

10-28-1998

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 10/28/1998

Marsha Brandt

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

Recommended Citation

Brandt, Marsha, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 10/28/1998" (1998). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 552.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/552>

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 SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES: October 28, 1998

Presiding Officer: John Alsoszatai-Petheo

Recording Secretary: Marsha Brandt

Meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Karen Adamson, Sara Amato, and Jim Beaghan.

Visitors: Among approximately thirty: Glen Bach, James Collins, Bobby Cummings, Barry Donahue, James Eubanks, Patricia Garrison, Ryan Golze, Reporter for ENDO Settle, Peggy Holmes, Rob Lowrey, Victor Marx, Abdul Nasser, Sid Nesselroad, Jim Nylander, James Pappas, Robert Perkins, Barbara Radke, Connie Roberts, Russ Schultz, and Sarah Shumate.

TOPIC OF DISCUSSION:

1. "The action of the Board of Trustees on Friday, October 9, 1998, on Theme 5 in light of:
 - a) the two resolutions passed in the Senate relative to this Theme on Wednesday, October 7, 1998,
 - b) the substance of the meetings that many of us attended with Board members on Thursday, October 8, 1998, and
 - c) the many responses from our Faculty regarding this Theme.
2. The current leadership in our University in terms of role, responsibilities, and tenure."

MOTION NO 3176: (Withdrawn) Morris Uebelacker moved and Jim Hawkins seconded a motion to conduct a vote of Confidence on the President

Senator Blaine Wilson requested the motion be taken to the departments for discussion prior to voting.

Chair Alsoszatai-Petheo stated that the Senate ByLaws require waiting until the next meeting if one senator requests it.

AMENDED REFERENDUM MOTION NO. 3177: (To be Voted on 11/4/98) Jim Hawkins moved and Keith Lewis seconded a motion, as amended by Michael Braunstein and Seconded by Morris Uebelacker

"Whereas actions taken by President Nelson and administrators reporting to President Nelson are believed by the faculty to not be in the best interests of the University; and

Whereas a campus climate task force report given in 1996 indicated serious problems with campus morale; and

Whereas subsequent actions by President Nelson and his administrators has not improved but in fact has worsened campus climate; and

Be it resolved: that the Faculty Senate within two weeks from November 4, 1998, will sponsor and conduct among the entire faculty eligible to vote for faculty senators, a formal vote to ascertain the "confidence" or "no confidence" the faculty have in President Ivory Nelson in his capacity as President of Central Washington University. And be it further resolved; that the results of this vote of confidence will be made available to the faculty, the President and the Board of Trustees."

Senator Schwing requested that the motion be taken to the departments for discussion prior to a vote.

Senator Uebelacker urged senators to also discuss the impact the vote will have.

DISCUSSION:

