July 1, 1997. Sub-share b. represents the level of sub-share d. that went into effect as of July 1, 1997. In any given year, we would have to experience an appropriation of two (2) per cent or more as a salary increase in order to fund merit awards.
2. In this proposal merit increases would always be limited to two(2) percent, assuming that every faculty member received a Level II award, with any appropriations over two percent distributed as an across-the-board increase.
3. In proposing the criteria for the award of merit Levels I and II, the joint committees have made a greater distinction between the levels than existed for the distribution that occurred in 1997 (1998). The criteria for merit level I would award those who are performing according to reasonable expectations. Level II would reward those who are meeting expectations beyond the reasonable.
4. Under the new system, priority rankings would no longer exist. Every one who met the criteria would receive merit at Level I or Level II.
5. The Faculty Senate requested that consideration be given to department chairs who, as their work has become ever more crushing, frequently have little opportunity to meet the criteria required of non-chairs. The joint committees' proposal responds to that request.
6. The joint committees invite faculty who attend the hearing to state a preference for implementation Alternative I or II.

PROPOSED MERIT CRITERIA

The following guidelines shall be refined and supplemented by individual departments and schools/colleges of the university per Faculty Code Section 8.75 A. 2.

LEVEL I

FOR THE CRITERIA LISTED BELOW THE FACULTY MEMBER, IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR A LEVEL I AWARD MUST MEET ALL ACCOMPLISHMENTS LISTED UNDER TEACHING CRITERIA AND TWO ACCOMPLISHMENTS EACH IN EITHER THE SCHOLARSHIP OR SERVICE CRITERIA. SEE FACULTY CODE SECTION 8.75 A. 1.

A. Teaching Criteria--Core Accomplishments--ALL

1. Student evaluation of instruction, according to departmental criteria for items and level of proficiency
2. Course evaluation by peers that may include review of classroom teaching
3. Teaching reflects stated philosophy and mission statement consistent with department and philosophy
4. Identification of student learner outcomes on syllabi
5. Advising support and excellence

AND/EITHER

B. Scholarship Criteria--ANY TWO Accomplishments

1. Serve as referee or on editorial board for scholarly journal
2. Review texts or other materials for a publishing firm
3. Submission of a grant or proposal
4. Evidence of substantial activity on works in progress
5. Creation of an artistic work
2. Development or dissemination of new or innovative technology
7. Consultation to improve one's academic status or scholarship
8. Attend seminars, conferences, and other development activities relevant to professional responsibilities
9. Local performance or presentation of an artistic work
10. Publish articles in scholarly, but non-refereed journals

OR

C. Service Criteria--ANY TWO Accomplishments

1. Serve on juries related to field of expertise
2. Serve as advisor to student organizations
3. Serve on a university committee
2. Consultation where the primary emphasis is community service
5. Presentations for community good

Level I--Department Chairs

Department chairs with teaching duties shall meet the same teaching criteria as other faculty. Full-time department chairs shall perform all duties of the department chair as a substitute for the teaching criteria.

LEVEL II

BEFORE FACULTY MEMBERS CAN QUALIFY FOR A LEVEL II MERIT AWARD, THEY MUST FIRST QUALIFY TO RECEIVE A LEVEL I AWARD.

A. Teaching Criteria--ANY ONE Accomplishment

1. Course or program development in response to published departmental mission
2. Upgrading of teaching to enhance student learning
3. Contributions to other classes
4. Proportional participation on undergraduate and graduate thesis or project committees
5. Teaching recognition awards
6. Serve as advisor to student honor society

AND/EITHER

B. Scholarship Criteria--ANY ONE Accomplishment

1. Author or co-author of a textbook
2. Author or co-author of a chapter in a textbook
3. Editor of a textbook
4. Author or co-author of an article published in a refereed journal
5. Creation and extra-local performance, presentation, or publication of a major artistic work
6. Major scientific discovery or innovation
7. Major grant submitted and/or funded
8. Present paper at extra-local conferences

OR

C. Service Criteria--ANY ONE Accomplishment

1. Professional expertise in community service
2. Serve as officer or committee member of scholarly or governmental organization
3. Provide continuing service to university students in non-university settings
4. Chair a university committee
5. Chair or serve as director of a community service organization

Level II--Department Chairs

Department chairs, both full-time and part-time, shall meet any two of the criteria in the combined teaching, scholarship or service categories with at most one in any category.

