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CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING - January 12, 1994

Presiding Officer: Sidney Nesselroad  
Recording Secretary: Sue Tirotta

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

ROLL CALL

Senators: All Senators or their alternates were present except Bowman, Caples, Carbaugh, Olivero and Spall.
Visitors: Carolyn Wells, Jill Orcutt, Debbie Hunt, Jim Hasket, Connie Roberts, Mark Young, Thomas Moore, Kris Henry and Barbara Radke.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

Agenda addendum distributed at meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

*MOTION NO. 2930  Ken Gamon moved and Dave Carns seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the December 1, 1993, Faculty Senate meeting with the following correction: Page 2, Report #3, Dean of the School of Business and Economics, line 5: change "American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)" to read "American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)." Motion passed.

COMMUNICATIONS

-11/23/93 memo from Charles McGhee, Senate Academic Affairs Committee, regarding proposal to drop students from classes; distributed to Faculty Senate, referred to Executive Committee.
-11/23/93 memo from Chester Keller, Philosophy, regarding Salary Adjustment Proposal; referred to Executive Committee and Personnel Committee.
-11/23/93 memo from Don Schliesman, Special Asst. to the Provost, regarding University Minority and Diversity Action Plan; referred to Code Committee and Personnel Committee.
-12/1/93 letter from Don Cummings, Chair/General Education Committee, regarding General Education Committee nominations to Ad Hoc Committee for SWAC (see Chair's report below).
-12/10/93 letter from Don Schliesman, Special Assistant to the Provost, regarding guidelines for use of Individual Study (-96); referred to Curriculum Committee.
-12/21/93 memo from Jim Pappas, Dean of Academic Services, regarding adding Director of Admission/Academic Advising Services as ex officio, non-voting member of Senate Curriculum Committee and General Education Committee; referred to Curriculum Committee and Dean of CLAS/Chair of General Education Committee.
-12/28/93 letter from President Ivory Nelson authorizing Provost Moore to make a one-time-only transfer of $4000 to the Faculty Senate budget; referred to Executive Committee

REPORTS

1. CHAIR

-Chair Nesselroad announced that a full set of Strategic Planning documentation has been moved from the former "Strategic Planning Reading Room" to the Faculty Senate Office (Barge 409). The information is available for review during the Senate's regular operating hours (8:00am-noon daily).
-Chair Nesselroad reported that a Deans' Council Retreat was held during the Winter break. One of the outcomes of the retreat was the development of a format and procedures for summarizing program assessments based on relative strengths and weaknesses across a wide variety of criteria.
-The Chair summarized recent Deans' Council agenda items and discussion issues: Individual Studies curricula (-96 courses); definition of Continuing Education; presentation by Educational Technology consultant Annette Lamb; responsibilities of Institutional Research; Impact of Initiative #401 tying increases in tuitions and fees to population growth factors; review of faculty and staff search activities and prioritization of positions; campus "Institutes" and "Centers"; Capitol Budget projects update; Information Resources prioritization of projects involving computer use; Strategic Planning; and Information Technology. Chair Nesselroad invited anyone wanting more detailed information on these topics to contact him at the Senate Office (963-3231).
-The Chair reported that there has been widespread concern regarding the effectiveness of the current format for the biennial faculty opinion survey of administrators. In response to these concerns, an "Ad Hoc Committee for Review of Administrator Evaluation" has been created. Jack Dugan, Sociology, has agreed to chair the committee, and Stephen Schepman, Psychology, has also agreed to serve on the
1. **CHAIR, continued**

Chair Nesselroad will speak with President Nelson next week regarding the appointment of an administrative representative to the committee.

- In response to recommendations by the 1992-93 Academic Affairs Committee, an "Ad Hoc Committee for Speaking and Writing Across the Curriculum (SWAC)" has been created. General Education Committee members Don Cummings, English, and Tim Yoxtheimer, IET, will represent the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, and the School of Professional Studies, respectively. Jeffrey Sneeker, Music, will represent the Senate Academic Affairs Committee on the committee, and a faculty member from the School of Business and Economics will also be appointed. [January 13, 1993 - Academic Affairs Committee Report: Judith Kleck has been appointed as Coordinator/Facilitator in the development of Speaking and Writing Across the Curriculum (SWAC). We recommend that the Senate appoint an ad hoc committee, consisting of at least one member of the Academic Affairs Committee and at least one member from the General Education Committee, to work with Ms. Kleck. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the Senate not accept Speaking and Writing Across the Curriculum as a rationale for reducing the number of Basic English Courses until SWAC has been implemented and evaluated. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the Senate establish a definite date for the Committee to report back to the Senate regarding proposals aimed at strengthening the writing proficiency of our students. Rationale: There seems to be considerable interest on campus in developing Speaking and Writing Across the Curriculum. The Academic Affairs Committee considers that SWAC is an idea of considerable merit which could have a profound impact on curriculum. As such, it needs broad campus involvement.]

