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Minutes
Central Washington University
Faculty Senate Regular Meeting Minutes: November 4, 1998
http://www.cwu.edu/~fsenate

Presiding Officer: John Alsoszatil-Petheo
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 Braunstein, Monson, and Prigge
Visitors: Among approximately thirty-five: Phil Backlund, Peter Burkholder, Gregory Chann, Bobby Cummings, David Dauwalder, Barry Donahue, Patricia Garrison, Philip Garrison, Ryan Golze, Steven Hackenberger, Peggy Holmes, Rob Lowery, Charles McGehee, Abdul Nasser, Jim Pappas, Robert Perkins, Barbara Radke, Connie Roberts, Russ Schultz, Elizabeth Street, Observer reporter, Amy Fraasier, KND0-Yakima TV reporter, Joseph Roses, Yakima Herald Republic and Daily Record reporter

Changes to and Approval of Agenda: Motion No. 3178 (Passed) Terry DeVietti moved and Bill Benson seconded a motion to approve the agenda as changed to allow the President's Report as the first item on the agenda to allow him to exit and allow the meeting to continue in his absence.

President's Report: President Nelson commented that since the Resolution of the Board of Trustee's passed last October 9th, that he has been meeting with the Faculty Senate Chair and the Board Chair to discuss ways of addressing alternate ideas and we will continue those discussions.

Higher Education Coordinating Board Programmatic Approvals and 1999-01 Operating and Capital Budget Recommendations for Central Washington University: President Nelson to The University Community, October 30, 1998
This information is a recapitulation of Central's success at the Higher Education Coordinating (HEC) Board as relates to our proposals. Our work did somewhat pay off. Three programs were approved. They are recommending a 4.5% each year for faculty salary. The most important part about this is that we think we have a change in the HEC Board in the sense that previously HEC Board members did not lobby or work the legislature. We had dinner with the HEC Board after they passed this resolution the last time, and we have a commitment from the HEC Board Chair and members that they will work with the colleges and universities to help lobby for the dollars for the colleges and universities in the State. This is a tremendous change from previous HEC Boards.

This is the long awaited opinion from the Attorney General's Office regarding salary increases, salary equity, use of local funds in the event a bargaining agreement provides for salary increases greater than legislatively appropriated. ... Copies of the twenty-two-page document may be requested of the President's and/or Faculty Senate's Office.

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the October 7, 1998, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as distributed. The minutes of the October 28, 1998, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

Communications: (Available for viewing in the Senate Office or distribution on request)
Dauwalder: 10/12/98, Re: Proposal for a Faculty Salary Inequity Process
Provost Dauwalder, Chair Schultz (Equity Committee), Executive Committee meet and decided to abide with the Equity Committee's direction as they had hired a consultant and to use the Provost's suggestions as a back up.
Ivory Nelson: 10/26/98: Re: 1) Faculty Code Legislation Governing Promotional Raises
2) Mechanism for Providing Step Increases on the Salary Scale for Full Professors
3) Distribution of Legislatively Appropriated Salary Dollars, University Provided Promotional Dollars, and Any Additional Legislatively Appropriated Dollars
4) Participation of Part-Time, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in the Academic Affairs of the University
These letters have been referred to the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Advisory Committee for discussion and resubmittal to the Senate in a more concrete form for the consideration of the Senate.

Nasser: 10/27/98: Re: Presentation of Information on CWU's budget and financial operations to the Associated Students of Central Washington University (BOD).
He has offered to present it to the Senate as well.

Dauwalder & CWU Deans: 10/20/98: Re: Proposed Changes to the CWU Faculty Code.
The Executive Committee has forwarded this memorandum to the Faculty Senate Code, Ad Hoc Advisory, and Personnel committees.

REPORTS:
A. ACTION ITEMS:

CHAIR: AMENDED REFERENDUM MOTION NO. 3177 (Passed by Roll Call Vote)

27 Yes

10 No
Blackett, Brodersen, Demorest, Ely, Beath, Fordan, On Behalf of the IET Department - Kaminski, On Behalf of the Business Administration Department - Richmond, Stacy, Wilson

"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 for 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."

(Accordingly, "a vote of the entire faculty on the action under review shall be conducted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The voting procedure shall provide for a secret vote of the faculty. The vote shall be completed by November 18, 1998.

The results of the faculty vote will be published on November 18, 1998, via e-mail to all faculty, senators, department chairs, academic administrators and Board of Trustees' members and will be announced formally at the December 2, 1998, meeting of the Senate.

AMENDMENT MOTION NO. 3177A (Withdrawn) Morris Uebelacker moved and Bill Benson seconded a motion to amend Motion No. 3177 to include ballot language text.

MOTION NO. 3178: It was moved & seconded to recess to study the Bylaws.

Chair Elect Linda Beath made a point of privilege to have the Faculty Senate go into Executive Session with the Senate Parliamentarian

Point of Business: Personnel Issues and Applicable Bylaws

Summary of Business Conducted in Executive Session:
No votes or motions took place in executive session.
Report on specific points having to do with Robert's Rules of Order with the nature of the By Laws and their applicability to the situation that we face at this point as far as whether or not we can or cannot go on with a roll call vote. We had ample discussion in terms of the fact that there are a variety of perceived and, in some people's minds, real pitfalls in proceeding with a roll call vote that is public. But I would like to commend the Senators for speaking up one after another in favor of speaking their minds publicly and going on ahead with the roll call vote.
MOTION NO. 3179 (Withdrawn) Uebelacker moved and Williams seconded a motion to amend Motion No. 3177 with ballot language.

MOTION NO. 3180: (Passed) Gamon moved and Hawkins seconded a motion that the structure of the vote give faculty four choices:
1) I have confidence in Ivory V. Nelson in his capacity as President of Central Washington University
2) I have no confidence in Ivory V. Nelson in his capacity as President of Central Washington University.
3) I do not know enough about President Ivory V. Nelson to vote.
4) I abstain.

Discussion:

Comment: What do we do in a situation like this? Where do we go? What is our strategy? Do we have one? I want to communicate three objectives: 1) Is President Nelson competent and effective in his position? 2) Is life at CWU better because of our President? and 3) Where should we invest our valuable time? Historical Background: Five charges to President Nelson from the Board of Trustees in 1991 (never been made public):
1) Academic Plan (We have a Strategic Plan),
2) Better Campus Atmosphere through Diversity (39% of tenure-track faculty are people of color [1996-97], 43% of new tenure-track faculty hires are women, women athletes have increased from 29% in 1992 to 44% in 1996. Minority students have increased from 9.1% to 12.3% in 1996. Faculty Opinion Survey rated the President on this issue at 4.19.),
3) Strong Administrative Team (Evaluation Instruments: Faculty Opinion Survey of the University President, 1998: mean score went up 18% [‘95, 2.3; ‘98, 2.8], improvement was made on 100% of items listed; Independent Evaluators Review of President Nelson: “From the perspective of having worked with and visited many public universities across the United States, the team was especially impressed with Central Washington University. In light of the controversy surrounding his appointment and severe resource limitations the achievement of the Board of Trustees and the President are remarkable.”),
4) Improve Internal Relations (Capital budget: CWU received the largest scholars funding for the Cooperative Library Project, the largest increase in the operating budget during the last two bienniums when compared to sister institutions. Yes, we have a new Black Hall, a new Science Facility, and the improvements that have been made technologically and physically by the previous administration to Shaw-Smyser),
5) Establish Sound Management (In light of Initiative 601: in 1995/96 we had a budget cut of 10.2% [$1.6M] which was absorbed without affecting faculty and staff; in 1995-97 CWU had the largest capital budget in its history; how many of you had computers on your desk in 1991 versus today?) and Increase External Fund Raising (Alumni giving is up 142%, donor base is up 200%, private donations are up 228%, and that we have established faculty professorship).

How has the passage of Initiative 601 limited what our president can do? There are a number of salary issues that can be directed back to this initiative. This initiative limited the increase of state spending to that of inflation and increase in population.

Is life at CWU better? Has improved strategic planning helped us? Has the encouragement of diversity improved our campus? Has the availability of technology improved our campus? Is the increase in external fund raising a positive? Does the acquisition of capital improvement projects make life better?

I would encourage us, rather than taking a vote of No Confidence, that we negotiate with the Board of Trustees and say that we need to establish a set of new charges for the President. The Senate needs to prepare its own Strategic Plan, our own program of work, identifying those issues and priorities we consider vital to submit to the President and the Board of Trustees. Let us negotiate our future using the Senate as our vehicle. Haste makes waste. I hope that as we move forward that we will be patient and give the process of the Senate and the desire of the Board to work with us a chance and not hastily jump to a conclusion and do something that could harm our future.

Comment: Individual faculty might use the above information as they decide how to vote. As a member of the Campus Climate Task Force, I recommend people read both the Campus Climate Task Force Report and the outside assessment and not just the selections we have just seen. Haste makes waste: Almost one and a half years ago, the entire faculty voted by an overwhelming
majority to ask the administration to adopt a model of governance which is a change in how
certain things that have come before the Senate would instead come through a union mechanism
and free the Senate for other sorts of activities. If we want to prove responsiveness o
the part of the administration we would have expected a positive reception of that very
earnest request. That request has been repeated in several ways, including support from the
Senate. It's been ignored. To me this represents the central locus of where I see the
problems to lie. I can't argue with many of the points made about the economics of this. I
have been careful in my criticisms of President Nelson to point out that he has certain
superb skills of energy in financial organization, but they are always reactive; they are
rarely, if ever, visionary; they require an authoritarian or authoritative point of view
rather than a cooperative one. They are not responsive to ideas of different models for
working which the faculty have earnestly asked to be adopted. Because so much of the
previous presentation regarded money, I remind you that this set of issues regarding Senate
empowerment and faculty unionization have never been really about money and salary. They
have been about creating structures that are responsive regardless of the people in the
positions of authority. It's about vision and methods of government that empower us and
create legally meaningful mechanisms for input and protection regardless of president or
board. While I see many of the positive aspects of Dr. Nelson's performances have been
outlined to us, I think they are only part of the picture. As someone who has been working
to try to get some movement and respect for the faculty-stated points of view with Dr.
Nelson for the past two years, I do not believe that shift of point of view and that
willfulness to encompass a broader set of ideas about how the University can do its business
are possible for him. So I would like to see each member of the faculty have an opportunity
to decide that for themselves and say so on a ballot.

Comment: I'm a member of the Associated Students of Central Washington University, Board of
Directors. I'm the Vice President for Academic Affairs. I have to ask, "What are we
doing?" I understand that the situation that we are currently in is grave. I understand
and I can understand why the faculty as a whole are dissatisfied, frustrated. This is your
livelihood. Certainly it's more than a job. I assume that as professors that there are
rewards far beyond the monetary rewards of teaching and that it's not just something you do
to make money, it's rewarding to you. Therefore, when there are great problems and you have
frustrations, it's even more impacting on you, even more important that your voice be heard
and than change is seen. But I don't think this is the correct action to take. I am
concerned that the vote of No Confidence will negatively impact students. I can't say for
sure regarding everything that would or could happen, but as a student I really don't want
to have a degree that is tainted with this vote of No Confidence. Certainly to prospective
students of our university, a vote of No Confidence is not a great attraction. As a student
soon to become an alumnus looking for a job, I am very concerned as to how this will affect
me and the rest of the student body. You most likely received a letter from a group that
calls itself "The Students." In this letter, they cited the negligence of the BOD. What
angers me most about it, disappoints me most, is that they purport that we don't care about
the faculty, that we will just let what happens to happen. That is not the case. I am
concerned about the faculty, but I don't think that any action should be taken, just any
thing should be done to fix the situation. I don't think we have arrived at the point yet
where we need to take such desperate measures. As a student, I want the faculty to have a
high morale, I want the University to have the ability to attract a high quality faculty.
However, I am concerned with the means that we use to reach that. I think we share a common
end, but I can't agree with this method of reaching that end. I also think that a vote of
No Confidence will enlarge the chasm between the faculty and the administration. I think
this will hurt communication, impede the progress that has been made already. We haven't
even seen another Board of Trustees meeting to see how they will react, to see what measures
they plan to implement in order to rectify the situation. I think this is a giant step
backwards. The administration know that the faculty are dissatisfied, this is not going to
be news for them. Yet that is all that this accomplishes. I have heard at this meeting
that it is purely a political move/maneuver in order to reach an end. The administration
already realize that there is a great problem with morale on this campus. I just don't
think this is the way to go about resolving the situation. That is why I am asking you not
to vote for the vote of No Confidence.

Comment: Over two years ago, there was a perceived lack of morale on this campus. A task force was
put together that measured the morale on campus, came to the conclusion the morale was very
low and made a number of recommendations as to what needed to be done to correct that. At
that time there were calls for a vote of No Confidence. The United Faculty was active at
that time and encouraged faculty to wait and see if we couldn't work through the Board of
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Trustees. Two years have elapsed since then and I think that most people would agree that the campus climate was worse now than it was then. To my knowledge, not one truly positive change has happened. We talk about "Haste makes waste," well, "Procrastination kills the activity. I think it is now time.

MOTION NO. 3180 (Passed): Terry DeVietti moved and Bill Benson seconded a motion to limit the discussion to five minutes.

Comment: Collective bargaining has been discussed openly at the Faculty Senate as long as I've been on it for over two years. I believe that the Senate and administration have been working hard and moving forward on the faculty issues that have been raised. After attending the special meeting of the Senate last week, I went back and talked with students whom I've been appointed to represent. I got a good idea of what they felt was best for the student of Central Washington University. Without fail they all asked what was a vote of No Confidence and asked why the faculty want this vote. Other concerns they raised were: 1) What will be the effect of the vote on recruitment and retention of qualified faculty at Central, 2) What will be the effect on the image of Central to Olympia and the outside world, 3) How will this vote effect the chances of graduating seniors in an already tight job market and juniors looking for internship possibilities, 4) What will be the effect on the recruitment of students to Central, 5) Will it make the morale on campus worse rather than better, 6) Are the faculty angry at the President or the Board of Trustees?, and 7) Could this vote hurt the chances of Central in a budget year to receive funds from the legislature? These issues are all valid and should be considered before the vote. I am speaking out against this vote as I feel it could only be harmful, not only to the students, also the faculty. I implore all Senators to defeat this measure which can only bring negative impacts to the Central community.

Comment: I'd like to speak both ways. In the presentation there were a lot of points brought up about how life at CWU was better, but I'm not so sure they are better because of President Nelson. I'm not sure the cause and effect relationship was really shown to us. Although on the other hand, anything that is good that happened is ultimately the off shoot of how administration is carried out here. The Strategic Plan wasn't devised by President Nelson at all. Just allowing them to be created was part of his doing. On the other hand, I do feel we're shooting from the hip. Although this is only my second year on the Senate, I haven't seen the Senate's Plan. Maybe all that goes on somewhere else, but I haven't seen the Senate say this is going to happen by this time, and this by that time, and if it doesn't, we vote.

Comment: I just want to remind senators that this is a referendum to the faculty. We're not going to decide this issue. I'm rather surprised at the gloom and doom. It's very possible that President Nelson might get a vote of confidence. I don't think that will happen, but trust your faculty. I have great confidence in this faculty. They have very good judgment, we've been very patient, we've waited and waited. We've have communicated in the most effective way that I know. I urge that you support this motion.

Comment: Good time on this campus have been pointed to. If these are the good times, I never want to be around during the bad times. Let's let the faculty decide; let them vote.

Comment: I think faculty should have a right to vote on this. I think we all have decided somehow the vote is going to be incredibly negative. That's telling in and of itself. That this is a "done deal." If that's the case, we ought to know it and the President should know it.

B. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. CHAIR: Impasse Committee (Section 1.15, Subsection F.3 of Code) Discussion only.
Chair Alsoszatai-Petheo shared a request from a faculty member for a change in the Faculty Code Section 1.15, Subsection F.3 - Impasse Committee.

   "b. The impasse Committee shall provide written notification of its recommendations to all affected parties. At its next meeting, the Board of Trustees shall review the impassed item and reach its final conclusion propose their final recommendation for ratification by the Faculty Senate. Ratification of the final recommendation of the Board of Trustees by a simple majority of the Faculty Senate completes this process.

   c. If the Faculty Senate fails to ratify the final recommendation of the Board of Trustees as provided in 1.15.F.3 b., the impassed item will be resolved through external.
impartial, finding arbitration, except as provided for in 1.15, F. 3 d. The outcome of such arbitration will be final and binding on all parties, and will result in the adoption of any changes to the Faculty Code determined through the arbitration process.

d. If the Board of Trustees has declared an emergency; and if the Faculty Senate fails to ratify the final recommendation of the Board of Trustees as provided in 1.15, F. 3 b; and if the impassed item hinges on, or materially impacts the conditions of the declared emergency, then the Board of Trustees will provide a written rationale of these circumstances to the faculty Senate, along with their final decision on the impassed item, without further recourse to binding arbitration as provided in 1.15, F. 3 c. The exception to binding arbitration contained in this Subsection (1.15 F. 3 d) shall not be used routinely, or to deny or frustrate the process described in Subsections 1.15 F. 3 b and 1.15 F. 3 c."

For many years it has been bemoaned that the Faculty Code has provisions for the administration and the Board of Trustees to have a final say but it does not have an equivalent clause for the faculty and, therefore, many feel it has no "teeth." This may be a way to implement a system in which there are incentives for both sides to work out differences without having to resort constantly to the last part "reach its final conclusion." This is an addition, not an alteration or omission of any portions of the Code. Instead of reaching a "final conclusion," the Board will propose their final recommendation for ratification by the Faculty Senate, and that the Senate can ratify such a decision by simple majority. If the Senate does not, then it will be passed on to an external and impartial binding arbitrator. The outcome of such arbitration will be final and binding on all parties. In our discussions with the Board members they expressed a concern that there had to be a provision legally for the Board to be able to act in case of a declared official emergency. Section d. of the proposed new section addresses these concerns. The final sentence of section d. states that the exception to binding arbitration contained in this Subsection shall not be used routinely, or to deny or frustrate the process described in the previous Subsections. In other words, this is to be used in good faith.

This proposed Code change has been discussed and has the unanimous support of the Senate Executive Committee. This is being sent to the Code Committee requesting input.

2. CHAIR ELECT No Report

3. FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Charles McGehee, Chair, reported receiving a letter from Ms. Jane Battey, Director of the State Approving Agency, to the Provost reaffirming approval of CWU academic programs for the purpose of enrolling persons eligible to receive certain Federal (veterans') benefits was forwarded to the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee for consideration since the letter indicated that the approving agency requires the following wording to be included in future CWU academic catalogues: "Central Washington University's academic programs of study are approved by the Higher Education Coordinating Board's State Approving Agency (HECB/SAA) for enrollment of persons eligible to receive educational benefits under Title 38 and Title 10, U.S. Code." In the view of the Academic Affairs Committee, this statement is for informational purposes only and adding it to the catalogue does not constitute a policy issue nor does the catalogue editor require the assent of the Senate to include it in the catalogue. It therefore requires no action by the Academic Affairs Committee or the Faculty Senate.

BUDGET COMMITTEE - No Report

CODE COMMITTEE: Chair Alsoszatai-Petheo read the following report submitted by the Code Committee:

"The Senate Code Committee meets every Tuesday, 10-12 a.m., in Science Building 311. So far this year, the Code Committee has rendered one code interpretation allowing replacements when vacancies on the Faculty Grievance Committee occur. It has also begun to discuss the entire issue of faculty load during the academic year and summer session and including the areas of independent study and thesis committees. In conjunction with the issue of load we shall also address, as requested by the Senate Executive Committee, whether set payments should be made to faculty who supervise
graduate theses completed during summer session. In addressing these issues the Code Committee is conferring with representatives of the Senate Personnel Committee. As the Code Committee deals with its many other charges during this academic year, it will continue to report to the Senate on its progress.”

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE No Report

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE No Report

PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Chair Beath commented that at their October 30, 1998, meeting the Public Affairs Committee met with Martha Lindley, Director of Government Relations, who has put together a proposal to address some of Central’s salary equity issues and faculty issues for the state legislature. Partly her proposal is paring up faculty with administrators with Board of Trustees’ members and students to share our stories with various legislators and people in Olympia. The committee will send out an e-mail soliciting volunteers for this proposal. Lindley is also going to write and sponsor some legislation to give additional monies to Central to address salary issues.

NEW BUSINESS:

Faculty Grievance Committee: Faculty Code Section 12.10: Chair Alsoszatai-Petheo read the response of the Code Committee to the Senate’s request for an interpretation as follows:
“When an alternative replaces an original appointee to the Faculty Grievance Committee, a replacement alternate shall be appointed and ratified immediately to complete the remainder of the original appointee’s and alternate’s term.”
The Code Committee also commented: “Even though the current Faculty Code provides for a replacement alternate only at the end of the term, it was not the intention of the Code that either regular or alternate positions on the Faculty Grievance Committee remain vacant for long periods of time.”

MOTION NO. 3181 (Passed) Ken Gamon moved and Terry DeVietti seconded a motion to replace Jim Brown (Chair of Political Science) on the Faculty Grievance Committee with Stephanie Stein, Psychology, for the remainder of the term ending 6/30/99.

MOTION NO. 3182 (Passed) Ken Gamon moved and Bob Fordan seconded a motion to replace Brenda Hubbard (Chair of Theatre Arts) on the Faculty Grievance Committee with Corwin King, Communication, for the remainder of the term ending 6/30/00.

MOTION NO. 3183 (Passed) Lynn Richmond moved and Morris Uebelacker seconded a motion to ratify Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee membership replacement of Joan Amby as CEPS representative with Ken Stege, IET, for the remainder of the term ending 6/15/99.

Senator Benson: Code Change to Summer Salaries: Section 15.30:
Chair Alsoszatai-Petheo commented that in response to Senator Benson’s inquiry about his Code change request, it will be forwarded to the Code Committee in a timely manner.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

***NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: December 2, 1998***

BARGE 412
FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
7:10 p.m., Wednesday, November 4, 1998
BARGE 412
AGENDA

INTERACTIVE CONNECTION: SEATAC

I. ROLL CALL

II. Motion: CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS
   Chair: AMENDED REFERENDUM MOTION NO. 3177

"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;

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."

VI. REPORTS/DISCUSSION ITEMS
   1. CHAIR (15 min.)
   2. CHAIR ELECT (15 min.)
   3. PRESIDENT (15 min.)
   4. SENATE COMMITTEES (35 min.)
      Academic Affairs Committee: Charles McGehee
      Catalogue statement on Higher Education Coordinating Board Affirmation of CWU programs
      Budget Committee: Barney Erickson
      Code Committee
      Curriculum Committee
      Personnel Committee
      Public Affairs Committee

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

***NEXT REGULAR SENATE MEETING: December 2, 1998***
BARGE 412
ROLL CALL 1998-99
FACULTY SENATE MEETING: 11/4/98

AMATON, Karen
ALSOSZATAI-PETHEO, John
AMATO, Sara
BAXTER, Louise
BEAGHAN, Jim
BENSON, William
BLACKETT, Robert
BRAUNSTEIN, Michael
BRODERSON, Bret
BULLOCK, John
COCHEBA, Don
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
LEWIS, Keith
MICHEL, John
MONSON, Luetta
MUSTAIN, Wendy
NELSON, Joshua
NGALAMULUME, Kalala
PRIGGE, Debra
RICHMOND, Lynn
SCHAEFER, Todd
SCHWING, James
SOLIZ, Jean
SPENCER, Andrew
STACY, Gerald
THYFAULT, Alberta
TULIRACKER, Morris
WILLIAMS, Wendy
WILSON, Blaine
WYATT, Marla

HOLTRETER, Robert
HACKENBERGER, Steven
OWENS, Patrick
RAUBESON, Linda
vacant
DUGAN, Jack
Palmquist, Bruce
KURTZ, Martha
GHOSH, Koushik
COLLINS, James
GAZIS, Carey
BEATH, Linda
GARRETT, Roger
HARPER, James
POWELL, Joe
FAIRBURN, Wayne
VASEK, Cheri
BURKHOLDER, Peter
HOLDEN, Lad
BACH, Glen
GAUSE, Tom
WOODCOCK, Don
JEFFERIES, Stephen
LEFKOWITZ, Natalie
HECKART, Beverly
CAPLES, Minerva
BRADLEY, James
WIRTH, Rex
DONAHUE, Barry
OLIVERO, Michael
SNEDEKER, Jeff
ABDALLA, Laila
BUTTERFIELD, Carol
ALWIN, John
WEYANDT, Lisa
BERTELSON, Cathy
SCHACTLER, Carolyn
Date: November 4, 1998

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting.
Thank you.
Redge
Lowry
Pappas
Gregory Chin
Masser
Holmes
Burkhoulder
Dauwalder
Sea TV
Observer
Schultz
Heckenberger
Donohue
Garrison, PA
Phil
Cumming
George
Roberts
Dolze
Backlund
Libby Street
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Alsoszathai-Petheo, Chair, Faculty Senate
    Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: David P. Dauwalder, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
       Liahna Babener, Dean, College of Arts & Humanities
       Lin Douglas, Dean, College of Education & Professional Studies
       Gary Lewis, Dean of Libraries
       John Ninnemann, Dean College of the Sciences
       Roy Savoian, Dean, School of Business & Economics


SUBJECT: PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CWU FACULTY CODE

Date: October 30, 1998

This memo has been developed through discussion among the college and library deans. The issues identified and changes proposed are submitted for consideration by the Faculty Senate through its committee structure. We request that the Faculty Senate work to address these major issues and consider incorporating the changes and clarifications that follow.

During 1996-97 and 1997-98, similar requests were forwarded to Senate committees and through the chair of the Senate. Those recommendations were reviewed by Senate standing committees and resulted in clarifications and improvements in the personnel process that are reflected in the current edition of the Faculty Code.

The deans and I stand ready to work with the Senate and its standing committees to continue clarifying and improving our faculty personnel policies and procedures and to seek solutions to the ongoing issues we face.

Major Issues

The following major issues need to be addressed more clearly in our faculty personnel policy and procedure:

- A mechanism to allow full professors to move up on the salary scale.
- A need to identify what specifically constitutes a salary inequity and a process to address inequities. (*Note accompanying recommendation on page 2.)
- A process through which to apply the results of the faculty salary study.
Merit increases, which are permanent, are separate from special salary awards of 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.

**Addition of a New Section 8.41 or 8.43; Recommend Revision to 5-8.1**—By action of the 1995 legislature, the university may now match or exceed bona fide salary offers received by faculty from other institutions. Section 2-2.48 of the university policy manual identifies the overall university policy, which can be applied to faculty and to other employees of the university as well. Section 5-8.1 of the university policy manual describes the academic affairs policy and procedure. Two issues surface in relation to the current salary-match policy:

1. Is inclusion in Sections 2-2.48 and 5-8.1 sufficient, or should this issue also be a part of the Faculty Code?

2. Should the academic affairs policy defined in 5-8.1 be revised?

The presence of this provision has resulted in opportunities for the university to retain faculty and administrators that have received offers from other institutions. If the university can retain high quality people who have genuinely sought opportunities elsewhere, the application of this policy is good. However, some faculty and some administrators have expressed concern that to place oneself on the job market with the intent to generate an internal salary match made possible by the receipt of an outside offer constitutes behavior that is less than ethical.

Section 2-2.48 was developed to reflect the legislatively identified process in university policy. Section 5-8.1 was developed to define more specifically the process of its application within the Division of Academic Affairs. Evidence exists that suggests that some of our sister institutions in the state are even making pre-emptive offers to faculty prior to offers being extended; however, this type of action would not be permissible within the procedures outlined in Section 5-8.1. The Attorney General ruling we are expecting shortly should help clarify the extent to which these types of actions fall within our legal possibilities. In summary, the policy needs to be reviewed and revised.

**Deletion of Section 8.48.D**—Please consider the following revision to Section 8.48.D:

- The salary for an appointment for the interim period between the end of the full summer session and the beginning of the new academic year shall be not more than 1/9th of the salary for such faculty member for the immediately preceding academic year, provided that such interim appointments shall be made in lieu of an appointment for one (1) term or one-half (1/2) of the summer session.
The proposed revision clarifies the requirements. Full-time non-tenure-track faculty may hold academic rank. However, full-time non-tenure-track faculty are not paid according to the faculty salary scale (although the scale will result in the determination of the minimum amount paid). For the salary of a coach or athletic director to be governed by the faculty salary scale would require that he or she also hold tenure or hold tenure-track status as a faculty member. This change clarifies that requirement.

**Deletion of Section 9.15.G**—Please consider deleting Section 9.15.G. This provision limits the income for services, grants, scholarships etc. received during professional leave to 135 percent of the salary the faculty member on leave could have expected to receive without taking the leave. Placing limitations on the potential earnings of a faculty member during a paid leave appears restrictive. Further discussion may be warranted to determine if CWU wishes to continue this restriction.
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DATE: October 26, 1998

SUBJECT: Faculty Code Legislation Governing Promotional Raises

As you know, there has been much concern about the number of faculty salary steps given to faculty at the time of promotion. During the past five years the average number of steps recommended for promotion is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date: October 27, 1998

SUBJECT: Mechanism for Providing Step Increases on the Salary Scale for Full Professors

There is much concern and discussion about the movement of full professors on the faculty salary scale. Presently when a faculty member is promoted to the rank of full professor, the faculty member is placed on a specific step on the scale. For a full professor to advance to a higher step on the faculty salary scale, the full professor must receive step increases for meritorious
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 30, 1998

TO:    John Alsoszathai-Petheo, Chair, Faculty Senate
       Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM:  David P. Dauwalder, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
       Liahna Babener, Dean, College of Arts & Humanities
       Lin Douglas, Dean, College of Education & Professional Studies
       Gary Lewis, Dean of Libraries
       John Ninnemann, Dean College of the Sciences
       Roy Savoian, Dean, School of Business & Economics


SUBJECT: PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CWU FACULTY CODE

This memo has been developed through discussion among the college and library deans. The issues identified and changes proposed are submitted for consideration by the Faculty Senate through its committee structure. We request that the Faculty Senate work to address these major issues and consider incorporating the changes and clarifications that follow.

During 1996-97 and 1997-98, similar requests were forwarded to Senate committees and through the chair of the Senate. Those recommendations were reviewed by Senate standing committees and resulted in clarifications and improvements in the personnel process that are reflected in the current edition of the Faculty Code.

The deans and I stand ready to work with the Senate and its standing committees to continue clarifying and improving our faculty personnel policies and procedures and to seek solutions to the ongoing issues we face.

Major Issues

The following major issues need to be addressed more clearly in our faculty personnel policy and procedure:

- A mechanism to allow full professors to move up on the salary scale.
- A need to identify what specifically constitutes a salary inequity and a process to address inequities. (*Note accompanying recommendation on page 2.)
- A process through which to apply the results of the faculty salary study.
Please consider requesting appropriate standing committees of the Faculty Senate to review these needs and forward through the Faculty Senate appropriate solutions. The deans, directors, vice provosts, and I offer to participate in these discussions as each is considered. Through such a collaborative effort, we can identify appropriate and workable approaches to each concern.