PROPOSED PROPOSED PROPOSED

Central Washington University
Proposed Faculty Salary Scale
EXAMPLE BASED ON SCALE, JULY 1, 1997

1
A
S
S
I
S
T
A
N
T

9
A
S
S
O
C
I
A
T
E

22

Step	9-Month					
	FULL		a		b	
	Annual	Semi-Monthly	Annual	Semi-Monthly	Annual	Semi-Monthly
1	28,733	1,596.28	29,020	1,612.22	29,308	1,628.22
2	29,596	1,644.22	29,892	1,660.67	30,188	1,677.11
3	30,484	1,693.56	30,789	1,710.50	31,094	1,727.44
4	31,398	1,744.33	31,712	1,761.78	32,026	1,779.22
5	32,340	1,796.67	32,663	1,814.61	32,987	1,832.61
6	33,310	1,850.56	33,643	1,869.06	33,976	1,887.56
7	34,310	1,906.11	34,653	1,925.17	34,996	1,944.22
8	35,339	1,963.28	35,692	1,982.89	36,046	2,002.56
9	36,398	2,022.11	36,762	2,042.33	37,126	2,062.56
10	37,491	2,082.83	37,866	2,103.67	38,241	2,124.50
11	38,616	2,145.33	39,002	2,166.78	39,388	2,188.22
12	39,774	2,209.67	40,172	2,231.78	40,569	2,253.83
13	40,967	2,275.94	41,377	2,298.72	41,786	2,321.44
14	42,197	2,344.28	42,619	2,367.72	43,041	2,391.17
15	43,462	2,414.56	43,897	2,438.72	44,331	2,462.83
16	44,767	2,487.06	45,215	2,511.94	45,662	2,536.78
17	46,110	2,561.67	46,571	2,587.28	47,032	2,612.89
18	47,493	2,638.50	47,968	2,664.89	48,443	2,691.28
19	48,918	2,717.67	49,407	2,744.83	49,896	2,772.00
20	50,385	2,799.17	50,889	2,827.17	51,393	2,855.17
21	51,897	2,883.17	52,416	2,912.00	52,935	2,940.83
22	53,453	2,969.61	53,988	2,999.33	54,522	3,029.00
23	55,058	3,058.78	55,609	3,089.39	56,159	3,119.94
24	56,709	3,150.50	57,276	3,182.00	57,843	3,213.50
25	58,409	3,244.94	58,993	3,277.39	59,577	3,309.83
26	60,162	3,342.33	60,764	3,375.78	61,365	3,409.17
27	61,967	3,442.61	62,587	3,477.06	63,206	3,511.44
28	63,826	3,545.89	64,464	3,581.33	65,103	3,616.83
29	65,741	3,652.28	66,398	3,688.78	67,056	3,725.33
30	67,713	3,761.83	68,390	3,799.44	69,067	3,837.06

Step	12-Month					
	Full		a		b	
	Annual	Semi-Monthly	Annual	Semi-Monthly	Annual	Semi-Monthly
1	35,118	1,463.25	35,469	1,477.88	35,820	1,492.50
2	36,172	1,507.17	36,534	1,522.25	36,895	1,537.29
3	37,256	1,552.33	37,629	1,567.88	38,001	1,583.38
4	38,375	1,598.96	38,759	1,614.96	39,143	1,630.96
5	39,526	1,646.92	39,921	1,663.38	40,317	1,679.88
6	40,713	1,696.38	41,120	1,713.33	41,527	1,730.29
7	41,933	1,747.21	42,352	1,764.67	42,772	1,782.17
8	43,190	1,799.58	43,622	1,817.58	44,054	1,835.58
9	44,486	1,853.58	44,931	1,872.13	45,376	1,890.67
10	45,821	1,909.21	46,279	1,928.29	46,737	1,947.38
11	47,196	1,966.50	47,668	1,986.17	48,140	2,005.83
12	48,612	2,025.50	49,098	2,045.75	49,584	2,066.00
13	50,070	2,086.25	50,571	2,107.13	51,071	2,127.96
14	51,573	2,148.88	52,089	2,170.38	52,604	2,191.83
15	53,119	2,213.29	53,650	2,235.42	54,181	2,257.54
16	54,713	2,279.71	55,260	2,302.50	55,807	2,325.29
17	56,354	2,348.08	56,918	2,371.58	57,481	2,395.04
18	58,046	2,418.58	58,626	2,442.75	59,207	2,466.96
19	59,786	2,491.08	60,384	2,516.00	60,982	2,540.92
20	61,580	2,565.83	62,196	2,591.50	62,812	2,617.17
21	63,427	2,642.79	64,061	2,669.21	64,696	2,695.67
22	65,330	2,722.08	65,983	2,749.29	66,637	2,776.54
23	67,290	2,803.75	67,963	2,831.79	68,636	2,859.83
24	69,308	2,887.83	70,001	2,916.71	70,694	2,945.58
25	71,388	2,974.50	72,102	3,004.25	72,816	3,034.00
26	73,530	3,063.75	74,265	3,094.38	75,001	3,125.04
27	75,736	3,155.67	76,493	3,187.21	77,251	3,218.79
28	78,007	3,250.29	78,787	3,282.79	79,567	3,315.29
29	80,347	3,347.79	81,150	3,381.25	81,954	3,414.75
30	82,758	3,448.25	83,586	3,482.75	84,413	3,517.21