- In response to Mary Marcy’s December 1, 1993, report to the Senate on formation of a "University Legislative Committee," the following individuals have agreed to serve on this committee: Rich Corona (Administrative Exempt), Carolyn Wells (Administrative Exempt), Mary Marcy, Director of Governmental Relations - CHAIR, Maria Firman (Civil Service), Tom Stoffle (Civil Service), Kris Henry (Student), Jeff Olsen (Student), Heather Fodstrom (Student), Ken Gamon, Math/College of Letters, Arts and Sciences (Faculty), Craig Rademacher/School of Professional Studies (Faculty), Connie Nott, Business Administration/School of Business and Economics (Faculty). (Committee will meet at noon in Barge Hall 304 each Friday during the legislative session, which begins January 11, 1994; all meetings are open to the public.)

- Chair Nesselroad reported that the Senate has been notified that it will receive an addition of $4000 to its budget this year. The Chair explained that the uncertainty in funding as well as lack of continuity in the Senate’s leadership has made it very difficult for the Senate Executive Committee to recruit a Faculty Legislative Representative (FLR) this year. The Chair invited volunteers from the Senate to serve in Olympia this quarter and stated that, if no other faculty are willing or able to fill the position, he may take on the responsibilities of FLR position part-time. The Chair explained that, due to many commitments on campus, he would be unable to fulfill all of the responsibilities of an FLR as outlined in the position description.

- Chair Nesselroad reminded the Senate that its Bylaws require election of next year’s Executive Committee at the Senate’s final meeting of Winter quarter [March 9, 1994]. The Chair stated that nominations for next year’s Executive Committee will be taken at the February 23, 1994, Senate meeting. Senators should approach those they plan to nominate well in advance of the election and ascertain their willingness to serve if elected; since the Senate Chair receives 50% released time from departmental duties [reimbursed by the Faculty Senate at the rate of $2400/quarter], individuals nominated to this position should discuss potential departmental impact with the Chair of their department.

*Motion No. 2931* Charles McGeehe moved and Rex Wirth seconded a motion to amend the Faculty Senate’s bylaws as follows [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 was presented for discussion at the December 1, 1993, Faculty Senate meeting]:

IV. Committees

A. Executive Committee

1. Composition

   The Executive Committee shall have six members consisting of the five
1. CHAIR, continued

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 most recent past Senate Chair available 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. It is likely that 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:

Motion No. 2931 passed.

2. PRESIDENT

President Ivory Nelson distributed the following written information to Senators:
-1/10/94 memo from the President to Department Chairs, Unit Directors, Deans and Principal Budget Administrators regarding Strategic Planning for 1994-2001. The President emphasized the final paragraph of the memo, which states: "It is expected that your faculty and staff will participate in developing each component of the Strategic Plan." A planning calendar/timelines developed by the Strategic Planning Committee was printed on the back of the memo. The entire planning packet is available for review in the Senate Office.
-C.W.U. 1994 Legislative Agenda.
-Graph illustrating budget cuts and enrollment increases at Central (1991-93 and 1993-95), including Governor's proposal for an additional 1.25% cut.
-12/23/93 memo from the President to the Management Information System (MIS) Committee, Strategic Planning Committee, and Unified Personnel Committee regarding data administration and showing primary responsibility for specific university operating systems.
-12/23/93 memo from the President to Management Information System (MIS) Committee outlining examples/lists of basic departmental data needs categorized by students, faculty, costs, space utilization and library.
-10/20/93 memo from the President to members of the task force to draft a design for an integrated personnel system (Unified Personnel System). Members: Rich Corona (Business Manager) -CHAIR, Kim Black (Secretary to the Provost), Donna Croft (Director, Financial Aid Office), Connie Roberts (Special Assistant to the Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment), Osa Youmans (Director of Personnel Services).

The President stated that several projects have been initiated that will improve the flow of information within the university as well as link the university to external sources of information.

3. PROVOST

Thomas Moore reported his impressions of Central after having served six months in the position of Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Provost stated that the university faces many challenges as well as opportunities in the near future. A strong leadership infrastructure is emerging, supported by the strategic planning process developed over the past 12-18 months. Areas related to technology and budgeting are being strengthened. Central currently has a very strong faculty and a high quality student body. But because many faculty members will be approaching retirement over the next several years, difficult resource issues may arise. The Provost noted that the young faculty being hired are particularly competent, but he stated that academic support areas (e.g., goods and services, equipment, etc.) are not being adequately supported.

