12-1-1993

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 12/01/1993

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

ROLL CALL
Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Arlt, Bowman, Carbaugh, Medlar, Myers, Nelson, Nethery, Olvera and Wirth.
Visitors: David Dauwalder, Connie Roberts, Mary Marcy, Agnes Canedo, Beverly Heckart, Anne Denman and Carolyn Wells.

CHANGES TO AGENDA
Delete report: Provost and President. Add report: Director of Governmental Relations.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
MOTION NO. 2929 Rob Perkins moved and Carolyn Schactler seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the October 20, 1993, and November 3, 1993, Faculty Senate meetings as distributed. Motion passed.

COMMUNICATIONS
-10/28/93 memo from Connie Roberts, Special Assistant to the Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment, regarding Faculty Workload Study. Referred to Senate Personnel Committee.

REPORTS
1. DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
Mary Marcy, Director of Governmental Relations, proposed improving communications concerning legislative activities by establishing a University Legislative Committee. Dr. Marcy explained that during the legislative session her presence on the Ellensburg campus is limited to Monday mornings and Fridays, and it is difficult for her to maintain adequate linkage and coordination between all campus constituencies. A University Legislative Committee would consist of representatives from the faculty, Association of Administrators, Civil Service and student body and would meet once a week during the legislative session and periodically, as necessary, when the legislature is out of session. Dr. Marcy explained that this group would not perform an advisory function or replace any of the many legislative action committees that currently exist. She suggested that the faculty membership on the committee be chosen by the Faculty Senate with an emphasis on representation from each school/college.

Dr. Marcy reported that the next legislative session begins on January 11, 1994. Faculty early retirement and analysis of faculty workloads will likely be on the legislature's agenda, but budget issues will continue to be the top priority during the upcoming session. Dr. Marcy stated that, due to efforts surrounding Initiatives 601 and 602, the status of higher education seems to have risen, but she cautioned that further education of the legislature and the public is necessary. In November, the Office of Financial Management (OFM) asked state agencies to submit 1993-95 budget reduction options for long-term, sustainable cuts of 2%. Dr. Marcy explained that the 2% requested cut is, in effect, a 4% reduction for higher education. The Governor plans to make his final budget recommendation in December.

2. CHAIR
-At President Ivory Nelson's request, Chair Nesselroad distributed copies of a November 15, 1993, letter from Courtney Jones, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs, to Ruta Fanning, Director of OFM; and a November 16, 1993, letter to Governor Mike Lowry from the Council of Presidents (COP). Both letters were in response to a November 8, 1993, memo from Ruta Fanning to All Agencies requesting 2% budget reduction options.

-Chair Nesselroad cautioned members of the Faculty Senate to be sensitive to gender issues in their use of language. He noted that, because of their relatively small numbers on the faculty, women carry an inordinate workload in the faculty governance system.

-Chair Nesselroad highlighted the topics of the Fall quarter Deans' Council meetings: travel restrictions; strategic planning; enrollment management; restructuring the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences ("The plan, whether it is the original or a variation, will go into effect on 7/1/94." - Deans' Council Notes, 9/23/93); reinstitution of Professional and Retraining Leave Committee; Class Size Policy; Tuition and Fee
Central Washington University

Faculty Senate Meeting - December 1, 1993

Presiding Officer: Sidney Nesselroad
Recording Secretary: Sue Tlrotta

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

Roll Call

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Arit, Bowman, Carbaugh, Medlar, Myers, Nelson, Nethery, Olivero and Wirth.

Visitors: David Dauwalder, Connie Roberts, Mary Marcy, Agnes Canedo, Beverly Heckart, Anne Denman and Carolyn Wells.

Changes to Agenda

Delete reports: Provost and President. Add report: Director of Governmental Relations.

Approval of Minutes

*MOTION NO. 229 Rob Perkins moved and Carolyn Schaetler seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the October 20, 1993, and November 3, 1993, Faculty Senate meetings as distributed. Motion passed.

Communications

-10/28/93 memo from Connie Roberts, Special Assistant to the Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment, regarding Faculty Workload Study. Referred to Senate Personnel Committee.

Reports

1. Director of Governmental Relations

Mary Marcy, Director of Governmental Relations, proposed improving communications concerning legislative activities by establishing a University Legislative Committee. Dr. Marcy explained that during the legislative session her presence on the Ellensburg campus is limited to Monday mornings and Fridays, and it is difficult for her to maintain adequate linkage and coordination between all campus constituencies. A University Legislative Committee would consist of representatives from the faculty, Association of Administrators, Civil Service and student body and would meet once a week during the legislative session and periodically, as necessary, when the legislature is out of session. Dr. Marcy explained that this group would not perform an advisory function or replace any of the many legislative action committees that currently exist. She suggested that the faculty membership on the committee be chosen by the Faculty Senate with an emphasis on representation from each school/college.

Dr. Marcy reported that the next legislative session begins on January 11, 1994. Faculty early retirement and analysis of faculty workloads will likely be on the legislature's agenda, but budget issues will continue to be the top priority during the upcoming session. Dr. Marcy stated that, due in large part to efforts surrounding Initiatives 601 and 602, the status of higher education seems to have risen, but she cautioned that further education of the legislature and the public is necessary. In November, the Office of Financial Management (OFM) asked state agencies to submit 1993-95 budget reduction options for long-term, sustainable cuts of 2%. Dr. Marcy explained that the 2% requested cut is, in effect, a 4% reduction for higher education. The Governor plans to make his final budget recommendation in December.

2. Chair

-At President Ivory Nelson's request, Chair Nesselroad distributed copies of a November 15, 1993, letter from Courtney Jones, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs, to Ruta Fanning, Director of OFM; and a November 16, 1993, letter to Governor Mike Lowry from the Council of Presidents (COP). Both letters were in response to a November 6, 1993, memo from Ruta Fanning to All Agencies requesting 2% budget reduction options.

-Chair Nesselroad cautioned members of the Faculty Senate to be sensitive to gender issues in their use of language. He noted that, because of their relatively small numbers on the faculty, women carry an inordinate workload in the faculty governance system.

-Chair Nesselroad highlighted the topics of the Fall quarter Deans' Council meetings: travel restrictions; strategic planning; enrollment management; restructuring the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences ("The plan, whether it is the original or a variation, will go into effect on 7/1/94." - Deans' Council Notes, 9/23/93); reinstitution of Professional and Retraining Leave Committee; Class Size Policy; Tuition and Fee
2. **CHAIR, continued**

Weavers; Continuing Education; Budget Reduction and Staffing plans; Project Jumpstart (learning communities, student retention, etc.); ACT proposal. Deans' Council agrees that support areas can't sustain much more cutting, so further budget reductions will begin to directly impact faculty, students and programs. Provost Moore has stated that he believes the university is "under-administered, and this is costing us a lot," and he cautioned that "administration" should not be confused with "administrators." The Provost has asked the deans to review, analyze and prioritize every program in their area, recognize how faculty drive quality, evaluate the quality and strengths of students from program to program, evaluate demand for enrollment, and recognize centrality/essentiality of certain programs. Deans' Council will hold a retreat on December 15 and 16, 1993, at which the deans will present their programmatic evaluations. Senators asked questions regarding the timelines and purpose of the deans' evaluation of programs. Chair Nesselroad stated that the Provost has emphasized that across-the-board cuts at this point would "weaken everyone equally," so further budget reduction efforts must be centered on keeping strong those excellent programs that are necessary to the university's progress.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS — DISCUSSION ONLY**

Proposed amendments to the Senate's bylaws require a two-thirds vote of those present and voting and are formally adopted at the subsequent meeting after introduction. This modification will be voted on at the January 12, 1994, Faculty Senate meeting:

**IV. Committees**

A. **Executive Committee**

1. **Composition**

   The Executive Committee shall have six members consisting of the five officers of the Senate: the Chair of the Senate, the Vice Chair, the Secretary, the two at-large members elected from the Senate membership, and the immediate past Senate Chair. **If the immediate past Senate Chair is unable to serve on the Executive Committee, the preceding Senate Chair will serve.** Unless a current Senator, the immediate past Senate Chair is without vote.

   **Rationale:** Immediate past Senate Chair Barney Erickson is teaching off campus this year and is unable to serve on the Executive Committee. The Senate temporarily suspended and amended its Bylaws this year to allow the preceding Senate Chair, Charles McGehee, to serve in his place. Since this situation is likely to occur again, it is prudent for the Senate to allow for it in its Bylaws rather than repeatedly going through the process of suspension and amendment.

   Senators stated that it is likely at some time that both the immediate past Senate Chair and the preceding Senate Chair would be unable to serve, and since it would be constructive for any past Chair to serve on the Executive Committee, provision for this contingency should be built into the bylaws language:

   **[AMENDMENT]... If the immediate past Senate Chair is unable to serve on the Executive Committee, the most recent past Senate Chair available will serve.** Unless a current Senator, the immediate past Senate Chair is without vote. . . .

   There was no objection to the amendment; the proposed bylaws change as amended will be presented on the January 12, 1994, Faculty Senate agenda.