- Comment: A senator expressed disappointment over the Board of Trustees' action at its October 9, 1998, meeting.
- Comment: I've heard numerous faculty react, feeling the Senate was presented with an opportunity to support an option presented by the Board of Trustees to be voted on. That set of 3 options was never voted on. Therefore, the first order of business is to reassert the Senate's support of Option 2 of Theme 5.
- Question: Could you provide more background?
- Comment: The senator explained Theme 5 (dealing with government structures of the institution) of the Theme's Document of the Board of Trustees and Options 1, 2 and 3 of Theme 5. The option supported by the Faculty Senate was Option 2 which is a collective bargaining relationship with the United Faculty of Central as the faculties representative for union types of issues. Those three options were set aside by the Board of Trustees for an omnibus option that actually originated as a statement of principles from the Senate which was presented as an overall set of values. At the Board meeting, that statement was substituted in place of Options 1, 2, or 3. I recommend that we get back to recommending a vote on the Options, and that the Senate supports Option 2.
- Comment: There is a history here. The issue is the Board's willingness to listen to the Senate. Twice before, this body, since 1994, has unanimously passed resolutions. Both times nothing happened. What are we doing here! We have to start looking at what we have here and do something about it.
- Question: Is it too late to reword the resolution with stronger language?
- Chair Alsozszatai-Petheo read Motion No. 3175 from the October 7, 1998, minutes of the Faculty Senate.
- Comment: It seems that what we are hearing from the Board is that they would like to deal with the Faculty Senate because they can ignore it when they want to. Neither the Senate nor the United Faculty of Central as a collective bargaining agent see it as an "either/or" between the Senate and collective bargaining. In fact, the United Faculty of Central feels very strongly that the only way to put teeth in the Senate is through a contract.
- Comment: In my department we're concerned about a number of issues, not simply the union. Is it your contention that nothing can be done without a union?
- Comment: It seems that collective bargaining is one of an array of possible solutions. I was glad to see the Board's response when senators met with them. I'm new here and I have never seen such a group of angry and depressed people. We have a larger leadership issue and I've heard non-union supporters expressing the very same level of frustration as union supporters in terms of larger leadership issues. I watched the Senate pass the resolution saying that we, at least, want to get to our peers in the State's level of salary. I have seen the Senate blamed for the wide disparity of promotional increases that came out recently, whereas the Senate's council was not sought on this. There are issues of communication and leadership. One solution is collective bargaining. The larger issue is whether the Board is hearing us on a number of issues.
- Comment: There is a discussion that needs to take place regarding leadership. I'm not certain the union issue is absolutely linked to the leadership problems. The faculty in my department were very unanimous in wanting me to vote on votes of No Confidence in the President, not whether or not we wanted to send a message back to the Board regarding the union.
- Comment: Our faculty also have expressed a certain amount of anger at the Board's ignoring what the Senate sent out as well -- which is related to the union issue. However, most of the concern is related to the trust and effectiveness of the administration.
- Comment: Let's not stray too far. The union issue served to focus on how much power or influence the Senate has. The Senate can work very hard and do great things and the Board has the right to ignore it. There is something wrong with this and the action on Theme 5 focused on that problem.
- Comment: Our department also felt the Board did not listen to faculty nor does it respond to the Faculty Senate.
- Comment: I don't in any way disagree with anything that is being put forth here. I think we do have a larger issue that is about confidence. The reason we are here is a direct result of how the Trustees chose to act on an issue the Senate had weighed in on with a large majority and justified their improper action with recourse to the power of the Senate. There is a powerful issue that in this case is about a motion that regarded the union in collective bargaining that underscored and pointed this thing out. I think we would be remiss at some point today not to reaffirm the resolution that was ignored.
- Comment: Our discussion serves the good purpose of considering the parallel, if not partnering, roles of the Senate and the collective bargaining agent. There is a communication problem in sending the will of the faculty to someone who will see it as a viable option. A collective bargainer cannot provide to the faculty nor to the administration the things the Senate must do, nor can the Senate arbitrate as a bargaining unit.