Motion No. 3154 Passed with one opposed
[to be submitted to the Board of Trustees June 12, 1998].

MOTION NO. 3155: Beverly Heckart moved approval of changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure the following as a package, withdrawing the Issue of Phased Retirement.

Motion No. 3155a: John Alsoszatai-Petheo moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to divide the question.

Motion No. 3154a Passed

MOTION NO. 3156 Beverly Heckart moved approval of changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure as follows:

ISSUE OF ORGANIZATION

3.25 Committees

- A. The Faculty Senate shall establish the following standing committees, with powers and duties as described;
6. The Faculty Senate Public Affairs Committee shall be concerned with matters relating to developing and expressing faculty positions for presentation by authorized university representatives before the State Legislature, Congress and other legislative bodies, as well as other bodies, public and private, which affect faculty interests and welfare. It shall advise the Faculty Legislative Representative(s), ascertain and articulate faculty positions on issues, act as liaison with the Director of Governmental Relations, and do other such similar things as may be requested by or approved by the Senate Executive Committee.

~~Sections IV.B.1. and 2. of the Senate Bylaws notwithstanding, the membership of the Public Affairs Committee will be the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Legislative Representative, two members of the Council of Faculty Representatives, and one or more additional faculty members. The Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate shall chair the committee.~~ [BT Motion 92-57, 6/12/92] [BT Motion 94-27, 6/10/94]

Rationale: Faculty Code Section 3.20 Officers of the Senate provides that the Faculty Senate shall have a chair and "such other principal officers, with their powers and duties, as established by its Bylaws." Therefore there is no need for the section proposed for deletion, as the Senate can determine the composition of this committee by altering the bylaws. Deleting this section will provide more flexibility for the Senate.

Motion No 3156 Passed [to be submitted to the Board of Trustees June 12, 1998].

MOTION NO. 3157 Beverly Heckart moved approval of changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure as follows:

ISSUE OF TENURE

Changes to conform with desires of provost:

5.25 Acquisition of Tenure - Probationary Periods

The decision whether to grant, deny or defer tenure shall be made in a manner consistent with the following provisions regarding probationary periods.

- C. A faculty member may, when circumstances make it justifiable, be granted tenure by the Board of Trustees, effective at a specified time prior to the expiration of a six (6) year probationary period with the university. As a general rule, faculty members appointed to the academic rank of Assistant Professor or higher who, at the time of appointment, have completed three (3) years of full-time service at the rank of instructor or higher at other institutions of higher learning, or three (3) years full-time service in other appropriate work, or three (3) years of combined teaching and other appropriate work, shall serve a probationary period of four (4) years, such provision to be made in the faculty member's original letter of appointment.

3. Individuals awarded tenure prior to the completion of the probationary period identified in the original letter of appointment must demonstrate positive, exemplary, and exceptional accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service.

- H. Denial of tenure during the final probationary year identified in the original letter of appointment will result in termination based on the notice requirements in Section 5.50 of this Faculty Code.