3. **DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS**

   David Dauwalder, Dean of the School of Business and Economics, outlined the challenges facing his school. Dean Dauwalder stated that coordination of the School of B&E is complicated because it operates three programs [Accounting, Business Administration, Economics] on three different sites, with nearly half its students and 40% of its faculty on the West Side. The school began working on the mid-1980's toward accreditation by the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), and much of its attention is focused on this goal. Five intra-school committees have been created this year to work on specific aspects of the AACSB self-study, with the aim of attaining accreditation by next year. Dean Dauwalder pointed out that new AACSB accreditation standards accentuate measurement of performance against stated mission, and this has added significant flexibility to the AACSB accreditation process.
4. STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Strategic Planning Committee Chair Anne Denman (Anthropology), reported on the role, schedule and activities of this year's Committee. She emphasized that the Committee hopes to learn from mistakes and inconsistencies in the Strategic Planning process that was initiated last year and views as its two primary tasks: 1) the re-vitalizing of units through enthusiasm for planning, and 2) routinization of planning as a process arising from the grassroots level. Dr. Denman stated that, even though a revised Strategic Planning document will be produced each year, planning should be seen as an on-going process. The Committee will carefully review the 1993-98 Strategic Plan and submit it to the Board of Trustees for acceptance; Strategic Planning will actively resume when department chairs are sent a planning package during Winter quarter 1994. The Vice Presidents' reports will be due by the end of March, and the Committee will hold several open forums on these plans and produce a 1994-99 Strategic Plan by June 1994. Dr. Denman stated that the planning process will not include as much data gathering this year, but will concentrate on review of goals, budgets, equipment needs and student outcomes assessment. Subcommittees will review various areas of the plan, with particular emphasis on coordinating strategic planning information with existing data bases in a unified Management Information System (MIS).

5. BUDGET COMMITTEE

Budget Committee Chair Barry Donahue referenced the November 15 and 16, 1993, budget memos [see Chair's report above] distributed by the Senate Chair and quoted for the Senate's information pertinent sections from the November 8, 1993 request to All Agencies from Ruta Fanning, OPM:

"...In determining reduction options, agencies should first consider cutbacks in those areas that will have the least possible impact on direct service delivery. Examples of appropriate options include: further reductions in equipment, travel and administrative costs; reductions in managerial FTEs; elimination of nonessential expenditures for advisory boards, conferences, etc. It is important that any cuts are sustainable over the long-term. Holding vacancies open for the balance of the 1993-95 Biennium or eliminating equipment replacement until 1995-97 would provide short-term savings, but would probably not be sustainable for the long run. As part of the 2 percent reduction, I would also ask that each agency propose three specific programs or activities for elimination.... Agencies should strive to group related reductions into one decision package to avoid submitting a large number of decision packages...

Senator Donahue pointed out that the November 15, 1993, memo from Courtney Jones, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs, to Ruta Fanning, Director of OFM, is vague regarding cuts and does not propose specific program/activities for elimination:

Given the short time frame required for a response to the call for a cut plan coupled with the extended time our internal processes take to develop specific program cuts, we are not in a position to spell out exactly where such a cut would ultimately be placed by program activity. Accordingly, our response of necessity has been couched in more general terms, i.e., fte faculty and staff, fte enrollments, etc. Nevertheless, it seems evident that the principle effect of a $1,332,440 cut to our budget would be the loss of the second year enrollment addition together with the faculty and staff fte and operations funding associated with it.

6. CODE COMMITTEE

Code Committee Chair Beverly Heckart reported that on November 19, 1993, the Board of Trustees approved changes to Faculty Code sections 9.90 [Retirement] and 9.92 [Phased Retirement for Faculty] as approved by the Faculty Senate on May 5, 1993, and October 20, 1993.

7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Curriculum Committee member Steven Olson reported that the Committee is working on revisions to the Curriculum Planning and Procedures manual and plans to have a first draft ready for review by the end of Winter quarter 1994.

8. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

No report.

9. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

No report.
OLD BUSINESS
CONTINUITY OF FACULTY SENATE LEADERSHIP
At the suggestion of Faculty Senators at the November 5, 1993, meeting, the following past Senate Chairs were asked to provide information and background regarding their experience as Chair of the Faculty Senate:
Charles McGehee, Sociology (Chair: 1990-91 and 1991-92)
Beverly Heckart, History (Chair: 1985-86 and 1989-90)
Connie Roberts, Institutional Research (Chair: 1988-89)
Owen Prattz, Psychology (Chair: 1987-88)
Ken Gamon, Math (Chair: 1986-87)

Discussion guidelines:
1) 2 Year Term for Senate Chair - Is the Senate Chair significantly more effective in a second year than in the first year as Chair?
2) Departmental/Personal Impact of 2 Year Term for Senate Chair - Is it reasonable to expect a largely uncompensated, four or five year commitment for the position of Senate Chair? Would a mandatory two-year term as Senate Chair with 50% released time have a negative impact on the Chair's department? Would a two-year term prevent smaller departments from being able to support such a position? Would a two-year term as Senate Chair discourage faculty in certain disciplines from serving as Senate Chair?
3) Senate Chair Representation During the Summer - Are significant decisions and policy recommendations made by the administration during the summer months? Is it necessary for the Senate Chair to represent faculty interests during the summer?
4) Senate Chair Compensation During the Summer - Should the Senate Chair continue to be compensated for summer service? Since the amount of compensation would vary widely according to the salary of the particular Senate Chair, should compensation be offered in the form of a stipend or honorarium at a lower rate? Should the Senate be forced to choose between faculty representation during the summer and faculty legislative representation during the school year?
5) Faculty Senate Budgetary and Reporting Responsibility - Should the Faculty Senate consider moving its reporting responsibilities and budget to the Provost's academic area and including the Provost rather than the President in its membership? What are the potential advantages/disadvantages of such a move?

Charles McGehee: Senator McGehee stated that the Senate Chair is generally more knowledgeable during the second year of service, primarily concerning the complexities of the university budget process. The Chair is not necessarily more effective during the second year, and it is a burden on any department (especially smaller ones) and potentially damaging to programs for a Senate Chair to be released for a two year period. Important administrative decisions are made during the summer months, and the Senate Chair has traditionally served uncompensated as a "labor of love." Although the Chair should be present during the summer and ideally should be compensated, this should not be presented in the Senate's budget as an "either/or" proposition (e.g., the Senate may choose to compensate the Chair OR have faculty legislative representation). Although the Senate reports to the President in a nominal fashion according to its placement on the same level as the President on the university's organizational chart, the Senate Chair has not been allowed to sit in on the President's executive group meetings, and the Senate does not seem to be held in the high regard indicated by its position on the chart. A change in organization to place the Senate under the auspices of the Provost would clearly place the Senate in a lower position in the "chain of command" structure.

Beverly Heckart: Dr. Heckart agreed with Senator McGehee that familiarity with budget issues is the most important knowledge gained by a Senate Chair who serves a second term. She concurred that it is very hard on departments to release a faculty member half time for two years of service, and the Senate Chair must be present during the summer and should, ideally, be compensated. Dr. Heckart pointed out that the issue of compensation during the summer months may vary in importance among individual Chairs, considering whether they would be on campus teaching during Summer Session and the state of their financial commitments (e.g., children, mortgage, etc.). Dr. Heckart cautioned that the Senate should be extremely careful in considering a change in organizational structure and should not presume that a move to the Provost's area would result in more consistent funding. She pointed out that the Senate has historically been underfunded, and when the office runs out of money each year, the President provides the necessary funds at the Senate Chair's request.

Connie Roberts: Dr. Roberts stated that a second year as Senate Chair would not necessarily increase the effectiveness of the position, but more continuity could be encouraged: the Vice Chair could begin attending meetings with the Chair in the Spring, assume the mantle of Chair the following year, and then serve a year as Past Chair on the Executive Committee. Dr. Roberts agreed that released time for Senate Chairs places a hardship on departments and programs, and she stated that although administrative activity during the summer months is inconsistent, the Chair should be present and should be compensated with a stipend/honorarium. She stated that the Senate Chair usually meets on a regular basis with the President and the Provost, and she recommended that the Senate consider very carefully what it would be giving up if it altered its reporting responsibility.
OLD BUSINESS, continued

CONTINUITY OF FACULTY SENATE LEADERSHIP, continued

Owen Pratz: Chair Nesselroad reported that Dr. Pratz was not present, but he sent a letter to the Senate addressing the questions. Dr. Pratz stated that "The essential problem is that any system that requires multiple years of entry and occupancy create an inflexibility that almost insures disappointment. Also, those multiple years of services are either coming out of the hide of the officer (if uncompensated) or the department (if compensated by release time). The ideal might be a multiple year term with full compensation to the department. On the other hand, this might begin to look like a quasi-administrative position. The faculty vs. administrative allegiance of the chair is perennially questioned. Longer terms, while providing more continuity and expertise, could very well jeopardize the relationship between the chair and faculty... In my perception, usually very little occurs during the summer that requires involvement of the senate chair. The risk, of course, is that even if the chair were on board, the faculty wouldn't be, and unilateral actions by the senate chair could easily create more problems than they solve. The tradition has been that the administration not take action on matters critical to faculty during the summer. To do so would look surreptitious... No chair in the past has ever been compensated for summer involvement. Clearly it has had unfortunate effects in this first case, and I'm unclear what benefits were provided for faculty... Question 5: The senate needs to work this one out."