- Comment: I would like to acknowledge the thirty to forty students demonstrating outside Barge Hall in support of this meeting and the faculty.
- Comment: I would agree that, as a member of the union, we have always seen that neither the union nor the Senate can do each other's jobs.
- Comment: The real issue here is that we are supposed to have a shared governance model, but nothing happens. It comes down to an issue of power. It's not a communication issue, it's a power issue. Our concerns are being ignored.
- Comment: There is a real cynicism here. I do not like to see the faculty wasting its time pulling teeth. We should get a better hearing from the administration than that. This morning I received a technicolored avalanche of last ditch correspondence from the President. By my standards of dependability and confidence, this came too late to help. It smacks of a cynical desire to manipulate the faculty.
- Comment: Do we have to go to the edge to get this kind of response from the administration?
- Comment: On the other hand, the Faculty Code has holes in it and it needs to be fixed.
- Comment: I agree that the issues in the President's correspondence have been in front of us for years and it's time we deal with them. A vote of No Confidence in the administration will hurt the university in many ways. I was here during previous votes of No Confidence and had to answer phone calls from parents. We need to be fully aware of that impact on us all. It doesn't mean we shouldn't do it. What we are doing is very serious and to have to be brought to this point says a lot about a lack of leadership and it's time we have to take a stand one way or the other.
- Comment: I agree. It also "frosts" me for the President to tell us with these four letters, that we are at the 14th percentile because of the Senate.
- Comment: If we act on our discussion, I would like to hear from people how this will affect us in Olympia, with parents, and with the students.
- Comment: I spent a good deal of time last year interviewing politicians about Central and Central's funding. The perception I got from people who have been top higher education staffers for twenty years is that Central has lost its identity, it is unable to strategize to leverage a new identity or even tell about its accomplishments. Staffers were aware of it, but they say the legislators aren't. I've talked with legislators who have agreed with this, in that other universities with the same funding problems as Central have done a better job on equity and using their resources to make sure students are getting their education. The problem last year with Eastern was a combination of the way money was being spent, including administrative funds, travel expenditures at high levels, and retirement bailout decisions made by their Board which did not serve the students as a whole. Olympia is interested in accountability. How we spend our money, especially in tight times is really important. If we use an analytical approach, we will get good responses.
- Comment: The first sentence of the Strategic Plan says the University is its faculty and the faculty is its institution. Under most situations as people go up in areas of influence, they are endorsed as the best of their colleagues and feel that they are, at least at the lower levels, representing the faculty with the institution. In this case, the higher we go there is an agency of representation from the institution down to the faculty member. This is not the way it should be. The administration of an academy should be, in academicism, a colleague. If we want to narrow the issue down to one of confidence, at present time, I have no confidence in the president in terms of his association with me as a colleague moving the University forward.
- Comment: One thing that has struck me during these meetings with the Senate, my colleagues, and the Trustees is the number of faculty who say, "I'm not a member of the union but..." It seems to be a simple issue of democratic processes that are supposed to represent the wants, desires and issues of a group of people that is not attained here. It doesn't appear as though what we do here matters. So for all of our procedure, we can be ignored at any point. I still value my vote as a senator, but it doesn't appear that the Senate's vote is valued. This process that seems to work for so many aspects of our society is not working here.
- Question: Should the issue of collective bargaining be used as the test case as to whether or not there's a shared governance model operating on campus? It seems to me that to the Board of Trustees, that is the mother of all issues and it may not be, in that sense, the best test case.
- Comment: Recently we have seen unilateral and unjustifiable selective salary raises initiated by this administration supposedly signed off by the Trustees that accentuated problems that were already clearly identified and that the administration and Trustees were pledged to address and yet the raises exasperated compression and morale. The Campus Climate Taskforce's findings have been given only tokenistic responses. If the root problem is morale, and the root cause of morale problems has to do with governance, and governance has something to do with power and influence, and over and over again the faculty has supported

the idea of unions and the Senate has supported the union in their quest for a collective bargaining relationship; then it seems to me so central that we might as well get down to it. I understand what you're saying: "Is there something that we need to do to build confidence in the Board of Trustees?" I have personally talked with the Board of Trustees regarding collective bargaining for the past two years, and I do not believe the will is there without political pressure.