Rationale: Occasionally, upon the request of tenure-track probationers supported by their departments, the university awards early tenure as allowed under Faculty Code Section 5.25 C. The proposed addition to Section 5.25 C. attempts to guide departments, deans, and provost so as to justify any breach of consistency that arises when they make such awards. The proposed addition of 5.25 H. simply codifies in this section a practice that already exists and is implied in Section 5.50.

Motion No. 3157 Passed [to be submitted to the Board of Trustees June 12, 1998].

MOTION NO. 3158 Beverly Heckart moved approval of changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure as follows:

ISSUE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Motion No. 3158 FAILED

MOTION NO. 3159: Morris Ubelacker moved and Ken Gamon seconded TO TABLE the rest of the Code changes.

Motion Failed

MOTION NO. 3160: Beverly Heckart moved and Jim Hawkins seconded a motion TO LIMIT DEBATE OF ISSUES TO 5 MINUTES

Motion Passed

MOTION NO. 3161 Beverly Heckart moved approval of changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure as follows:

ISSUE OF SALARY, MERIT, PROMOTION, EVALUATION

(with the changed wording in B.3.: Add: by personnel committees and, independently, by department chairs Replace: Such evaluation shall be with Chairs are responsible for conducting evaluations)

4.60 Non-Tenure-Track Appointments

Non-tenure-track ranked positions and lecturers or adjuncts may be appointed by the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of an academic department, the appropriate academic administrators and the president when, in the judgment of the department, such appointments are desirable to help the department meet teaching loads.

A. Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Ranked Positions and Lecturer - Rights, Privileges, and Limitations

Except as otherwise provided in the Faculty Code, full-time non-tenure-track appointees shall have the following rights and privileges, and are subject to the following limitations: . . .

8. Full-time non-tenure-track appointees shall be evaluated by personnel committees and, independently, by department chairs at least once each year before any renewal of the appointment occurs. Such evaluation shall take Section 4.60 A. 6. of this Faculty Code and the terms of the appointee's contract into account. Department chairs shall inform the dean of the results of the evaluation.

B. Part-Time Non-Tenure-Track (Adjunct) Appointments

3. Adjuncts may be appointed to serve in the following ways: . . .

d. The performance of adjunct appointees' contracted assignments shall be evaluated by personnel committees and, independently, by department chairs at least once each year. Such evaluation shall be in accordance with departmental criteria and procedures. Department chairs shall inform the dean of the results of the evaluation.

8.80 Tenured Faculty Review

Tenured faculty shall be reviewed by departmental personnel committees and, independently, by department chairs at least once every three years. Merit or promotion review may constitute such a continuing performance evaluation; if merit or promotion reviews do not occur for a given faculty member during a three-year period, a separate performance evaluation shall be conducted. The criteria and procedures for such evaluation shall be consistent with those for the award of merit and promotion.

Phased retirees shall be evaluated by departmental personnel committees and, independently, by department chairs at least once every three years in accordance with Section 9.92. G. of this Faculty Code.

Through the review of tenured faculty, the university encourages and assists faculty members in their efforts to improve professionally.

Rationale: The guidelines for the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges require, as a condition of accreditation, that universities evaluate all instructors. The proposed changes would satisfy these guidelines and codify policies that are already in the process of implementation.

C. Promotions in Rank - Procedure

Promotions in academic rank shall be determined annually according to the following procedure:

2. In January of each year the appropriate deans will prepare a list of all faculty in ~~his~~ their schools or areas who appear eligible for promotion according to the provisions of this code.
3. It is the responsibility of faculty members to update The Personnel Committee of the department or the department as a whole may prepare a ~~priority~~ list of recommendations for promotion to the dean. The department chair shall submit an independent ~~priority~~ list of recommendations for promotion to the dean. The department chair will inform qualified faculty members of their placement on the chair's ~~priority~~ list, of the priority ranking recommendation of the Personnel Committee whenever relevant, prior to the transmission of the list(s) to the appropriate administrator.

At each level. . . .

4. The dean will receive. . . .

The dean will meet. . . .

The school dean will prepare ~~priority~~ lists, by rank, of faculty members within the school who are recommended for promotion. ~~After the list has been prepared, the dean will review the list with each department chair and the representative. The final priority list prepared by the dean will show only one name for each priority position.~~ The dean will notify each eligible faculty member in writing ~~indicating the person's priority ranking and~~ whether or not he/she is being recommended for promotion. This information shall remain in the personnel files only upon the written consent of the faculty member.