Ken Gamon: Senator Gamon pointed out that he served during the summer of 1986 and also served in place of Owen Pratz at Dr. Pratz's request during the summer of 1987. He stated that the Senate Chair should be available during the summer, but the amount of work does not require full compensation, and an honorarium would be more appropriate. Increased continuity of the Chairsip is important; he pointed out that the Senate's Vice Chair has not usually followed to become Chair, and often the elected Chair has not even served on the Executive Committee. It would be nearly impossible to obtain a three or four year commitment of the Senate Chair, and further efforts should be made to minimize the impact on departments of releasing the Senate Chair. The Senate's reporting responsibility should be kept with the President.

In response to questions from Senators, Chair Nesselroad replied that although he has met with the Provost weekly during Full quarter, he has not yet had sufficient time or specific cause to meet with President Nelson. The Chair reported that, per the Senate's October 20, 1993, instruction [MOTION NO. 2923], he sent a letter to the Budget Advisory Committee addressing the need for faculty legislative representation, but the Senate has not yet received an acknowledgement or reply. Provost Moore has indicated that he supports faculty legislative representation. In response to questions concerning the nature and definition of the "reporting responsibility" of the Senate, it was clarified that the Senate does not actually "report" to the President [as indicated by the Senate being placed on the same level as the President on the organizational chart and connected to that position by a broken line], and a more accurate definition would be that the President has "budgetary authority" for the Faculty Senate. Chair Nesselroad pointed out that the official linkage to the Board of Trustees is through the President.

NEW BUSINESS

PROFESSIONAL LEAVES

Senator Dan Ramsdell stated that only four faculty professional leaves for 1994-95 were forwarded by the administration and approved by the Board on November 19, 1993. He reminded the Faculty Senate that, per MOTION NO. 2887 passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on February 3, 1993: "...the Faculty Senate recommend[s], retroactive to those leaves approved for 1993-94, restoration of a professional leave policy which will offer opportunity for a greater number of grants and is consistent with the existing Faculty Code." Senator Ramsdell maintained that the sense of the motion regarding "a greater number of grants" was not confined to 1993-94 and questioned whether the change to fewer leaves should be viewed as a move toward a permanent policy change. Chair Nesselroad answered that Provost Moore has expressed strong support for the concept of a professional leave program, and the Provost will be asked to address the Senate's questions on this issue at the next meeting. The Chair reported that, although the number of leaves approved was small, the Provost abided by the recommendations and prioritization of the Professional and Retraining Leave Committee per the procedures outlined in the Faculty Code. In a letter to the Professional and Retraining Leave Committee dated November 15, 1993, the Provost states "You should have heard by now that we are facing the probability of an additional budget reccession in the order of two to four percent. For that reason, and in view of the reasons I discussed at our meeting a few weeks ago, I have decided to recommend that the President and Board of Trustees approve the committee's first four selections. I wish things were different, as I consider professional leave a very important opportunity for professional development and academic renewal. However, given the general financial instability of the State, I believe I need to be cautious in making commitments which could negatively impact our course and staffing requirements." Chair Nesselroad stated that there were 12 applications for leave this year (17 last year), and it seems unclear whether sending faculty on professional leave saves or costs the university money. Senator Ken Gamon, CF, reported that it is his understanding that the other state universities are submitting to growing pressure to cut the number and length of professional leaves awarded, and the trend seems to be toward leaves of a single quarter or semester rather than a full academic year.
NEW BUSINESS, continued

INTERNET  
Senators questioned whether the university community has access to the Internet computer network. Senator Thomas Yeh, Library, explained that those with a VAX account have access to Internet now. Senators criticized campus computer security which tends to restrict and limit computer utilization and stated that there is a lack of information on how to use the system. Senator Barry Donahue, Computer Science, reported that solutions are being sought to the problems concerning the university's computing system. Chair Nesselroad stated that the Senate Office is supporting a move away from a paper-oriented information system and toward better use of an electronic system.

* * * * NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: January 12, 1994 * * * *
I. ROLL CALL
II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - October 20, 1993 and November 3, 1993

IV. COMMUNICATIONS
   -10/28/93 memo from Connie Roberts, Special Assistant to the Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment, re. Faculty Workload Study. Referred to Personnel Committee.

V. REPORTS
   1. CHAIR
      -Gender Neutral Language
      -Deans' Council
      -Amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws [attached]
   2. PRESIDENT
   3. PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: Thomas Moore
   4. DEAN OF SCHOOL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS: David Dauwalder
   5. STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE: Anne Denman, Chair
   6. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
   7. BUDGET COMMITTEE
   8. CODE COMMITTEE
   9. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
   10. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
   11. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

VI. OLD BUSINESS
    -REPORT AND DISCUSSION: Continuity of Faculty Senate Leadership [attached]

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

*** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: January 12, 1994 ***
CHAIR

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS --- DISCUSSION ONLY

[NOTE: Proposed amendments to the Senate’s bylaws require a two-thirds vote of those present and voting and are formally adopted at the subsequent meeting after introduction. This modification will be voted on at the January 12, 1994, Faculty Senate meeting.]

IV. Committees
A. Executive Committee
1. Composition
   The Executive Committee shall have six members consisting of the five officers of the Senate: the Chair of the Senate, the Vice Chair, the Secretary, the two at-large members elected from the Senate membership, and the immediate past Senate Chair. If the immediate past Senate Chair is unable to serve on the Executive Committee, the preceding Senate Chair will serve. Unless a current Senator, the immediate past Senate Chair is without vote.

Rationale: Immediate past Senate Chair Barney Erickson is teaching off campus this year and is unable to serve on the Executive Committee. The Senate temporarily suspended and amended its Bylaws this year to allow the preceding Senate Chair, Charles McGehee, to serve in his place. Since this situation is likely to occur again, it is prudent for the Senate to allow for it in its Bylaws rather than repeatedly going through the process of suspension and amendment.

OLD BUSINESS

CONTINUITY OF FACULTY SENATE LEADERSHIP

At the suggestion of Faculty Senators at the November 3, 1993, meeting, the following past Senate Chairs have been asked to provide information and background regarding their experience as Chair of the Faculty Senate:

Charles McGehee, Sociology (Chair: 1990-91 and 1991-92)
Beverly Heckart, History (Chair: 1985-86 and 1989-90)
Connie Roberts, Institutional Research (Chair: 1988-89)
Owen Pratz, Psychology (Chair: 1987-88)
Ken Gamon, Math (Chair 1986-87)

Discussion guidelines:
1) 2 Year Term for Senate Chair - Is the Senate Chair significantly more effective in a second year than in the first year as Chair?
2) Departmental/Personal Impact of 2 Year Term for Senate Chair - Is it reasonable to expect a largely uncompensated, four or five year commitment for the position of Senate Chair? Would a mandatory two-year term as Senate Chair with 50% released time have a negative impact on the Chair's department? Would a two-year term prevent smaller departments from being able to support such a position? Would a two-year term as Senate Chair discourage faculty in certain disciplines from serving as Senate Chair?
3) Senate Chair Representation During the Summer - Are significant decisions and policy recommendations made by the administration during the summer months? Is it necessary for the Senate Chair to represent faculty interests during the summer?
4) Senate Chair Compensation During the Summer - Should the Senate Chair continue to be compensated for summer service? Since the amount of compensation would vary widely according to the salary of the particular Senate Chair, should compensation be offered in the form of a stipend or honorarium at a lower rate? Should the Senate be forced to choose between faculty representation during the summer and faculty legislative representation during the school year?
5) Faculty Senate Budgetary and Reporting Responsibility - Should the Faculty Senate consider moving its reporting responsibilities and budget to the Provost’s academic area and including the Provost rather than the President in its membership? What are the potential advantages/disadvantages of such a move?
Central Washington University
Information Resources
Memo

To: Professor Sidney Nesselroad and the Faculty Senate

From: Jim Haskett
Director

Date: January 13, 1994

Subj: Internet Question in Faculty Senate Minutes

Professor Nesselroad, The minutes of the December 1 Faculty Senate Meeting noted questions about the availability of Internet. Internet is available. See CWUsers, our newsletter, for the announcement. Copies are available from Information Resources (2921). Watch for a coming announcement from the President on the availability of the CWU prototype Gopher. Also, please attend "A Tour of the Internet" on January 18 from 3:00 until 5:00 PM in Hebeler Auditorium.
ROLL CALL 1993-94

Walter ARLT
Linda BEATH
Andrea BOWMAN
John BRANGWIN
Peter BURKHOLDER
Minerva CAPLES
Robert CARBAUGH
David CARNES
Ken CORY
Bobby CUMMINGS
Barry DONAHUE
Ken GAMON
Mary GOSSAGE
Charles MCGHEE
Deborah MEDLAR
Robert MYERS
Ivory NELSON
Connie NOTT
Sidney NESSELROAD
Vince NETHERY
Michael OLIVERO
Steve OLSON
Rob PERKINS
Dan RAMSDELL
Dieter ROMBOY
Sharon ROSELL
Eric ROTH
Charles RUBIN
Carolyn SCHACTLER
Hugh SPALL
Kristan STARBUCK
Stephanie STEIN
Alan TAYLOR
Thomas THELEN
Morris UEBELACKER
Lisa WEYANDT [pron. Y'-ANT]
Rex WIRTH
Thomas YEH
Mark ZETTERBERG

