MINUTES
CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: December 1, 1999
http://www.cwu.edu/~fsenate

Presiding Officer: Linda S. Beath
Recording Secretary: Nancy Bradshaw

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

ROLL CALL:
Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except: Phillips, Polishook, Ngalamulume, Olivero, Scott Roberts, Spencer, Stacy.


CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA: MOTION NO. 3625 (Passed) Chair Beath moved approval of the agenda as distributed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the November 3, 1999, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS: (Available for viewing in the Senate Office or distribution on request)
No communications.

REPORTS:
A. ACTION ITEMS:
   Chair:
   
   Motion No. 3266 (Passed) Chair Beath proposed a motion that after discussion and debate was approved: "Creation of Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee."

   Motion No. 3267 (Passed) Chair Beath proposed a motion that was approved: "Appointment of members to the Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee: Lois Breedlove, Communication, Keith Lewis, Art, Michael Braunstein, Physics, Terry DeVietti, Psychology, Lad Holden, Industrial & Engineering Technology, Connie Roberts, Administrative Management and Business Education, Karen Adamson, Accounting, Peter Saunders, Economics, Daniel CannCasciato, Library."

   Motion No. 3268 (Passed) Chair Beath proposed a motion that was approved: "Replace Fuji Collins, Psychology, with James Beaghan, Business Administration on Faculty Senate Personnel Committee."

   Motion No. 3269 (Passed) Chair Beath proposed a motion that after debate was approved: "Appointment of members to the Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Opinion Survey of Academic Administrators: Jim Cadello, Philosophy, Bill Craig, Center for Learning Technology, Lynn Richmond, Business Administration, Skip Smith, Biological Sciences."

   Curriculum:
   
   Motion No. 3258A (Passed) Senator Luetta Monson proposed a motion that was approved: "To take from the table Motion No. 3258: Addition of BS Leisure Services Specialization in Tourism Management."

   Motion No. 3258 (Passed) After discussion tabled Motion No. 3258 was approved: "Addition of BS Leisure Services, Specialization in Tourism Management (approval of specialization only)."
Motion No. 3259A (Passed) Senator Luette Monson proposed a motion that was approved: "To take from the table Motion No. 3259: Addition of BS Leisure Services, Specialization in Recreation Management."

Motion No. 3259 (Passed) After discussion tabled Motion No. 3259 was approved: "Addition of BS Leisure Services, Specialization in Recreation Management (approval of specialization only)."

Motion No. 3270 (Passed) Toni Čuljak, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, proposed a motion that after discussion was approved: "Addition of a Master of Professional Accountancy."

Motion No. 3271 (Passed) Toni Čuljak, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, proposed a motion that was approved: "Addition of a Master of Science in Engineering Technology."

B. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
1. CHAIR: Chair Beath referred senators to the Faculty Salary Base report attached to the agenda.
2. CHAIR ELECT: Chair Elect Josh Nelson reported on a meeting he and other CWU personnel attended in Ellensburg with Representative Gary Chandler, Representative Joyce Mulliken and Senator Harold Hochstatter. Senator Nelson stated that the representatives were interested in Central’s faculty morale and urged faculty to keep working on the salary issue by keeping pressure on the administration.
3. PRESIDENT: Absent, no report.
4. PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH UPDATE: Senator Morris Uebelacker presented an update on the university’s presidential search. He explained that the applicant pool has been reduced to six candidates. Committee members conducted “airport interviews” with these candidates in SeaTac and that the committee will be ready to forward a list of finalists to the Board of Trustees at the December 10 Board meeting. At this time the finalist names will become public and arrangements will be made for them to visit campus in mid January to meet with various university groups. Senator Uebelacker urged the campus community to provide input on each candidate. The search committee will review and discuss all comments and input with the Board before they make a final selection.
5. PROGRAM REVIEW: Mark Young, Vice President for Special Projects presented a report regarding Program Review. You may request a copy of the report from the Faculty Senate Office or view it on the web at <http://www.cwu.edu/~fsenate/991201.htm>.
6. ACCREDITATION BRIEFING: Roy Savoian, Dean of the School of Business and Economics (SBE), provided a status report regarding the SBE’s effort related to accreditation by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). The presentation described the value and importance of accreditation, particularly in terms of external confirmation of quality and the need to meet the competition (i.e., the 15 public and private institutions in Idaho, Oregon and Washington with AACSB accreditation). Dean Savoian identified changes in accreditation standards and implementation since 1993-94. Accreditation now focuses to a much greater extent on outcomes assessment and continuous quality improvement and ensures a greater role for faculty in processes related to mission, curriculum, students, instruction, intellectual contribution (scholarly activities) and faculty composition/development.

In July 1999, the SBE entered the AACSB Candidacy Program, a voluntary assistance program that provides a systematic means for the SBE to pursue a “critical path” to accreditation. During 1999-2000, the SBB will conduct a Self-Assessment of its current mission as well as strengths and weaknesses on a standard-by-standard basis. The SBE will develop an Action Plan for accreditation based on the Self-Assessment. The Self-Assessment and Action Plan will be submitted in August 2000 for evaluation by AACSB’s Candidacy Committee. From this evaluation, one of four
outcomes will occur: (1) approval, unconditional; (2) approval, conditional (specified); (3) revise Self-Assessment and Action Plan; or, (4) SBE withdrawal from accreditation process. Dean Savoian will report on their progress.

7. SENATE CONCERNS: Senator Bill Benson expressed concerns regarding summer school and the summer school planning documents. He stated that he believes faculty now see themselves as entrepreneurs interested in making money, and in the process, have neglected the institution’s mission which is to provide each department the resources to offer university curriculum during summer session. He explained that when the Faculty Senate Code Committee wrote the interpretation last year, committee members reiterated that the focus of summer school was university programs and that the fundamental point of summer school is to provide students with as many choices as possible from as many disciplines as possible. He further stated that he believed it was ridiculous that departments are not able to offer summer programs because of lack of funding, while at the same time, profits equaling $750,000 are being distributed back to departments. Senator Benson concluded by stating that he would like to see the university move toward funding all summer programs, regardless of the number of students in each, in order to best serve students.

Senator Keith Lewis thanked the provost for developing the report on the faculty salary base and that he believes it will be a good tool in addressing the faculty salary equity concerns. He then referred to table 2 in the report that shows during 1998-99 approximately 15 percent of salary savings was allocated to equipment. He then asked the provost, as custodian of academic affairs, if he was willing to unequivocally commit to developing and advocating policies that require the retention of salary savings as part of the salary base except in the case of financial emergency. The provost answered by stating that the addition of Section 8.30 in the Faculty Code became does protect salary savings from one year to the next. The provost further explained that in table 2 the distribution of salary savings were generated from all positions at Central that included faculty, administrative exempt, civil service and students. Data was not available to reflect salary savings by specific positions. Senator Lewis then stated that ultimately he was asking for some reinforcement that salary savings will not be used as a mechanism of funding nonacademic things.

The provost went on to say that this year academic affairs units created a baseline budget to accommodate the establishment of 8.30 of the Faculty Code. He believes this is the best way to manage the year to year flow of resources making sure the dollars in faculty positions are untouched.

Senator Vince Nethery stated that in looking at the salary base report, he found that his salary was below the average salary for full professors. He then asked the provost if it is possible to develop a change in ranges of salary by computing a median salary for faculty who fall below the average. Senator Nethery believed that this would be a better representation of the actual change in salary. Chair Linda Beath added that the salary study and market definition ad hoc committees are currently addressing this issue. The provost also stated that he felt that a median and a range for each different set of faculty reported could be computed.

Senator Todd Shaeffer stated that hopefully during the process of fixing the problems of faculty salaries, the issue of faculty movement up the salary scale was being addressed. He asked how can departments regain all the money lost in the salary base in previous years? Senator Josh Nelson replied by saying that the legislature has said there will be no extra funding for faculty salary adjustments.
Senator Terry DeVietti asked if the data was computed from annualized salaries. The provost stated that to compute the averages, all faculty were transferred to a nine-month salary to create a constant base for computing.