- Comment: The union is our only means to get shared governance. We have discussed it now for ten years. Why will people want to come here?
- Comment: I think what all this boils down to is shared governance. My opinion is the union is our only means to get shared governance. Is there another way? We have been discussing that for two, three, four years. If we don't do something now, our reputation in Olympia will get worse. We will even find great difficulty in hiring people to come here. How are we going to tell them what it is like to be here?
- Comment: If anyone wants to judge their confidence in President Nelson, read the Strategic Plan he handed out to the Senate a couple of weeks ago and that alone should be enough to judge in favor or against the confidence you have in this administration. Compare that Strategic Plan to the agenda the Board of Trustees is putting forward and the relationship the President has with the Board of Trustees. Do this because the Board of Trustees has proposed to go through an agenda of options which are already spelled out in the Strategic Plan. The President is already moving to collect action items for different objectives from administrative officers on his Strategic Plan. If you want to make a final judgment on the confidence of our administration, please read that plan and the agenda the Board is considering. Please carefully read those two documents.
- Comment: We are getting close to financial exigency. If Initiative 49 passes, it can cause seven percent to come from our budget. We sat here and listened to the President say that he thinks the instructional budget shouldn't be spared. Given the track record of this administrations' decisions, (the Faculty Code doesn't seem to serve us well in those conditions) I don't want them making those kinds of decisions under those conditions.
- Question: Are there other alternate solutions? How will our solution resolve the problem? How are they resolved in other institutions?
- Comment: I'm not sure the problem has not been identified. I guess you could say Central has gone from about the 50th percentile during the past six years to 14th percentile. Our sister institution, Eastern, has gone from about the 37th percentile to the 58th percentile during that time and presently has plans to move to the 68th percentile. The other institutions have better track records on equity. We have serious equity problems within the scale as well as being at the 14th percentile. That means that there are a lot of faculty at the 1st percentile. Other institutions have better interaction between faculty and administration. For example, we in the State have criteria set up by the institutions with regard to accountability. This year, the six institutions have been working toward changing those accountability measures. At the other five institutions, faculty are involved in that and are very well aware of what is being worked on. We are not even aware that they are being worked on.
- Comment: As to solutions, we find ourselves in a very difficult situation right now and a situation that is, in reference to the union issue which is proposed as one solution, pretty classic. We have a management that does not want to recognize a union, so the strategies necessary to achieve recognition of the union are somewhat different than the strategies that must operate in order for the union situation to work once it is established. The law in Washington State is such that we cannot force the administration, through ordinary legal means to recognize a union, it must be by political pressure. Because they haven't listened to reason, and we have given them reasoned, careful and consistent justification and common sense approaches to our union structure which will work and won't be detrimental to the institution, we are involved in attempting to giving them no other option. The thing the union has to do and the faculty has to believe in and help the union do, is to be clear always in our minds that the means by which we need to get to that place (which are about politics), can be set aside in the interest of the institution once we get at the table. The greatest challenge, for all of this -- for the whole faculty and for the administration -- is going to be to understand that we are engaged in a process to get a place at the table right now and that does not define how the process of functioning at the table will proceed. As we think about this, we have to think about how would we address some of these problems. We have to make that good faith effort too, but I wonder about spending our time doing it when we know it will only still be advisory.
- Comment: I'm a junior senator, a senior faculty member, and have been at Central twenty-three years and I chose to come here and I chose to stay, to spend my career here. After twenty-three years, I can look everyone of you in the eyes and say I look forward to coming to work every day, meeting my students -- I'm excited about my career. I hear your comments and I

respect your views; but for one faculty member, I love Central, I love my career, I love Ellensburg, I'm glad I'm here. Yes, I'd like to be paid more, but I chose to come here and I'm choosing to stay here. There are positives here. I think we are ignoring them. We need to look at those too.