The Provost emphasized that Central must develop and integrate a culture of evaluation in order to set priorities that will allow program needs to drive budgets rather than budget issues driving
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, continued

*MOTION NO. 2932 Steve Olson moved approval of the following proposal to change the General Education Program:

Delete Geology 345 [Principles of Geology] and its lab from the list of physical science offerings in the breadth block and replace it with new course Geology 150 [Geology of National Parks], to be taken concurrently with a lab section, Geology 145.1 [Physical Geology Laboratory].

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: COURSE CHANGE (REPLACES GEOL 305 -- Geology of Western National Parks, 2 credits): GEOLOGY 150 GEOL 150, Geology of National Parks (4).

The geological history and primary geological landforms of selected national parks and monuments in North America. Four lectures per week. Geology 145.1 must be taken concurrently. Students cannot receive credit in both GEOL 150 and GEOL 145 [Physical Geology]. GEOL 150 is a prerequisite for the following courses: GEO 200 (Global Change and Earth Evolution), GEO 210 (Introduction to Geologic Field Methods), GEO 346 (Mineralogy). RATIONALE: This class change is part of a complete revision of the geology curriculum. The content of National Parks has been changed to reflect completely new content, thus a change in description. The number changes will make it part of the beginning classes in the geology major and for non-majors that desire an overview of the earth systems. Basic geologic principles will be taught using the National Parks as an example. Students will register for Geology 145.1 laboratory concurrently. [Passed unanimously by General Education Committee on 12/6/93; passed by Senate Curriculum Committee on 1/6/94.]

Senators asked why Geology 150 was not assigned its own numbered lab section, why the 300 level course currently in the General Education Program was being replaced by a 100 level course, and how the subject matter of Geology 150 differs from that of Geology 145. Senator Charles Rubin, Geology, responded that the Geology Department recently completed an extensive revision of its entire curriculum, including changes in course levels and numbering. Geology 150 differs from Geology 145 in that general geological principles are illustrated through a textbook and instruction based on the geology of the national park system; the Geology 145 lab covers material that is appropriate and applicable for Geology 150. Senator Rubin stated that the Geology Department added Geology 150 to its curriculum as a "more interesting alternative" to Geology 145 and pointed out that the textbook used in Geology 150 was produced by the instructor who would be teaching the course; Senators questioned whether these motivations were sufficient to change the content of the General Education Program.

MOTION NO. 2932 passed (28 yes, 2 no, 3 abstentions).

*MOTION NO. 2933 Steve Olson moved approval of the following proposal to change the General Education Program:

Add Geology 170 [Volcanoes, Earthquakes, and Civilization] to the list of non-lab physical science options in the breadth block of the General Education Program.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NEW COURSE: GEOLOGY 170 GEOL 170. Volcanoes, Earthquakes and Civilization (3). The role of catastrophic processes, such as volcanoes and earthquakes, in shaping the earth and the environment and their effects on civilization. Three hours of lecture per week. RATIONALE: There are few introductory offerings in the physical sciences at Central. The Department of Geology currently lacks an introductory non-laboratory course in geology. This new course change is part of an overall revision of the geology curriculum. [Passed by General Education Committee by a vote of 5 yea, 1 no, and 1 abstention on 12/6/93; passed by Senate Curriculum Committee on 1/6/94.]

Senators questioned why Geology 170 was offered without a lab, whether further changes should be made in view of the upcoming review of the General Education Program, and why a 3 credit course was proposed in the Physical Sciences portion of the General Education Program that requires students to take a minimum of 4 credits. Senator Charles Rubin, Geology, responded that the General Education Committee, of which he is a member, has not yet made plans to begin reviewing the
ROLL CALL

CHANGES TO AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 1, 1993

COMMUNICATIONS

-11/23/93 memo from Charles McGehee, Senate Personnel Committee, re. proposal to drop students from classes; referred to Executive Committee.

-11/23/93 memo from Chester Keller, Philosophy, re. Salary Adjustment Proposal; referred to Executive Committee and Personnel Committee.

-11/23/93 memo from Don Schliesman, Special Asst. to the Provost, re. University Minority and Diversity Action Plan; referred to Code Committee and Personnel Committee.

-12/1/93 letter from Don Cummings, Chair/General Education Committee, re. GEd Committee nominations to Ad Hoc Committee for SWAC (see Chair's report below).

-12/10/93 letter from Don Schliesman, Special Assistant to the Provost, re. guidelines for use of Individual Study (-96); referred to Curriculum Committee.

-12/21/93 memo from Jim Pappas, Dean of Academic Services, re. adding Director of Admission/Academic Advising Services as ex officio, non-voting member of Senate Curriculum Committee and General Education Committee; referred to Curriculum Committee and Dean of CLAS/Chair of General Education Committee.

-12/28/93 letter from President Ivory Nelson authorizing Provost Moore to make a one-time-only transfer of $4000 to the Faculty Senate budget; referred to Executive Committee.