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: December 1, 1993

Stephen JEFFERIES
Dan FENNERTY
Madalon LALLEY
Kris HENRY
John UTZINGER
Susan DONAHOE
David HEDRICK
Walt KAMINSKI
Margaret SAHLSTRAND

George TOWN
James HARPER
Jeff OLSEN
David KAUFMAN
Gary HEESACKER
Patrick OWENS
Thomas MOORE

Andrew SPENCER
Robert GREGSON

Cathy BERTELSON
Beverly HECKART
Stella MORENO
Michael BRAUNSTEIN
Geoffrey BOERS
James HINTHORNE
Carolyn THOMAS

Shawn CHRISTIE
Stephen SCHEPMAN
Robert GARRETT
John CARR
John ALWIN
Roger FOUTS

Jerry HOGAN
Wesley VAN TASSEL

(ROSTER) ROLL CALL 93; November 1, 1993)
Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.
TO: PAST SENATE CHAIRS:
Charles McGehee, Sociology (Chair: 1990-91 and 1991-92)
Beverly Heckart, History (Chair: 1985-86 and 1989-90)
Connie Roberts, Institutional Research (Chair: 1988-89)
Owen Pratz, Psychology (Chair: 1987-88)
Ken Gamon, Math (Chair 1986-87)

FROM: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair
Faculty Senate

DATE: November 9, 1993

RE: PAST CHAIR'S REPORT: DECEMBER 1, 1993, FACULTY SENATE MEETING

At its meetings on October 20 and November 3, 1993, the Faculty Senate discussed continuity of Faculty Senate leadership, compensation of the Faculty Senate Chair for services performed during the summer months, and the possibility of changing the reporting and budgetary responsibilities of the Faculty Senate from the President's area to the Provost's area.

Senators determined at their November 3 meeting that they did not have sufficient information regarding the duties of Senate Chairs to draw any firm conclusions or make informed recommendations. It was agreed that past Chairs would be invited to a Senate meeting to provide information and background regarding their experience as Chair of the Faculty Senate.

The Executive Committee therefore invites you to the Wednesday, December 1, 1993, Faculty Senate meeting (3:10 p.m., SUB 204-205). Each Chair will be asked to briefly (5 minutes or less) describe his or her experience as Faculty Senate Chair, and the floor will then be opened for further questions and discussion.

Please use the following statements and questions as a guideline for your brief report:

1) **2 Year Term for Senate Chair**
The 1992 University Governance Report states that "Continuity of Senate leadership is a problem. The current term of the Senate Chair is one year and it virtually takes one year to learn the job. As a result, the Chair is often inadequately informed and, consequently, less effective in representing the faculty in situations requiring a comprehensive understanding of university governance." Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

Is the Senate Chair significantly more effective in a second year than in the first year as Chair?

2) **Departmental/Personal Impact of 2 Year Term for Senate Chair**
The 1992 University Governance Report suggests that "the Senate Chair might be elected for a two-year term and a Chair-elect might be designated to serve one year on the Executive Committee"
before actually taking office." Senators have raised concerns about whether it is reasonable to expect a largely uncompensated, four or five year commitment for the position of Senate Chair (one or two years on the Executive Committee prior to serving as Chair; two years as Chair with 50% released time; one year on the Executive Committee as Past Chair).

Senate Chairs are usually tenured, senior faculty members. Would a mandatory two-year term as Senate Chair with 50% released time have a negative impact on their department? Would a two-year term prevent smaller departments from being able to support such a position? Would a two-year term as Senate Chair discourage faculty in certain disciplines from serving as Senate Chair?

3) Senate Chair Representation During the Summer  
Are significant decisions and policy recommendations made by the administration during the summer months? Is it necessary for the Senate Chair to represent faculty interests during the summer?

4) Senate Chair Compensation During the Summer  
The 1992 University Governance report states that "the Senate Chair should be retained and receive compensation for service during the summer." This recommendation was instituted for the first time during summer 1993; the Senate Chair was compensated at the rate of 1/9th (equivalent of 6 credit hours) his regular, academic year salary for two months. This decision (based upon a misunderstood agreement between the Senate and the administration) has made it virtually impossible for the Senate to send faculty legislative representation to Olympia this year. Should the Senate Chair continue to be compensated for summer service? Since the amount of compensation would vary widely according to the salary of the particular Senate Chair, should compensation be offered in the form of a stipend or honorarium at a lower rate?

Should the Senate be forced to choose between faculty representation during the summer and faculty legislative representation during the school year?

5) Faculty Senate Budgetary and Reporting Responsibility  
The university's organizational chart currently shows the Board of Trustees at the apex of the chart, with the President directly below the Board and the Faculty Senate and President's Advisory Council flanking the President on either side. In accordance with the organization of the university, the Senate reports to the President as its principal budget administrator, and the President, rather than the Provost, serves as an ex officio (non-voting) member of the Faculty Senate. In the spring of 1993, President Nelson requested that the Code be changed, removing the President from the Senate and, instead, making the Provost an ex officio member. Action on this request was delayed to allow the new Provost to submit input. Subsequently, Provost Thomas Moore has requested that the Provost be made an ex officio, non-voting Faculty Senator, and this request has been forwarded to the Code Committee for consideration. Should the Faculty Senate consider moving its reporting responsibilities and budget to the Provost's academic area and including the Provost rather than the President in its membership? What are the potential advantages/disadvantages of such a move?

R.S.V.P.
Please call Sue (3231) at your earliest convenience to confirm whether or not you'll be able to attend the Senate meeting on December 1.

c: Thomas Moore, Provost/VP for Academic Affairs

sft [c:\wpdocs\agendas\12-1-93.chr]
November 15, 1993

President Ivory V. Nelson
Executive Offices
Campus

Dear President Nelson:

This letter has two purposes, the first of which is to transmit the recommendation of the Professional and Retraining Leave Committee regarding applications received for the 1994-95 academic year. The committee's recommendations are included in the attached letter from Patricia Maguire.

The second is to give my recommendation and seek your support for the following professional leaves. It is my pleasure to recommend that the faculty members listed below be granted a professional leave for the entire 1994-95 academic year:

Richard V. Alumbaugh . . . Professor, Psychology
Phillip B. Garrison . . . . Professor, English
Elizabeth M. Street . . . . Professor, Psychology
Warren R. Street . . . . Professor, Psychology

The attached cover page, upon your review and approval, can be used to transmit the recommendations to the Board of Trustees for their consideration at the November 19, 1993 meeting.

If you have any questions, I would be pleased to answer them.

Sincerely,

Thomas D. Moore
Provost/Vice President
for Academic Affairs

/kb
TO: Rich Corona (Administrative Exempt)  
Carolyn Wells (Administrative Exempt)  
Mary Marcy (Chair)  
Marla Firman (Civil Service)  
Tom Stoffle (Civil Service)  
Kris Henry (Student)  
Jeff Olsen (Student)  
Heather Flodstrom (Student)  
3 Faculty Representatives (to be named by Faculty Senate)  

RE: University Legislative Committee  

As each of you are well aware, the activities of the state legislature have great relevance to all of Central Washington University. Central is represented in Olympia by Dr. Mary Marcy, and during the legislative session she is in Olympia at least as frequently as she is on campus. However, I believe it is important to maintain the links between the groups on campus and Central's efforts in Olympia. At present, Central has a number of groups that have legislative action committees of one sort or another. While I do not want to infringe upon the activities of those groups, I recognize that it is simply not possible for Dr. Marcy to serve our interests in Olympia and also meet with all of the groups with an interest in legislative activities during the short time she is on campus.

In an effort to coordinate our legislative activities, I am appointing each of you to serve on a University Legislative Committee. The committee will meet once a week during the legislative session, and periodically as necessary when the legislature is out of session. This group is not an advisory committee, but a means of communicating information and, when necessary, the positions of specific groups on campus on particular legislation.

Please advise me of your willingness to serve on the University Legislative Committee prior to the Christmas holidays. Meeting times and venues will be arranged in the near future.

Thank you for your willingness to consider this appointment, and for your continued service to the Central community.

Ivory V. Nelson  
President
November 8, 1993

TO: All Agencies
FROM: Ruta Fanning, Director
SUBJECT: BUDGET REDUCTION PLANS

As referenced in my October 1 memorandum, the Office of Financial Management's (OFM) review of supplemental budget issues will involve consideration of some reductions to the existing 1993-95 expenditure levels. This approach is necessitated by the uncertainty of ongoing revenues and the desire to continue to improve on efficiencies and savings already initiated.

It should be emphasized that the data requested will form just one part of the OFM analysis, and that final decisions will require a great deal of interaction with agencies in a cooperative effort. Our timetable assumes a final Governor's budget recommendation in December 1993, prior to the 1994 legislative session. This leaves less than two months to re-examine the current budget and propose alternatives.

OFM staff has already spent considerable time reviewing agency supplemental budget requests. The Governor has made it clear that OFM should consider reductions that, at minimum, offset any of the unavoidable cost increases we identify.