- Comment: I absolutely agree with you because I've made similar choices. However, I have colleagues in many departments across colleges some who have literally been in tears over the last couple of weeks over these issues who have families that they need to take care of and the amount of money they are being paid is not adequate to do that. They don't want to leave. In the words of one of my colleagues: "We're being driven out of this place and I don't want to go. What do I do?" As a chair, I said, "Well, you could get another job." Reality is that we're at a point where people have reached a threshold in their emotions and they've reached a threshold as to where their compensation is and they're leaving. We're seeing across campus disenfranchisement, people taking leaves without pay, people quitting the university, resignations. We're at a turning point and we must act. I can't go back and say, "Stay because you love this -- I'm sure your mortgage will take care of itself." I understand what you're saying and I honor you for making those choices. Many of us have. But at the same time, I have to maintain a faculty. We have to maintain a faculty. I've got people in front of classrooms right now who are totally preoccupied. They're not concentrating on their work. It's affecting the students that are here right now. We need to act and I don't know what the right thing to do here is, but it is not to form another committee. It's not to do another equity study for two years. These issues have been before us. I have to have something to say to these people. I was told to come here today and to make sure a vote happened, that they had a right to vote. They want to say something and they want to say it to Ivory. I wish they could say it in private without saying it to the entire State and I think many of them did at the Faculty Forum last week. However, that is not enough. (At this point Senator Uebelacker made a motion to take a vote of No Confidence on the President and Senator Hawkins seconded the motion.)
- Comment: I don't think that those are mutually exclusive concerns over the direction the university is taking right now and its present structure. Love for this valley and the campus and the community are not mutually exclusive. You can't have -- in fact, in the breakout session with the Trustees, it specifically addressed that -- that I love my job, I love my students, I love the whole atmosphere, I love the University -- what it stands for to me -- that's why I am getting involved in this. I want to rectify perceived problems, to help rectify perceived problems so that people in good faith -- this is not the stuff of which hatred, or animosity, or people who would have disrespect or who would try to impugn the institution... I stated that specifically, and in as many words, to the Trustees: Sanchez, Jones, you and President Nelson. I don't know of a single colleague who would try to do anything to damage the credibility of this University.
- Comment: This is really a vote about our confidence in an administrative management philosophy in a very stressful economic and political environment. This is not a vote about a person. Likewise, I've heard no animosity directed toward the President, but a great deal of frustration. I repeat, I've heard no animosity directed toward him as a person. This is an issue about economics and politics, recognizing that this is a very difficult position for any president of any university to be in.
- Comment: I agree with the senator's comments. I don't believe that there is anyone here that is not in that situation. They love the university, they love Ellensburg, they love to teach their students. But that's why we're here, because we do. It's not because we want to get at anyone or any thing.
- Comment: What if we set a future date, with milestones that if the Board and the administration didn't meet these milestones, then we would act and exactly spell out what we're trying to do. Right now I understand this is a motion to get a vote of faculty across campus. Does that make sense or would we just be ignored?
- Comment: My thought is we'd be ignored. It would be a stall game again. How many times do we have to go through this?
- Comment: I'd like to speak against the motion to vote for No Confidence. It is very, very early in the game, in this kind of game, to be voting a No Confidence. I like much better the idea of -- I think the Board of Trustees knows as does the rest of the administration what the Senate is doing here today -- that we are to the point of voting No Confidence in the President. I don't think it is time to do this now. I think it makes a lot more sense to give them a chance, as was pointed out, certain milestones of where we want to go with this, and then vote for No Confidence. The last time we did a vote of No Confidence (and it wasn't that long ago) we were trying to get a decent budget out of Olympia. I think it hurt us immeasurably at that time in trying to get that budget. And I don't care what you say, everybody outside the University is going to look upon this as an emotional reaction to the situation. I think it makes a lot more sense to pull back, think a little bit about

what we're going to do. And note too, what was the administration's reaction the last time we did this? We ended up with Ivory Nelson as President. Who are we going to get next time Saddam Hussain?

Comment: I'm mindful of the points you've made, but confidence is something that grows with experience. I don't know what another six months of experience is going to add to six years. I had written down my reasons for thinking about supporting this motion and I finally came up with this: "I support this motion because I think in the clearest possible sense, there truly is reason to conclude that confidence in this President is misplaced. Confidence comes from satisfying working relationships. It comes from clear evident success at crucial tasks and it comes from a sense that an individual or administrator can rise to both the symbolic and the technical needs of their job. On experience and reflection, I cannot say that I have confidence in this President." I don't think you teach show dogs new tricks. I think there are certain ways that business will be done -- a particular model, a particular set of notions -- I don't think they're effective, I don't think they're appropriate for our current political situation. I sat in the Faculty Forum on Friday and I heard a heartfelt, genuine appeal from the President about the Liberal Arts. and about how important they were to him personally and how crucial they are in education. And then an instantaneous about face where he pointed out that you can't talk that language in Olympia. Well, somebody has to do it and the President is in a role of moral, symbolic, and technical leadership in the operation of the institution and I think it is time to say it hasn't worked for six years and it is not going to work now.

Comment: At this point Senator Blaine Wilson requested the motion be taken to the departments for discussion prior to voting. Chair Alsoszatai-Petheo stated that the Senate ByLaws require waiting until the next meeting which is on November 4, 1998, if one senator requests it. The main motion to vote No Confidence was withdrawn.

Question: What is the scenario if we vote No Confidence? What would a good one be?