Senator Bill Benson stated that after reading the report, he is not aware or does not personally know anyone who received a 13 percent salary increase as reflected in the report.

Senator Vince Nethery stated that approximately ten years ago the Faculty Senate voted to eliminate the professional growth step which was an annual incremental step increasing salaries and when tied to merit could result in a faculty member receiving a double step. He further stated that his understanding was that money saved from the elimination of this step increase was going into a pool to be distributed among faculty who were objectively evaluated and determined productive. Senator Nethery stated that he believes that for the last ten years this has not been the case. He then asked if this issue could be investigated and perhaps reintroduce some type of growth step mechanism. He suggested referring this issue to the body that originally brought it to the Senate floor for introduction.

8. STUDENT REPORT: Josh Kilen introduced the ASCWU Vice President for Clubs and Organizations, Mindy Widmyer. Senator Kilen expressed student concerns regarding the cancellation of summer classes. He stated that it has come to some students’ attention that there is a possibility that some necessary classes could be canceled during the summer session for lack of enrollment. He referred to a student who needed one course to graduate but that the course was canceled due to low enrollment resulting in the need to attend one more quarter. Senator Kilen wanted the Senate to be aware of these concerns because he believes it could eventually become a large issue with students.

9. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES: Lad Holden and Ken Gamon reported on the November CFR meeting held in Ellensburg. Professor Holden stated that during the meeting members discussed the importance of faculty involvement with the legislature regarding issues other than their salary.

10. FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:
    ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - No report.
    BUDGET COMMITTEE - No report.
    CODE COMMITTEE - Chair Beath read a report from the Code Committee: The Code Committee has met regularly on Friday afternoons since the end of September. While a few people have asked for opinion and interpretations concerning different sections of the Code, a large part of time this quarter was spent in cooperating with the summer school coordinator and the provost in working out guidelines for the administration of last year's amendments to Section 7.20 B. 4, the section that deals with individual studies of all kinds. The Code Committee intends still to address various problems that have arisen with the administration of Section 7.20 B. 4 and will bring to you a proposed Code amendment in the spring.

    We have also devised and had passed by the Board an amendment allowing for additional alternates for the members of the Grievance Committee.

    Currently we are working on two items that should yield proposed amendments to the Code in the future: 1) More clear and fair procedures concerning reappointment, the award of tenure, and the awards of merit and promotion; and 2) A salary policy that will facilitate the movement of faculty members up the salary scale so as to approach and achieve average salaries that place Central's faculty in the 75th percentile of salaries nation-wide, just as the existing Code encourages. During exam week, the Code Committee will meet with members of the Budget and Personnel Committees to discuss salary policy. We hope to have some suggestions for your consideration by January, 2000.
At the beginning of this academic year, the Code Committee began its work with a list of 31 items to be achieved. Individual faculty, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and administrators have added to that list since the end of September. We just hope we get it all done.

**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE** - Toni Culjak gave a brief overview of the current curriculum process and summarized the flow charts in the Curriculum Policies and Procedures Manual. The charts may be viewed at [http://www.cwu.edu/~provost/](http://www.cwu.edu/~provost/).

She stated that this report was designed to assure Senators that in the curriculum evaluation process, there is a continual examination of courses and programs to determine that they are sufficient enough to meet the quality of the university.

**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE** - No report.

**PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE** - Senator Josh Nelson referred to Lad Holden’s comments in the CFR report and agreed that faculty should become involved with legislators with issues other than salaries and that while he was working in California he learned the importance of political strategy.

Senator Robert Fordan stated that he too attended the meeting with the state representatives and referred to Representative Mulliken’s concerns regarding the issue of time-to-degree. He suggested developing a way to flag students in this category in order to determine why they have not graduated. He further stated that time-to-degree seemed to be a personal issue with Representative Mulliken, and would be to Central’s advantage to find ways to address it.

**OLD BUSINESS:** No old business.

**NEW BUSINESS:** No new business.

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

***NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: January 12, 2000***

**BARGE 412**
I. ROLL CALL

II. MOTION NO. 3265 CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS (15 mins)
   Chair
   Motion No. 3266: Creation of Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee (Exhibit A)
   Motion No. 3267: Appointment of Members to the Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee (Exhibit B)
   Motion No. 3268: Appoint member on Faculty Senate Personnel Committee: Replace Fuji Collins, Psychology, with James Beaghan, Business Administration.
   Motion No. 3269: Appointment of Members to the Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Opinion Survey of Academic Administrators: Jim Cadello, Philosophy, Bill Craig, Center for Learning Technology, Lynn Richmond, Business Administration, Skip Smith, Biological Sciences.

   Curriculum Committee
   Tabled Motion No. 3258: Addition of BS Leisure Services, Specialization in Tourism Management. (Approval of specialization only.) (Exhibit C)
   Tabled Motion No. 3259: Addition of BS Leisure Services, Specialization in Recreation Management. (Approval of specialization only.) (Exhibit D)
   Motion No. 3270: Addition of a Master of Professional Accountancy (Exhibit E)
   Motion No. 3271: Addition of a Master of Science in Engineering Technology (Exhibit F)

VI. REPORTS/DISCUSSION ITEMS
   1. CHAIR: Faculty Salary Base Report (Exhibit G) (5 mins)
   2. CHAIR ELECT (5 mins)
   3. PRESIDENT (5 mins)
   4. PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH UPDATE: Roger Fouts (Morris Uebelacker) (5 mins)
   5. PROGRAM REVIEW: Mark Young, Vice President for Special Projects (15 mins)
   6. ACCREDITATION BRIEFING: Roy Savoian, Dean, School of Business and Economics (15 mins)
   7. SENATE CONCERNS (20 mins)
   8. STUDENT REPORT (5 mins)
   9. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES: Lad Holden and Ken Gamon (5 mins)
   10. SENATE COMMITTEES: (15 Mins)
       Academic Affairs Committee: Susan Donahoe
       Budget Committee: Barney Erickson
       Code Committee: Beverly Heckart
       Curriculum Committee: Toni Čuljak
       Personnel Committee:
       Public Affairs Committee: Joshua Nelson

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

***NEXT REGULAR SENATE MEETING: January 12, 2000***
BARGE 412
Exhibit A

Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee Charge

Thank you for volunteering to participate in this very important conversation about definitions of market and how they do or do not apply to the university culture.

As you know, this committee's work is in response to an issue raised last year through the faculty salary equity study and concerns over salary compression. It is my goal that this committee's work can help to inform our thinking and suggest possible avenues of actions in addressing faculty salary issues.

The committee is asked to address three basic questions:
1. What is a definition(s) of market as it applies to faculty salaries?
2. Do, or should, these definitions apply to the university culture?
3. How can these market definitions be applied or implemented in university hiring practices?
4. Please use these questions as a starting guide. They are not meant to be prescriptive. You may find other, more useful questions to frame your discussions and any recommendations from the committee. I would also encourage you to discuss this issue with those in administration who have to make personnel decisions, particularly department chairs and deans.

Exhibit B

Proposed members for the Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee:
Chair: Josh Nelson, Chair Elect of Faculty Senate
CAH: Lois Breedlove, Communication
      Keith Lewis, Art
COTS: Michael Braunstein, Physics
      Terry DeVietti, Psychology
CEPS: Lad Holden, Industrial & Engineering Technology
      Connie Roberts, Administrative Management & Business Education
SBE: Karen Adamson, Accounting
     Peter Saunders, Economics
LIB: Daniel CannCasciato, Library
ADDITION: Bachelor of Science
Leisure Services
Specialization in Tourism Management

Tourism Facts:

Travel and tourism is the nation’s largest services export industry, third largest retail sales industry and one of America’s largest employers. Tourism is in fact the first, second or third largest employer in 32 states. Tourism is one of the top industries in Washington. Approximately one out of every 17 U.S. residents is employed due to the patronage of travelers to and within the U.S. Travel and tourism provides more than 684,000 executive level jobs. The U.S. receives the larger share of the world tourism market: approximately 16.1% ($75 billion per year). The tourism industry shows no sign of decline.