Other Changes and Clarifications

Clarification of Section 8.40—The current Section 8.40 describes “Yearly Salary Adjustments.” It may suggest to some readers that the three types of yearly salary adjustments listed—(a) promotions, (b) across-the-board salary adjustments, and (c) merit increases—must each come from the direct appropriations of the state legislature and/or governor. Those direct appropriations are not provided on a consistent basis from year to year; they are determined as part of the state’s biennial budget process. The practice over at least the past five years has been to fund promotions independently from direct salary-adjustment appropriations by the legislature and/or governor. A revision in wording may clarify this section.

With the Development of a Salary Equity Process*, Revisions to Section 8.40.A and 8.40.C.2—The current policy (a) allows the awards of at least a two-step salary increase, (b) requires that the faculty member attain at least the minimum step for the new rank, and (c) implies (Section 8.40.C.2, last sentence) that promotion serves in the place of merit for faculty during years in which they earn promotion to a new rank. Much concern has been recently expressed regarding this provision and its application.

Discussion among the deans led to a suggestion that we may wish to consider a clearer separation of merit increases and promotion increases. If this separation is desired, the deans recommend consideration of a standard three-step increase at promotion and an elimination of the connection between merit awards and promotion decisions.

Please consider the following changes to Section 8.40.A

Promotions in rank: — provided that a UPON PROMOTION IN RANK, THE faculty member promoted during any given biennium shall WILL receive at least a STANDARD salary increase of two (2) THREE (3) full steps on the salary scale, PROVIDED THAT SAID INCREASE PLACES THE SALARY and simultaneously attain at least AT the current minimum salary step for the new rank. OTHERWISE, THE FACULTY MEMBER WILL RECEIVE THE STEP INCREASE NECESSARY TO BRING HIM OR HER TO THE 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.

To address item “c” in the explanation, please consider an accompanying deletion of the last line of 8.40.C.2. Section 8.40.C.2 showing the recommended deletion follows:
Merit increases, which are permanent, are separate from special salary awards of 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.

Addition of a New Section 8.41 or 8.43: Recommend Revision to 5-8.1—By action of the 1995 legislature, the university may now match or exceed bona fide salary offers received by faculty from other institutions. Section 2-2.48 of the university policy manual identifies the overall university policy, which can be applied to faculty and to other employees of the university as well. Section 5-8.1 of the university policy manual describes the academic affairs policy and procedure. Two issues surface in relation to the current salary-match policy:

(1) Is inclusion in Sections 2-2.48 and 5-8.1 sufficient, or should this issue also be a part of the Faculty Code?

(2) Should the academic affairs policy defined in 5-8.1 be revised?

The presence of this provision has resulted in opportunities for the university to retain faculty and administrators that have received offers from other institutions. If the university can retain high quality people who have genuinely sought opportunities elsewhere, the application of this policy is good. However, some faculty and some administrators have expressed concern that to place oneself on the job market with the intent to generate an internal salary match made possible by the receipt of an outside offer constitutes behavior that is less than ethical.

Section 2-2.48 was developed to reflect the legislatively identified process in university policy. Section 5-8.1 was developed to define more specifically the process of its application within the Division of Academic Affairs. Evidence exists that suggests that some of our sister institutions in the state are even making pre-emptive offers to faculty prior to offers being extended; however, this type of action would not be permissible within the procedures outlined in Section 5-8.1. The Attorney General ruling we are expecting shortly should help clarify the extent to which these types of actions fall within our legal possibilities. In summary, the policy needs to be reviewed and revised.

Deletion of Section 8.48.D—Please consider the following revision to Section 8.48.D:

The salary for an appointment for the interim period between the end of the full summer session and the beginning of the new academic year shall be not more than 1/9th of the salary for such faculty member for the immediately preceding academic year, provided that such interim appointments shall be made in lieu of an appointment for one (1) term or one-half (1/2) of the summer session.
The statement appears to conflict with the Section 4.85.E., which states the following: "Nothing in this Section 4.85 shall preclude the university from offering employment to faculty members during periods when they normally would not have been under contract . . ." The direct application of the reference here to Section 4.85 is not clear.

In addition, the reason for any restriction against paying a faculty member for work performed between summer session and the beginning of fall quarter appears to limit the income that a faculty member could earn during a calendar year. If the faculty member works a full summer session and contracts for additional work during the period between summer session and fall quarter, he or she should be able to be paid for that additional work.

Revision of Section 4.60.A.2—Please consider revising Section 4.60.A.2 as follows:

Non-tenure-track positions and lecturers are normally appointed for a term of service not to exceed one year at a time, and may be subsequently reappointed for an additional term or terms of service. Written notice by the president or his designee shall notify individuals in such full-time positions in writing three months prior to expiration of the contract of intent to renew the contract. (See also Section 5.50)

The combination of 5.50.B and 4.60.A.2 appears to result in no need for notification. Termination at the end of the contract is inherent in a full-time non-tenure-track contract by 5.50.B. In effect, the faculty member is notified in the contract. The second sentence may serve to mislead.

Revision of Section 8.48.F—Please consider revising Section 8.48.F as follows:

Salaries for faculty members with special appointments clearly and specifically limited to a brief association with the university may be established at any appropriate level on the salary scale.

A special appointment will either be a part-time appointment or a full-time non-tenure track appointment. Neither type of appointment is made in reference to the faculty salary scale other than the provision that the minimum salaries for these two types of appointments for appointees with terminal degrees will be equivalent to Step One of the Faculty Salary Scale by 2000-01.

Revision of Section 4.67.A—Please consider revising Section 4.67.A as follows:

Individuals appointed to the position of coach or athletic director may be granted the academic rank for which they qualify according to Section 4.30. If, however, a coach or athletic director is granted academic rank AND HOLDS TENURED OR TENURE-TRACK STATUS AS A FACULTY MEMBER, subsequent salary adjustments are governed by the conditions of the approved faculty salary schedule in regard to rank and salary. However, such individuals shall not be granted tenure as coaches.
The proposed revision clarifies the requirements. Full-time non-tenure-track faculty may hold academic rank. However, full-time non-tenure-track faculty are not paid according to the faculty salary scale (although the scale will result in the determination of the minimum amount paid). For the salary of a coach or athletic director to be governed by the faculty salary scale would require that he or she also hold tenure or hold tenure-track status as a faculty member. This change clarifies that requirement.

Deletion of Section 9.15.G—Please consider deleting Section 9.15.G. This provision limits the income for services, grants, scholarships etc. received during professional leave to 135 percent of the salary the faculty member on leave could have expected to receive without taking the leave. Placing limitations on the potential earnings of a faculty member during a paid leave appears restrictive. Further discussion may be warranted to determine if CWU wishes to continue this restriction.
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DATE: October 26, 1998

SUBJECT: Faculty Code Legislation Governing Promotional Raises

As you know, there has been much concern about the number of faculty salary steps given to faculty at the time of promotion. During the past five years the average number of steps recommended for promotion is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board of Trustees in their motion supporting Faculty Senate Motion 3174 passed October 7, 1998 stipulated the following in Item 2:

The Board of Trustees commits itself to meaningfully and expediently address and resolve the equity differences in faculty salaries at Central Washington University.

As presently interpreted, the Faculty Code requires a minimum of two salary steps per promotional raise, but does not specify a maximum number of salary steps per promotional raise. (Section 8.40.A)

I respectfully request that the Faculty Senate review Section 8.40.A and all relevant sections of the Faculty Code to provide recommendations to the President and to the Board of Trustees that will define criteria and specific expectations for determination and allocation of the maximum number of steps that can be provided per promotional raise.

In providing this recommendation, I ask that you consider the long-term effect of providing a maximum number of steps that will keep the average faculty salary of CWU's faculty comparable with our peers.

It would be extremely beneficial if this recommendation could come from the Faculty Code Committee and the Faculty Senate in time for implementation for promotional raises in May 1999.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this important matter.

Ivory V. Nelson
President

C: David Dauwalder, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
   Abdul Nasser, Vice President of Business and Financial Affairs
   Academic Deans (Babener, Douglas, Lewis, Ninnemann, Savoian)
   Department Chairs
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Date: October 27, 1998

SUBJECT: Mechanism for Providing Step Increases on the Salary Scale for Full Professors

There is much concern and discussion about the movement of full professors on the faculty salary scale. Presently when a faculty member is promoted to the rank of full professor, the faculty member is placed on a specific step on the scale. For a full professor to advance to a higher step on the faculty salary scale, the full professor must receive step increases for meritorious
performance. Herein lies the problem. Since 1992 all legislatively appropriated funds have been recommended by the Faculty Senate as across-the-board percentage raises except for 1 percent in 1997 that was recommended for merit. Thus many full professors who were promoted many years ago are stuck on a salary step without the possibility of advancement on the Faculty Salary Scale unless they receive a meritorious step advancement.

If the Faculty Senate continues to make recommendations that provide for across-the-board percentage raises, faculty holding the rank of full professor will be forever stuck on the step given when they were promoted to full professor. This creates a morale problem for our full professors and a financial concern that requires a new and fresh look at step movement on the faculty salary scale.

I respectfully request that the Faculty Senate make recommendations to the President and the Board of Trustees to revise the Faculty Code to address the issue of providing well identified specific opportunities other than meritorious step advancement for a full professor to receive additional step advancement on the Faculty Salary Scale over a specified period of time. This examination and recommendation should only cover the full professor, as the assistant and associate professors have opportunities to advance on the faculty salary scale.

Thank you very much for your earliest consideration of this matter.

Ivory V. Nelson
President

David Dauwalder, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
Abdul Nasser, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
Academic Deans (Babener, Douglas, Lewis, Ninnemann, Savoian)
Department Chairs
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DATE: October 26, 1998

SUBJECT: Distribution of Legislatively Appropriated Salary Dollars, University Provided Promotional Dollars, and Any Additional Legislatively Appropriated Dollars

In its 1999-01 Legislative Budget Request, the university has requested two types of salary appropriations: (a) 4.5 percent salary increase each year of the biennium and (b) retention and recruitment pool for each year of the biennium.
The university administration is committed to providing the necessary dollars for faculty promotions above any appropriations received in the two items listed above. These dollars will create an available pool for faculty salary increases if the legislature provides the necessary language to use the retention pool dollars for salary adjustments.

In accordance with Faculty Senate Motion 3174 passed October 7, 1998 and accepted by the Board of Trustees with one change, Item 2 of the motion stipulates the following:

The Board of Trustees commits itself to meaningfully and expeditiously address and resolve the equity differences in faculty salaries at Central Washington University.

All raises since 1992 have been recommended by the Faculty Senate as across-the-board percentage raises, except for 1 percent in 1997 that was recommended for merit. The Board of Trustees has approved all faculty salary recommendations by the Faculty Senate since 1992. Since 1992, the State Legislature has provided the following percentages for faculty raises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>CWU Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order for the university to address the faculty salary issue, it is imperative that the Faculty Senate provide recommendations to distribute salary dollars in other ways other than across the board.

I respectfully request that you provide recommendations to the President and the Board of Trustees that will distribute the faculty salary pool by percentages of the available dollars to address (1) merit increases, (2) equity and compression issues identified in the faculty salary study, and (3) promotion increases. In addition, please recommend a process by which the total amount available for promotion can be determined each year.
I also respectfully request that you submit this recommendation in time for implementation of any salary adjustments this year.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this very important matter.

Ivory Y. Nelson
President

c: Dave Dauwalder, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
   Abdul Nasser, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
   Academic Deans (Babener, Douglas, Lewis, Ninnemann, Savoian)
   Department Chairs
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DATE: October 26, 1998

SUBJECT: Participation of Part-Time, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in the Academic Affairs of the University

Participation of part-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the academic affairs of the university varies significantly from academic department to academic department. In accordance with Faculty Senate Motion 3174 passed October 7, 1998 and accepted by the Board of Trustees with one change, Item 4 of the motion stipulates the following:
The Board of Trustees commits itself to positively address the issues of part-time faculty pay, status and participation of part-time faculty in the academic affairs of the university.

Concerns regarding part-time faculty pay have been identified over the past few years. Following the Spring 1997 recommendation of the Faculty Senate to pursue a four-year plan to increase part-time faculty pay, a plan was developed and is in its second year of implementation.

That policy states the following:

- The minimum rate for non-tenure-track appointees with the designated terminal degree for the discipline should be equivalent to step one of the faculty salary scale by Academic Year 2000-01. The rate per credit will equal the nine-month Step 1 salary divided by 45.

- The minimum rate for non-tenure-track appointees without the designated terminal degree for the discipline should be equivalent to 80 percent of the amount for non-tenure-track appointees with a terminal degree.

The status of part-time, non-tenure-track faculty is identified in the faculty code. However, the participation of part-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the affairs of the university varies significantly from department to department. Certain departments are very restrictive in allowing part-time, non-tenure-track faculty to participate in the curriculum development and other academic endeavors within the department. Certain departments allow part-time, non-tenure-track faculty to participate in all activities of the department, and even in some cases allow the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to participate as their representative member to the Faculty Senate.

This uneven treatment of a valuable faculty resource is not in the best interest of the university. Thus, it is necessary that guidance be provided in the Faculty Code whereby all part-time, non-tenure-track faculty are treated the same in each department of the university.

I respectfully request that the Faculty Senate review all relevant sections of the Faculty Code describing the activities of part-time, non-tenure track faculty and provide recommendations to the President and the Board of Trustees that will specifically define criteria and direction that will require each academic department to utilize their part-time, non-tenure-track faculty resources in a consistent manner.
Thank you very much for your earliest consideration of this matter.

Ivory V. Nelson
President

c: David Dauwalder, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
Abdul Nasser, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
Academic Deans (Babener, Douglas, Lewis, Ninnemann, Savoian)
Department Chairs
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DATE: October 21, 1998

SUBJECT: Committee Charge for Academic Year 1998-99

As we begin the 1998-99 academic year, the President’s Office has produced the following documents for planning: (1) the Essence of Central Washington University in 2003; (2) an environmental scan providing the context for planning in 1998-99 at the university; and (3) a set of identified goals for planning for the 1998-99 year. The Board of Trustees has directed the university administration to implement Board Resolution 98-06 that codifies Faculty Senate Motion 3174 passed October 7, 1998. Implementation of the six priority areas defined in the resolution will be part of the university’s planning strategies.

I respectfully request that the Strategic Planning Committee address the following issues:

1. Describe the distribution of the allocation of state appropriated budget and expenditure resources to the president and five vice presidential areas of the university using instructional, research, library, student, physical plant, development, salaries (faculty, exempt, classified) and other relevant categorical areas. Compare with a select number of peer institutions.
2. Describe the distribution of the allocation of non-state appropriated budget and expenditure resources to the president and five vice presidential areas of the university using instructional, research, library, student, physical plant, development, salaries (faculty, exempt, classified) and other relevant categorical areas. Compare with a select number of peer institutions.

Items 1 and 2 listed above are in accordance with Item 5 from Board Resolution 98-06 is as follows:

The Board of Trustees commits itself to achieving and maintaining a fair and equitable allocation of resources to faculty, staff and students which is reflective of the university's standing obligations, the mission of the university, and which reflects proportionally the responsibilities imposed upon each (faculty, staff, and students) by state agencies external to the university.

3. Draft and finalize the university's response to NASC Accreditation Standard 1.

4. Examine the strategic planning process and the format planning instructions for 1999-00 to insure the Board of Trustees initiatives are addressed by each unit in its unit specific plans.