Comment: There is a point at which, because of the advisory nature of this body and the unwillingness of the administration and the Trustees to support proactive wishes of this body, certainly on issues of governance and representation, where what you have left are motions which signal that it is not business as usual any more. At this particular point in time, there are a lot of things going on right now on behalf of the faculty. The United Faculty of Central is acting, based on votes and cards and a lot of support coming from the faculty to induce the Board of Trustees to approve collective bargaining. The Senate has weighed in on that and approved it as well and signaled by its vote at its last meeting that it is not in conflict with the role of the Senate. To back off from pursuing this vote of No Confidence at this time is simply buying time for the administration and the Trustees to hope that energy dissipates, things blow over, and the Senate gets over what's probably being perceived by them as a tiff, and what I perceive as a deep essential flaw in how we are being asked to do our job. This would move it along, it would be a milestone where the Trustees would see they have issues they have to address and would signal to the public our belief that the current mode of operation is not appropriate nor fixable as far as the day-to-day operational things, I think we all make our decisions and tend to do our jobs because we care about the place. However, it takes away this continued, absurd notion that the Trustees keep bringing up with the help of the President that somehow we're a deliberative body, and they can ignore us whenever they want.

Question: What would happen if there was a vote of "No Confidence? Are there any legal implications?"

Comment: A vote of No Confidence says to the Board of Trustees that there is no confidence in the presidency. We've had a vote of No Confidence, Provost Edington in 1991 was removed from the position, not from the University and he didn't lose his pay. President Brooks survived the threat of a confidence vote and some changes were made. We have no way of knowing what will happen at this point. The President can resign, or work to correct the lack of confidence. The Board of Trustees can ask him to resign or the Board can say, "let's work together to correct this." We don't know. We don't have the power to say any thing is going to happen other than expressing our lack of confidence.

Comment: This is a vote of No Confidence in the Board of Trustees. Because it is the Board of Trustees that has made the decision which we are now voting No Confidence. That is why I am cautioning that this is a time where you go slowly and negotiate first before you start voting No Confidence.

Comment: I couldn't disagree with you more. At Eastern, were there not votes of No Confidence? Eastern hurt? On the contrary, Eastern is in much better shape than we are. They have collaborative government. No, the vote is directed toward the President, not the Board.

Comment: This is not a new idea. It has been going on for a year. We have been trying to work with the President and the Board to change the way the governance of this institution works. In that sense there is an indirect link to the Board, but the direct link is -- we have looked

at what's happened with this administration and the decisions that have been made and they are lacking. We need a change.

Hawkins: At this point, Senator Hawkins moved to accept the resolution without the first paragraph.

Braunstein: At this point, Senator Braunstein moved to amend the resolution to also delete the second to the last paragraph.

Comment: In terms of the Faculty Code we have a fiduciary responsibility to our colleagues. We need to listen, we need to reach out. The idea of the Senate is that we're uninstructed delegates through this particular body. We stand here as uninstructed delegates to make these particular recommendations. What we are gathered here today to do and if we do decide to take this vote of No Confidence, or a vote of confidence to put it in a positive way -- what we should be concerned with is this issue of managerial style and a collegial institutional model of administration which fundamentally involves all of us because history and the institution itself has suggested that that's when these climes of things we call universities are the strongest. I think that is what is really at issue here. We have perhaps lost sight that we ourselves bear a certain responsibility to that particular kind of drift away from the fundamental concern for the academic mission of the university. I've been here thirty-one years, and I see this as a reawakening of the primacy of the faculty, not just to realize our economic well being, although it is absolutely important to us, but we owe this to our students, the general public, that we stand out for quality and reaffirm that we feel that that particular quality is in danger. It's a matter of managerial philosophy, a matter of reassertion of the faculty presence and in the allocation of resources to the prime mission of the university.

Question: Who writes the job description for the President's position?