Budget Reduction Targets
We are asking agencies to submit reduction options equating to 2 percent of both State General Fund and combined Other Fund operating appropriations for the current biennium. These amounts are displayed in Attachment A of this memorandum. (Agencies with combined appropriations of less than $1 million are not included on this list and need not submit specific plans.)

In determining reduction options, agencies should first consider cutbacks in those areas that will have the least possible impact on direct service delivery. Examples of appropriate options include: further reductions in equipment, travel and administrative costs; reductions in managerial FTEs; elimination of nonessential expenditures for advisory boards, conferences, etc.
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It is important that any cuts are sustainable over the long-term. Holding vacancies open for the balance of the 1993-95 Biennium or eliminating all equipment replacement until 1995-97 would provide short-term savings, but would probably not be sustainable for the long run.

Program Review  
As part of the 2 percent reduction, I would also ask that each agency propose three specific programs or activities for elimination. Although it is not our intent to debate major funding priorities for the 1993-95 Biennium, we know that many agencies have taken the opportunity in the last six months to re-evaluate elements of their agency operation and it makes sense to incorporate some of those ideas into this budget adjustment.

Format and Timetable for Submittals  
Please prepare your reduction decision-package submittals in conformance with the attached formats. Attachment B is a summary, listing all reduction options in priority order. Attachment C asks for a description of each reduction option, including the impact on staffing and estimated expenditures by fund. Also, please attach a description of any legislative changes required to implement each reduction. Agencies should strive to group related reductions into one decision package to avoid submitting a large number of decision packages.

These decision packages are to be submitted to OFM by Monday, November 15, 1993.

I recognize that this is a very short turn-around time for you, but I also know that most of you have already conducted a review of budget options pursuant to the initiatives. Given the deep reductions in current authorizations that would have been required under Initiative 602, we held off asking for formal reduction packages until the fate of that measure was known. Despite the defeat of Initiative 602, the Governor is nonetheless committed to tight controls on expenditures in the current biennium — especially given the uncertainties posed by the apparent passage of Initiative 601.

The Governor was extremely pleased by agencies’ efforts to keep expenditures within the allotments for the first quarter of Fiscal Year 1994 and has emphasized to me the importance of doing so in the months to come. As to the reduction options, please send completed documents to:

Budget Division, Operations Section  
Office of Financial Management  
PO Box 43113  
Olympia, WA 98504-3113

If you have any questions, contact your assigned budget analyst.

RF: CE:jg  
Attachments
### 1993-95 Operating Budget - Reduction Targets

#### Appropriated Funds ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Fund-State</th>
<th>GF-S</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>2.0% Reduction</td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>2.0% Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011 House of Representatives</td>
<td>46,189,000</td>
<td>923,780</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 Senate</td>
<td>35,457,000</td>
<td>791,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014 Legislative Budget Committee</td>
<td>2,067,000</td>
<td>41,340</td>
<td>565,000</td>
<td>11,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015 Legislative Transportation Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,644,000</td>
<td>52,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020 LEAP</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035 State Actuary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,649,000</td>
<td>32,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038 Joint Legislative Systems</td>
<td>9,480,000</td>
<td>189,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040 Statute Law Committee</td>
<td>3,952,000</td>
<td>119,040</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045 Supreme Court</td>
<td>9,769,000</td>
<td>195,380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046 State Law Library</td>
<td>3,193,000</td>
<td>63,860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048 Court of Appeals</td>
<td>17,117,000</td>
<td>342,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050 Commission on Judicial Conduct</td>
<td>1,013,000</td>
<td>20,260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055 Administrator for the Courts</td>
<td>24,418,000</td>
<td>488,360</td>
<td>43,384,000</td>
<td>867,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075 Office of the Governor</td>
<td>6,138,000</td>
<td>122,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077 Washington State Energy Office</td>
<td>1,518,000</td>
<td>30,360</td>
<td>37,644,000</td>
<td>752,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082 Public Disclosure Commission</td>
<td>1,989,000</td>
<td>39,780</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085 Office of the Secretary of State</td>
<td>8,049,000</td>
<td>160,980</td>
<td>3,772,000</td>
<td>75,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090 State Treasurer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,020,000</td>
<td>200,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095 Office of State Auditor</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>36,964,000</td>
<td>739,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Office of Attorney General</td>
<td>5,918,000</td>
<td>118,360</td>
<td>102,538,000</td>
<td>2,050,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Dept. of Financial Institutions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,218,000</td>
<td>64,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Office of Financial Management</td>
<td>19,660,000</td>
<td>393,200</td>
<td>1,277,000</td>
<td>25,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 State Health Care Authority</td>
<td>6,810,000</td>
<td>136,200</td>
<td>149,413,000</td>
<td>2,988,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 Dept. of Community Development</td>
<td>88,457,000</td>
<td>1,769,140</td>
<td>235,831,000</td>
<td>4,716,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Administrative Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,535,000</td>
<td>250,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Department of Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,060,000</td>
<td>381,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 State Lottery Commission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,745,000</td>
<td>394,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Human Rights Commission</td>
<td>3,919,000</td>
<td>78,380</td>
<td>1,411,000</td>
<td>28,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 Personnel Appeals Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,268,000</td>
<td>25,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 Dept. of Retirement Systems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,988,000</td>
<td>639,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 State Investment Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,939,000</td>
<td>138,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 Department of Revenue</td>
<td>123,538,000</td>
<td>-2,470,760</td>
<td>5,040,000</td>
<td>100,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 Board of Tax Appeals</td>
<td>1,340,000</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 Off. of Minority &amp; Women's Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,103,000</td>
<td>42,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Dept. of General Administration</td>
<td>393,000</td>
<td>7,860</td>
<td>41,498,000</td>
<td>829,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 Dept. of Information Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,510,000</td>
<td>70,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,310,000</td>
<td>366,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 Board of Accountancy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,202,000</td>
<td>24,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185 Horse Racing Commission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,876,000</td>
<td>97,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1993 - 95 OPERATING BUDGET - REDUCTION TARGETS

#### APPROPRIATED FUNDS ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Fund-State</th>
<th>GF-S</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>20% Reduction</td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>20% Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190 Industrial Insurance Appeals</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>20,408,000</td>
<td>408,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195 Liquor Control Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111,231,000</td>
<td>2,224,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 Utilities and Transportation Commission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,559,000</td>
<td>591,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 Washington State Patrol</td>
<td>14,223,000</td>
<td>284,460</td>
<td>218,165,000</td>
<td>4,363,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 Criminal Justice Training Commission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,200,000</td>
<td>224,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 Traffic Safety Commission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,357,000</td>
<td>67,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235 Dept. of Labor and Industries</td>
<td>9,241,000</td>
<td>184,820</td>
<td>369,433,000</td>
<td>7,388,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Department of Licensing</td>
<td>6,536,000</td>
<td>130,720</td>
<td>157,951,000</td>
<td>3,159,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 Military Department</td>
<td>8,365,000</td>
<td>167,300</td>
<td>9,036,000</td>
<td>180,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Indeterminate Sentence Review</td>
<td>2,643,000</td>
<td>52,860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275 Public Employment Relations Comm.</td>
<td>1,771,000</td>
<td>35,420</td>
<td>2,637,000</td>
<td>52,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 DSHS</td>
<td>3,945,485,000</td>
<td>78,909,700</td>
<td>5,079,879,000</td>
<td>101,597,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 Health Services Commission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,004,000</td>
<td>80,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 Department of Health</td>
<td>92,520,000</td>
<td>1,850,400</td>
<td>260,089,000</td>
<td>5,201,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 Department of Veterans' Affairs</td>
<td>20,701,000</td>
<td>414,020</td>
<td>26,241,000</td>
<td>524,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 Department of Corrections</td>
<td>700,639,000</td>
<td>14,012,780</td>
<td>3,172,000</td>
<td>63,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318 Dept. of Services for the Blind</td>
<td>2,601,000</td>
<td>52,020</td>
<td>8,632,000</td>
<td>172,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343 Higher Education Coordinating Board</td>
<td>130,333,000</td>
<td>2,606,660</td>
<td>8,916,000</td>
<td>178,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 Superintendent of Public Instruction *</td>
<td>543,659,000</td>
<td>10,873,180</td>
<td>20,514,000</td>
<td>410,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 State School for the Blind</td>
<td>6,862,000</td>
<td>137,240</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353 State School for the Deaf</td>
<td>12,566,000</td>
<td>251,320</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354 Work Force Train &amp; Educ Coord Board</td>
<td>3,517,000</td>
<td>70,340</td>
<td>34,651,000</td>
<td>693,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 University of Washington</td>
<td>507,618,000</td>
<td>10,152,360</td>
<td>14,836,000</td>
<td>296,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365 Washington State University</td>
<td>292,545,000</td>
<td>5,850,900</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370 Eastern Washington University</td>
<td>72,813,000</td>
<td>1,456,260</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375 Central Washington University</td>
<td>66,482,000</td>
<td>1,329,640</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376 The Evergreen State College</td>
<td>37,207,000</td>
<td>744,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380 Western Washington University</td>
<td>81,618,000</td>
<td>1,632,360</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 State Library</td>
<td>14,062,000</td>
<td>281,240</td>
<td>4,842,000</td>
<td>96,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387 Washington State Arts Commission</td>
<td>4,274,000</td>
<td>85,480</td>
<td>934,000</td>
<td>18,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390 Washington State Historical Society</td>
<td>2,321,000</td>
<td>46,420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 Dept. of Transportation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>772,956,000</td>
<td>15,459,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466 County Road Administration Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87,924,000</td>
<td>1,758,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 Transportation Improvement Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211,822,000</td>
<td>4,236,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Transportation Commission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,637,000</td>
<td>32,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460 Columbia River Gorge Comm.</td>
<td>574,000</td>
<td>11,480</td>
<td>542,000</td>
<td>10,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461 Department of Ecology</td>
<td>55,625,000</td>
<td>1,112,500</td>
<td>205,898,000</td>
<td>4,117,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465 Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>54,130,000</td>
<td>1,082,600</td>
<td>7,621,000</td>
<td>152,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467 Interagency Crmre. for Outdoor Rec.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund-State</td>
<td>GF-S</td>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>Other Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>2.0% Reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468 Environmental Hearings Office</td>
<td>1,205,000</td>
<td>24.100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470 Trade and Economic Development</td>
<td>25,026,000</td>
<td>500,520</td>
<td>9,454,000</td>
<td>189,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471 State Conservation Commission</td>
<td>1,670,000</td>
<td>33,400</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>4,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474 PSWQA</td>
<td>3,059,000</td>
<td>61,180</td>
<td>1,148,000</td>
<td>22,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475 Office of Marine Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,496,000</td>
<td>89,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476 Growth Planning Hearings Office</td>
<td>3,028,000</td>
<td>60,560</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480 Department of Fisheries</td>
<td>55,740,000</td>
<td>1,114,800</td>
<td>43,186,000</td>
<td>863,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485 Department of Wildlife</td>
<td>10,226,000</td>
<td>204,520</td>
<td>98,968,000</td>
<td>1,979,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490 Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td>49,394,000</td>
<td>987,880</td>
<td>133,270,000</td>
<td>2,665,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>13,462,000</td>
<td>269,240</td>
<td>6,705,000</td>
<td>134,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540 Employment Security</td>
<td>1,397,000</td>
<td>27,940</td>
<td>343,929,000</td>
<td>6,878,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 Convention and Trade Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,471,000</td>
<td>389,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699 Community/Technical Colleges</td>
<td>676,763,000</td>
<td>13,535,260</td>
<td>46,535,000</td>
<td>930,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SPI Appropriation that is subject to reduction does not include Basic Education funding.