REPORTS

1. CHAIR
   -NOTICE: Full set of Strategic Planning documentation now available for review in the Faculty Senate Office, Barge 409
   -Deans' Council Update
   -Ad Hoc Committee to review Administrator Evaluation
   -Ad Hoc Committee for Speaking and Writing Across the Curriculum (SWAC)
   -University Legislative Committee (list of members attached)
   -Faculty Legislative Representative

2. PRESIDENT

3. PROVOST

4. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
   -Proposed Changes to GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM [attached]

5. VP FOR UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT [Mark Young]: University Initiative Process

6. SPECIAL ASST. TO THE PROVOST FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT [Connie Roberts]: Assessment and Faculty Activity Analysis

7. DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES [Jim Haskett]: INTERNET

8. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES [Ken Gamon]

9. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

10. BUDGET COMMITTEE

11. CODE COMMITTEE

12. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

13. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

** * * NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: February 2, 1994 * * **
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dean Brown and Other Interested Parties
FROM: D. W. Cummings
Professor of English
Chair, University Curriculum Committee
DATE: December 9, 1993

TOPIC: The University General Education Committee and Geology's Curriculum Proposal

At a meeting on December 6, 1993 the University General Education Committee discussed a series of proposals from the Geology Department for changes in their General Education offerings. The formal actions of the committee were as follows:

1. It was moved by Fred Cutlip and seconded by Bob Jacobs that Geology 348 and its lab be deleted from the list of physical science offerings in the breadth block and that it be replaced with a new course, Geology 150, The Geology of National Parks, to be taken concurrently with a lab section, Geology 148.1. After considerable discussion the motion passed unanimously.

2. It was moved by John Resiler and seconded by Fred Cutlip that Geology 170, Volcanoes, Earthquakes, and Civilization be added to the list of non-lab physical science options in the breadth block. After considerable discussion the motion passed (5 yea, 1 nay, 1 abstention).

pc: Sue Troughton
Phyllis Weddington

GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

General Information

It is expected that students entering Central Washington University have developed some proficiency in communication and critical thinking. The general education program provides opportunities to develop these skills by integrating them into the academic requirements of the university.

A goal of the general education program is to help students acquire a liberal education through study in various disciplines in the arts and humanities, the social and behavioral sciences, and the natural sciences and mathematics. General education courses in these areas stress, where applicable, the rationale for the discipline as well as its scope, history, philosophy and methodology. Courses include writing, speaking, and critical thinking where appropriate. Fundamental objectives are to promote awareness of the diversity, yet commonality, of life and respect for the balances in nature.

Credits

I. BASIC REQUIREMENT ........................................ 16

A. Writing ......................................................... 9
ENG 101, 102, 301

B. Reasoning ..................................................... 5
PHIL 301 or MATH 1001

C. Physical Education Activities ............................ 2
PPE 100, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117
PETN 110, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117
PETD 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117
PEAQ 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 118
PETD 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118
PETD 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 121, 122
PETD 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 123
PETD 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118
PETD 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 121, 122
PETD 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 123
PEGT 110, 111, 112

II. BREADTH REQUIREMENTS ................................. 44-45

Students must earn a minimum of five credits in subjects dealing with non-English speaking cultures. Courses listed below which meet that requirement are identified with an asterisk.

A. Arts and Humanities .................................... 14-15

Select a minimum of four credits in courses listed under the heading "Literary Background" and a minimum of 10 credits in those under the heading "Other Arts and Humanities," keeping in mind special rule No. 2 below.

1. Literary Background ......................................... 4-5
(see special rule No. 3.)
ENG 105
HUM 175
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS

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 was presented for discussion at the December 1, 1993, 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 most recent past Senate Chair available 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.

It is likely that 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:
ROLL CALL 1993-94

- Walter ARLT
- Linda BEATH
- Andrea BOWMAN
- John BRANGWIN
- Peter BURKHOLDER
- Minerva CAPLES
- Robert CARBAUGH
- David CARNs
- Ken CORY
- Bobby CUMMINGS
- Barry DONAHUE
- Ken GAMON
- Mary GOSSAGE
- Charles MCGEHEE
- 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: January 12, 1994

- Stephen JEFFERIES
- Dan FENNERTY
- Madalon LALLEY
- Kris HENRY
- Jay BACHRACH
- 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

(ROSTERS/ROLLCALL.93; January 12, 1994)
VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Date

January 12, 1994

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.
TO: Wesley Van Tassel, Chair  
Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee  
c/o Theatre Arts/7460 

FROM: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair  
Faculty Senate 

DATE: November 24, 1993 

RE: CURRICULUM FLOW PROCESS 

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee would like you (or another representative from the Curriculum Committee) to attend its next meeting and deliver a short report on the efficacy of the revised curriculum flow process:

Wednesday, January 5, 1994 
3:00 p.m. 
BARGE HALL 409 

[You may attend the meeting at any of the following times: 3:00 pm, 3:15 pm, 3:30 pm, 3:45 pm, 4:00 pm -- RSVP regarding the time you or your representative are able to attend: 963-3231]

* * * * *

There appears to be particular concern regarding how the following responsibilities in the curriculum change process are being carried out:

Department Chair/Program Director 
... 
6. Run a global search on the electronic catalog to identify all programs affected. 
7. Notify all department chairs/program directors affected by the change. 
... 