5. Work with the Executive Director of NASC to prepare a diagrammatic chart and word description illustrating how the university's strategic planning efforts are in compliance with NASC Standards. Standard 1 B. Planning and Effectiveness; Standard 2 B. Educational Program Planning and Effectiveness; and Standard 2.2 Policy on Educational Assessment.

6. In addressing the issue of an effective distance education strategic plan, work with the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs/Vice Provost for Learning Technology and address the issue of CWU's compliance with NASC Standard 2.6 Policy on Distance Delivery Courses, Certificate, and Degree Programs.

7. Explore ways in which the university budget requests, ten-year capital plan, and campus master plan can be more obviously integrated into the strategic planning process.

8. Examine the development, role, and use of the following strategic plans: Affirmative Action, People of Color, and University Computing. Make any recommendations necessary for greater response to these plans.

9. Develop ways to make more obvious the link between planning and budget decisions.

10. Identify planning mechanisms to assist planning across unit boundaries.
11. Establish a set of accountability measures for each university goal. Consider the proposed new university goals in establishing the accountability measures. Incorporate the legislatively mandated accountability measures within the specific university goal.

Thank you very much for your continued support and hard work.

Ivy V. Nelson
President

c: Dave Dauwalder, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
   Jim Pappas, Vice President for Enrollment Management and Marketing
   Mark Young, Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations
   Sarah Shumate, Vice President for Student Affairs
   Elizabeth Street, Executive Director, NASC Accreditation Process
   Academic Deans Babener, Douglas, Lewis, Ninneman, and Savoian
   Department Chairs
   Members, Faculty Senate
   John Alsoszatai-Pethoe, Chair, Faculty Senate
## CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
**HIGHLIGHTS-SIX YEARS IN REVIEW**
**FISCAL YEAR 1998-1999 ESTIMATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>$15,678</td>
<td>$17,264</td>
<td>$20,624</td>
<td>$23,141</td>
<td>$24,845</td>
<td>$26,867</td>
<td>$27,673</td>
<td>$28,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>31,960</td>
<td>35,316</td>
<td>32,028</td>
<td>32,096</td>
<td>35,837</td>
<td>36,398</td>
<td>37,244</td>
<td>38,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Contracts, and Gifts</td>
<td>7,251</td>
<td>7,876</td>
<td>8,899</td>
<td>9,487</td>
<td>10,294</td>
<td>11,757</td>
<td>12,345</td>
<td>12,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Services</td>
<td>16,719</td>
<td>18,057</td>
<td>18,781</td>
<td>19,754</td>
<td>20,018</td>
<td>21,012</td>
<td>21,852</td>
<td>22,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources of Funds</strong></td>
<td>$72,538</td>
<td>$79,256</td>
<td>$80,717</td>
<td>$85,575</td>
<td>$92,046</td>
<td>$98,079</td>
<td>$101,314</td>
<td>$105,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$27,157</td>
<td>$28,834</td>
<td>$28,367</td>
<td>$31,102</td>
<td>$32,256</td>
<td>$32,858</td>
<td>$36,546</td>
<td>$36,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Support</strong></td>
<td>$5,789</td>
<td>$6,451</td>
<td>$6,599</td>
<td>$7,655</td>
<td>$8,098</td>
<td>$9,277</td>
<td>$8,368</td>
<td>$8,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>3,578</td>
<td>3,717</td>
<td>4,297</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>4,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>5,661</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>5,976</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>7,010</td>
<td>6,876</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>7,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>5,886</td>
<td>6,596</td>
<td>6,041</td>
<td>6,583</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>6,952</td>
<td>7,084</td>
<td>7,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>6,497</td>
<td>6,641</td>
<td>7,275</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>8,222</td>
<td>9,608</td>
<td>9,469</td>
<td>9,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>17,761</td>
<td>18,819</td>
<td>19,217</td>
<td>19,534</td>
<td>20,308</td>
<td>21,879</td>
<td>23,202</td>
<td>23,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$72,661</td>
<td>$77,294</td>
<td>$77,509</td>
<td>$84,147</td>
<td>$87,567</td>
<td>$93,489</td>
<td>$97,475</td>
<td>$97,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT ENROLLMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Headcount</td>
<td>7,085</td>
<td>7,387</td>
<td>8,085</td>
<td>8,072</td>
<td>8,033</td>
<td>8,108</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Full-Time Equivalent</td>
<td>6,312</td>
<td>6,589</td>
<td>7,339</td>
<td>7,337</td>
<td>7,448</td>
<td>7,474</td>
<td>7,474</td>
<td>7,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
### HIGHLIGHTS-SIX YEARS IN REVIEW*
### FISCAL YEAR 1998-1999 ESTIMATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL OUTLAY</strong> (Dollars in Thousands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$8,977</td>
<td>$15,273</td>
<td>$12,839</td>
<td>$12,151</td>
<td>$8,197</td>
<td>$25,737</td>
<td>$42,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAMPUS SPACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Building Square Footage (in Thousands)</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUITION AND FEES PER ACADEMIC YEAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate - Resident</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate - Nonresident</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>6,297</td>
<td>6,948</td>
<td>7,974</td>
<td>8,289</td>
<td>8,616</td>
<td>8,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate - Resident</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,741</td>
<td>3,885</td>
<td>4,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate - Nonresident</td>
<td>8,187</td>
<td>8,640</td>
<td>9,537</td>
<td>10,935</td>
<td>11,367</td>
<td>11,817</td>
<td>12,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Hall Room and Board per Academic Year</td>
<td>$3,332</td>
<td>$3,415</td>
<td>$3,673</td>
<td>$3,820</td>
<td>$3,995</td>
<td>$4,130</td>
<td>$4,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Support (Library) high in FY 1997 due to the Cooperative Library Project.
MEMORANDUM

TO: James Pappas
   Vice President for Enrollment Management and Marketing

   Martha Lindley
   Director of Government Relations

DATE: October 21, 1998

SUBJECT: Legislative Strategy for Faculty/Staff Salaries and Capital and Operational Budget Request

In accordance with Faculty Senate Motion 3174 passed October 7, 1998 and adopted by the Board of Trustees with one change. The first three items of the motion are listed below:

1. The Board of Trustees commits all its energies and powers to achieve faculty compensation parity for Central's faculty with Central's peer institutions in Washington State.

2. The Board of Trustees commits itself to meaningfully and expediently address and resolve the equity differences in faculty salaries at Central Washington University.

3. The Board of Trustees commits itself to work with the State Legislature to secure funding in support of the university, its programs, employee needs, and student needs.

There is much discussion on how to achieve the necessary appropriated dollars to address Central Washington University's Faculty Salary issues. No matter what strategy is proposed, we can only succeed if we can convince the legislature to provide a specific appropriation for faculty salary equity for Central Washington University. A rough calculation of the money needed to raise faculty salaries to the 75th percentile of our national peers shows that we would need $6.6 million in each year of the next biennium to reach that goal. This request to address our particular problem is in addition to the recruitment and retention pool and the 4.5 percent salary increase per year that the six public baccalaureate institutions have agreed to work on together.

No matter what kind of lobbying strategies we conduct, we can only succeed if we can convince the legislature that faculty salary parity is indeed a problem for...
CWU. I am going to need your help and the help of faculty to make the case to the legislators.

I am asking you to develop a plan to help us reach this goal. The plan to approach the State Legislature for CWU operational and capital budget support along with the special request must use a variety of people (trustees, faculty, administrators, and students) to carry the message. **To be successful we must identify legislators with sufficient political influence to sponsor a bill and an appropriation with specific language to increase faculty salaries at Central.**

This is not an easy assignment. The budgetary climate and available dollars make for a hard sell. I look forward to reviewing the proposed plan. Please submit the plan for my review by October 31, 1998.

Thank you very much for your assistance and cooperation in this matter.

Ivory V. Nelson

President

c: Dave Dauwalder, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
   Abdul Nasser, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
   Deans Babener, Douglas, Lewis, Ninneman, and Savoian
   Department Chairs
   Members, Faculty Senate
   John Alsoszatai-Petheo, Chair, Faculty Senate
Important Memorandum

TO: The University Community

DATE: October 30, 1998

SUBJECT: Higher Education Coordinating Board Programmatic Approvals and 1999-01 Operating and Capital Budget Recommendations for Central Washington University

I am pleased to report to the university community that our efforts with the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) have resulted in HECB approval on October 28, 1998 of the following academic programs for Central Washington University:

- Bachelor of Arts in Asian Studies
- Bachelor of Science in Primate Behavior and Ecology
- Bachelor of Fine Arts

The HECB recommended the following items to the Governor and the State Legislature for the 1999-01 Operating Budget in the following priority (highest priority: critical; next priority: essential).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Faculty Salaries (faculty only)</td>
<td>$3.96m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5% each year of the biennium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Recruitment and Retention Salary Increases for Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Enrollment Increase</td>
<td>$5.62m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>253 FTE/1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>261 FTE/2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Academic Support System</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.41m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.21m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Higher Education Coordinating Board also recommended a carry forward level of $111.31m.

The 1999-01 HECB Capital Budget Recommendations/New Appropriations for Central Washington University Ellensburg Campus are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Institution Request</th>
<th>Critical Funding Level</th>
<th>Essential Funding Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music Facility</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Hall Remodel</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Predesign</td>
<td>130,400</td>
<td>130,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-20 Campus Distance Education Classrooms</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall/Michaelson Mechanical Upgrade</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,552,000</td>
<td>182,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell Stage/Classroom Remodel</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>248,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Utility Upgrade</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3,723,000</td>
<td>3,723,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamline Improvements</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,580,000</td>
<td>1,580,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus (Minor Works): Program</td>
<td>063</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3,322,000</td>
<td>3,322,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus (Minor Works): Preservation</td>
<td>063</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3,077,000</td>
<td>3,077,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber Optic Upgrade</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2,081,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,081,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Facility</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Predesign</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebeler Hall Remodel</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>D/Construction</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Building: Remodel</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>D/Construction</td>
<td>3,425,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>All Funds</td>
<td>$25,640,500</td>
<td>$15,762,700</td>
<td>$2,081,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>$19,241,500</td>
<td>$ 9,363,700</td>
<td>$2,081,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td>$ 6,399,000</td>
<td>$ 6,399,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Multi-Institutional Initiatives 1999-2001 HECB Capital Budget Recommendations/New Appropriations for Central Washington University Centers are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Institution Request</th>
<th>Critical Funding Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWU/Edmonds Community College Center</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWU/Highline Community College Center</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YVCC, CWU, WSU: Higher Education Center</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Design/land</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The HECB also recommended the following tuition increases for all of higher education:

- 4.0% 1999
- 3.2% 2000
- 2.0% optional increase for 1999
- 2.0% optional increase for 2000

The optional increases will be at the discretion of each Board of Trustees or Regents. Optional increases (if taken by the respective Boards) will not be carried forward in the next biennium. Proposed basic tuition increases (4.0%/3.2%) would generate $2.05m for Central Washington University over the biennium. Proposed optional tuition increases would generate $1.04m over the biennium for Central Washington University.

This is the first step. We now must secure the support of the Governor (OFM) and final appropriations from the State Legislature to be completely successful. Members of the campus community are encouraged to tell the CWU story and provide support as we work to reach our goals.

Ivory V. Nelson
President

\jm
October 27, 1998

John Alsoszatai-Petheo
Chair, Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Dear John:

Last Thursday evening I met with the Associated Students of Central Washington University (BOD) and other interested students to present information on Central Washington University's budget and financial operations. I am enclosing that presentation (in handout form) for your perusal. I would be happy to make this presentation to the Faculty Senate or any other faculty forum you would like. I believe the information in this presentation is informative and helps clear up misunderstandings regarding Central Washington University's budget procedures and policies.

Another option I would like to offer is to visit individual academic departments and discuss budget matters with faculty and staff in department meetings. Please extend this offer to members of the Faculty Senate.

You may contact Shirley Sadler (2323) if you would like to schedule a time for me to make a budget presentation to the Faculty Senate. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Abdul Nasser
Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
This presentation will cover:

- CWU Financial Resources
- Budget Process
- How can CWU get more money?

Capital Expenditures

- FY91 $3,588,814
- FY92 8,976,652
- FY93 15,273,369
- FY94 14,934,773
- FY95 13,584,753
- FY96 8,170,383
- FY97 26,259,613
- FY98 43,115,396
- Current 32,951,195

TOTAL $166,854,948
CWU Financial Resources
FY98

Self-Support Operations
FY98

Fund
Grants & Contracts
Summer School
Internal Service Funds
Auxiliary Enterprise Funds

Expenditures
$ 9,800,000
2,210,000
3,511,179
17,327,372

Total: $32,831,451

State/Tuition Fund - Expenditures (Dollars in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY94</th>
<th>FY95</th>
<th>FY96</th>
<th>FY97</th>
<th>FY98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>24,032</td>
<td>25,684</td>
<td>26,090</td>
<td>26,656</td>
<td>28,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>5,517</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>6,905</td>
<td>7,633</td>
<td>8,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>5,901</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>6,359</td>
<td>6,548</td>
<td>7,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>6,010</td>
<td>6,582</td>
<td>6,712</td>
<td>6,952</td>
<td>7,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Exp. $43,723 $47,478 $48,171 $50,214 $53,658

CWU Financial Resources
FY98

• Self-Support Operations
  – Grants & Contracts
  – Summer School
  – Internal Service Funds
    – Central Stores, Work Force, Motor Pool, General Services & Scheduling Center
  – Auxiliary Enterprise Funds
    – Student Activities, University Store, Parking, Housing & Food Services

State/Tuition

$56,420,348

Total: $32,831,451

President
$1,192,493

Academic Affairs
37,443,308

Business Affairs
14,548,318

Student Affairs
1,875,157

Advancement
1,005,517

Unemp/Ins.
355,555

TOTAL $56,420,348
CWU Financial Resources
FY98 - $132,466,687

- Capital
- Self-Support
- State/Tuition

$56,420,349
$43,214,888
$32,831,451

Budget Process
- EXTERNAL
  - Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB)
  - Office of Financial Management (OFM)
  - Governor
  - The House of Representatives
  - The Senate
- INTERNAL (CWU)
  - Strategic Planning Committee
  - Budget Committee

What do we get new money for?
- Specific capital projects
- Salary Increases
- Enrollment
- Library
- Technology Initiatives
- Tuition Increases

State/Tuition Fund New Monies By Division (Dollars in Thousands)

State/Tuition Fund New Monies By Division (Dollars in Thousands)

State/Tuition Fund New Monies By Division (Dollars in Thousands)

State/Tuition Fund New Monies By Division (Dollars in Thousands)

President $ 12.3 $ 0 $ 20 $ 20 $ 0
Academic Affairs 400.0 275 400 1,045 325.8
Business Affairs 69.0 207 130 100 90.0
Student Affairs 33.9 45 88 52.4
Advancement 43.5 29 35 100 183.5
TOTAL $558.7 $511 $650 $1,351 $651.7
How can CWU get more money?