Identifying A Need:

There is a need for qualified tourism professionals in a variety of sectors within the industry. Central Washington University is one of a very few Tourism Management programs in the Pacific Northwest. The new Tourism Management specialization was designed to reflect the needs of students interested in the tourism industry as well as professional management needs and industry needs.

Currently the Leisure Services program has 60-65 majors (over half) interested in specializing in Tourism Management. Job placement of students from this type of emphasis has been extraordinary with a placement rate of almost 100%. There is an ongoing demand for well educated tourism management professionals. The new Tourism Management specialization will prepare students to:

1) Develop, market, and manage the businesses that provide quality products and services for the increasing number of leisure and business travelers.

2) Develop and manage the large variety of businesses which provide, supply and support the tourism businesses.

3) Develop and manage the public and nonprofit infrastructure elements which enable the tourism industry to function.

4) Research and develop plans which guide governments, agencies, and businesses in providing tourism related products and services which provide the greatest benefits to the tourist and destination community. These plans also preclude or mitigate the harmful impacts which are often associated with unplanned tourism development.

5) Develop and provide a quality educational environment in which persons can learn and develop the needed communication, technological and critical thinking skills demanded by the cutting edge and future tourism profession. Today’s students are tomorrow’s tourism leaders.

Courses in BS Leisure Services - Specialization in Tourism Management

LES 271  Introduction to Tourism
LES 292  Practicum
LES 325  Public Relations in Leisure Services
LES 371  Tourism Essentials
LES 373a Supervision in the Hospitality Industry
LES 373b Strategic Marketing in Hospitality
LES 374  Applied Technology in Tourism
LES 375  Career Development and Communication in Tourism
LES 419  Applied Research
LES 420 Research Analysis
LES 471 Planning and Development of Tourism
LES 490 Cooperative Education
HRM 381 Management of Human Resources
BUS 241 Legal Environment of Business
ACCT 301 Financial Accounting Analysis

Dept. approved electives (15 cr.)

Exhibit D

ADDITION: Bachelor of Science
Leisure Services
Specialization in Recreation Management

This program specialization addition is related to the division of the Leisure Services Program into two distinct areas of specialization. They are "Recreation Management" and "Tourism Management."

The Recreation Management specialization prepares professionals for supervisory and administrative careers with city, county or state parks and recreation departments, YMCA’s Boys and Girls Clubs, armed forces recreation, university recreation and intramural sports programs, fitness and racquet clubs, camping and outdoor recreation, and employee recreation services including specializations working with specific programs and populations.

Courses in BS Leisure Services - Specialization in Recreation Management

LES 201 Introduction to Recreation Management
LES 221 Community Recreation Leadership
LES 292 Practicum
LES 321 Program Supervision
LES 480 Community Recreation Management
LES 483 Budget and Finance in Recreation Management
LES 484 Legal Liability and Risk Management
LES 490 Cooperative Education
ADMG 101 Computer Applications
MGT 380 Organizational Management
MGT 381 Management of Human Resources
PE 245 First Aid

Select from the following:

Psych 205 Psychology of Adjustment (or)
Psych 314 Human Development and the Learner
(Population specific psychology/sociology courses may be substituted with approval of the academic advisor for Recreation Management)

Advisor approved electives (24 credits)
Exhibit E

Proposed Master of Professional Accountancy Program

The proposed Master of Professional Accountancy program is designed to prepare students for careers in public accounting. Over the past 20 years, the educational requirements for entrance into the CPA profession have been raised on a state by state basis. Beginning July 1, 2000, Washington will become one of 48 jurisdictions which require or will require the equivalent of 225 quarter hours of college education to sit for the CPA exam. While a masters' degree is not part of the new requirement, offering the program as a "five year" undergraduate program adversely impacts CWU's time to degree metric and would make the program less competitive with other undergraduate degrees. All other public institutions in Washington with an accounting program have chosen the master degree option for their students, which would also make a five-year undergraduate program less competitive. We believe that the Master of Professional Accountancy program is the best approach for our students, the University, and the public who depend upon quality professionals.

Required Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Core</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGT 505 - Customer Value/Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT 525 - Strategic Management/Business Simulation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounting Core</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 510 - Information Systems Security, Control, and Audit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 520 - Tax and Legal Strategies for Business</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 530 - Financial Statement Analysis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 590 - Cooperative Education, or</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 596 - Individual Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 700 - Master's Thesis, Project Study, and/or Examination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Required Credits: 31

Elective Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elective Courses</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 540 - Electronic Commerce</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 550 - Enterprise Business Modeling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 560 - Object Oriented Analysis and Design</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 570 - Tax Planning for Individuals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 580 - Tax Planning for Entities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 552 - Managerial Economics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Electives - 400 Level or Above</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Credits Required: 46

Exhibit F

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

The need for a Master of Science in Engineering Technology (MSET) degree has been identified for the State of Washington. Currently there are no institutions in the entire Northwest that offer an MSET degree program as described in this document. Central Washington University desires to fill that gap by utilizing the existing faculty, laboratories, and resources within the Industrial and Engineering Technology (IET) Department. However, technology is advancing so rapidly that it is necessary to expose the engineering technologist to some of the latest advances, that is, to update their knowledge base. The MSET program is multi-disciplinary, giving the graduate student sufficient choices to fit diverse needs. There are no special fees nor concurrent course stipulations. The MSET degree will be offered at two CWU centers, the Ellensburg Campus and the Steilacoom Center. Preapproval from the HEC Board has already been given for the MSET at these two centers. The Steilacoom Center will provide administrative support for two locations where the MSET degree will be taught, the Puyallup Location and the Boeing/Auburn Location. The maximum number of students after the fourth year is estimated to be 80, with 20 in Ellensburg, 20 at the Puyallup Location and 40 at Boeing/Auburn Location. A cost analysis indicates that the MSET program can be conducted in a self support manner.
### Required Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IET 520 Finite Element Analysis**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 521 Product Design and Development*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 522 PLC Applications***</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 530 Fundamentals of Lasers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 577 Robotics**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 596 Individual Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 599 Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 700 Thesis or Option*#</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Course Total:</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Department Approved Technical Electives

The student must select 15 credits from the following list to complete a total program of 45 credit hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IET 512 Alternative Energy Systems**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 523 Emerging Technologies*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 524 Quality Control***</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 525 Systems Analysis and Simulation*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 526 Engineering Project Cost Analysis*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 532 Generation and Transmission of Electrical Power**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 537 Utilization of Community Industrial Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 555 Engineering Project Management*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 592 Field Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET 423 Computer Aided Design and Manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 443 Energy Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHM 483 Ergonomics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMGT 442 Building Service Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 462 Economics of Energy Resources and Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elective Total: 15

### Program Total: 45

**Notes:**
- * New Course
- ** 500 level course based on existing 400 level course
- *** 500 level course based on existing 300 level course
- # Students electing to do a written examination will select 6 credits of approved course work in lieu of IET 700
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

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

COPIES: D. Norton, President’s Cabinet, Academic Affairs Council,
Academic Department Chairs Organization, Budget Office

SUBJECT: FACULTY SALARY BASE

Date: November 1, 1999

Section 8.30 of the Faculty Code calls for a yearly report to the Faculty Senate conveying information related to faculty salaries. This report conveys information related to the faculty salary base, the average salary of the university’s tenured and tenure-track faculty, the disposition of all funds authorized and appropriated for faculty salaries, and funds paid to faculty from all sources.