School/College Dean 
... 
2. Check for and resolve conflicts and overlaps with other courses or programs. 
... 

The April 5, 1993, memo on the "New Curriculum Process and Procedures" states that "the major responsibility to follow guidelines rests with the department chair/program director. The respective dean's office has the responsibility to ensure that the process was followed correctly." In brief, the Executive Committee would like to know how successful departments are in following the guidelines and how effective deans are in monitoring the new process and assuring that it is carried out.

sft 
[c:\wpdocs\committe\11-24-93.SCC]
To: Dr. Sidney Nesselroad, Chair, Faculty Senate

From: Chester Z. Keller, Chair, Philosophy

Date: November 23, 1993

RE: Faculty Salary Adjustment Proposal

In response to your September 27th follow-up memo re the Faculty Salary Adjustment Proposal, the Department of Philosophy met on November 5 and spent the major portion of its two hour meeting examining the proposal. Toward the end of that discussion the Department unanimously agreed to ask the Faculty Senate to return the Proposal to committee.

The over-all goal of a faculty salary proposal should be to have it so formulated that it will not only make possible but also make highly probable both the encouragement and growth of each faculty member. To meet this ideal the proposal's structure should be designed to make it likely that each member both can and wants to develop continuously her/his interests and talents on behalf of teaching and learning.

Accordingly, the department finds the following to be appropriate for Faculty Senate consideration:

1. The three categories: teaching, scholarship and service, along with their attendant criteria, are central points to consider in any department's deliberations about salary for a given faculty member. They should be consulted however only as highly tentative lists and as points of departure in the evaluation process.

2. A careful accounting of the member's achievements must, to be fair to the person, and to what the university hopes to achieve, select only those categories and/or criteria that are pertinent to the idiosyncratic growth of the member in question. Remember that not only is the department in the best position to do such work; it also is in the unique position to ask the faculty member in question what and why in his/her view are the most important categories to consider in the evaluation and then to take his/her answer as the most serious point of departure for the evaluation.

3. It follows that the department could find that a given faculty member is so outstanding in teaching alone that any scholarship would itself be obvious through the quality of her/his teaching and that this kind of teaching, because of the direct and indirect impacts upon students and colleagues, would be of the highest service to the university. A similar case could readily be made where scholarship composes the predominant focus. In other cases, faculty members might well be judged by reference to two categories or, in rare instances, by reference to all three.
December 2, 1993

Robert Brown, Dean
CLAS
Campus

Dear Dean Brown:

The Computer Science Department faculty met several weeks ago to consider the proposal made by the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee regarding the merit process. The department agreed unanimously to the following points:

1. The proposal seems designed to reward mediocrity. Most of the items listed as examples of "meritorious" behavior are simply those things that should be expected as normal activity on the part of every faculty member. In fact, one of the greatest promoters of this scheme has admitted that she would consider it very likely that all faculty would receive a merit award. Hmm? Is this then truly "merit?"

2. The proposal would encourage departments to compete to develop the least restrictive objectives thus ensuring members of their departments a greater chance at receiving a "merit" award than members of other departments.

3. The system of steps and fractional steps, first level merit and second level merit, three different professional records for each faculty member (level 1, level 2, promotion), etc. will be very cumbersome and probably unworkable.

4. There would be great disparities in the amount of a merit award from one year to the next based on the total amount of money allocated by the legislature for salary increases. The proposal speaks repeatedly about morale, but does not consider the negative morale on faculty in one year's merit pool performing at the same level as faculty in another year's pool but receiving substantially less money.
5. The proposal will require an inordinate time commitment on the part of chairs to meet individually with faculty to develop objectives and measure their completion.

In short, the present salary scale is simple and workable. There are problems with the current process of awarding merit, but not with the scale. It is unfortunate that those problems have not been addressed by the proposal. Indeed, most of the problems of the current system arise because of the unwillingness of many chairs to make the hard decisions about merit. It is just easier to rotate merit awards than to face the anger of one's colleagues. Of course, this annoys those who do work harder and better than others, but they generally remain silent to maintain departmental good will. The proposal doesn't address this issue; it simply codifies spineless department chair activity.