- Legislative Process
- Enrollment

Enrollment - Trend

"So does anybody else feel that their needs aren't being met?"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>FY91</th>
<th>FY92</th>
<th>FY93</th>
<th>FY94</th>
<th>FY95</th>
<th>FY96</th>
<th>FY97</th>
<th>FY98</th>
<th>Total Remaining</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>255,470</td>
<td>1,394,791</td>
<td>4,405,163</td>
<td>17,223,699</td>
<td>21,744,095</td>
<td>13,686,782</td>
<td>58,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Remodel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>118,626</td>
<td>264,218</td>
<td>728,540</td>
<td>2,929,410</td>
<td>16,978,712</td>
<td>6,224,895</td>
<td>27,244,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Capital Projects</td>
<td>1,382,002</td>
<td>1,576,042</td>
<td>1,414,369</td>
<td>3,197,457</td>
<td>2,976,804</td>
<td>1,830,317</td>
<td>3,871,627</td>
<td>2,736,924</td>
<td>5,981,760</td>
<td>24,967,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barge Hall Renovation</td>
<td>510,636</td>
<td>2,488,859</td>
<td>6,075,600</td>
<td>1,320,962</td>
<td>201,970</td>
<td>86,599</td>
<td>23,220</td>
<td>10,707,846</td>
<td>2,697,475</td>
<td>166,854,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw/Smyser Remodel</td>
<td>104,423</td>
<td>1,231,143</td>
<td>3,707,876</td>
<td>6,075,600</td>
<td>1,320,962</td>
<td>201,970</td>
<td>86,599</td>
<td>10,707,846</td>
<td>2,697,475</td>
<td>166,854,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouillon ASB:Design</td>
<td>282,334</td>
<td>4,304,493</td>
<td>352,342</td>
<td>5,506</td>
<td>41,879</td>
<td>9,585</td>
<td>3,923,599</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive Management</td>
<td>219,630</td>
<td>2,096,171</td>
<td>1,534,532</td>
<td>21,802</td>
<td>41,879</td>
<td>9,585</td>
<td>3,923,599</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Animal Research Facility</td>
<td>424,531</td>
<td>1,484,021</td>
<td>280,836</td>
<td>35,386</td>
<td>391,573</td>
<td>81,128</td>
<td>2,697,475</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Cable Replacement</td>
<td>34,447</td>
<td>597,620</td>
<td>794,274</td>
<td>11,674</td>
<td>7,014</td>
<td>62,944</td>
<td>2,697,475</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamline</td>
<td>817,625</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>8,996</td>
<td>331,260</td>
<td>86,599</td>
<td>23,220</td>
<td>10,707,846</td>
<td>2,697,475</td>
<td>2,697,475</td>
<td>2,697,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>306,784</td>
<td>438,718</td>
<td>519,341</td>
<td>102,792</td>
<td>84,148</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>5,071</td>
<td>3,851</td>
<td>67,950</td>
<td>1,578,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Safety</td>
<td>244,602</td>
<td>423,754</td>
<td>413,786</td>
<td>83,672</td>
<td>241,987</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>415,408</td>
<td>1,967,781</td>
<td>1,967,781</td>
<td>1,967,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications System</td>
<td>193,232</td>
<td>215,072</td>
<td>641,613</td>
<td>206,632</td>
<td>64,434</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>118,626</td>
<td>1,350,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson Pavilion</td>
<td>84,010</td>
<td>73,435</td>
<td>1,096,565</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,096,565</td>
<td>1,096,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Preservations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>1,189,059</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,189,059</td>
<td>1,189,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilled Water Expansion</td>
<td>20,719</td>
<td>180,859</td>
<td>531,254</td>
<td>49,684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>346,009</td>
<td>836,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Science</td>
<td>161,090</td>
<td>32,410</td>
<td>11,198</td>
<td>479,278</td>
<td>357,928</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,043,501</td>
<td>1,043,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing Infrastructure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>883,690</td>
<td>66,310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lind Hall Remodel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>883,690</td>
<td>66,310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Tac Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>318,929</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86,298</td>
<td>654,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Tank Replacement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,305</td>
<td>187,401</td>
<td>46,278</td>
<td>33,016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,059,962</td>
<td>1,059,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Savings Projects</td>
<td>266,781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>276,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Disabilities Act</td>
<td>68,140</td>
<td>11,727</td>
<td>90,565</td>
<td>36,027</td>
<td>10,208</td>
<td>34,091</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>327,258</td>
<td>327,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertz Emergency Repair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91,267</td>
<td>16,642</td>
<td>107,721</td>
<td>9,816</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>225,446</td>
<td>225,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Boiler</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81,459</td>
<td>1,368,541</td>
<td>72,940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71,468</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71,468</td>
<td>71,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Remodel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Proj Abatement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,109</td>
<td>5,478</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46,905</td>
<td>46,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynnwood Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>172,986</td>
<td>172,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Indoor Air Quality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>410,929</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>429,000</td>
<td>429,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Repairs &amp; Improvements</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3,588,814</td>
<td>8,976,652</td>
<td>15,273,369</td>
<td>14,934,773</td>
<td>13,584,753</td>
<td>8,170,383</td>
<td>43,115,396</td>
<td>32,951,195</td>
<td>32,951,195</td>
<td>166,854,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

166,854,948
## CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
**HIGHLIGHTS-SIX YEARS IN REVIEW**

For Fiscal Years Ended June 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$22,221</td>
<td>$23,990</td>
<td>$24,052</td>
<td>$25,684</td>
<td>$26,060</td>
<td>$26,656</td>
<td>$28,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>5,596</td>
<td>6,239</td>
<td>5,517</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>6,905</td>
<td>7,633</td>
<td>8,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>5,532</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>5,901</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>6,509</td>
<td>6,548</td>
<td>7,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>6,568</td>
<td>6,010</td>
<td>6,582</td>
<td>6,712</td>
<td>6,952</td>
<td>7,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expends</td>
<td>$41,434</td>
<td>$45,391</td>
<td>$43,723</td>
<td>$47,487</td>
<td>$48,463</td>
<td>$50,210</td>
<td>$53,658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Dollars in Thousands)*
State/Tuition Fund New Monies By Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>FY96</th>
<th>SB96</th>
<th>FY97</th>
<th>SB97</th>
<th>FY98</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President's Area</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$52,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1,045,000</td>
<td>325,800</td>
<td>$2,445,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Affairs</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>$596,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>52,400</td>
<td>$217,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Advancement</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>183,500</td>
<td>$391,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$558,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$511,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$630,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,351,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$651,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,702,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 12, 1998

TO: John Alsoszathai-Petheo, Chair, Faculty Senate

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


SUBJECT: PROPOSAL FOR A FACULTY SALARY INEQUITY PROCESS

Please permit me to meet with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to discuss the attached potential process to begin addressing faculty concerns regarding possible inequities among faculty salaries.

Section 8.46 of the CWU Faculty Code states, “A salary adjustment may be given to correct a salary inequity. Such salary adjustments are permanent.” Though Section 8.46 permits salary adjustments to take place, no process has been identified. Past attempts to begin the process by defining potential inequities have resulted in a lack of agreement regarding the definitions. The current faculty salary study process, which was to complete its study by Spring 1998, appears still to be in the process of selecting a consultant.

This proposal can serve in parallel with the study that is being conducted. It would allow faculty who perceive that an inequity exists to pursue a process through which some progress toward addressing a possible inequity can be achieved. The process assumes that the opinion from the Attorney General will permit the institution to establish such a fund without tying the fund to legislatively identified funding. A ruling is expected very soon.

I hope that this request to meet with the Executive Committee can lead to joint support from the faculty and the administration to take a positive step forward in this one aspect of faculty salaries.
Section 8.46 of the Faculty Code states, "A salary adjustment may be given to correct a salary inequity. Such salary adjustments are permanent." Past practice has required funding to correct salary inequities to come from legislatively appropriated funds, perhaps due to a potential conflict with a statement in Section 8.40 of the Faculty Code.

For the 1997-99 biennium, the president authorized $50,000 to be spent in conducting a faculty salary equity study, which was to be completed by the end of Spring 1998. The Faculty Senate formed an ad hoc Salary Equity Committee to develop an RFP and select a consultant to conduct the study. The first call for proposals resulted in none being acceptable. The committee is continuing to consider proposals generated through the revised call for proposals.

This document describes key elements of a proposed faculty salary inequity claim process that could begin working to address perceived inequities this year. The process is initially proposed as a three-year commitment to beginning to address inequities that may have occurred in our salary system through the years.

**FACULTY SELF SELECT**—If a tenured or tenure-track faculty member feels as if he or she has a salary equity claim, he or she applies for a remedy from this fund.

**ESTABLISH A FUND FOR THREE YEARS**—A yearly fund is established for FY1999, FY2000, and FY2001. The fund provides the college, school, or library to which the faculty member is assigned with sufficient dollars to cover the identified raise in pay for salary and benefits for the first year of the award. Budget adjustments within the college and division will have to be made to cover the salary changes beginning in year 2.

**FACULTY APPLICATION**—Tenured or tenure-track faculty will include three items in their application for consideration of a salary inequity claim:

1. Equity Claim—A ½-page or less description of the equity claim.
2. Documentation—Sufficient documentation to support the claim.
3. Professional Record File—A copy of the faculty member’s updated professional record file.

**EQUITY CLAIM COMMITTEE**—The Equity Claim Committee will be formed. Seven tenured faculty members will be elected from a list of nominees that contains one tenured faculty member from each academic department, including one from the library. Nominees will be forwarded by department chairs. Therefore, the ballot will hold approximately 30 names. (Aerospace Studies and Military Science would not participate.)

All tenured and tenure-track faculty will be invited to vote for five people from the list of nominees. The faculty member from each college with the highest number of votes will be elected (4 members). The faculty member from the library with the highest number of votes will be elected (1 member). The faculty members from any unit with the next two highest numbers of votes will be elected (2 members). The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will settle all ties by selecting one member from those tied. The committee selects its own chair.

**COMMITTEE DELIBERATION PROCESS**—The Equity Claim Committee (a) receives applications for consideration; (b) reviews applications for consideration; (c) has access to university data on salaries through Institutional Studies, Office of the Provost, and the Budget Office; and (d) has access to all professional record files.

**COMMITTEE DECISIONS**—The Equity Claim Committee distributes equity pool funds including benefits in total faculty salary scale subshare amounts. The committee does not have to meet the entire claim but must stay within the specified available funds for the year in question.

**DISPOSITION OF UNUSED FUNDS**—Any funds not expended in FY1999 may carry over into the FY2000 fund in addition to the funding allocated to the FY2000 fund. Any funds not spent during FY2000 may carry over to the FY2001 fund in addition to the funding allocated to the FY2001 fund. Disposition of unused funds in FY2001 will be determined during FY2001.

**POSSIBILITY OF SUBSEQUENT AWARDS**—Faculty receipt of an award in one year does not preclude application for consideration in a subsequent year. Each case is a separate and discrete consideration based on the set of factors present at the time of the committee deliberations and based on the applications for consideration forwarded by faculty members.

**APPEAL**—No formal appeal process is a part of the committee process; faculty may always pursue the faculty grievance process.
The Board of Trustees recognizes that the President of CWU must attend to a wide range of duties and responsibilities. The Board, from its side, will provide support for you in the exercise of designated responsibilities and pledges to do so by setting clear policy, communicating its priorities and assisting you in developing strong relations with external constituencies.

In return, the Board asks a commitment from the President to work constructively with faculty, staff, students and other groups which comprise the University; and to strive for effective working relations with this Board.

Among the many tasks you will be called upon to perform, the Board particularly asks that you give special emphasis to the following major issues over the next three to five years.

First, CWU needs a workable academic plan. Such a plan should be based on a thorough analysis and assessment of current academic offerings. It should establish clear priorities and realistically address methods of implementation. It should grow out of a planning process which involves wide participation, is ongoing and contains a mechanism for periodic review. In developing the plan, we would ask specifically, that you review issues of program excellence, teacher education and accreditation.
We next ask that you enlist all elements of the University in creating a better campus atmosphere. We need an environment of greater trust, a larger sense that the community cares about itself and that it respects its individual members and shares common goals for CWU. The University we would like to see is, above all, student-oriented and operates through effective governance at all levels.

Part of the campus atmosphere, one deserving special mention, is a more widespread acceptance of and encouragement of diversity. We want you to demonstrate a personal commitment to a pluralistic campus and to lead its members in positive steps towards the achievement of true diversity. We see pluralism, acceptance and promotion of diversity not as separate goals, but ones which are eventually well integrated into all significant aspects of campus life -- academic programs, hiring and admissions practices, planning, administrative and student leadership, and campus activities. The ideals of pluralism and diversity should embrace all aspects of CWU's service to the State of Washington, while not giving special emphasis to needs of economic and ethnic groups in geographic proximity to the University.

We want you to develop a strong administrative team. This task involves more than recruiting talented and diverse individuals from within and outside the University. It also includes a thorough review of existing administrative responsibilities and organization; performance review; attention to the improvement of campus communications; and designing the means for appropriate campus involvement in the selection of administrators and in the review of their performance. It also includes establishing a decision-making process which includes those people and department most closely affected, whether it's curriculum, budget or other matters.
External relations will require your particular attention. We would like to see closer relations with the legislature and with other elements of state government. We need better outreach to our service area and better media relations. We think there is the need for a marketing plan which will bring us to the attention of community groups throughout the state and may give special emphasis to relations with public schools. In all of this we would also like to see closer relations with other institutions of higher education within our state.

Finally, we need you to attend to establishing sound fiscal management. CWU probably needs better fiscal and budget controls and a review of how campus constituencies can most effectively be involved in the budget process. Certainly we need better ways to keep the faculty, staff and Board informed about both the budget process and the decisions which result from it.

The University must expand external fund raising from foundations, industry and other non-state sources. In this regard, we will expect you to work with and recruit additional members of the University Foundation.

With these expectations in place, we also think it fair for you and for us -- to establish, in advance, a process for evaluation of your service as President.
Evaluation and Term of Service

It is the expectation of the Board that you will tend to the daily operations of Central Washington University without the necessity for constant Board supervision. However, the Board does expect you to keep it informed of any special or unusual developments which might impinge upon the public representation functions of the Board. You should also keep the Board chair informed about the general operating condition of the University. Ongoing assessment of your success in performing those functions will constitute a form of continuous evaluation by the Board of the President’s performance.

Your performance will also be more formally evaluated by the Board during an annual review. For that purpose, you will be asked to prepare a report of accomplishments under your direction during the immediately preceding year. The Board, in turn, will provide a statement of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with your performance and suggestions for improvements. This review will not be conducted in public, although the Board may make a public announcement of the results of its evaluation of the President’s performance.