Faculty Salary Base

The 1999-2000 faculty salary base at Central Washington University equals $20,282,839. The faculty salary base is the sum of the budget lines of tenured, tenure-track, and full-time-non-tenure-track faculty plus adjunct lines and phased retirees in the 1999-2000 baseline budget. Administrative stipends have been traditionally reported on salary lines but will be reported on separate lines in the 2000-01 baseline budget.

Average Salary of the University’s Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

The average faculty salary of the university’s tenured and tenure-track faculty can be computed two ways. One approach includes only tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty but not phased retirees. The second approach includes tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and phased retirees. (Section 9.92.F states that “During phased retirement, retirees shall retain all the tenure and seniority privileges they had at the time of retirement.”)

- The average salary in Fall 1999 of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, excluding phased retirees is $49,440.
- The average salary in Fall 1999 of the tenured and tenure-track faculty including phased retirees is $49,875.
Please note that each of these computations weights the salaries of faculty on split appointments and on fractional appointments proportionally according to the fractional appointment. Exempt administrators with faculty tenure are not included in either set.

The computation of the Fall 1997 average faculty salary reported by the Higher Education Coordinating Board during 1998-99 included the set of faculty reported through CWU’s participation in the U.S. government’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) report covering academic year 1997-98. That report was based on data collected during 1997-98 and was reported a year later during 1998-99. The similar comparison with other institutions to measure the effect of funding added to our faculty salary base for 1999-2000 cannot be made until 2000-01 following the IPEDS data collections that will occur during this academic year. Progress toward meeting the 75th percentile of average salaries of peer institutions cannot be reported until the national data is collected and reported.

The IPEDS faculty differs from the two sets of faculty used to compute the average salaries reported above. The annual salary survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education collects data regarding full-time instructional faculty. That set includes full-time tenured and non-tenured faculty, including lecturers. Faculty not included in the IPEDS data are (a) tenured and non-tenured faculty in positions less than full time, (b) librarians holding faculty rank, (c) coaches, and (d) exempt administrators with tenure. In Fall 1997, instructional faculty teaching through the Office of International Studies and Programs (OISP) were also not included; however, data from OISP should be included in this report set in future years because the unit’s faculty are full-time instructional faculty by the IPEDS definition.

The Fall 1997 average faculty salary reported for Central Washington University for the IPEDS report was $43,619. For Fall 1998, the average was $44,666. The Fall 1999 average using the same set of faculty classifications without International Studies and Programs faculty included is $49,268. The Fall 1999 average faculty salary including full-time instructional faculty in International Studies and Programs is $48,939.

The Fall 1999 average of $49,268 is 13 percent higher than the average salary reported for the Fall 1997 IPEDS report.

Disposition of All funds Authorized and Appropriated for Faculty Salaries

Table 1 reports the adjustments to the faculty salary base from the beginning of 1997-1998 to the establishment of the 1999-2000 faculty salary base as reported by the CWU Budget Office. The Budget Office currently estimates benefits for new full-time faculty positions at 26 percent and benefits for new part-time faculty positions at 10 percent. When additional funds are allocated to existing positions, the Budget Office estimates the need for an accompanying increase to the benefits pool of 16 percent. In Table 1, the figures reported as “adjustments to salaries” (column 2) represent funding added or deleted from the existing salary lines in the baseline budget. Therefore, the benefits column (column 3) in Table 1 reports 16 percent of the amount showing on each line in column 2.

The following notations provide further explanation for each line of Table 1. The letter in parentheses refers to the letter representing each line in Table 1.
TABLE 1
FACULTY SALARY BASE REPORT (1999-2000)
CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
November 1, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salaries (Excluding Benefits)</th>
<th>Adjustments to Salaries (Excluding Benefits)</th>
<th>Estimated Benefits (Additions to Benefits Pool—Equals 16 Percent of Adjustment to Salaries)</th>
<th>Total (Salary Plus Estimated Benefits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) 1997-98 Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>$18,708,021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 2-Percent Raise</td>
<td>289,858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Grievance and Position Changes</td>
<td>124,469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 1998-99 Faculty Salary Base</td>
<td>$19,122,348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) 3-Percent Salary Increase</td>
<td>$551,998</td>
<td>$88,320</td>
<td>$640,318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Faculty Salary Equity</td>
<td>215,517</td>
<td>34,483</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Recruitment &amp; Retention Funding</td>
<td>208,717</td>
<td>33,395</td>
<td>242,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Promotions</td>
<td>215,517</td>
<td>34,483</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Faculty Composition/Compensation Changes</td>
<td>76,667</td>
<td>12,267</td>
<td>88,934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Administrative Stipends</td>
<td>-107,925</td>
<td>-17,268</td>
<td>-125,193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Sum of Lines e through j</td>
<td>$1,160,491</td>
<td>$185,680</td>
<td>$1,346,171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Adjustments to Salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) Faculty Salary Base</td>
<td>$20,282,839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) This figure is an adjusted beginning base for 1998-99. The printed budget for 1998-99 included promotions that took effect in July and September 1998. The printed budget did not include the 2-percent reallocation of funding identified in line b.

(b) The Budget Office inserted the salary increases awarded to faculty for 1998-99. The funds came from vacant positions that were eliminated and from adjunct lines that were reduced. The effect of the reduction of those lines from the base is reported in line c.

(c) This line reflects the additions and deletions from faculty lines for the grievance adjustments awarded during 1998-99, the adjustments from vacant positions and adjunct lines required to meet the 2-percent reallocation for faculty raises, and other adjustments to faculty salary lines including shifts in faculty funds between full-time and part-time faculty positions with the accompanying effect on the funds allocated to the benefits pool. The detail is available in the Budget Office or through Paul Apeles, Budget Analyst in the Office of the Provost.

(d) This line represents the 1998-99 faculty salary base. Please note that this figure also includes administrative stipends because the stipends were recorded on faculty salary lines during 1998-99.

(e) This figure represents a 3-percent increase to each faculty salary line in which a faculty member was in a full-time position in Spring 1999 and continued in a full-time position in Fall 1999. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3.

(f) The figure in column 2 represents the without-benefits portion of the $250,000 approved by the Board of Trustees for use for faculty salary equity. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3. The availability of the funds was anticipated from the increased revenues from the additional 224 students assigned to CWU for 1999-2000.

(g) The figure in column 2 represents the without-benefits portion of the funding approved by the Board of Trustees from the recruitment and retention fund provided by the state legislature. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3. CWU was permitted to apply recruitment and retention funds to equity adjustments. The Board of Trustees approved the use of $242,112 to support equity adjustments for faculty positions.

(h) The figure in column 2 represents the without-benefits portion of the $250,000 anticipated for faculty promotions. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3. Promotions equaled $165,143 plus a 16-percent estimated benefits amount of $26,423 for a total of $191,566. The residual has been added to adjunct salary lines to address the approximately 8-percent increase in the minimum salary level for part-time faculty in 1999-2000 as compared to 1998-99. That amount totals $53,122, with an estimated benefits amount of $5,312, totaling $58,434.

(i) This figure represents an influx of funding from (a) changes in the full-time/part-time mix and the accompanying changes in anticipated benefits costs, (b) increases in chair-stipend rates, (c) code-required increases to tenure-track faculty completing doctorates, and (d) changes to faculty salary lines including scale adjustments to new faculty salary lines. The funding source is reallocation of current budget funds from other budget lines. Details can be reviewed in the Budget Office or through Paul Apeles, Budget Analyst in the Office of the Provost.

(j) The $107,925 reported here represents the total administrative stipends in the 1999-2000 baseline budget for department-chair stipends.

(k) This line reports the sum of each column 2, 3, and 4.

(l) This line reflects the sum of items e, f, g, h, i, and j for column 2. This figure represents the total additions to the faculty salary base from 1998-99.