**NOTE:** Debt Service, Retirement Contributions, and Basic Education are not subject to reductions.
**Decision Package Format**

**BUDGET REDUCTION PLANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code and Name:</th>
<th>Reduction Amount:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY.1994:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fiscal Details**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Operating Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List by fund source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Staffing (FTEs):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund-State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Object of Expenditure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List by object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List by fund and source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

*The description should include the programs and the types of expenditures being reduced and/or eliminated.*

**Impact Statement**

*The impact statement should provide a clear description of the impact of the allotment reduction on agency clients and services and/or the impact on other state programs or other units of government (i.e., local or federal government). Describe what operations will be impacted by the reduction.*

**Legislation required?**

Yes [ ] No [ ]

*Attach a description of any legislative changes that are required to implement this reduction.*
SUMMARY OF AGENCY BUDGET REDUCTION DECISION PACKAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code and Agency Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 1994</th>
<th>FY 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Packages in Priority Order</td>
<td>FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals By Fund Source**

**GRAND TOTAL**

*If General Fund-State reductions result in reductions to other funds, this dollar effect should be listed.*
November 15, 1993

Ruta Fanning, Director
Office of Financial Management
300 Insurance Building, AQ-44
PO Box 43113
Olympia, WA 98504-3113

Dear Ms. Fanning:

In response to your letter of November 8, 1993, Central Washington University herewith submits the following potential cut to the 93-95 operating budget as requested.

I would like to suggest that in considering further budget cuts to CWU's budget, it be kept in mind that if such a "2%" cut were to be made, it would in reality be essentially a "4%" cut to the second year since the year is already well underway and commitments have been made to students. Further, the cut would come on the heels of previous cuts of 2.5% (carry forward 3.1%) in 1991-93 and an initial cut of 4.7% in 1993-95 respectively making a cumulative cut of over 11% in the 1994-95 level. Much has been said about cutting out waste and inefficiency and not cutting services. Unfortunately, at these levels of cut it is simply unrealistic to believe that one can merely cut more "inefficiencies" and not affect service levels to students both in terms of quality and quantity.

The previous cuts have been absorbed without reducing the targeted enrollment. Indeed the 93-94 enrollment increased 6.3% from the 91-92 level while the budget was cut 7.8% (2.5% in 91-93 & .6% + 4.7% = 5.3% in 93-95). This was done in keeping with the guideline to preserve enrollment as well as our desire to maintain and expand service levels to students. Increased levels of enrollments are vital not only to respond to demand for access but also to enable us to further our diversification efforts.

However, the achieved maintenance of enrollment does not mean that there was no effect from the successive cuts. Support services which took the brunt of the cuts are stretched thin. Moreover, instructional program quality has also been negatively affected. Consider for example the longer term effect of the loss of equipment funds which over time is detrimental to science and other equipment intensive areas where rapid technological obsolescence is the rule.
November 16, 1993

Honorable Mike Lowry
Governor of the State of Washington
Third Floor, Legislative Building
Olympia, Washington 98504

Dear Governor Lowry,

As you approach the difficult task of preparing the Supplemental Budget for the 1993-95 biennium, we are writing to express our appreciation for the candid and accessible relationship we are developing with OFM Director Ruta Fanning, and to offer our assistance to you and to her as you craft your budget. Although each of us provided responses to OFM's recent letter requesting 2% budget reduction options, we want to offer a few points which collectively we believe are important considerations in developing a budget plan:

**Cumulative Budget Reductions:**

*The public four-year higher education sector has experienced GF-S budget reductions in both the 1991-93 and the 1993-95 biennia, which when considered cumulatively total approximately 8%. Over this same period, total enrollments increased. These trends seriously threaten our ability to protect instructional quality and provide access to students.*

Pursuant to legislative budget guidelines, we have made every attempt to increase efficiency and productivity and reduce administrative costs in order to protect our instructional programs when achieving these reductions. We have done as much as we can to reduce administration and to eliminate non-essential costs. Therefore, continued budget reductions will make it necessary to impact programs and students to achieve reduction target levels.

Demographic trends show that between 1992 and 2009 this state will be graduating 68% more high school seniors. Additionally, as the workforce continues to change, an increasing number of adults are returning to institutions of higher education to become more competitive. The pressures for increased access to quality instruction at our institutions speak strongly for a renewed commitment to invest in higher education.

We ask that you consider higher education as a budget priority, and resist making further reductions.
To: Sidney Nesselroade, Chair  
Faculty Senate  

From: Owen Pratz, Past Chair  
Faculty Senate  

Date: November 18, 1993  

Re: Past chairs' report: Dec. 1, 1993 Faculty Senate meeting  

Dear Sid,  

Thank you for the invitation, but I will not be attending the Faculty Senate meeting on Dec. 1, 1993. You expressed a number of questions in your invitation. My responses are below.

Questions 1 and 2 having to do with the term of the chair, setting up entry to the chair, etc. in the interest of continuity have been with us for some time. The essential problem is that any system that requires multiple years of entry and occupancy create an inflexibility that almost insures disappointment. Also, those multiple years of service are either coming out of the hide of the officer (if uncompensated) or the department (if compensated by release time). The ideal might be a multiple year term with full compensation to the department. On the other hand, this might begin to look like a quasi-administrative position. The faculty vs administrative allegiance of the chair is perennially questioned. Longer terms, while providing more continuity and expertise, could very well jeopardize the relationship between the chair and faculty.

Question 3: This varies. In my perception, usually very little occurs during the summer that requires involvement of the senate chair. The risk, of course, is that even if the chair were on board, the faculty wouldn’t be, and unilateral actions by the senate chair could easily create more problems than they solve. The tradition has been that the administration not take action on matters critical to faculty during the summer. To do so would look surreptitious. It probably would anyway, even if the chair were on board. The only time I recall when something big transpired was when Lillian Canzler was chair, and she called a meeting of the faculty during the summer to discuss the ongoing layoff. The call and the response were both a matter of concern rather than a matter of being on board during the summer.

Question 4: I really shouldn’t comment on this. No chair in the past has ever been compensated for summer involvement. Clearly it has had unfortunate effects in this first case, and I’m unclear what benefits were provided for faculty.

Question 5: The senate needs to work this one out.

Best wishes for the year,  

Owen Pratz
MESSAGE:

Please replace "Faculty Workload Study" information sent to you earlier with attached. Earlier version was incorrectly copied!

Sorry about that!