During the fourth year of your service, the Board will conduct a formal evaluation of your performance, utilizing external as well as internal evaluation techniques. You will assist the Board in designing that process and will submit a play for such an evaluation prior to the beginning of the third year of service. Evaluation will be conducted in the first four months of the fourth year of service. That response will constitute a formal evaluation of your service.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty, Deans, Directors, Department Heads and Students

SUBJECT: Central Washington University Successes

DATE: December 21, 1995

As we begin the new year, it is important that we remember how our university has fared during the past four years under stringent financial stress. I am sure you are all aware that since March 1992 Central Washington University has had to absorb a 10.2% cut to its base level of state appropriations. Specifically 2.4% of the 10.2% cut was made for the 1995-97 biennium. In spite of these financial strains it is noteworthy that we have achieved the following due to quality strategic planning:

- Central Washington University has the highest capital budget in its history for 1995-97, $100,580,000.
- We cut $1.6 million from the 1995-97 operating budget without decreasing faculty or staff.
- We have placed a computer on every faculty members desk at a cost of approximately $3000 per faculty.
- Some revenues from our summer session are being returned to the academic deans to use on priorities (1995, $452,000).
- Fifty percent of grant overhead received at the university is returned to the academic deans for their use on academic priorities ($69,600 from July 1 - Nov. 30, 1995).
- Approximately $900,000 was spent to develop student computer laboratories for specific departments in 1994-95: Art, Computer Science, Communications, English, Foreign Language, Geography, Geology, Mathematics, Physics, and Sociology. Included furniture, networking, hardware, software and remodeling for 99 work stations.
- Seventy-five new faculty have been recruited and hired over a period of two years to replace retired faculty members. The expense for this activity has been considerable. The salary and other requirements for success to recruit these faculty have been funded.
• We funded opportunity hires for new positions in four academic departments during 1994-95 ($150,000). (Economics, Theatre Arts, Sociology, Teacher Education Programs.)
• We provided all funding needed each year for tenure and promotion of faculty.
• We designed and implemented an Administrative Exempt employee system and began equity funding from our 4% 1995 salary increase.
• We increased our staff in University Advancement to assist in fund-raising for CWU. This past year almost $900,000 came to CWU through the Foundation for scholarships and faculty mini grant support. This was a record.
• We matched a $500,000 National Science Foundation grant, secured by Dr. Meghan Miller, Geology, with $650,000 of university money to perform renovation for Geology in Lind Hall.
• We provided additional revenues to the Library to offset a portion of increased periodical costs $25,000 in 94/95 and $68,000 in 95/96.
• We identified and established funding and budgets for general education. These are dollars to departments for instruction for increased enrollment.
• During the period since March 1992, we have decreased funding of nearly all supporting areas while protecting academic instruction, to mitigate the cuts we have absorbed.
• We provided an additional faculty position ($50,000) to match the $200,000 renewable grant to Strengthen Native American Management of Natural and Cultural Resources secured by Dr. Ken Hammond in geography.
• We requested and received $592,000 from the legislature to establish our first distance education classroom. We went live to Wenatchee January 1995. Eastern, Western, and Evergreen have no such classroom.
• We have established two new Master Programs, Master of Music Business and Master in Geology.
• The Higher Education Coordinating Board in November 1995, recognized our off-campus centers as part of the higher education system in the state of Washington.
• We have established, in cooperation with the Dean’s Council and the Provost, private gift funding priorities for professorships, scholarships, library, faculty development and equipment. The Foundation has made a commitment of $700,000 this year, and has goals with priorities totaling more than $16,000,000.
• Each department has been allowed to keep their carry-forward budget dollars for 1995-96.
• We have reallocated and provided additional dollars to support internet and operations of academic computing laboratories.
• We have made many administrative changes, too numerous to list, as a result of strategic planning.
• All mandatory step increases for classified staff have been absorbed in the base budget.
• Library resources in 1991 were valued at $13,530,110 and today library resources are valued at $16,315,991.
Although library salary expenses were reduced from $1,984,778 in 1991/92 to $1,723,244 in 1994/95, the library operating expenditures including collection development, equipment, goods, services, and travel went from $1,071,624 in 1991/92 to $1,712,099 in 1994/95 with an additional $176,000 carried forward. This includes $690,000 for the cooperative library project to connect Central to a six-university statewide network.

All of these accomplishments would not have been possible without strategic planning and the establishment of funding priorities. The relative ease by which we have absorbed the 10.2% cut since 1992, and specifically how we absorbed the 2.4% cut for 1995-97 biennium can be attributed to our strategic planning efforts.

Attached to this letter is how we specifically allocated our funds for 1995-96 according to the priorities established by the Provost and respective vice presidents based on the Provost's and vice president's submissions to the Budget Advisory Committee.

Your continued efforts in strategic planning will assure us a methodology for resource allocation based on priorities. Have a Happy New Year.

Ivory V. Nelson
President

cc: Member, Board of Trustees
    Provost
    Vice Presidents
The following funding priorities were identified by the Vice Presidents in 1994/95. All priorities are not listed; those that were funded in 1995/96 are identified. Distribution of additional 96/97 will be determined within the division.

President: EL 10
1) Increased cost of operation (Attorney General)
2) Increased cost of operation (Affirmative Action)
3) .25 FTE increased staff support (Senate)
4) Increased cost of operation (Senate)

Vice President for Business Affairs: EL 20
1) Student computing labs funded in 95/96
2) Pers rep/exempt admin funded 95/96
3) Hazardous waste operation (ops) funded in 95/96
4) DIS interface funded in 95/96
5) Restore Dir for Capital Prgs.
6) Telecomm staff
7) Restore Asst Dir CTS
8) LAN specialist
9) Internet T1 upgrade funded in 95/96
10) Instruct. Tech

Provost and Vice President Academic Affairs: EL 40
1) Utilities funded
2) Benefits funded
3) Classified Staff increments funded
4) Promotion Steps/Degree Completion funded
5) Leases (Center Increases) funded
6) Equity Affirmation Hires funded
7) Student Lab Support funded
8) Mandated Program Instruction Travel
9) Equipment Repair/Maintenance/Contracts
10) Distance Learning Program Costs funded
11) New Degree Center/Wenatchee funded
12) Recruitment (Faculty & Staff)
13) Start Up Costs for Faculty & Staff (selective)
14) Inflation
Vice President for University Advancement: EL 50
1) operations Catalog/Viewbook
2) staffing Advancement
3) operations Community Relations
4) University Info staffing & goods
5) University Advancement staffing & goods
6) Gov & Corp. Rel. staffing & goods

Vice President for Student Affairs EL80
1) Student Affairs Generalist, Westside
2) Financial Aid Counselor funded 95/96
3) Counselor, Counseling Center funded 95/96
4) Staffing Women's Resource Center (WRC) accomplished internally
5) Staffing Coop. Ed. accomplished internally
6) Goods and Services - Career Planning & Placement (CPPC) accomplished internally
7) Student wages CPPC accomplished internally
8) Student wages ADAASA accomplished internally
9) Goods and Services Fin Aid accomplished internally
10) Software CPPC accomplished internally
11) Travel Fin Aid accomplished internally
12) Goods and Services Coop Ed accomplished internally
13) ADAASA Counselor
14) Career Counselor (CPPC)
1995/96 CWU Budgeted State Appropriation and Operating Fees: $48,603,000

Annual Carry Forward Budgets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL10</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL20</td>
<td>$10,512,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL30</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL40</td>
<td>$24,792,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL50</td>
<td>$5,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL80</td>
<td>$1,467,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWU Essential Requirements Level (ERL) Additions:
(The following amounts have been added to the base budget)

- Utilities rate increase: $170,000
- Postal rate increase: $15,000
- Comp/tele rate increase: $22,000
- Lease rate (incl. Wenatchee off camp util/cust): $160,000
- Faculty Promotions: $75,000
- Classified steps: $178,000
- Unemploy comp: $20,000
- Transition: $68,000
- Catalog/Viewbook: $39,000

Other Adds:
- Counselor Fin Aid: $29,000
- CTS student comp labs: $128,000
- DIS interface: $4,000
- Faculty diversity hires: $150,000
- Faculty PC's (non base): $120,000
- Hazardous waste ops: $20,000
- Pers rep/exempt admin: $55,000

Net Available funds 1995/96: $0

The

1996/97 Additional Budgeted Proposed Appropriation and Operating Fees: $1,003,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>(EL)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>(EL10)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
<td>(EL80)</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for University Advancement</td>
<td>(EL50)</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs</td>
<td>(EL20)</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>(EL40)</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected revenue for which distribution has not yet been specified: $373,000

A Budget Hearing will be held during Spring Quarter 1996 to set the final distribution of the 1996/97 proposed allocations.
A special meeting of the Board of Trustees of Central Washington University was called to order by Board Chair Gwen Chaplin at 11:00 a.m., May 29, 1997, in Room 412 of Barge Hall on the Central Washington University campus.

Roll Call

Ms. Gwen Chaplin, Chair
Mr. Frederic L. "Fritz" Glover
Mr. Frank Sánchez
Mr. Mike Sells
Dr. R. Y. Woodhouse
Mr. Wilfred Woods, Vice Chair

A quorum was present.

Others

Dr. Aims C. McGuinness, Jr., Consultant, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
Ms. Judy B. Miller, Secretary to the Board
Dr. Ivory V. Nelson, President

Executive Session

Mrs. Chaplin announced that in accordance with RCW 42.30.110(g), the Board would meet in executive session for two hours to review the performance of a public employee. At 1:00 p.m. the executive session was extended to 1:30 p.m. The Board reconvened in open session at 1:30 p.m.

Open Session

Dr. Aims McGuinness and Dr. James Norton, consultants from the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, reviewed the performance of the Board of Trustees and President Nelson in a joint assessment. Dr. McGuinness presented an oral and written report of that evaluation.

Dr. McGuinness complimented the Board and Dr. Nelson for engaging in such a unique, joint evaluation of the board and president. Dr. McGuinness stressed that the assessment included only institutional leadership; it was not an accreditation visit. The report reflects perceptions gained from extensive on-campus and external constituency interviews.

The consultants reported that they were impressed with Central Washington University—its great potential, resources, faculty, programs, and campus. They found that Central changed dramatically over the last five years under the leadership of President Nelson. When Dr. Nelson was hired, he was given explicit directions by the Board of Trustees. In response to those directives, many institutional problems were resolved and remarkable progress has been made. Dr. Nelson is well known in Olympia as a person who is direct, blunt, and honest. State officials regard him as a credible man who knows the public policy issues facing the state.

Tremendous potential exists at Central. New faculty and staff contribute to its strength. A viable strategic plan provides an outstanding beginning for the next phase of planning. In broad terms, the institution is
healthy. Good progress has been made toward achieving data-based informational decisions. Are we prepared to move forward?

Often, people look at a set of external forces affecting an institution and hold the president personally accountable. External pressures will present greater challenges in the next few years creating a greater need for strengthened leadership from the Board and President.

Strengthened leadership will be supported by more visible, cohesive leadership from the Board of Trustees, a Board willing to forge a stronger partnership with the President. The President will contribute by building deeper consensus with the Board and the community, eliciting understanding and commitment to a well-stated institutional vision. He must focus on the vision and work with the university team to achieve its reality.

The institution is at a critical stage. Dramatic leadership approaches will enable us to meet the challenges of the future.

Board members expressed gratitude for the outside evaluation and appreciated the thoughtful comments. A Board retreat will be scheduled so the trustees can review the recommendations, understand the challenges, clarify the role of the board, and establish the direction of the university. Facing the challenges of higher education in the future will require commitment from the Board of Trustees, the President, and the university community.

The process of change is not easy and often is accompanied by anxiety. The basic message of the report clarified that during periods of intense change, everyone must work to meet the challenges.

Adjournment

The meeting was declared adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Judy B. Miller, Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Central Washington University

Gwen Chaplin, Chair
Board of Trustees
Central Washington University

Attachment: Assessment Report
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND PRESIDENT

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

James A. (Dolph) Norton
Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.

Conducted under the Auspices of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

May 29, 1997
Charge

The charge to the assessment team was to undertake an assessment of both the Board of Trustees and the President of Central Washington University (CWU). This assessment is being undertaken under the aegis of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), the principal national association of boards of trustees of public and independent colleges and universities. Simultaneous assessment of both the board and the president is a new process. It stems from an AGB finding that assessments that focus only on the board or president often fail to recognize the critical interdependence of these roles in ensuring effective leadership for the institution. The Board of Trustees and President should be complimented for their willingness for CWU to be one of the first institutions in the nation to embark on this new process.

Assessment Focus and Limitations

This assessment focused on Central Washington University’s leadership -- especially on the President and Board of Trustees. Because of this sharp focus and the practical limitations of time, this was not an assessment of CWU as a whole. Certainly as we gathered information about the Board and President, we inevitably obtained information about a wide range of institutional issues. While this information was useful to our understanding of the context, our focus remained on the question of institutional leadership.

Approach

Prior to the initial visit to Ellensburg, the team reviewed extensive background information on CWU. These materials included, among many items, the Strategic Plan, the Mission Statement, minutes of recent Board meetings, accreditation reports, the initial Board of Trustees’ statement of presidential expectations of December 1991, the presidential appointment letter, and subsequent presidential evaluations.

The team met with the Assessment Committee on Thursday evening, April 3, 1997, prior to the regular meeting of the Board of Trustees in Wenatchee. The Assessment Committee meeting provided an opportunity for a discussion of both the objectives of the assessment and the methodology to be followed. It was agreed at that meeting that, while the assessment would necessarily consider issues of past board and presidential performance, the emphasis would be forward looking. The discussion at this preliminary meeting and in most of the subsequent meetings and interviews centered on these basic questions:

1. What is the most serious challenge facing Central Washington University?
2. Is the leadership of Central Washington University (the Board of Trustees and President) positioned to meet this challenge?

3. What are the most serious barriers to meeting this challenge?

The team requested that each Board member provide confidential answers to each of these questions as well as to the questions for Board self-study provided by the Association of Governing Boards. Notices to the campus community invited written comments to be submitted to the team.

The visit to Wenatchee afforded the team an opportunity to observe the Board of Trustees in a regular meeting—a meeting conducted with an interactive video link between Wenatchee and the CWU main campus in Ellensburg. It also provided an opportunity for the team to learn about the CWU center in Wenatchee and to meet informally with both representatives of the Wenatchee community and CWU board members, administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

The team returned to Washington State for a full site visit beginning with a dinner meeting with President Nelson and his wife, Patricia, followed by three days of extensive interviews and meetings with community leaders and campus representatives in Ellensburg on April 21 through April 23. On the afternoon of April 23, the team traveled to the CWU SeaTac Center. The following day, we met with key legislative leaders and leaders from the Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Council of Presidents. During this visit, the team met with the Assessment Committee and had an opportunity to meet individually—either in person or by telephone—with each current Board member and two former Board members who had also served as Board chairs.

The team wishes to express its deep appreciation to the Board of Trustees and President Nelson for an open and warm welcome to CWU. We especially appreciated the outstanding staff assistance provided by Judy Miller and the staff of the Office of the President, and by Martha Lindley who organized our visits in Olympia.

**Overall Assessment**

From the perspective of having worked with and visited many public universities across the United States, the team was especially impressed by Central Washington University (CWU)—the range and quality of its programs, its traditions, the dedication of the faculty and administrators, the strength of the student leadership, the vitality of the centers, and the attractiveness of the Ellensburg campus. There is much to be proud of at this university. Its recent recognition as “one of the best college buys in the U.S.” is well-deserved.
To a significant degree, the current status and potential of CWU can be attributed to the leadership of President Ivory Nelson with the support of the Board of Trustees over the past six years. While we did not dwell on the conditions at CWU at the time that President Nelson assumed the presidency, the evidence is clear that the university faced serious problems of declining academic quality and mismanagement. In light of the controversy surrounding his appointment and the severe resource limitations, the achievements of the Board of Trustees and President Nelson are remarkable.

The clarity of the Board of Trustees’ expectations for the new president, the “Statement of Issues--December 1991,” no doubt contributed to Dr. Nelson’s ability to set a course toward improvement. As documented in his annual reports to the Board of Trustees, Dr. Nelson has made consistent progress toward the goals set forth by the Board. Among the accomplishments most frequently mentioned by those with whom the team consulted are the following:

- Developing a Strategic Plan which is increasingly being linked to the university’s budget process.
- Sustaining the university through effective management and internal efficiencies despite severe budget constraints and an increasingly negative external political and economic environment.
- Addressing longstanding academic issues including achieving a positive interim fifth year accreditation review by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, and reaccreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).
- Developing an openness and integrity in formal university communications regarding the budget and academic and administrative processes.
- Greatly strengthening the integrity and efficiency of the university’s internal management and organization.
- Improving campus diversity as reflected in both people of color and women in the composition of the faculty, administration, and student body, and in increased sensitivity to diversity in the campus climate.
- Substantially improved access to technology throughout the campus.
- Recognizing and strengthening the role of the university’s off-campus centers at Lynnwood, SeaTac, Wenatchee, and Yakima, and gaining recognition of these centers in the Higher Education Coordination Board (HECB) Master Plan.
- Increasing the visibility and respect for CWU in the state capitol—the legislature, the Higher Education Coordinating Board, the Office of Financial Management, and the Council of Presidents.