(m) The 1999-2000 faculty salary base.
Funds Paid to Faculty From All Sources

Table 2 reports the distribution of salary savings funds generated from all positions (faculty, administrative exempt, civil service, and student) in the academic colleges during 1998-99:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct salaries</td>
<td>$240,450</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>97,227</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Salary Increase</td>
<td>289,585</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$627,262</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Budget Office reports that in fiscal year 1999 (1998-99), $22,419,631 was posted to position control for all ranks of faculty. For this report, the term “all ranks of faculty” is defined as tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, full-time non-tenure track faculty, adjuncts, and graduate assistants. The Budget Office reports that it is in the process of trying to obtain data for 1997 and 1998. Once received, these data will be reported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamson, Karen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alsoszatai-Petheo, John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaghan, Jim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beath, Linda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, William</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braunstein, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtz, Martha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cables, Minerva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocheba, Don</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devietti, Terry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely, Lisa (Gone Fall Quarter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordan, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamon, Ken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Loretta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunn, Gerald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, Jim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Cheyang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaminski, Walter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilen, Josh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Keith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polishook, Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monson, Luetta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nethery, Vince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, Joshua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngalamulume, Kalala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivero, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens, Patrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Lynn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raubeson, Linda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Connie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaefer, Todd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwing, James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer, Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy, Gerald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyfault, Alberta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu, Charlie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uebelacker, Morris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Wendy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyatt, Maria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtfreter, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuentes, Agustin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman, Andrea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugan, Jack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmquist, Bruce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington, Jane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahoe, Susan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghosh, Koushik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, James &quot;Fuji&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazis, Carey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, Roger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harter, James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Joe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairburn, Wayne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasek, Cheri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood, Webster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden, Ladd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach, Glen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gause, Tom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock, Don</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lefkowitz, Natalie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heckart, Beverly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannasciato, Daniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley, James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxter, Louise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochie, Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'acquisto, Leo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirth, Rex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue, Barry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneekere, Jeff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdalla, Laila</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfield, Carol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alwin, John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penick, Jeff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schactler, Carolyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, December 1, 1999
BARGE 412
REVISED AGENDA

ROLL CALL

II. MOTION NO. 3265 CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - passed

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS (15 mins)

Chair
- Motion No. 3266: Creation of Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee (Exhibit A)
- Motion No. 3267: Appointment of Members to the Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee (Exhibit B)
- Motion No. 3268: Appoint member on Faculty Senate Personnel Committee: Replace Fuji Collins, Psychology, with James Beaghan, Business Administration.
- Motion No. 3269: Appointment of Members to the Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Opinion Survey of Academic Administrators: Jim Cadello, Philosophy, Bill Craig, Center for Learning Technology, Lynn Richmond, Business Administration, Skip Smith, Biological Sciences.

Tabled Motion No. 3258: Addition of BS Leisure Services, Specialization in Tourism Management. (Approval of specialization only.) (Exhibit C)

Tabled Motion No. 3259: Addition of BS Leisure Services, Specialization in Recreation Management. (Approval of specialization only.) (Exhibit D)

Motion No. 3270: Addition of a Master of Professional Accountancy (Exhibit E)

Motion No. 3271: Addition of a Master of Science in Engineering Technology (Exhibit F)

VI. REPORTS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. CHAIR: Faculty Salary Base Report (Exhibit G) (5 mins)
2. CHAIR ELECT (5 mins)
3. PRESIDENT (5 mins)
4. PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH UPDATE: Roger Fouts (Morris Uebelacker) (5 mins)
5. PROGRAM REVIEW: Mark Young, Vice President for Special Projects (15 mins)
6. ACCREDITATION BRIEFING: Roy Savoian, Dean, School of Business and Economics (15 mins)
7. SENATE CONCERNS (20 mins)
8. STUDENT REPORT (5 mins)
9. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES: Lad Holden and Ken Gamon (5 mins)
10. SENATE COMMITTEES: (15 Mins)
    - Academic Affairs Committee: Susan Donahoe
    - Budget Committee: Barney Erickson
    - Code Committee: Beverly Heckart
    - Curriculum Committee: Toni Culjak
    - Personnel Committee:
    - Public Affairs Committee: Joshua Nelson

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

***NEXT REGULAR SENATE MEETING: January 12, 2000***
BARGE 412
Exhibit A

Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee Charge

Thank you for volunteering to participate in this very important conversation about definitions of market and how they do or do not apply to the university culture.

As you know, this committee's work is in response to an issue raised last year through the faculty salary equity study and concerns over salary compression. It is my goal that this committee's work can help to inform our thinking and suggest possible avenues of actions in addressing faculty salary issues.

The committee is asked to address three basic questions:

1. What is a definition(s) of market as it applies to faculty salaries?
2. Do, or should, these definitions apply to the university culture?
3. How can these market definitions be applied or implemented in university hiring practices?
4. Please use these questions as a starting guide. They are not meant to be prescriptive. You may find other, more useful questions to frame your discussions and any recommendations from the committee. I would also encourage you to discuss this issue with those in administration who have to make personnel decisions, particularly department chairs and deans.

Exhibit B

Proposed members for the Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee:
Chair: Josh Nelson, Chair Elect of Faculty Senate
CAH: Lois Breedlove, Communication
     Keith Lewis, Art
COTS: Michael Braunstein, Physics
     Terry DeVietti, Psychology
CEPS: Lad Holden, Industrial & Engineering Technology
     Connie Roberts, Administrative Management & Business Education
SBE: Karen Adamson, Accounting
     Peter Saunders, Economics
LIB: Daniel CannCasciato, Library
Exhibit C

ADDITION: Bachelor of Science Leisure Services Specialization in Tourism Management

Tourism Facts:

Travel and tourism is the nation’s largest services export industry, third largest retail sales industry and one of America’s largest employers. Tourism is in fact the first, second or third largest employer in 32 states. Tourism is one of the top industries in Washington. Approximately one out of every 17 U.S. residents is employed due to the patronage of travelers to and within the U.S. Travel and tourism provides more than 684,000 executive level jobs. The U.S. receives the larger share of the world tourism market: approximately 16.1% ($75 billion per year). The tourism industry shows no sign of decline.

Identifying A Need:

There is a need for qualified tourism professionals in a variety of sectors within the industry. Central Washington University is one of a very few Tourism Management programs in the Pacific Northwest. The new Tourism Management specialization was designed to reflect the needs of students interested in the tourism industry as well as professional management needs and industry needs.

Currently the Leisure Services program has 60-65 majors (over half) interested in specializing in Tourism Management. Job placement of students from this type of emphasis has been extraordinary with a placement rate of almost 100%. There is an ongoing demand for well educated tourism management professionals. The new Tourism Management specialization will prepare students to:

1) Develop, market, and manage the businesses that provide quality products and services for the increasing number of leisure and business travelers.

2) Develop and manage the large variety of businesses which provide, supply and support the tourism businesses.

3) Develop and manage the public and nonprofit infrastructure elements which enable the tourism industry to function.

4) Research and develop plans which guide governments, agencies, and businesses in providing tourism related products and services which provide the greatest benefits to the tourist and destination community. These plans also preclude or mitigate the harmful impacts which are often associated with unplanned tourism development.

5) Develop and provide a quality educational environment in which persons can learn and develop the needed communication, technological and critical thinking skills demanded by the cutting edge and future tourism profession. Today’s students are tomorrow’s tourism leaders.

Courses in BS Leisure Services - Specialization in Tourism Management

LES 271 Introduction to Tourism
LES 292 Practicum
LES 325 Public Relations in Leisure Services
LES 371 Tourism Essentials
LES 373a Supervision in the Hospitality Industry
LES 373b Strategic Marketing in Hospitality
LES 374 Applied Technology in Tourism
LES 375 Career Development and Communication in Tourism
LES 419 Applied Research
ADDICTION: Bachelor of Science
Leisure Services
Specialization in Recreation Management

This program specialization addition is related to the division of the Leisure Services Program into two distinct areas of specialization. They are "Recreation Management" and "Tourism Management."