☐ PLEASE ANSWER
☐ Your signature
☐ CC to me
☐ Prepare rough draft for me
☐ Prepare answer for us to co-sign
☐ Prepare answer for my signature

☐ FOR YOUR ACTION
☐ Please follow up
☐ Please keep me posted
☐ Action requested by:
☐ For your approval
☐ Supply info and return
☐ Please return with your evaluation
☐ Refer or delegate to others

☐ LET'S DISCUSS
☐ Please phone me
☐ Let's meet. Time: ___________
☐ Please advise me on action to be taken
☐ Please review for accuracy
☐ If inaccurate, report inaccuracies to:

☐ FOR YOUR INFORMATION
☐ Please return to me
☐ Please return for filing
☐ Need not return
☐ For your files. Send to:
☐ Library
☐ _________________________

☐ RETURNED WITH THANKS
MEMORANDUM

TO: Senate Personnel Committee
FROM: Connie Roberts, Special Assistant to the Provost
       Institutional Research and Assessment
DATE: October 28, 1993
RE: Faculty Workload Study

Attached is a copy of the HECB staff briefing paper on the proposed Faculty Workload Study; the 14-page document explains the study design, includes revised data definitions and spreadsheet formats, and alludes to the use of the information for policy formation.

Gerry Stacy, Frank Cioffi, and myself are the CWU representatives on this HECB committee. A meeting was held in August and another in October; I believe Frank submitted a meeting summary to the Senate.

I am inviting your participation in the development of the Faculty Activity Analysis Form; the attached form is merely a draft and will be revised next week. Please review the HECB briefing paper and send me a copy of your response or call me (1444) with your questions. We welcome your involvement.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Higher Education Coordinating Board
FROM: Elson S. Floyd, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Staff Briefing on Faculty Workload Study

BOARD ACTION

No Board action is requested.

BACKGROUND

Legislative and Board Directions

In the 1992 Update to the Master Plan, the HECB recommended that the Board and four-year institutions would "cooperatively develop criteria for conducting an evaluation of faculty teaching load." At the March 1993 Board meeting, staff presented a briefing paper on Faculty Teaching Load which provided a rough outline for the proposed study of faculty teaching loads. Subsequently, the 1993 Legislature passed SSSB 5836 which directed the HECB, in conjunction with the four-year institutions, to conduct a study "Developing criteria for and conducting an evaluation of faculty productivity." Board and legislative representatives have indicated the need for the study to be completed prior to the 1995 legislative session.
Past Washington Studies

Washington State has never undertaken a comprehensive study of how faculty spend their time. In 1971 and 1977, the CPE compiled data on "classroom contact hours" for faculty at the two- and four-year institutions. These studies did not collect data on time spent by faculty on other activities.

What Is a Workload Study?

Through long discussions among HECB staff, institutions, legislative staff, and legislators, the data collection half of the current study has focussed on faculty workload. This decision constitutes a change from the focus of the March 1993 briefing paper that covered faculty "teaching load" in some detail. Teaching load has been construed as describing only the time spent on direct instruction, i.e., classroom contact (which captures only that time spent in classroom instruction) or credits taught (which would include classroom instruction, independent study credits, and thesis and dissertation credits). Some studies have included an estimate of time spent on instruction-related activities (which includes preparing classes, evaluating student papers, constructing tests, etc.). Teaching load studies do not estimate the number of hours or percent of time spent on other faculty activities (e.g., research, public service, administration).

Faculty workload is a term that describes how faculty members allocate their work-related time across all of their current activities. The majority of studies conducted by other states have been of faculty workload. A workload study does not assess how well that time is spent, i.e., whether it is productive, a good use of faculty time, or that the teaching or research accomplished with this time is of high quality. A workload study will answer the question, "How do faculty spend their time?" but will not answer the questions, "Are faculty being productive with their time?" or "Are the faculty producing quality instruction or research?" As presently designed, the data collection half of the study is not a comprehensive "faculty productivity study" nor a "faculty evaluation study."

However, certain data elements collected in the study can be construed as productivity measures (i.e., number of sections taught, student credit hours generated). A full-fledged productivity study (assessing the productivity of all faculty activities) has not been conducted by any state. It would require a far lengthier process than allowed in a one-year timeframe. It would require staff, institutions, and faculty groups to define, quantify, and evaluate appropriate productivity measures across different disciplines, institutional types, and faculty ranks. For example, will productive research be defined as a published article, an external grant, a juried exhibit, a breakthrough in thinking about the discipline? Who, then, will decide which articles in which journals are "productive," or what constitutes a
"breakthrough?" Is the production of five articles greater productivity than one "breakthrough" article? These questions are beyond the scope of the current study.

Similar issues cloud a "faculty evaluation study," which would attempt to evaluate the quality of the faculty's performance. Currently, each institution, through its promotion and tenure process — and post-tenure evaluation process, if applicable — has the responsibility to assure that faculty offered promotion, tenure, or a continuing contract possess and practice the accepted standards of the discipline and institution.

However, a workload study does allow state and institutional representatives to learn how faculty currently allocate their work time across various responsibilities. This information allows for informed discussions of whether the current allocation of time (or workload) is appropriate or whether priorities (as indicated by the amount of time allocated to an activity) should change. Based on the data collected in the first half of the current study, faculty, the institutions, and the state will be able to discuss and decide upon alternative priorities and the means for accomplishing them.

STUDY DESIGN

Study Goals

The Faculty Workload Study is an opportunity for the HECB and the four-year institutions to work toward the following state goals:

1. Describe how faculty currently spend their time and explain in greater detail the activities of the faculty;
2. Establish baseline information on faculty workloads against which to track change;
3. Increase access to higher education (or, increase system capacity);
4. Decrease time-to-degree for students (or, increase system efficiency); and
5. Improve the quality of education.

Although it is frequently suggested that increasing access and improving quality are mutually exclusive, this conclusion is not necessarily nor consistently true. As discussions of faculty
workload progress, we will be continuously challenged to find creative ways to ensure that both state goals are accomplished.

Two Important Halves

The Faculty Workload Study has two important halves: (1) the collection of data and description of current faculty workloads, and (2) the development of policies to achieve the study goals above. Although it is often easier to focus attention on the data portion of the study, the study’s policy half has the potential to enable faculty and institutions to make important progress toward these goals.

As described later in this briefing paper, staff and the advisory committee have completed planning for the data collection half of the study. Discussions are still underway on what the policy half will include, what it will produce, and how it will be reported.

Data Design and Definitions

Study Questions. The data portion of the study will answer the following questions:

1. How much time do faculty currently spend in the classroom?
2. How much time do faculty currently spend in instruction-related activities?
3. Which faculty are teaching undergraduates at lower- and upper-division levels?
4. How much time do faculty currently spend on research and other scholarship?
5. How many hours per week do faculty spend doing their job as currently defined?
6. What funding source pays for the research being conducted by faculty?

Data Elements. Based on information provided by the faculty, data on average workload per week will be reported to the HECB by each academic department in the categories listed below.
A. Faculty Instructional Effort

1. Faculty workload funded by state instructional dollars allocated to instructional activities:

- **Total Number of Sections Taught**
  By course level (100-200; 300-400; 500; 600+)
  By professor level (Full; Associate; Assistant; Other; TA; RA; TESC Faculty)
  By funding source (State-Funded Faculty; Non-State Funded Faculty)

- **Student Credit Hours (SCHs) Generated**
  By course level (100-200; 300-400; 500; 600+)
  By professor level (Full; Associate; Assistant; Other; TA; RA; TESC Faculty)
  By funding source (State-Funded Faculty; Non-State Funded Faculty)

2. Hours of faculty time funded by state instructional dollars allocated to:

- **Scheduled Course Faculty Contact Hours**
  Courses (Enrollments $> 1$)
  By course level (100-200; 300-400; 500; 600+)
  By professor level (Full; Associate; Assistant; Other; TA; RA; TESC Faculty)
  By funding source (State-Funded Faculty; Non-State Funded Faculty)

  Individualized Courses (Enrollment = 1)
  By course level (100-200; 300-400; 500; 600+)
  By professor level (Full; Associate; Assistant; Other; TA; RA; TESC Faculty)
  By funding source (State-Funded Faculty; Non-State Funded Faculty)
Other Faculty-Student Contact Hours
By professor level (Full; Associate; Assistant; Other; TA; RA; TESC Faculty)
By funding source (State-Funded Faculty; Non-State-Funded Faculty)

Other Instruction-Related Activities
By professor level (Full; Associate; Assistant; Other; TA; RA; TESC Faculty)
By funding source (State-Funded Faculty; Non-State-Funded Faculty)

Instruction-Related Research/Scholarship
By professor level (Full; Associate; Assistant; Other; TA; RA; TESC Faculty)
By funding source (State-Funded Faculty; Non-State-Funded Faculty)

B. Hours of faculty time spent on:

Teaching and Related Activities (see Section A.2. above)
Administration/Service (Funded by Program 01)
Public Service (Funded by Program 03)
State-funded Research (Funded by Program 02)
Sponsored Research (Funded by Program 10)

C. Total Hours Worked per Week

Appendix A provides a visual representation of the data elements for the Faculty Workload Study which has been prepared solely to aid understanding of the relationships implicit in the above listing. However, staff plan to display data in a much simpler format to answer the study questions. Hours of faculty time may be easily translated into percent of effort by category, for comparisons with other faculty workload studies using similar classifications.

Data Definitions.

Appendix B provides detailed definitions for the data elements listed above. These definitions have been developed to help faculty determine to which category different activities should be allocated and to help make the resulting data more consistent across faculty, departments, and institutions.
Data Collection. State statute requires the HECB to conduct the Educational Cost Study every four years. Therefore, faculty effort during the upcoming year, 1993-94, will provide data for both the Cost Study and the Faculty Workload Study.