The team was especially encouraged by the enthusiasm and optimism of deans and department chairs during our campus visits, and the evidence that 40 percent of the faculty has been at CWU for fewer than five years. While there are legitimate issues
regarding the instability of leadership, especially in the position of provost, CWU has an extraordinary opportunity afforded by its ability to attract a whole new generation of faculty and staff. The challenge, of course, will be to create and sustain an environment that will support these new people.

These and other improvements have made CWU a stronger institution than it was in 1991. Yet change inevitably stimulates strong resistance within an academic community. As one could reasonably expect, the breadth and speed of change at CWU over the past six years have had a negative impact on the campus climate and perceptions of the institutional leadership. It is especially important in situations such as this to attempt to distinguish between those conditions that are the result of largely uncontrollable external and internal tensions, and those that result from deliberate action or inaction by university leaders. In a brief visit, it was impossible for the team to understand fully the origins of current concerns. It appears, however, that many of these are resulting from the sharp contrast between the pace of change on campus and the rapid economic, political, and technological changes in the state of Washington and beyond. The Board of Trustees and President are at the intersection between these contrasting forces. Bridging the gap between internal and external worlds and continuing to prepare CWU to thrive in the new environment will be major challenges facing the university leadership over the next decade.

The team’s positive assessment of the progress of the past six years does not mean problems do not remain. The principal concern is the capacity of the university to confront the challenges of the next decade. The demand for baccalaureate and graduate education in the state of Washington will continue to outstrip available public resources. The policy and economic environment in which the board and president will have to lead will be increasingly difficult. Public officials, the general public, and employers are demanding a more responsive, accountable system. Competition from other institutions is intensifying, especially related to distance learning and technology-intensive education delivery. The increasing diversity of the state’s population and other demographic changes will continue to challenge institutions such as CWU.

Our assessment is that CWU now has a good foundation from which it can more forward. Progress in the future, however, will require that together the Board of Trustees and the President make fundamental changes in the ways they lead the university. What worked in the past six years will not be adequate for the future.

The Board of Trustees must become a more visible, cohesive policy leadership body for the university. It must become more engaged in the critical roles of strategic planning, advocacy, and oversight. It must be more visible and accessible as a team within the university community and the state.

The President must play a more active role in developing a consensus in the university community on the university’s goals and the challenges of the next decade. This will
require both increased support for the Board of Trustees in its more visible and active role as well as greater engagement with the university community. Despite the progress of the past six years, lasting change will require a broad consensus on the fundamental goals to be achieved and culture of openness, trust, and respect among the key university constituencies.

Having led CWU through difficult times, the challenge for the President now is to step back and focus on building a consensus on what the university must achieve; while delegating to and supporting the strong team he now has in place to assume responsibility for how these goals are to be achieved.

Developing leadership for the future will require the concerted efforts of both the Board of Trustees and the President. The Board will not be able to function as a cohesive policy leadership body without the support of the President. And the President must have clear direction and support from the Board for him to continue to make progress.

The university is at a critical turning point. It could lurch backward, reject change, resort to rigid protections against perceived threats, and seek to return to a more idyllic age that never existed. To do so at this stage could threaten its capacity to thrive in the next decade and beyond. Or, the university could acknowledge the progress it has made in the past six years, take bold steps to increase its responsiveness and competitiveness, and seize the opportunity to accelerate its progress toward becoming the preeminent institution within its carefully defined mission in the state of Washington and the West. Which course the university pursues depends directly on the capacity and willingness of the Board of Trustees and President to change and adapt in order to be able to lead in this new environment.
TO: Board of Trustees
Central Washington University
Ms. Gwen Chaplin, Chair
Mr. Wilf Woods, Vice Chair
Mr. Fritz Glover
Mr. Frank Sánchez
Mr. Mike Sells
Dr. R. Y. Woodhouse

DATE: May 9, 1997

SUBJECT: Self-Evaluation of Presidential Performance
March 1996 to March 1997

Each year of my tenure at Central Washington University I have provided a written performance assessment for the Board of Trustees based on the 1991 Statement of Issues. The reports have covered the following periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report I</td>
<td>March 1992 to March 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report II</td>
<td>March 1993 to March 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report III</td>
<td>March 1994 to March 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report IV</td>
<td>March 1995 to March 1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report, Report V, uses the central themes of the original Statement of Issues and covers the period from March 1996 to March 1997.

Goal 1: Maintain and Improve Strategic Planning as a University Priority

We have completed four cycles for university strategic planning and have produced three executive summaries. Our most recent strategic planning document (1996-2001) incorporates all university planning. Each academic and administrative unit is represented as well as specific all-university issues such as affirmative action,
people of color participation, private giving fund-raising, gender equity, ten-year capital facilities, university computing, Samuelson Union Building, and ten-year campus master planning. Central's strategic plan has served the institution well, both as an external document to state agencies and in preparation of our biennial capital and operating budget requests for 1997-99 legislative funding.

At your request, we are reexamining our mission statement. The strategic planning committee has reviewed the mission statement, solicited campus input, and has forwarded the revised statement to the Board for your review. We have also begun a reexamination of university goals and underlying assumptions for strategic planning at the university.

Central's participation in the state's K-20 technology project (distance education) is our newest planning effort. It is our intent to develop a distance education network within the next five years which will allow Central to deliver about ten percent of our instruction via electronic classrooms at Lynnwood, Pierce, SeaTac, Yakima, Moses Lake, Wenatchee, Omak, and Everett.

Goal 2: Encourage Diversity and Pluralism

Employment initiatives continue to produce impressive gains in diversifying staff at the university. Goals for women and people of color were met within the executive job category. People of color constituted 39 percent of tenure-track faculty hires this year. Women constituted 43 percent of tenure-track faculty hires this year.

The participation rate for female athletes has increased from 29 percent in 1992 to 44 percent in 1996. Current participation for 1997 is 44 percent. We have exceeded our Higher Education Coordinating Board goal of 39 percent. However, Title IX dictates that athletic participation must reflect the gender enrollment of the university. Currently, the university enrolls 52.2 percent females.

The number of African-Americans, American Indians, Asia/Pacific Islanders, and Hispanic students has increased since September 1991. The percentage of minority students has increased from 9.1 percent Fall 1991 to 12.3 percent Fall 1996. The number of employees of color has increased from 72 (7.28 percent) Fall 1991 to 109 (8.13 percent) Fall 1996. The number of minority students attaining baccalaureate degrees has increased from 136 in 1991-92 to 200 in 1995-96.

We continue to encourage curriculum diversity. The Douglas Honors College has revised its reading list and now includes readings of people of color and women. Faculty are granted release time from teaching one course during an academic year to design new courses that will contain diverse participation perspectives. An academic minor in Asia/Pacific Studies has been established.
Student Life and academic departments have presented numerous on-campus programs to celebrate the contributions of diverse cultures and enhance student, faculty, and staff understanding across cultures.

Goal 3: Update Curriculum Programs/Maintain Program Excellence

For the first time in over twenty years, the Faculty Senate has approved a new general education curriculum to be implemented Fall 1997. The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee has reviewed, updated, and codified all of the academic policies which have been adopted by the Senate. Faculty have revised curriculum in Art, English, Communication, Music, Sociology, and Family and Consumer Science.

The School of Business and Economics has applied to the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) for an accreditation visit in 1998. We have begun preparation for the university-wide accreditation visit from the Northwest Association of School and Colleges Fall 1999 and an accreditation visit Spring 1999 for our Teacher Education Program from NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education).

Results of accreditation reviews of our programs in Electronic Engineering Technology and Mechanical Engineering Technology by the engineering technology accrediting body have not yet been received. The Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies and the Chair of the Department of Technology are confident that these two strong programs will be accredited.

Goal 4: Review Existing Administrative Organizations for Efficiency

The university’s 1995-96 audit, performed by the State Auditor’s office, did not disclose any findings or questioned cost. Audits were conducted on use of the Associated Student Fund, Housing and Food Service Operations, and overall university operations.

Central’s personnel office is undergoing change to become a human resources office. We are currently developing various staff training programs, and we have reallocated a position in Facilities Management for a university training coordinator. This year a significant number of training programs were made available to faculty and staff. It is our intent to provide more training programs for our administrative personnel in such areas as sexual harassment, good administrative practices, human relations skills, requirements of state ethics laws, and other policy areas of the university.

Self-Evaluation/Ivory Nelson

May 9, 1997
Auxiliary Services (*Dining Services, The Conference Center, and the Bookstore*) was moved from business and financial affairs to student affairs. Since the services of this function are primarily related to providing student services, and since we had a duplication of resident hall staffing in student affairs and business affairs, it made good management sense to consolidate Auxiliary Services with Student Affairs. For example, we now have one administrator for all housing functions whereas previously two administrators divided the functions. This merger was completed January 1, 1997.

Several financial functions of the university have been consolidated under the Director of Financial Services. Previously, Facility Plant Accounting, Auxiliary Services Accounting, and Continuing Education Accounting were the responsibility of the individual units, with general oversight by the Director of Financial Services. Now the Director of Financial Services has direct responsibility for these services and all financial functions at the university. Staff members who were responsible for accounting in the above offices will continue to perform the same functions and have been relocated to offices in the accounting section of Mitchell Hall.

The university had two competing printing organizations on campus—Instructional Media Center and Auxiliary Services Production. During the past year these two entities have been working together to formulate one university structure to serve publications needs on campus. The merged operation will be implemented by July 1, 1997. It is our intent that university customers have one-stop shopping for needed publication and printing services rather than competing university operations. The merged unit will be under the direction of the Instructional Media Center or a new name reflecting the combination of the two entities.

Parking Administration will report to Business Service and Contracts effective July 1, 1997. Central Stores has been transferred from Facilities Management and has reported to Business Service and Contracts since March 1, 1997. Effective July 1, 1997 some supply items carried by the Central Stores and others will be transferred to the University Store.

The responsibility for our distance education program (K-20 Technology) has been given to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, who also has the responsibility for the coordination of our University Centers.

This latest set of reorganizations completes the reorganization effort begun five years ago. We now have relevant units placed in a university organizational structure that provides operational efficiency. Academic reorganization is complete at the school and college level. Administrative units have been placed in a management structure that should provide cost-effective operation. In recognition of Central’s teacher education legacy, teacher education has been restored to the level of a college (College of Education and Professional Studies).
Goal 5: Prepare a University Response for the Campus Climate Report

On October 28, 1996, six months after the release of the Campus Climate Report, a university report prepared by the four vice presidents addressing specific issues in the campus climate report was disseminated to the entire campus. In addition to identifying specific issues, the report stressed the university’s commitment to equitable treatment of individuals at all levels of the university, attentive listening and swift response to concerns, unbiased acceptance of varying lifestyles, effective and open channels of communication, frequent and open expression of pride in the accomplishments of colleagues and coworkers, the presence of and support for stimulating intellectual discussion, and zero tolerance for violence, discrimination and sexual harassment. Each vice president is to provide a yearly report on successful efforts to address climate issues. The first report is due December 1997.

Goal 6: Prepare the Campus Technologically for the 21st Century

By July 1, 1997, we will have completed the computer wiring of the campus. While we have placed computers on all faculty/staff desks, our next major task is to upgrade a significant number of personal computers from 286 technology. We have begun to implement the university computing plan to change our computer environment from vax technology to distributed computing. A significant amount of time has been spent adjusting our present computing system to address problems of the year 2000. We are presently planning to implement our Academic Support System over the next four years. This requires the university to transform all of its vax-based operating systems with client server technology.

The University Library has completed the first phase of the Cooperative Library Project that will link libraries of the six public four-year institutions in the state of Washington. Presently, the Library is heavily engaged in the retrospective conversion of our library collection to the Library of Congress system.

We have delivered over thirty courses this year via our distance education link with Wenatchee Valley College. This provides the university with the necessary experience to develop a strong distance education program connecting the university’s off-campus centers using the state-funded K-20 technology plan. The proposed university’s participation in distance education has been defined for the next five years. Planning and details for implementation are a continuous process in the Provost’s Office.

We have completed and begun implementation of the first phase of our Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS) and renamed the system Central’s Academic Progress System (CAPS). The Electronic Catalog is operational and provides up-to-date curriculum changes. Block registration techniques have been implemented which provide a smooth transition for our incoming freshmen.
university received considerable positive press for this new innovation. It is possible now to apply for admission to the university via our web page. We have received an award for the utility of our web page.

Goal 7: Improve Internal and External Campus Communications

Using our campus-wide communications, all agendas and minutes for major meetings of the President’s Cabinet, Deans’ Council, Student Affairs Council, Business Affairs Council, University Advancement, and Faculty Senate are posted via e-mail. Budgetary and other management information about the university is available via GOCAT, our management information system. Minutes of major university committees are distributed by e-mail. Campus forums on the Campus Master Plan and meetings of the Budget Advisory Committee and Strategic Planning Committee are televised and open to the public.

A university/Ellensburg community advisory committee is kept abreast of potential contentious issues. University Relations produces daily news releases for local newspapers featuring CWU faculty, staff, and students.

Goal 8: Maintain a Decision-Making Process that Includes Affected Units

The development of strategic plans, budget plans, assessment activities, curricula changes, and evaluation begins at the department or unit level. All proposed university policies are forwarded to the Faculty Senate, classified staff organization, and the appropriate committee for comment before adoption by the President’s Cabinet. Curriculum development and academic policies are handled by the Faculty Senate through its various committees.

Goal 9: Maintain State Funding for Operations and Capital Projects

For the 1995-97 biennium, Central received $100,580,000 for capital construction. This is the largest construction budget in CWU history. All of our construction projects, especially the Biology and Chemistry Building (Science Facility) and Education Building, are presently on budget and on schedule. The university submitted its 1997-99 Legislative Budget Request for Operations and Capital in accordance with its strategic plans. We received our proportionate share of funding comparative to our comprehensive sister universities. During the past two bienniums, Central received the highest percentage of state funding increase for its operation budget. Central received the second largest dollar funding for the Cooperative Library Project for the 1995-97 biennium. The university prepared a set of legislative issues that provided the direction for our 1997-99 legislative activity.
Comparatively speaking, Central maintained a positive position in receiving funds from the legislature.

Goal 10:  Increase External Fund-Raising from Private Sources

Alumni Relations has changed the direction of the alumni organization by establishing an alumni dues program and alumni chapters. Alumni giving has increased by 142 percent over the past year. The Director of Development has increased the donor base of the university to 2,373/50,000. This represents a 200 percent increase. Private donations to the university have increased by 228 percent to $1,345,000. We have received $350,000 from the CWU Foundation to match $350,000 from the state to establish one faculty professorship and four graduate assistantships. University Advancement has been given the responsibility of cataloging and recording all private giving to the university. This function was previously located in Business and Financial Affairs. The Foundation’s small grants program has increased from $6,000 a year to $40,000 a year. The Foundation has adopted the university’s strategic plan and private gift funding priorities as the priorities of the Foundation. During FY 96, annual giving was $34,723, CWU Associates $111,805, corporations/foundations $56,350, graduate fellowships $52,000, memorials $4,090, and bequests $5,000 for a total of $262,968.