The Recreation Management specialization prepares professionals for supervisory and administrative careers with city, county or state parks and recreation departments, YMCA’s Boys and Girls Clubs, armed forces recreation, university recreation and intramural sports programs, fitness and racquet clubs, camping and outdoor recreation, and employee recreation services including specializations working with specific programs and populations.

Courses in BS Leisure Services - Specialization in Recreation Management

LES 201 Introduction to Recreation Management
LES 221 Community Recreation Leadership
LES 292 Practicum
LES 321 Program Supervision
LES 480 Community Recreation Management
LES 483 Budget and Finance in Recreation Management
LES 484 Legal Liability and Risk Management
LES 490 Cooperative Education
ADMG 101 Computer Applications
MGT 380 Organizational Management
MGT 381 Management of Human Resources
PE 245 First Aid

Select from the following:

Psych 205 Psychology of Adjustment (or)
Psych 314 Human Development and the Learner
(Population specific psychology/sociology courses may be substituted with approval of the academic advisor for Recreation Management)

Advisor approved electives (24 credits)
Exhibit E

Proposed Master of Professional Accountancy Program

The proposed Master of Professional Accountancy program is designed to prepare students for careers in public accounting. Over the past 20 years, the educational requirements for entrance into the CPA profession have been raised on a state by state basis. Beginning July 1, 2000, Washington will become one of 48 jurisdictions which require or will require the equivalent of 225 quarter hours of college education to sit for the CPA exam. While a masters' degree is not part of the new requirement, offering the program as a "five year" undergraduate program adversely impacts CWU's time to degree metric and would make the program less competitive with other undergraduate degrees. All other public institutions in Washington with an accounting program have chosen the master degree option for their students, which would also make a five-year undergraduate program less competitive. We believe that the Master of Professional Accountancy program is the best approach for our students, the University, and the public who depend upon quality professionals.

Required Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Core</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGT 505 - Customer Value/Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT 525 - Strategic Management/Business Simulation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 510 - Information Systems Security, Control, and Audit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 520 - Tax and Legal Strategies for Business</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 530 - Financial Statement Analysis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 590 - Cooperative Education, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 596 - Individual Study</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 700 - Master's Thesis, Project Study, and/or Examination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Required Credits 31

Elective Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 540 - Electronic Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 550 - Enterprise Business Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 560 - Object Oriented Analysis and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 570 - Tax Planning for Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 580 - Tax Planning for Entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 552 - Managerial Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Electives - 400 Level or Above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Credits Required 46

Exhibit F

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

The need for a Master of Science in Engineering Technology (MSET) degree has been identified for the State of Washington. Currently there are no institutions in the entire Northwest that offer an MSET degree program as described in this document. Central Washington University desires to fill that gap by utilizing the existing faculty, laboratories, and resources within the Industrial and Engineering Technology (IET) Department. However, technology is advancing so rapidly that it is necessary to expose the engineering technologist to some of the latest advances, that is, to update their knowledge base. The MSET program is multi-disciplinary, giving the graduate student sufficient choices to fit diverse needs. There are no special fees nor concurrent course stipulations. The MSET degree will be offered at two CWU centers, the Ellensburg Campus and the Steilacoom Center. Preapproval from the HEC Board has already been given for the MSET at these two centers. The Steilacoom Center will provide administrative support for two locations where the MSET degree will be taught, the Puyallup Location and the Boeing/Auburn Location. The maximum number of students after the fourth year is estimated to be 80, with 20 in Ellensburg, 20 at the Puyallup Location and 40 at Boeing/Auburn Location. A cost analysis indicates that the MSET program can be conducted in a self support manner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-course code</th>
<th>course name</th>
<th>credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IET 520</td>
<td>Finite Element Analysis**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 521</td>
<td>Product Design and Development*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 522</td>
<td>PLC Applications***</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 530</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Lasers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 577</td>
<td>Robotics**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 596</td>
<td>Individual Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 599</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 700</td>
<td>Thesis or Option*#</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Required Course Total:**</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department Approved Technical Electives**

The student must select 15 credits from the following list to complete a total program of 45 credit hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-course code</th>
<th>course name</th>
<th>credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IET 512</td>
<td>Alternative Energy Systems**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 523</td>
<td>Emerging Technologies*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 524</td>
<td>Quality Control***</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 525</td>
<td>Systems Analysis and Simulation*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 526</td>
<td>Engineering Project Cost Analysis*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 532</td>
<td>Generation and Transmission of Electrical Power**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 537</td>
<td>Utilization of Community Industrial Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 555</td>
<td>Engineering Project Management*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 592</td>
<td>Field Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET 423</td>
<td>Computer Aided Design and Manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG443</td>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHM 483</td>
<td>Ergonomics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMGT442</td>
<td>Building Service Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 462</td>
<td>Economics of Energy Resources and Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Elective Total:**</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Program Total:| 45 |

**Notes:**
- * New Course
- ** 500 level course based on existing 400 level course
- *** 500 level course based on existing 300 level course
- # Students electing to do a written examination will select 6 credits of approved course work in lieu of IET 700
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 1, 1999

TO: Faculty Senate

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

COPIES: D. Norton, President’s Cabinet, Academic Affairs Council, Academic Department Chairs Organization, Budget Office

SUBJECT: FACULTY SALARY BASE

Section 8.30 of the Faculty Code calls for a yearly report to the Faculty Senate conveying information related to faculty salaries. This report conveys information related to the faculty salary base, the average salary of the university’s tenured and tenure-track faculty, the disposition of all funds authorized and appropriated for faculty salaries, and funds paid to faculty from all sources.

Faculty Salary Base

The 1999-2000 faculty salary base at Central Washington University equals $20,282,839. The faculty salary base is the sum of the budget lines of tenured, tenure-track, and full-time-non-tenure-track faculty plus adjunct lines and phased retirees in the 1999-2000 baseline budget. Administrative stipends have been traditionally reported on salary lines but will be reported on separate lines in the 2000-01 baseline budget.

Average Salary of the University’s Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

The average faculty salary of the university’s tenured and tenure-track faculty can be computed two ways. One approach includes only tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty but not phased retirees. The second approach includes tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and phased retirees. (Section 9.92.F states that “During phased retirement, retirees shall retain all the tenure and seniority privileges they had at the time of retirement.”)

- The average salary in Fall 1999 of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, excluding phased retirees is $49,440.
- The average salary in Fall 1999 of the tenured and tenure-track faculty including phased retirees is $49,875.
Please note that each of these computations weights the salaries of faculty on split appointments and on fractional appointments proportionally according to the fractional appointment. Exempt administrators with faculty tenure are not included in either set.

The computation of the Fall 1997 average faculty salary reported by the Higher Education Coordinating Board during 1998-99 included the set of faculty reported through CWU’s participation in the U.S. government’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) report covering academic year 1997-98. That report was based on data collected during 1997-98 and was reported a year later during 1998-99. The similar comparison with other institutions to measure the effect of funding added to our faculty salary base for 1999-2000 cannot be made until 2000-01 following the IPEDS data collections that will occur during this academic year. Progress toward meeting the 75th percentile of average salaries of peer institutions cannot be reported until the national data is collected and reported.

The IPEDS faculty differs from the two sets of faculty used to compute the average salaries reported above. The annual salary survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education collects data regarding full-time instructional faculty. That set includes full-time tenured and non-tenured faculty, including lecturers. Faculty not included in the IPEDS data are (a) tenured and non-tenured faculty in positions less than full time, (b) librarians holding faculty rank, (c) coaches, and (d) exempt administrators with tenure. In Fall 1997, instructional faculty teaching through the Office of International Studies and Programs (OISP) were also not included; however, data from OISP should be included in this report set in future years because the unit’s faculty are full-time instructional faculty by the IPEDS definition.

The Fall 1997 average faculty salary reported for Central Washington University for the IPEDS report was $43,619. For Fall 1998, the average was $44,666. The Fall 1999 average using the same set of faculty classifications without International Studies and Programs faculty included is $49,268. The Fall 1999 average faculty salary including full-time instructional faculty in International Studies and Programs is $48,939.