Pappas: The Board of Trustees wrote the President's job description. There are several questions I feel are really not answered: The impact on the legislature, the Foundation, the students, and accreditation. The '91/'93 vote of No Confidence had a devastating effect on the University. That's something we need to consider. My purpose is not to back you up as a Vice President. It is very difficult to realize what we have to do to increase our image and stay viable, and stay strong. We need to take a look at the ripple effect. Students are asking what happens if there is a vote of No Confidence. They will ask, "What is NCATE? What is accreditation? Why should I continue to come here?" We have not completely recovered from that. It's a great blow for a Foundation Board member to do fund-raising work when they realize there is a problem. It was already raised last Friday when there was a discussion of a capital campaign. How can alumni be asked for money when there is turmoil at the university? The same occurs with accreditation and the hiring of new faculty. You waved the President's letters and said, "It's too late." Look at those carefully, they are charges and they regard faculty salaries. The Board of Trustees is deeply concerned about the issues and so is Ivory. You have their attention. And, hopefully, something will be done.

Comment: I should be doing more productive things with my teaching responsibilities, trying to help students get internships next quarter. The fact that we are even dealing with this kind of an issue at such a meeting means there is a failure or miscommunication.

Comment: In response to Dr. Pappas, in 1991 there was a vote of confidence on the Provost. He left the office which had nothing to do with NCATE accreditation. That had to do with other problems within the university. There was never a vote of confidence on President Garrity, the Board of Trustees asked President Garrity to resign.

Comment: Also in response to Dr. Pappas: If by doing all of this, we have gained Ivory's attention, I hope we don't need to do this every time we need his attention. If we take this as a substitute for change, it would be a mistake.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

*****NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: November 4, 1998*****
BARGE 412

October 28, 1998

We the undersigned request the following resolution be placed on the agenda for consideration by the faculty senate at its regular meeting November 4, 1998. We further request that senators consult with their departments in the intervening interval between October 28 and November 4, 1998, to comply with the provisions of the Faculty Senate Bylaws contained in Section VI.B.

Whereas actions taken by President Nelson and administrators reporting to President Nelson are believed by the faculty to not be in the best interests of the University; and

Whereas a campus climate task force report given in 1996 indicated serious problems with campus morale; and

Whereas subsequent actions by President Nelson and his administrators has not improved but in fact has worsened campus climate; and

Whereas the faculty have lost confidence and trust in President Nelson's ability to govern this University; now, therefore

Be it resolved: that the Faculty Senate within two weeks from November 4, 1998 will sponsor and conduct among the entire faculty eligible to vote for faculty senators, a formal vote to ascertain the "confidence" or "no confidence" the faculty have in President Ivory Nelson in his capacity as President of Central Washington University. And be it further resolved; that the results of this vote of confidence will be made available to the faculty, the President and the board of trustees.

Signed: See pages attached.

**FACULTY SENATE
SPECIAL MEETING
3:15 p.m., Wednesday, October 28, 1998
Barge 412**

INTERACTIVE CONNECTION: SEATAC

AGENDA

1. "The action of the Board of Trustees on Friday, October 9, 1998, on Theme 5 in light of:
 - a) the two resolutions passed in the Senate relative to this Theme on Wednesday, October 7, 1998,
 - b) the substance of the meetings that many of us attended with Board members on Thursday, October 8, 1998, and
 - c) the many responses from our Faculty regarding this Theme.