Goal 11:  Establish Quality External Image and Media Relations

The vice presidents have received professional media relations training. The university is now participating in the statewide logo licensing program. CWU supporters and alumni can purchase license plates with the Wildcat logo. Our university stationery and cards have a consistent design. University publications are being produced with a thematic emphasis. A brochure containing our mission and goals was prepared and distributed to colleges, universities, legislators, CWU supporters, and to audiences where I make presentations about the university. We broadcast many university events over TV Channel 2. We have hired an information specialist to work at least several days a month in the Puget Sound market to increase Central’s visibility.

Goal 12:  Prepare the University for Upcoming Accreditation Visits

We have begun preparations for accreditation visits by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (1999), Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NWASC) (Fall 1999), and the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) (1998). The Provost has established a working committee for the NWASC, and the Dean of Education and Professional Studies is leading the self-study efforts with the Provost on the NCATE
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accreditation. The Dean of the School of Business and Economics is working with the Provost for the preparation of the self-study AACSB report for the 1998 visit.

Goal 13:  Work with the Board of Trustees on Specific Issues

I asked the Faculty Senate to examine the issue of part-time faculty under the faculty code. A response has been prepared by the chair of the Faculty Code Committee, Dr. Beverly Heckart, clarifying the role of part-time faculty. I have worked with faculty union representatives and prepared a report on faculty unionization which was submitted to the Board in April 1997. We have submitted the university’s mission and goals statement to the Board for reexamination. The Board has been involved in the legislative agenda of the university, and the Board and President are currently undergoing an outside evaluation and performance assessment.

Goal 14:  Continue Evaluation of Key Administrators

Each vice president has submitted an annual, written self-evaluation report responding to specific questions and issues. I have provided a written evaluation of each of the vice presidents as part of my assessment. Each vice president has also provided evaluations of the administrators who report to them. All administrative evaluations are placed in the personnel file of the respective administrator.

Goal 15:  Provide Service to the External Community

I continue to serve on the Washington State Commission for Student Learning (K-12 Educational Reform), participate in the Rotary Club of Ellensburg, and Alpha Omicron Boulé of Seattle. I am a board member of the Council of Presidents for the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (CWU is a member); member of the Commission on International Programs, American Council of Education; state representative for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities; member of the Appeals Committee of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; and a member of the Council of Presidents of Washington State Universities.

I meet on a monthly basis with the Superintendent of the Ellensburg School District, President of the Chamber of Commerce, Mayor of Ellensburg, and one of the Kittitas County Commissioners. We discuss ways to improve our working relationship and strengthen the community.

Goal 16:  Provide a statement of my strategic issues and positioning of the university for the next five years.

Self-Evaluation/Ivory Nelson 8 May 9, 1997
President's Strategic Statement

For every right that you cherish, you have a duty which you must fulfill. For every hope that you entertain, you have a task that you must perform. For every good that you wish to preserve, you will have to sacrifice your comfort and your ease. There is nothing for nothing any longer.

Walter Lippmann

As we position ourselves for the success of Central Washington University in the new millennium, higher education and the university must adapt to the same societal, economic, and political pressures of industry. These external forces may be identified as follows:

Rapidly Changing Markets

The composition of the university’s future student body will be radically different than it was two decades ago in three significant ways: (1) The traditional anglo student soon will be in the minority; (2) the average age of students will continue to rise; and (3) the “preparation gap” of entering students will continue to widen. Efforts within the K-12 community to implement competency-based admission standards could narrow the “preparation gap.” On the other hand, expanded service to students returning to higher education from the workplace may well offset any narrowing of the gap that is achieved by K-12 reform.

Heightened Competition

Competition to attract the best students is universal. External research support from federal agencies and industrial laboratories continues to shrink. This is also true for the philanthropic dollar. Competition for faculty now focuses on national and even international markets which place differential values on various skills and abilities.

New Technology

The motivation to adopt new technology has been quality improvement—more effective teaching and learning. As financial pressures intensify in higher education, academic and political leaders view technology as a possible source of reduced costs. The phrase “teaching productivity” is still an anathema to some faculty members, but inevitably this will become less so.

Diminishing Resources

As the university focuses on reducing costs, rearranging priorities, and changing the mix of activities, options can be grouped under four broad headings: (1) do less with
less (2) do the same with less; (3) change the educational delivery system; and (4) sharpen and differentiate Central Washington University's mission.

Demands for Accountability by Multiple Constituencies

The demands for educational accountability become more intense by the day. This accountability reaches well beyond finances. Higher admission standards, better outcomes assessment, improved graduation rates, increased faculty productivity, workforce preparation, and shifting the burden of payment for higher education away from society and parents toward the student have become the accountability standards for higher education and Central Washington University.

A Vision for the Future

In reality, we are being asked to do more with less. As a result, we need to look positively at the future and begin reshaping and reconfiguring Central Washington University's curricular offerings to fit future demands. In most instances this will possibly require fewer curricular offerings and improved working relationships with elementary and secondary education and the business community. Our curriculum must become more multicultural as we make these changes. Central must become more attuned to the dimensions of international education that bear heavily on the economic competitiveness and growth of the state of Washington.

We must pay more attention to retaining students until graduation and to the relationship between our curricular offerings and our students' job prospects. We must understand our mission more clearly and define the kinds of students that our mission can serve. We must define exactly what our freshmen and transfer students need to succeed. We must tailor our programs—curriculum, schedules, support services, office hours—to meet the needs of the students we admit, not the convenience of staff and faculty. We must rigorously assess what our students know and are able to do in order to improve both student and institutional performance.

Central Washington University must participate in the transformation of our educational system into a seamless system that can produce and support a nation of learners, providing access to educational services when and where learners need them.

We must challenge both state and federal agencies to remove regulatory restrictions and provide financial management flexibility the university needs to educate students. Institutional creativity, not micromanagement, is an essential precondition to change.
Central Washington University, higher education and the society we serve face a fork in the road. Either we, as educators, raise our sights and take the difficult steps to transform ourselves by addressing defined problems or we will face the certain and unpleasant prospect of a decline. One can look squarely at the quality of undergraduate and graduate education at Central and be optimistic.

The time for change is now. There is more than sufficient evidence to conclude that those institutions that do not change—that fail to understand the underlying nature of the market place and the pace and effects of technological change—will lose both influence and resources.

It has been a most rewarding and successful year.

Ivory V. Nelson
President
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1. Stimulates imaginative and realistic plans for the future of the University.
2. Evidences respect and trust in the faculty to exercise good judgment.
3. Communicates in a clear and organized manner.
4. Works effectively to obtain support for the University.
5. Represents the University academic programs effectively to the Board of Trustees.
6. Projects a positive image of the University to the public.
7. Anticipates and deals with problems in a timely manner.
8. Bases decisions on stated University goals and procedures.
9. Properly delegates responsibility and commensurate authority.
10. Demonstrates integrity and honesty in dealing with others.
11. Actively supports quality in the academic programs.
12. Maintains and supports the undergraduate liberal arts program.
13. Maintains and supports the professional programs.
14. Maintains and supports the graduate programs.
15. Maintains and supports the research programs.
16. Actively encourages diversity.
17. Encourages full participation by faculty in decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>1993 Mean</th>
<th>1995 Mean</th>
<th>1998 Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cannot Judge</th>
<th>Actual Judge</th>
<th>Global Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response categories for this survey are:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree
6 = Cannot Judge
9 = Based on Actual Events
10 = Based on Global Impression

SD = STANDARD DEVIATION
Proposed changes/additions to Section 1.15, Subsection F.3 of the Faculty Code

b. The impasse Committee shall provide written notification of its recommendations to all affected parties. At its next meeting, the Board of Trustees shall review the impassed item and reach its final conclusion. propose their final recommendation for ratification by the Faculty Senate. Ratification of the final recommendation of the Board of Trustees by a simple majority of the Faculty Senate completes this process.

c. If the Faculty Senate fails to ratify the final recommendation of the Board of Trustees as provided in 1.15, F.3 b, the impassed item will be resolved through external, impartial, binding arbitration, except as provided for in 1.15, F.3 d. The outcome of such arbitration will be final and binding on all parties, and will result in the adoption of any changes to the Faculty Code determined through the arbitration process.

d. If the Board of Trustees has declared an emergency; and if the Faculty Senate fails to ratify the final recommendation of the Board of Trustees as provided in 1.15, F.3 b; and if the impassed item hinges on, or materially impacts the conditions of the declared emergency, then the Board of Trustees will provide a written rationale of these circumstances to the Faculty Senate, along with their final decision on the impassed item, without further recourse to binding arbitration as provided in 1.15 F.3 c. The exception to binding arbitration contained in this Subsection (1.15 F. 3 d) shall not be used routinely, or to deny or frustrate the process described in Subsections 1.15 F. 3 b and 1.15 F. 3c.
TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Charles McGehee, Chair
Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee

DATE: October 2, 1998

RE: Catalogue statement on HEC Board Affirmation of CWU programs

A letter from Ms. Jane Battey, Director of the State Approving Agency, to the Provost reaffirming approval of CWU academic programs for the purpose of enrolling persons eligible to receive certain Federal [veterans'] benefits was forwarded to the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee for consideration since the letter indicated that the approving agency requires the following wording to be included in future CWU academic catalogues:

"Central Washington University's academic programs of study are approved by the Higher Education Coordinating Board's State Approving Agency (HECB/SAA) for enrollment of persons eligible to receive educational benefits under Title 38 and Title 10, U.S. Code."

In the view of the Academic Affairs Committee, this statement is for informational purposes only and adding it to the catalogue does not constitute a policy issue nor does the catalogue editor require the assent of the Senate to include it in the catalogue. It therefore requires no action by the Academic Affairs Committee or the Faculty Senate.

End of report.

Charles L. McGehee   e-mail: chasm@cwu.edu
Department of Sociology http://www.cwu.edu/~chasm
Central Washington University  fax: 509-963-1308
Ellensburg, WA 98926 USA   tel: 509-963-2005
Dear Marsha-----Will you please read the following report from the Code Committee to the Senate at the appropriate time. I have another meeting this afternoon and shall not be there in person.

The Senate Code Committee meets every Tuesday, 10-12 a.m., in Science Building 311. So far this year, the Code Committee has rendered one code interpretation allowing for replacements when vacancies on the Faculty Grievance Committee occur. It has also begun to discuss the entire issue of faculty load during the academic year and summer session and including the areas of independent study and thesis committees. In conjunction with the issue of load we shall also address, as requested by the Senate Executive Committee, whether set payments should be made to faculty who supervise graduate theses completed during summer session. In addressing these issues the Code Committee is conferring with representatives of the Senate Personnel Committee. As the Code Committee deals with its many other charges during this academic year, it will continue to report to the Senate on its progress.

Thanks, Marsha.

Beverly
October 29, 1998

Mr. John Alsoszatai-Petheo, Chair
Faculty Senate, Central Washington University
Campus--7509

Dear John:

In response to your request of October 15, 1998 for an interpretation regarding replacements for the Faculty Grievance Committee under Faculty Code Section 12.10, the Code Committee has determined the following:

When an alternate replaces an original appointee to the Faculty Grievance Committee, a replacement alternate shall be appointed and ratified immediately to complete the remainder of the original appointee’s and alternate’s term.

Even though the current Faculty Code provides for a replacement alternate only at the end of the term, it was not the intention of the Code that either regular or alternate positions on the Faculty Grievance Committee remain vacant for long periods of time.

Sincerely,

Beverly Heckart, Chair
Faculty Senate Code Committee
Motion: That the text of the resolution to be voted upon by the faculty read as follows:

The faculty senate has become aware of a perception among faculty that President Ivory Nelson of Central Washington University has:

1. Failed to implement a model for operation of the University consistent with its mission and potential
2. Failed to adequately voice the mission, concerns and needs of the University to the Legislature and the community
3. Reallocated and directed resources within the University at the grave expense of instructional resources
4. Failed to implement a meaningful shared governance of the University with the faculty
5. Failed to address in a meaningful way faculty salary equity

In view of the overriding importance of these issues to the well-being of the University, the Faculty Senate is asking for a determination by the faculty of their confidence in President Nelson to develop meaningful measures to address these five issues by April 14, 1999.

______ I have CONFIDENCE that President Ivory Nelson can develop meaningful measures to address these five issues of foremost importance to the faculty by April 14, 1999

______ I have NO CONFIDENCE that President Ivory Nelson can develop meaningful measures to address these five issues of foremost importance to the faculty by April 14, 1999

______ I do not believe that this vote of confidence is appropriate at this time
At 06:59 PM 11/4/1998 +0000, Faculty Senate (Marsha Brandt) wrote:

>MINUTES >CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY >FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: November 4, 1998 > >Please edit and return. > >

>PRESIDENT'S REPORT: President Nelson commented that since the Resolution of the Board of Trustee's passed last October 9th, that he has been meeting with the Faculty Senate Chair and the Board Chair to discuss ways of alternate ideas and we will continue those discussions. >

>Higher Education Coordinating Board Programmatic Approvals and 1999-01 Operating and Capital Budget Recommendations for Central >Washington University: President Nelson to The University Community, October 30, 1998 >>This information is a recapitulation of Central's success at the Higher Education Coordinating (HEC) Board as relates to our proposals. Our work did somewhat pay off. Three programs were approved. They are recommending a 4.5% each year for faculty salary. The most important part about this is that we think we have a change in the HEC Board in the sense that previously HEC Board members did not lobby or work the legislature. We had dinner with the HEC Board after they passed this resolution the last time, and we have a commitment from the HEC Board Chair and members that they will work with the colleges and universities to help lobby for the dollars for the colleges and universities in the State. This is a tremendous change from previous HEC Boards. >>OPINION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON: October 28, 1998 >>This is the long awaited opinion from the Attorney General's Office regarding salary increases, salary equity, use of local funds in the event a bargaining agreement provides for salary increases greater than legislatively appropriated.... Copies of the twenty-two-page document may be requested of the President's and/or Faculty Senate's Office. >

Ivory V. Nelson President CWU Tel 509 963 2111 Fax 509 963 3206 nelsoni@cwu.edu

Faculty Senate (Marsha Brandt) -- 1 -- Thu, 5 Nov 1998 07:17:42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAMSON, Karen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALSOSZATAI-PETHEO, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMATO, Sara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAXTER, Louise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAGHAN, Jim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENSON, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACKETT, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAUNSTEIN, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRODERSON, Bret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLOCK, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHEBA, Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'ACQUISTO, Leo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOREST, Claire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeVIEITTI, Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY, Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMANS, Cindy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORDAN, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMON, Ken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAY, Loretta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUNN, Gerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWKINS, Jim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOD, Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMINSKI, Walter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS, Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHEL, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONSON, Luetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSTAIN, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NELSON, Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGALAMULUME, Kalala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIGGE, Debra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND, Lynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHAEFER, Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHWING, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLIZ, Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENCER, Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STACY, Gerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THYFAULT, Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBELEACKER, Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMS, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON, Blaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYATT, Marla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLTRETER, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACKENBERGER, Steven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWENS, Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAUBESON, Linda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUGAN, Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMQUIST, Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTZ, Martha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHOSH, Koushik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLINS, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZIS, Carey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEATH, Linda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARRETT, Roger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARPER, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWELL, Joe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRBURN, Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VASEK, Cheri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURKHOLDER, Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLDEN, Lad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACH, Glen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUSE, Tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODCOCK, Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFERIES, Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEFKOWITZ, Natalie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HECKART, Beverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPLES, Minerva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADLEY, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIRTH, Rex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONAHUE, Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLIVERO, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNEDEKER, Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABDALLA, Laila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTERFIELD, Carol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWIN, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEYANDT, Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERTELSON, Cathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHACTLER, Carolyn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>