The Fall 1999 average of $49,268 is 13 percent higher than the average salary reported for the Fall 1997 IPEDS report.

Disposition of All funds Authorized and Appropriated for Faculty Salaries

Table I reports the adjustments to the faculty salary base from the beginning of 1997-1998 to the establishment of the 1999-2000 faculty salary base as reported by the CWU Budget Office. The Budget Office currently estimates benefits for new full-time faculty positions at 26 percent and benefits for new part-time faculty positions at 10 percent. When additional funds are allocated to existing positions, the Budget Office estimates the need for an accompanying increase to the benefits pool of 16 percent. In Table I, the figures reported as “adjustments to salaries” (column 2) represent funding added or deleted from the existing salary lines in the baseline budget. Therefore, the benefits column (column 3) in Table I reports 16 percent of the amount showing on each line in column 2.

The following notations provide further explanation for each line of Table 1. The letter in parentheses refers to the letter representing each line in Table 1.
### TABLE 1


**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

**November 1, 1999**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Salaries (Excluding Benefits)</th>
<th>Adjustments to Salaries (Excluding Benefits)</th>
<th>Estimated Benefits (Additions to Benefits Pool—Equals 16 Percent of Adjustment to Salaries)</th>
<th>Total (Salary Plus Estimated Benefits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) 1997-98 Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>$18,708,021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 2-Percent Raise</td>
<td>289,858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Grievance and Position Changes</td>
<td>124,469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 1998-99 Faculty Salary Base</td>
<td>$19,122,348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) 3-Percent Salary Increase</td>
<td>$ 551,998</td>
<td>$ 88,320</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 640,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Faculty Salary Equity</td>
<td>215,517</td>
<td>34,483</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Recruitment &amp; Retention Funding</td>
<td>208,717</td>
<td>33,395</td>
<td>242,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Promotions</td>
<td>215,517</td>
<td>34,483</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Faculty Composition/Compensation Changes</td>
<td>76,667</td>
<td>12,267</td>
<td>88,934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Administrative Stipends</td>
<td>-107,925</td>
<td>-17,268</td>
<td>-125,193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Sum of Lines e through j</td>
<td>$1,160,491</td>
<td>$185,680</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,346,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Adjustments to Salaries</td>
<td>1,160,491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) Faculty Salary Base</td>
<td>$20,282,839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) This figure is an adjusted beginning base for 1998-99. The printed budget for 1998-99 included promotions that took effect in July and September 1998. The printed budget did not include the 2-percent reallocation of funding identified in line b.

(b) The Budget Office inserted the salary increases awarded to faculty for 1998-99. The funds came from vacant positions that were eliminated and from adjunct lines that were reduced. The effect of the reduction of those lines from the base is reported in line c.

(c) This line reflects the additions and deletions from faculty lines for the grievance adjustments awarded during 1998-99, the adjustments from vacant positions and adjunct lines required to meet the 2-percent reallocation for faculty raises, and other adjustments to faculty salary lines including shifts in faculty funds between full-time and part-time faculty positions with the accompanying effect on the funds allocated to the benefits pool. The detail is available in the Budget Office or through Paul Apeles, Budget Analyst in the Office of the Provost.

(d) This line represents the 1998-99 faculty salary base. Please note that this figure also includes administrative stipends because the stipends were recorded on faculty salary lines during 1998-99.

(e) This figure represents a 3-percent increase to each faculty salary line in which a faculty member was in a full-time position in Spring 1999 and continued in a full-time position in Fall 1999. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3.

(f) The figure in column 2 represents the without-benefits portion of the $250,000 approved by the Board of Trustees for use for faculty salary equity. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3. The availability of the funds was anticipated from the increased revenues from the additional 224 students assigned to CWU for 1999-2000.

(g) The figure in column 2 represents the without-benefits portion of the funding approved by the Board of Trustees from the recruitment and retention fund provided by the state legislature. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3. CWU was permitted to apply recruitment and retention funds to equity adjustments. The Board of Trustees approved the use of $242,112 to support equity adjustments for faculty positions.

(h) The figure in column 2 represents the without-benefits portion of the $250,000 anticipated for faculty promotions. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3. Promotions equaled $165,143 plus a 16-percent estimated benefits amount of $26,423 for a total of $191,566. The residual has been added to adjunct salary lines to address the approximately 8-percent increase in the minimum salary level for part-time faculty in 1999-2000 as compared to 1998-99. That amount totals $53,122, with an estimated benefits amount of $5,312, totaling $58,434.

(i) This figure represents an influx of funding from (a) changes in the full-time/part-time mix and the accompanying changes in anticipated benefits costs, (b) increases in chair-stipend rates, (c) code-required increases to tenure-track faculty completing doctorates, and (d) changes to faculty salary lines including scale adjustments to new faculty salary lines. The funding source is reallocation of current budget funds from other budget lines. Details can be reviewed in the Budget Office or through Paul Apeles, Budget Analyst in the Office of the Provost.

(j) The $107,925 reported here represents the total administrative stipends in the 1999-2000 baseline budget for department-chair stipends.

(k) This line reports the sum of each column 2, 3, and 4.

(l) This line reflects the sum of items e, f, g, h, i, and j for column 2. This figure represents the total additions to the faculty salary base from 1998-99.

(m) The 1999-2000 faculty salary base.
Funds Paid to Faculty From All Sources

Table 2 reports the distribution of salary savings funds generated from all positions (faculty, administrative exempt, civil service, and student) in the academic colleges during 1998-99:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct salaries</td>
<td>$240,450</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>97,227</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Salary Increase</td>
<td>289,585</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$627,262</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Budget Office reports that in fiscal year 1999 (1998-99), $22,419,631 was posted to position control for all ranks of faculty. For this report, the term “all ranks of faculty” is defined as tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, full-time non-tenure track faculty, adjuncts, and graduate assistants. The Budget Office reports that it is in the process of trying to obtain data for 1997 and 1998. Once received, these data will be reported.
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This report is a summary of the paper prepared for the Central Washington University Board of Trustees. A presentation will be given to the Board on December 10, 1999. It was prepared under the direction of Mark Young, vice president for special projects. The paper was written in response to Board Resolution 99-03 entitled “Nonacademic and Academic Program Review at Central Washington University” approved on June 11, 1999.
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Setting the Context

Over the course of the last two months a campus dialogue has occurred on the integration of a comprehensive program review effort at CWU. This dialogue involved hundreds of people in a multitude of settings. Input and feedback were provided by many persons interested in creating an effective and meaningful process. Research was conducted identifying several institutions that provided valuable perspective from their own program review experiences. A review of the literature proved most valuable in setting the context for the campus discussions. Conversations with both the University Strategic Planning and Assessment committees led to the decision to expand the breadth and scope and hence the value of these reviews.

Program Review at Central Washington University

Various forms of program review, some more formal than others, have existed at CWU since its beginnings as a state normal school. However, it was not until the early 1970s that a systematic formal process of program review was instituted. Under this procedure, educational degree programs were reviewed periodically (5 or 10 year intervals) to meet state (CPE and HECB) guidelines. These reviews consisted of a self-study, a visit and report by an external reviewer, and a summary statement. At the same time, the university participated in specialized accreditation reviews for some of its programs.