Rationale: Many faculty as well as members of the Academic Affairs Council have argued for the last several years that no priority ranking for promotion should occur. Faculty either meet the requirement for and receive promotion or they do not. The proposed changes respond to those arguments.

Motion No. 3161 Passed [to be submitted to the Board of Trustees June 12, 1998].

MOTION NO. 3162 Beverly Heckart moved approval of changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure as follows:

ISSUE OF LEAVE

9.15 Professional Leave - Special Conditions

- K. The ~~period of year on~~ professional leave shall be counted as a ~~period year~~ of service to the university, with seniority and retirement rights retained and insurance and other similar benefits continued.

9.40 Retraining Leave

Retraining leave provides assistance at full salary for one or more quarters of an academic year to those faculty desiring to retrain to benefit the university. . . .

9.42 Retraining Leave - Eligibility and Procedures

- A. The Board of Trustees may award a retraining leave to any tenured faculty member defined in Section 4.20 of this Faculty Code. Such tenured faculty member shall have at least four years (48 months) of service at Central Washington University.

- D. Other conditions relating to retraining leave are as follows:

4. The ~~period of year on~~ retraining leave shall be counted as a ~~period year~~ of service to the university, with seniority and retirement rights retained and insurance and other similar benefits continued (RCW 28.10.650).

Rationale: The proposed changes to the professional and retraining leave policies would clarify issues that have proved to be contentious in the past. Making such changes will guarantee faculty members certain benefits and assure that leaves fulfill the purpose of retraining.

Motion No. 3162 Passed [to be submitted to the Board of Trustees June 12, 1998].

MOTION NO. 3163 Beverly Heckart moved approval of changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure as follows:

ISSUE OF CHAIRS' CONTRACTS

14.40 Chairs - Contracts

The contract for chairs shall normally extend for nine months of the academic year. Chairs with longer than normal contracts shall have monthly duties enumerated by the dean that are comparable to the duties performed in each of the other nine months. The schedule of compensation for chairs in money and released time shall be published annually along with the faculty salary scale.

Rationale: Some of the more recent contracts for chairs have been written for ten, eleven and twelve months, while many others remain at nine months. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee charged the Code Committee this year with codifying this new practice with a view to creating fairness and consistency in the treatment of chairs. Investigations on the part of the Code Committee yielded no explicit reasons for lengthening the term of the chairs' contracts, so the Committee recommends that the normal chairs' contract remain at nine months. If the extra duties justify a longer term, deans and provost should enumerate them in the chair's contract so that the justification becomes transparent to everyone.

Motion No. 3163 Passed [to be submitted to the Board of Trustees June 12, 1998].

2. BUDGET COMMITTEE

MOTION NO. 3164 Barney Erickson moved approved of "The 2% salary increase approved for the 1998-99 fiscal year be used as an across-the-board scale adjustment."

Motion No 3164 Passed with two opposed
[to be submitted to the Board of Trustees June 12, 1998].

NEW BUSINESS: Motion from John Alsoszatai-Petheo:

"In keeping with past motions of the faculty Senate, and in view of the Board of Trustee's actions, that the Executive Committee form an Ad Hoc Committee; which will meet over the coming summer, to continue the preparation of materials outlining those responsibilities to be retained by the Senate, those responsibilities to be assumed by the United Faculty of Central (UFC), and those areas of joint interest to both."

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

*****NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING:, June 3, 1998*****

SUB 204/205

ROLL CALL 1997-98
 FACULTY SENATE MEETING: 5/20/98

- ALSOSZATAI-PETHEO, John
- AMATO, Sara
- BAXTER, Louise
- BEAGHAN, Jim X
- BRODERSEN, Bret X
- CLEARLY, Delores
- COCHEBA, Don X
- CUMMINGS, Bobby
- D'ACQUISTO, Leo
- DEMOREST, Claire
- DeVIETTI, Terry
- ELY, Lisa
- EMMANS, Cindy
- FORDAN, Robert
- GAMON, Ken
- GRAY, Loretta
- GUNN, Gerald
- HAWKINS, Jim
- HOOD, Webster
- KAMINSKI, Walter
- KIDWELL, Michelle
- LEWIS, Keith
- MONSON, Luetta
- MUSTAIN, Wendy
- NELSON, Ivory
- NESSELROAD, Sidney
- NGALAMULUME, Kalala
- O'SHAUGHNESSY, Patrick X
- PERKINS, Rob
- PRIGGE, Debra
- RICHMOND, Lynn
- ROMBOY, Dieter
- ROSELL, Sharon
- RUSSELL, Amy X
- SCHAEFER, Todd
- SOLIZ, Jean X
- SPENCER, Andrew
- THOMAS, Carin X
- THYFAULT, Alberta *See Tac*
- UBELACKER, Morris X
- WILLIAMS, Wendy
- WYATT, Marla