It should also be noted that the Faculty Senate voted to accept some principles of a new merit system, but not to accept the proposal made by the Personnel Committee. This vote has unfortunately been inaccurately promoted as having been a vote supporting the proposal itself. The departments and deans have subsequently been presented with a timeline for implementing the proposal. This appears to be not a little disingenuous.

Sincerely,

Barry J. Donahue, Chair
Computer Science

c: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair, Faculty Senate
December 2, 1993

TO: Dean Robert Brown, CLAS
   Professor Sidney Nesselroad, Faculty Senate
FROM: Anne S. Denman, Chair
RE: Salary Adjustment Proposal

A Department of Anthropology sub-committee composed of John Alsoszatai-Petheo, Linda Klug and myself has met several times over the course of Fall quarter to discuss the Salary Adjustment Proposal. At the December 1 meeting of the Department faculty, our work was approved for transmittal to Dean Brown. However, all of us are concerned that the university context within which salary adjustments take place must be thoroughly discussed before any new proposal is implemented. I'm sending a copy of "Basic Philosophical Considerations" to Professor Nesselroad, and ask that they be considered by the Senate Personnel Committee and the Senate, along with other letters we've seen from Computer Science, Philosophy, and English.
Department of Anthropology  
Salary Adjustment Proposal - November 1993  
Basic Philosophical Considerations

Department faculty feel that the Faculty Senate's initial salary adjustment proposal provides a solid basis for proceeding with cross-campus discussion of these important issues. We do, however, have concerns about the university context within which these proposals are implemented, and we feel it is important that such issues be addressed both by the Dean's Council and by the Senate Personnel Committee.

This proposal reflects a more precise articulation by the faculty of standards for achievement of merit. While this is entirely appropriate, and will ease the work of departmental and university colleagues and administrators, we must not lose sight of the university context. Three contextual elements, in particular, cause us concern.

1. Teaching must be the major factor in faculty merit awards. A basic factor underlying all discussions of salary adjustments at CWU must be to reflect the crucial importance given to the role of teaching within faculty assignments. This is expressed in the university's mission and goals statements, in the accepted faculty assignment allotting 80% time to teaching and 20% to other activities, and in a number of other aspects of university policy.

Two effects of the importance attached to teaching are that achievement of an acceptable performance in teaching is basic to faculty performance, but also that the average faculty member cannot be expected to perform at exceptional levels in either research or public service in order to earn a Level 1 merit award. (Acceptable teaching is absolutely essential, but acceptable research or public service, except as related to teaching, are not).

A concomitant effect of the basic focus on teaching is that when faculty assignments are something other than 100% instructional FTE (still assuming the 80-20 split) -- for example, Chairs or faculty with part-or full-time research assignments -- then relative weight given to the criteria by which they will be judged will need to be altered.

2. Mutual commitment to criteria and implementation. If the faculty, via the Senate, embarks on a salary adjustment proposal, there must be a strong expectation of mutual commitment between faculty and administration. Such a commitment must be expressed contractually, and must include:
   a. Administrative commitment to adequate resources to support activities leading to merit. Now, precision of standards is taking place at the same time as resources for institutional support are decreasing (travel, research support monies).
   b. Commitment to annual implementation of criteria. Equal opportunity for the fulfillment of adjustment criteria must be maintained from one year to the next, or the entire system breaks down regardless of how good the criteria are. (For example, in the past individuals have received relatively high ranking on the merit list, only to discover that...
no merit monies are available that year. Their "equal opportunity" to be judged by a standardized set of merit criteria then becomes meaningless.)

c. Commitment to cross-school/college, cross-disciplinary implementation of criteria. There have been inequities in the past between Schools/Colleges in the degree to which release time or travel money was available to the faculty of different schools. On the other hand, use of a strict "quota" system is likely to undermine the validity of criteria.

d. Recognition of differences between disciplines. It should be recognized that some disciplines lend themselves more easily than others to fulfillment of criteria for research or public service, than do other disciplines. This may be related to public "demand" for services (e.g. consulting work) or to the nature of teaching in the discipline (e.g. teaching in some music or theatre arts fields inevitably leads to production of public performances.)

3. Judgements of quality must remain a crucial element. A system must not become so "rote" that the benefit of qualitative judgement by the Chair and disciplinary colleagues is lost. Simple counting of achievements cannot replace the quality of judgement by one's peers.