Specifically, the university conforms to the standards of and seeks review from the following specialized accrediting bodies:

- National Association of Schools of Music
- National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences
- National Recreation and Parks Association
- American Medical Association: Committee of Allied Health Education
- American Council for Construction Education
- University Aviation Association
- Technology Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
- American Dietetics Association
- National Council for Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE)
- Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC)

Two events transpired in the early 1990s that resulted in a revision of the program review process. First, the transition from the state Council for Postsecondary Education (CPE) to the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) resulted in revisions at the state level in the process of academic program review. Second, the university was embarking on a systematic program of strategic planning, and efforts were undertaken to incorporate assessment, accountability, and program review into the strategic planning process. One result was that the cyclic external program reviews that had been in place for the prior twenty years were suspended, and only programs that were subject to specialized accreditation guidelines were reviewed in the 1991-1992 academic year.
Recent Activities of Program Review

In 1996, the dean of graduate studies and research conducted an internal review of all graduate programs as a first step in clarifying the role of graduate programs at CWU. By 1997, the university department and programs produced their first strategic plans that incorporated program review requirements other than external review. At the same time, the HEC Board was moving toward granting greater autonomy for universities to establish their own approaches to program review.

In approving Resolution 99-03 “Nonacademic and Academic Program Review at Central Washington University”, the Board of Trustees underscored that a systematic approach to program review will form the basis for decision-making and budgeting at the university. In his September 10, 1999 memo to the University Assessment committee, Provost Dauwalder charged the committee to “develop a proposal for regular program review.” In his October 12, 1999 memorandum to the university community, President Norton reiterated the importance of integrating program review more fully into strategic planning. Thus, the stage has been set for the university to clarify its approach to and rationale for program review.

Definition of Program Review

Program review can, for ease of discussion be divided into two types: review of academic programs or units and review of university functions. At CWU, program review typically has concentrated on the former, in fact, formal review has almost always highlight educational degree programs of the university. Specialized accreditation also focuses largely on educational degree programs. The reviews focus on the quality of the curriculum, its delivery, its faculty, and its students. Questions often are posed about the viability of the program in the overall university structure. In addition to reviews of specific educational degree program, other academic programs of the university also can and do subject themselves to internal and external program review, for example, students services, athletic programs, and information resources.

A review of university functions takes on a slightly different approach. Important functions of the university are identified and the effectiveness with which the university undertakes them is evaluated across all divisions, units, or departments that contribute to the function. Regional accreditation takes this approach, placing much more weight on the overall functioning of the university than on the effectiveness of any individual program. Common areas that are evaluated in a review of university functions might include mission and goals, recruit and admit students, maintain facilities, serve students needs, produce scholarship/research, or facilitate student learning. It is not uncommon for a specific unit of the university to have primary responsibility for a particular function, but oftentimes, the general effectiveness of the function requires the participation of a broad number of partners in the institution.

Reviewing University Functions

Functional review is the umbrella term for an evaluation process that seeks to determine the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of specific university undertakings. Standards are established against which programs are evaluated, and these standards change from time to time based on
shifting values and constituent needs. All program functions may be evaluated in accordance with certain common standards, e.g., ethics, but each may also be evaluated according to standards that are unique to their purposes. Terms such as assessment and accountability describe aspects of program review. Assessment is the collection of data that describes the status of an organization or unit in relation to a particular standard. Accountability describes the degree to which the organization or unit’s status is in keeping with internal and external expectations that are placed on it.

**Combined Formative and Summative Review Process**

Program reviews can be classified into four types according to primary motivation (Barak & Breier, 1990):

- Formative reviews to improve the program
- Summative reviews to aid selection, certification, or accountability
- Public relations reviews to increase awareness or to market a program’s importance
- Authoritative reviews to exercise authority.

In most cases, program review of academic programs is formative in nature, that is the review is directed toward program improvement. However, it also can be construed as summative in the sense that program reviews may result in enhancement or discontinuation of programs of the university. Clearly, the Board of Trustees resolution combines both of these functions.

To be effective, and for its outcomes to be accepted, a program review must be fair, appropriately comprehensive, timely, objective, credible, and useful. There must be good communication about the process and outcome of the review (Barak & Breier, 1990). When these criteria are met, program review can improve decision making and result in more effective use of limited resources.

**Benefits of Functional Review at CWU**

At CWU there exists an attitude of doubt that adding another process such as program review will bring about any significant institutional change. Most people will see value in conducting program reviews if changes can be integrated into the strategic planning and budgeting process. Creating trust and ownership are critical elements to the success of program review efforts.

The commitment to comprehensive program review by CWU is a necessary and bold step in an effort to assess our effectiveness and look for ways to improve the quality of the educational experiences at Central. The term program review has been replaced by functional review, because in fact, we desire to review the functions of the University, which involve many different departments and offices and not just degree programs or administrative units themselves. Broad functional review will enhance cross-discipline cooperation, strengthen trust, and expand stakeholder participation. These by-products will also assist in the ongoing improvement of campus climate and open communication.

**Recommendations for Implementation**

The following recommendations are proposed to implement this program of functional review:

1. The University create and adopt a formal policy, as recommended by the President’s Cabinet,
committing itself to comprehensive functional review with the intention that every functional area of the University be reviewed at least every five years.

2. The University adopt a clear definition of functional review and commit this effort of functional review as a priority in its strategic planning and budgeting process (see enclosed graphic of Planning and Evaluation Process).

3. The University create a university-wide Functional Review Committee with broad representation and a clear commission as to its workload, including the responsibility to set criteria, establish review areas, develop templates, oversee the process, and make recommendations to the President.

4. The University direct the Strategic Planning Committee to integrate the results of functional review into its processes so as to insure priority areas receive the recommended attention.

5. The University administration accept written reports and recommendations from respective review teams and delineate to the university community when strategic decisions are made as a result of information provided.

6. The University produce a mechanism whereby incentives are available for recommendations that result in significant efficiencies and/or financial savings for the University.

For a complete report, please refer to the document, *Review of University Functions at Central Washington University*, available from the offices of the President or the Provost.
Review of University Functions

Each review team will conduct the following activities as a standard review:

- identify and review goals as stated in strategic plan
- assess processes to achieve goals
- evaluate functions associated with these goals
- measure performance against the goals
- provide recommendations for improvement.

It is recommended that each review team use the following evaluation tools:

- self-study
- alumni survey
- data collection and analysis
- internal resource assessment
- external review

The following areas are recommended for review in the respective years:

- Construct Mission, Vision & Goals (2000)
- Adopt Administrative Structure (2000)
- Establish Data Collection & Management (2000)
- Recruit & Admit Students (2001)
- Produce Scholarship & Research (2001)
- Govern the University (2001)
- Retain & Advise Students (2002)
- Provide Student Financial Support Services (2002)
- Support Employees (2002)
- Facilitate Student Learning (2003)
- Promote the University (2003)
- Serve the Community (2004)
- Maintain Facilities (2005)
- Support Student Basic Needs (2005)
- Insure External Accountability (2005)
Report from Faculty Senate Code Committee
December 1, 1999, Faculty Senate Meeting

The Code Committee has met regularly on Friday afternoons since the end of September. While a few people have asked for opinion and interpretations concerning different sections of the Code, a large part of time this quarter was spent in cooperating with the summer school coordinator and the provost in working out guidelines for the administration of last year's amendments to Section 7.20 B. 4, the section that deals with individual studies of all kinds. The Code Committee intends still to address various problems that have arisen with the administration of Section 7.20 B. 4 and will bring to you a proposed Code amendment in the spring.

We have also devised and had passed by the Board an amendment allowing for additional alternates for the members of the Grievance Committee.

Currently we are working on two items that should yield proposed amendments to the Code in the future: 1) More clear and fair procedures concerning reappointment, the award of tenure, and the awards of merit and promotion; and 2) A salary policy that will facilitate the movement of faculty members up the salary scale so as to approach and achieve average salaries that place Central's faculty in the 75th percentile of salaries nation-wide, just as the existing Code encourages. During exam week, the Code Committee will meet with members of the Budget and Personnel Committees to discuss salary policy. We hope to have some suggestions for your consideration by January, 2000.

At the beginning of this academic year, the Code Committee began its work with a list of 31 items to be achieved. Individual faculty, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and administrators have added to that list since the end of September. We just hope we get it all done.

BH

CC: <bensonb@cwu.EDU>, <raubeson@cwu.EDU>, <schaefet@cwu.EDU>