- HACKENBERGER, Steven
- OWENS, Patrick
- RAUBESON, Linda
- vacant
- BENSON, William
- GHOSH, Koushik
- OLSON, Steve
- JEFFERIES, Stephen
- COLLINS, James
- HINTHORNE, James
- BEATH, Linda
- GARRETT, Roger
- HARPER, James
- CIOFFI, Frank
- FAIRBURN, Wayne
- ZETTERBERG, Mark
- BURKHOLDER, Peter
- HOLDEN, LAD
- GELLENBECK, Ed
- BACH, Glen
- WOODCOCK, Don
- DAUWALDER, David
- HECKART, Beverly
- HOLTFRETER, Robert
- BERTELSON, Cathy
- CAPLES, Minerva
- BRADLEY, James
- MORENO, Stella
- BRAUNSTEIN, Michael
- GILLESPIE, Amy
- WIRTH, Rex
- OLIVERO, Michael
- BOERS, Geoffrey
- KURTZ, Martha
- MADLEY, Susan
- ALWIN, John
- WEYANDT, Lisa
- SCHACTLER, Carolyn

*Hectay
 mefeh
 Clara
 Dauwaller* *Blackett
 Paul Gross* *Radke
 Eubank*

Motion:

In keeping with past motions of the Faculty Senate, and in view of the Board of Trustee's actions, that the Executive Committee form an Ad Hoc Committee; which will meet over the coming summer, to continue the preparation of materials outlining those responsibilities to be retained by the Senate, those responsibilities to be assumed by the United Faculty of Central (UFC), and those areas of joint interest to both.



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost / Vice President
for Academic Affairs

RECEIVED
MAY 12 1998
CWU FACULTY SENATE

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 12, 1998

TO: Rob Perkins, Chair, Faculty Senate

FROM: David P. Dauwalder, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs *D.P. Dauwalder*

COPIES: Academic Affairs Council

SUBJECT: APPOINTMENTS TO UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

Thank you and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for the careful consideration placed in to the nomination of faculty to serve on university committees. Members of the Academic Affairs Council have reviewed and discussed the nominations forwarded. Following is the list of nominees that has emerged from our discussions.

<u>Committee</u>	<u>Faculty Nominee</u>	<u>Department</u>
Affirmative Action	Lad Holden*	Industrial Engineering Technology
Affirmative Action Grievance	Robert Fordan* Jan Bowers	Communications Family & Consumer Sciences
Assessment	Louise Baxter	Biological Sciences
Athletics	Mark Zetterberg	Theatre Arts
Campus Judicial Council	Mary Wise	Library & Media Services
Campus Safety & Health	Dale Wilson	Industrial Engineering Technology
Campus Site & Development	Carrie Rehkopf-Michel	Music
Classified Staff Grievance	Peter Saunders Mary Wise	Economics Library & Media Services
Faculty Development & Research	Thomas Wellock Marte Fallshore Peter Saunders	History Psychology Economics

R. Perkins

-2-

May 12, 1998

<u>Committee</u>	<u>Faculty Nominee</u>	<u>Department</u>
General Education	Lois Breedlove Toni Culjak* Karl Lillquist* Joan Amby	Communications English Geography Family & Consumer Sciences
Graduate Council	Margaret Beilke Russ Schultz	Administrative Mgt & Business Ed. Music
International Programs Advisory	Kelton Knight Roxanne Easley	Foreign Language History
Library Advisory	Javier M. de Valasco William Folkestad Chris Lee	Foreign Languages Art Business Administration
Professional & Retraining Leave	CJK Papadopoulos Barney Erickson	Art Mathematics
Retirement & Insurance	William Owen	Mathematics
Services & Activity, Fee	Roger Matteson	Industrial Engineering Technology
University Computing	Rodney Bransdorfer William Turnquist	Foreign Languages Business Administration
University Professional Education Council	Connie Lambert Steve Schmitz Martha Kurtz Mike Emme	Teacher Ed Programs Teacher Ed Programs Chemistry Art

*Nominee differs from the nominee forwarded by the Executive Committee

In addition two individuals were suggested for service on the Faculty Grievance Committee, though neither has been contacted to determine interest in serving: Alberta Thyfault (Teacher Education Programs) and Michael Chinn (Art).