2. The current leadership in our University in terms of role, responsibilities, and tenure."

ROLL CALL 1998-99
 FACULTY SENATE MEETING: 10/28/98

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ADAMSON, Karen | <input type="checkbox"/> HOLTFRETER, Robert |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ALSOSZATAI-PETHEO, John | <input type="checkbox"/> HACKENBERGER, Steven |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMATO, Sara | <input type="checkbox"/> OWENS, Patrick |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BAXTER, Louise | <input type="checkbox"/> RAUBESON, Linda |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BEAGHAN, Jim | <input type="checkbox"/> vacant |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BENSON, William | <input type="checkbox"/> DUGAN, Jack |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BLACKETT, Robert | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BRAUNSTEIN, Michael | <input type="checkbox"/> PALMQUIST, Bruce |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BRODERSON, Bret | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> BULLOCK, John | <input type="checkbox"/> KURTZ, Martha |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COCHEBA, Don | <input type="checkbox"/> GHOSH, Koushik |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D'ACQUISTO, Leo | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DEMOREST, Claire | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DeVIETTI, Terry | <input type="checkbox"/> COLLINS, James |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ELY, Lisa | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GAZIS, Carey |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EMMANS, Cindy | <input type="checkbox"/> BEATH, Linda |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FORDAN, Robert | <input type="checkbox"/> GARRETT, Roger |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GAMON, Ken | <input type="checkbox"/> HARPER, James |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GRAY, Loretta | <input type="checkbox"/> POWELL, Joe |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GUNN, Gerald | <input type="checkbox"/> FAIRBURN, Wayne |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HAWKINS, Jim | <input type="checkbox"/> VASEK, Cheri |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HOOD, Webster | <input type="checkbox"/> BURKHOLDER, Peter |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KAMINSKI, Walter | <input type="checkbox"/> HOLDEN, Lad |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LEWIS, Keith | <input type="checkbox"/> BACH, Glen |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MICHEL, John | <input type="checkbox"/> GAUSE, Tom |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MONSON, Luetta | <input type="checkbox"/> WOODCOCK, Don |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MUSTAIN, Wendy | <input type="checkbox"/> JEFFERIES, Stephen |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NELSON, Joshua | <input type="checkbox"/> LEFKOWITZ, Natalie |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NGALAMULUME, Kalala | <input type="checkbox"/> HECKART, Beverly |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRIGGE, Debra | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPLES, Minerva |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RICHMOND, Lynn | <input type="checkbox"/> BRADLEY, James |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCHAEFER, Todd | <input type="checkbox"/> WIRTH, Rex |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCHWING, James | <input type="checkbox"/> DONAHUE, Barry |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> STACY, Gerald | <input type="checkbox"/> ABDALLA, Laila |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SOLIZ, Jean | <input type="checkbox"/> OLIVERO, Michael |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPENCER, Andrew | <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> THYFAULT, Alberta | <input type="checkbox"/> BUTTERFIELD, Carol |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UBELACKER, Morris | <input type="checkbox"/> ALWIN, John |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WILLIAMS, Wendy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WEYANDT, Lisa |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WILSON, Blaine | <input type="checkbox"/> BERTELSON, Cathy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WYATT, Marla | <input type="checkbox"/> SCHACTLER, Carolyn |

24
 27
 36
 67
 38
 38

Date sent: Wed, 21 Oct 1998 07:33:37 -0800
From: Debbi Prigge <prigged@cwu.edu>
Subject: Re: Special Senate Meeting
To: senate@cwu.EDU
Copies to: japetheo@cwu.EDU

Marsha:

Neither I or my alternate will be able to attend to special Senate meeting on 10/28.

Debbi Prigge

>>Minerva:

>>

>>I will not be able to attend the special Senate meeting scheduled
>>for Wednesday, October 28th at 3:15 p.m. Will you be able to attend
>>in my absence? Please let me know ASAP.

>>

>>Thanks!

>>

>>Debbi

>>

>10/20/98

>

>Debbi,

>

>I teach a class from 3:00-3:50 p.m. MWF. Therefore, I am unable to
>attend the Senate meeting. Sorry.

>

>Minerva

>

:) Dr. Debbi Prigge :)
"Those who laugh, last."
Office: (509)963-2133
Message: (509)963-1461
Home: (509)962-2678
E-mail: prigged@cwu.edu

[Handwritten signatures and checkmarks]
✓ Nesselrode
✓ Mack
✓ Barry Donahue
✓ Victor Marx
✓ Connie Roberts
✓ Russ Sepultz
✓ Rob Perkins
✓ James Collins
✓ Rob Lowrey
✓ Nasser
✓ Bobby Cummings
✓ Shymate
✓ Tappes

Date: October 28, 1998

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Jim Nylander ✓
Patricia Jarama
KNIO
Peggy Holmes
Bob Lawrence
Victor Marx
James Burbank
B Cradler

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting.
Thank you.