We must be clear about what is meant by "Level 1" and "Level 2" awards. Our department has interpreted Level 1 awards as being equivalent to a step increment. This level of achievement reflects what is expected of the ordinary faculty member to achieve a salary increment from one year to the next. Level 2 reflects a truly "meritorious" achievement; in other words, that faculty member has gone above and beyond the expectations for the typical faculty member at CWU. Not to achieve a Level 1 increment would not mean that the faculty member had failed in an absolute sense, but would indicate that that person had not met expectations for typical faculty performance at CWU.
December 28, 1993

Dr. Sidney Nesselroad
Faculty Senate Chair

Dear Sidney:

In response to the controversy surrounding the Faculty Senate budget, I am enclosing copies of a spreadsheet sent to this office in 1992, and a current analysis of Senate allocations and actual expenditures. These documents show that mid-year allocation adjustments had been the norm prior to 1993. Last year the Senate allocation was 175% of the 1992 allocation. It was the first year funds were not moved into the budget mid-year, and probably the first year the Senate had unused allocation. Please note that the actual expenditures of the Faculty Senate have increased by 156% since 1988. It is also worth noting that the increased funding in 1993 supported departmental adjunct coverage for the Senate Chair of $7200, and an additional $4,500 for the Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) Chair.

The 1994 reduction in the Senate budget was primarily in unused allocation. The 1994 allocation was only 5% less than the 1993 actual expenditure with support for the CFR chair. It seemed reasonable to expect the expenses to be reduced in 1994 since Central's representative would no longer chair the CFR.

By the time I received the request of summer pay for the Senate Chair, the budget was set and it was assumed that budgetary issues had been considered. I will authorize Provost Moore to make a one-time-only transfer of $4000 to the Faculty Senate. I believe you and I should meet to discuss the Faculty Senate's role and activities and the related expenses. We should then budget accordingly, and operate within the budget allocations.

Very truly yours,

Ivory V. Nelson
President

cc  Tom Moore
Members of the Faculty Senate
### Senate Budget: 1987/88 - 1993/94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200 Adjunct Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 Summer Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 Parttime</td>
<td>$7,635</td>
<td>$8,378</td>
<td>$9,060</td>
<td>$10,237</td>
<td>$11,692</td>
<td>$12,517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$2,510</td>
<td>$3,077</td>
<td>$2,727</td>
<td>$10,216</td>
<td>$7,705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 Extra Hours</td>
<td>$708</td>
<td>$1,004</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td>$2,727</td>
<td>$3,077</td>
<td>$2,510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>$998</td>
<td>$12,665</td>
<td>$8,865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 G&amp;S/6000 Equip</td>
<td>$2,352</td>
<td>$3,016</td>
<td>$4,287</td>
<td>$5,264</td>
<td>$4,496</td>
<td>$3,092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,650</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>$2,533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 Travel</td>
<td>$752</td>
<td>$1,573</td>
<td>$1,069</td>
<td>$2,139</td>
<td>$1,734</td>
<td>$1,015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,150</td>
<td>$189</td>
<td>$1,961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Allocation         | $11,447 | $13,971 | $15,736 | $20,367 | $20,999 | $30,834 | $30,981 |

$1,453 reduction of allocation from last years expenditures

4.71% percent of reduction from last year's actual expenditures

#### Senate Allocation and Actual Expenditures 1988-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>$11,755</td>
<td>$11,447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>$12,187</td>
<td>$13,971</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>22.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$14,032</td>
<td>$15,736</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
<td>12.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$14,565</td>
<td>$20,367</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>29.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$13,449</td>
<td>$20,999</td>
<td>-7.66%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$36,881</td>
<td>$30,834</td>
<td>174.23%</td>
<td>46.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$29,381</td>
<td>-20.34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1994 allocation as a percent of 1993 expen -4.71%
## FACULTY SENATE BUDGET
### 1988-1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Original Allocation</th>
<th>Supplemental Allocation</th>
<th>Sub-Total Expenses</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>3000-Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>2100.00</td>
<td>252.00</td>
<td>2352.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000-Travel</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>752.00</td>
<td>752.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300/1400-Salaries</td>
<td>9655.00</td>
<td>-1,312.00</td>
<td>8343.00</td>
<td>11,447.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11,755.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,447.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>3000-Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>2100.00</td>
<td>916.25</td>
<td>3016.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000-Travel</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,572.59</td>
<td>1,572.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300/1400-Salaries</td>
<td>10087.00</td>
<td>-704.93</td>
<td>9382.07</td>
<td>13,970.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12,187.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,970.91</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>3000-Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>3360.00</td>
<td>927.37</td>
<td>4287.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000-Travel</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,068.82</td>
<td>1068.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300/1400-Salaries</td>
<td>10672.00</td>
<td>-292.22</td>
<td>10379.78</td>
<td>15,735.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14,032.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,735.97</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>3000-Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>3360.00</td>
<td>1,904.38</td>
<td>5264.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000-Travel</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,138.82</td>
<td>2138.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300/1400-Salaries</td>
<td>11205.00</td>
<td>1,758.62</td>
<td>12963.62</td>
<td>20,366.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14,565.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,366.82</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92**</td>
<td>3000-Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>3360.00</td>
<td>1,136.00</td>
<td>4496.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000-Travel</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,734.00</td>
<td>1734.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300/1400-Salaries</td>
<td>13449.00</td>
<td>1,319.51</td>
<td>14768.51</td>
<td>20,998.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECTED TOTALS**