To conduct the Cost Study in the past, each institution developed a Faculty Activity Analysis (FAA) form that separated faculty effort into instructional and other categories. It is the intent of the Faculty Workload Study and the Cost Study to request that institutions include the data elements specified above in their Faculty Activity Analysis form. The data from the FAA will then be used directly in the Faculty Workload Study to answer the study questions above. The Cost Study must combine information from the FAA with extensive cost data and analysis to prepare its final report. However, data taken from the FAA will be used in both HECB studies which should require only one data-collection effort for faculty and institutions and more consistent and comparable information between the two studies.

Data will be collected on all faculty within the system. Librarians, counselors, and other staff will be excluded from the study.

All faculty will be asked to provide "average weekly workload" data across the data elements described earlier for a typical week in one term of the 1993-94 academic year. Collecting such detailed data from all faculty for all terms has been deemed to be too difficult for only a moderate improvement in the confidence of results. Therefore, one term will serve as the baseline for future workload studies. However, data on course enrollments (e.g., scheduled course faculty contact hours) that can be easily provided from registration data or other institutional data systems will be reported for all terms from 10th-day enrollment reports.

Policy Questions

As noted earlier, staff and the advisory committee of institutional representatives and Faculty Senate Chairs are continuing discussions of the types of policies and approaches to be included. Clearly, as the state and institutions contemplate faculty workload, the policies affecting faculty must be reviewed to ensure that they support institutional plans. One example of policy development work might include a review and revision of policies concerning faculty tenure and promotion.

Staff believe this is an important part of the study which can lay the groundwork for implementing changes that can have long-term impact on higher education in this state. Staff will brief the Board at its December meeting on how these issues will be addressed.
PROCESS

HECB Staff Team

The study has been designed with the assistance and coordination of several HECB staff. Members of the staff-level team have included individuals with responsibilities for the Educational Cost Study, information systems, and study design. As has been discussed earlier, every attempt has been made to coordinate the Faculty Workload Study's data-gathering and reporting requirements with those of the Cost Study, so that data may be consistent across studies and data collection not be overly burdensome for the institutions.

Advisory Committee

Membership. An advisory committee has been established to assist staff in designing and completing the Faculty Workload Study. Generally, the committee includes:

- Provosts (or their designees); and
- Chairs of Faculty Senates (or their designees).

Appendix C lists these institutional representatives to the advisory committee.

Staff to several legislative committees and the Office of Financial Management have been, and will continue to be, invited to advisory committee meetings. They will be able to inform the advisory committee of emerging legislative concerns as the study proceeds.

Meetings. The advisory committee has met twice. On August 12, the committee met to discuss the data design and collection portion of the study. On October 1, the committee met to complete the design of the data collection half of the study and to begin discussions on the policy portion of the study. The input of the committee members has contributed substantially to the final study design.

It was decided that these early meetings — discussing essential design elements of the study — should be conducted in person. However, given the state's restriction on funds for travel, additional face-to-face meetings will be limited and held only when crucial issues must be discussed and the presence of all parties will contribute to mutual understanding and/or consensus. Staff will maximize the use of low-cost alternatives (e.g., mail, fax, Internet, conference calls) to monitor the on-going study.
Timelines

Data Collection. Collection of the data elements (Appendix B) on faculty workload will occur during one term of the 1993-94 academic year. It will take several months of staff time to clean, compile, and confirm the initial data reports with the institutions. Data on 10th-day enrollments for all terms will also need to be compiled and analyzed. Staff estimate that an initial report of data would be ready for Board review during late spring.

Policy Development. The policy development portion of the study will also begin immediately and follow the appropriate internal procedures for each institution. Staff expect that institutional reports would be ready for review in late summer.

Appendix D presents a draft timeline for the study.

HECB Briefings

Staff intend to brief the Board on the Faculty Workload Study approximately every other Board meeting. Monthly briefings may be desirable as the study nears completion.

In the March 1993 briefing paper, staff presented a list of states which have undertaken faculty workload studies, states with studies that are underway, and results from national studies. Staff have collected copies of additional studies and can periodically brief the Board on what other states are doing in this area as well.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Sample Data Display for One Academic Department
Appendix B Detailed Data Definitions
Appendix C Institutional Representatives on Advisory Committee
Appendix D Draft Timeline for Study
# Visual Representation of Data Elements for the Faculty Workload Study
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**DEPARTMENT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty by Fund Source</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Course Sections Taught</th>
<th>Student Credit Hours Generated</th>
<th>Scheduled Course Faculty Contact Hours</th>
<th>Individual Course Faculty Contact Hours</th>
<th>Other Faculty-Student Contact Hours</th>
<th>Other Instr-Related Activities and Scholarship</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS for Teaching &amp; Related Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td>Total Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Asst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Asst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESC Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**APPENDIX A**

**Sample Data Display**
## FACULTY WORKLOAD STUDY

**Page 2**

**DEPARTMENT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty by Fund Source</th>
<th>Teaching &amp; Related Activities (from Pg 1)</th>
<th>Admin/Service</th>
<th>Public Service</th>
<th>State-Funded Research</th>
<th>Sponsored Research</th>
<th>Hours per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asso Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Asst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Asst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESC Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State-Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

**Average**
NOTE: Workload should be allocated to one individual. Therefore, if a TA is assisting faculty in the delivery of a course, a judgment should be made of how the workload should be split between the faculty person and the TA. There should be no double-counting of classroom hours and SCHs.

STAFFING

Faculty: Include teaching, research, and public service faculty funded from programs 01, 02, 03, 04, 07, and 10. The "Other" category for faculty is designed to capture the effort of all non-ranked individuals (e.g., adjunct, lecturer, instructor, temporary, or other terms used by the institution).

Number: Number (headcount) of faculty in the department, by faculty rank

FTE: Number of faculty based on the academic year (faculty appointment for 9/10 months); faculty on 12-month appointments would be listed as 1 FTE; faculty on 9/10-month appointment would be listed as 1 FTE; faculty for a one-quarter-term appointment would be listed as .33 FTE. A full-time TA equals 0.5 FTE faculty.

Sabbaticals: Include faculty on sabbaticals being paid from state instructional dollars with the chair's best estimate of their activities, allocating the sabbatical time between "Instruction-Related Research and Scholarship" or other activities as appropriate.

SCH GENERATED

Student Credit Hours Generated: Calculation based on number of students enrolled by level of instruction and credit hour value of course.

INSTRUCTION

Scheduled Course Faculty Contact Hours:

Courses (Enrollment > 1): Actual number of hours faculty spend per week in scheduled courses instructing students. May include labs,
Individualized Courses (Enrollment = 1):

Actual number of hours faculty spent per week in individualized instruction (this may not be equal to the number of credit hours offered to students and may not be regularly scheduled); include hours spent assisting students with independent study projects, chairing and contributing to thesis or dissertation committees, practica, field experiences, internships, music lessons, or clinical situations.

Other Faculty-Student Contact Hours:

Actual number of hours faculty spend per week in contact with undergraduate and graduate students, e.g., advising, student conferences or tutorials, career counseling, guest lectures, field trips, or office hours. Contact with students may be in person, via phone or e-mail.

Other Instruction-Related Activities:

Actual number of hours faculty spend per week preparing for classes to be delivered in the current term, assessment activities, preparing and grading tests, preparing course materials, preparing student evaluations, record-keeping, preparing and evaluating writing assignments, supervising post-doctoral assistants, working with visiting faculty, supervising TAs, and curriculum development for courses to be taught in a future term. (Work performed by the TA should be credited to the TA.)

Instruction-Related Research/Scholarship:

Actual number of hours spent per week on instruction-related research or scholarship funded by the state as part of instructional program dollars. May involve undergraduate or graduate students. May include (1) scholarship pursued in anticipation of revising or developing new curricula, (2) research conducted in order to prepare publications, (3) writing a journal article or book, (4) sabbatical time whose primary purpose is to pursue a research project or develop new research expertise, preparation of publication, and (5) sabbatical time whose primary purpose is to develop new expertise or curricula for eventual incorporation into program offerings.
## HOURS OF WORKWEEK SPENT ON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Instruction-Related Activities:</td>
<td>Hours spent per week on teaching/instruction, including contact hours for scheduled courses, other faculty-student contact hours, other instruction-related activities, and instruction-related research and scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Service:</td>
<td>Hours spent per week on (1) program administration, including admissions and other duties; (2) committees providing service to the department, college, and/or university; (3) public lectures or faculty expertise provided gratis to external groups or constituencies such as K-12 schools or business groups. All of these activities are funded from program 01 instructional budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service:</td>
<td>Hours spent per week on activities providing non-instructional services beneficial to groups external to the institution. These are separately funded and budgeted activities under program 03 and include Community Service and Cooperative Extension Service. Do not include consultancies or activities for which faculty were paid by an external group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Research:</td>
<td>Hours spent per week on separately funded and budgeted research activities funded by the state (program 02); excludes activities funded through Grants and Contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Research:</td>
<td>Hours spent per week on research activities performed in accordance with the conditions of a specific grant or contract from funding entities external to the institution; generally includes all Grants and Contracts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL HOURS WORKED PER WEEK

Total Hours Worked per Week: Includes all activities, e.g., teaching, research, public service, etc.