Please note any concerns regarding any appointment on this list before the end of May. I will send appointment letters to each faculty member in June or shortly after receiving a response.



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Office of the Dean
College of Education and Professional Studies

RECEIVED
MAY 13 1998
CWU FACULTY SENATE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Rob Perkins, Faculty Senate

FROM: Lin D. Douglas, Dean *Lin D. Douglas*

DATE: May 13, 1998

RE: Summer Thesis for Faculty

Per section 15.4 of the Faculty Code, the College of Education and Professional Studies adopted the following pay schedule for summer thesis work. The rationale for this pay formula is to recognize and reward faculty work while respecting the departments' wishes to maintain a stable revenue sharing base to support other departmental initiatives during the academic year.

Formula: A maximum allocation of \$500 per thesis committee for students completing their Master's program during summer quarter. The allocation may be distributed differently, by departments, across committee members (i.e. \$500 to the committee chair only, \$300 to the committee chair and \$100 to each committee member, \$400 to the committee chair). The departmental allocation decision is influenced by their wish to maintain stable revenue sharing dollars. Each department has capped a maximum total distribution of \$2,000/individual for summer thesis pay.

I invite the Executive Committee to review the thesis pay process in the CEPS.

- c Provost
- Dr. Alawiye
- Dr. Bowers
- Dr. Byrd
- Dr. Gregor
- Dr. Schomer
- Professor Yoxtheimer



United Faculty of Central
111 Peavine Road
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: 962-7258

May 18, 1998

Robert Perkins, Chair, Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Barge 409 • 400 East 8th Avenue
Ellensburg, WA 98926-7509

Dear Dr Perkins:

As you know, last fall the United Faculty of Central sent out a bargaining issues survey to all faculty. Based on their responses to that survey, we have drafted a set of interest statements and some specific bargaining proposals. On Monday, June 1, from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. in Sub 208, we plan to hold a Bargaining Issues Forum to share these proposals with all members of the bargaining unit.

Information from this Forum will be incorporated into the draft of our bargaining proposals. Once that draft is completed, it will be sent to each faculty member for review, and for any further changes, additions, or deletions. Once these changes are made, the final draft will be sent out again, with a ballot, for the faculty's approval for bargaining purposes.

The Faculty Senate has traditionally expressed an interest in informing itself on union-related issues. Moreover, since the Board of Trustees has recently formed a subcommittee to formulate a time line for collective bargaining, we would like to make sure that the Executive Committee stays informed. Therefore, we extend to you, and to the other members of the Senate Executive Committee, a special invitation to attend.

We hope to see all of you there.

Sincerely,

Ken Gamon, Co-President, UFC

Patricia Garrison, Co-President, UFC

cc: Bobby Cummings
Terry DeVietti
Jim Hawkins
Michele Kidwell
Sidney Nesselroad
John Alsoszatai-Petheo

Date sent: **Wed, 13 May 1998 07:26:30 -0700**
From: **Lynn Richmond <richmond@cwu.edu>**
Subject: **advice re hybrid transferable ATA degrees**
To: **senate@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU**
Copies to: **nixond@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU, spallh@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU, lasikj@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU**

Good morning Rob,

May I ask your advice re. a challenge facing us (Don Nixon and me) in our work with our community college partners to fashion a conceptually new hybrid ATA comm coll degree that could be transferable to specific CWU programs? (As you know President Nelson is not only aware of this possibility, he is enthusiastically supporting it as something that we at CWU might have exclusively--at least until the competition catches up!) This new degree possibility will assist our community college partners serve their students by giving their technically trained students a new opportunity to obtain a four-year degree. We think it will have great appeal to legislators, parents, community college students, administrators and faculty at our partner community colleges, etc.--as well as providing Central a potentially huge pool of potential students.

There are of course a few challenges--most immediately, one that involves the faculty senate and the Gen Ed committee. At this time the challenge is the movement on the part of the Gen Ed committee to redesignate Gen Ed courses for lower division credit only. Thus far, we have not seen any absolute prohibition against permitting a Gen Ed course at the upper division level, but instead just a movement to renumber the Gen Ed courses for lower division credit only.

While conceptually it may be unimportant whether such courses are numbered at the upper or lower division level on the campus, it is another matter at the centers where the articulation agreements with our community college partners preclude the centers offering ANY lower division courses. And since the proposed new hybrid transferable ATA degree will require Central to offer about 20 credits of Gen Ed approved courses--usually at our centers, these courses will have to be available for upper division credit.

Separately, we have learned from our associate dean, John Lasik, that the members of the Gen Ed committee (although not necessarily the chair), have become more sympathetic to what we are attempting to accomplish once they understood our objectives--and the limitations due to the requirements of the articulation agreements.

Now the question for your advice: would you advise us (me) to propose a motion to express the senate's support for the concept of permitting the university centers the option to offer, through the regular departments, a limited number of the currently approved Gen Ed courses for upper division credit (e.g., could change one or two Gen Ed approved courses back to the 300 level as they were prior to the recent round of course renumbering--such as ECON 356) as well as requesting the Gen Ed committee to consider providing Gen Ed credit for a limited number of specific courses which currently do not have such approval (e.g., ENG 329, POSC 370, and GEOG 308).

Such a direct approach through the Senate probably would be our preference, but alternatively you might want to recommend some alternative process, e.g., taking both aspects to the Gen Ed committee directly, or ...??

We would appreciate your advice.

Date sent: Wed, 20 May 1998 09:20:48 -0700 (PDT)
From: Carolyn Clark <clrk@wsu.edu>
Subject: Faculty input to the 2020 Commission
To: gamonk@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU, bentonr@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU, alumbaugh@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU, senate@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU, tbonsor@mail.ewu.edu, dlindekugel@mail.ewu.edu, balvin@mail.ewu.edu, swilson@mail.ewu.edu, romanoe@elwha.evergreen.edu, mhenders@elwha.evergreen.edu, taylorn@elwha.evergreen.edu, clrk@wsu.edu, eaustin@wsu.edu, greenberg@wsu.edu, stock@mme.wsu.edu, fasenoff@mail.wsu.edu, eames@cc.wvu.edu, bmathers@henson.cc.wvu.edu, jmelious@mail2.admcs.wvu.edu, ahealy@nessie.cc.wvu.edu, taricani@u.washington.edu, aberg@u.washington.edu, jsgardne@u.washington.edu
Copies to: Rob Perkins <perkinsr@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, Sandra Christensen <schristensen@mail.ewu.edu>, Evelia Romanoe Thuesen <romanoe@elwha.evergreen.edu>, Mary Wack <mwack@mail.wsu.edu>, Chris Bulcroft <kbulcroft@cms.wvu.edu>, Jackie Gardner <jsgardne@u.washington.edu>, Kathie Friedman-Kasaba <friedman@u.washington.edu>

I don't know whether you have followed up on Stan Marshburn's invitation to send a vision-type statement from your campus to the 2020 Commission. In any case, there was an interesting sequence of comments yesterday at the end of a short talk by one of the 2020 Commission co chairs, Jack Creighton.

From the audience, a comment from Senator Harriet Spanel (D, Bellingham): It doesn't seem that you've gotten input from those who will be most directly affected by change in higher education, the faculty and staff. And they may have some good ideas.

Creighton: we're talking to university administrators and [something to the affect] they can speak for faculty. And, too, we have an email address where they can communicate with us.

Spanel: Maybe something more?

Creighton: What would you suggest?

President Karen Morse (WWU): There is a Council of Faculty Representatives Creighton: Oh.

Evelia and I were sitting next to Sen. Spanel and Pres. Morse -- so we could thank them immediately (and tell them a bit about our mtg in April with Stan Marshburn). I talked to Creighton immediately afterwards, volunteered to collect a group of faculty who are involved with campus change, either directly through new ways of delivering edn or through policy-type efforts. He asked how we would communicate with the Commn. I said I believed it would be most fruitful if we could talk, rather than put things on paper, but He has my card; and based on what he had to say, I expect we'll probably hear from him soon.

More later about the Roundtable.

Carolyn Clark
Department of Economics, Washington State University