16,809.00  4,189.51  20,998.51

(BUDGET 14-3-89: Appropriations April 3, 1989)
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
WASHINGTON CENTER SUMMER INSTITUTE TEAM
FORD FOUNDATION CULTURAL PLURALISM PROJECT
AUGUST 12-20, 1994

Nominations and applications are now being accepted for five faculty to attend the Summer Institute on Cultural Pluralism funded by the Washington Center, the Ford Foundation, and CWU Faculty Development Fund. Candidates may nominate themselves or, with candidate approval, be nominated by a colleague. Any full-time faculty (full academic year appointment) with teaching responsibilities in general education courses may apply. The five member Institute team members will be expected to engage in identified course development or revision, to disseminate information from the Institute to our faculty, and to serve in a leadership capacity in the development of multicultural curricula. Features of the Institute are:

- An all expenses paid 8-day residential Institute housed at The Evergreen State College.

- Interaction with Institute faculty who have expertise in African-American Studies, American Indian Studies, Asian American Studies, Latino Studies, and Euro-American Studies (note emphasis of program is on diversity issues in American society).

- A residential community of 70 faculty participants from 2-year and 4-year colleges and universities around the state.

- An opportunity to develop or redesign general education courses that reflect cultural pluralism in American society.

- A $500 stipend plus room and board for the Institute.

Nomination and application forms are attached. If you need additional forms or have any questions about the program, please contact D. Gerald Stacy, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research (3101). The deadline for application is Friday, January 28, 1994. Project participants will be chosen by the Dean's Council.
APPLICATION FORM
SUMMER INSTITUTE TEAM WASHINGTON CENTER/FORD FOUNDATION CULTURAL PLURALISM PROJECT

PART I
NAME OF APPLICANT ___________________________ DATE __________________
PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT ____________________________
TYPICAL COURSES TAUGHT:

PART II
I understand that being selected for the Summer Institute entails:

- Attending a one-day seminar (scheduled in Spring 1994) with other members of the Summer Institute and the Planning Team.
- Attending an 8-day all expenses paid residential Summer Institute (August 12-20) to be held at The Evergreen State College.
- Receiving a $500 stipend and room and board for attending the Institute.
- Engaging in new course curriculum development or redesign of current courses.
- Sharing information and resources from the Institute through giving professional development workshops and consulting with interested individuals and departments.
- Attending follow-up activities sponsored by the Washington Center including seminars for the Summer Institute Team.
- Serving in a leadership position in the promotion of cultural diversity in the curriculum.

Signature ___________________________ Date __________________

PART III
Please attach a letter addressing your reasons for applying to the Summer Institute. Include
- your philosophy of general education;
- your interest in and commitment to a culturally diverse curriculum;
- specific courses or ideas you would like to develop or redesign; and
- your willingness to share what you learn at the Institute with your colleagues in the 1994-95 academic year.

Return to Dr. Gerald Stacy, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research by January 28, 1994.
NOMINATION FORM
SUMMER INSTITUTE TEAM
WASHINGTON CENTER/FORD FOUNDATION
CULTURAL PLURALISM PROJECT

NAME OF NOMINEE ___________________________________ DATE __________

PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT _____________________________________________

PHONE ____________

NOMINATED BY ___________________ PHONE ____________

Briefly explain your reasons for nominating the individual named above. Refer to this person's interest in multicultural curriculum development and their capacity for leadership in promoting cultural pluralism in the curriculum. The individual you nominate will be sent a separate application form to fill out. Deadline for application is Friday, January 28, 1994.
MEMO

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Sid Nesselroad, Chair

FROM: Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee
Charles McGehee, Chair

DATE: November 23, 1993

RE: Proposal to drop students from classes

In response to the charge to respond to Prof. Owen Pratz' request to allow faculty to drop students for non-attendance on the first day of class, the Academic Affairs Committee has met and deliberated and submits the following response:

The Academic Affairs Committee has considered Owen Pratz' proposal to permit faculty to drop students on the first day of class for non-attendance.

Prof. Pratz' point that non-attending students take space from students who would like to enroll in a class is well-taken, especially as we enter a period of increasing enrollments without the prospect of increases in staffing. We must make every effort to insure that every available seat is filled.

Still, there are problems with the proposal. In the first place, the first day of class is typically characterized by considerable disarray. By implication, Prof. Pratz lays the blame for first-day absences on students. Much confusion, however, is generated by factors within the institution itself. Faculty change classrooms without notice, courses have been added or deleted, and a variety of routine mixups makes it likely that a number of students will not be able to attend the first day of class even when they try. This is especially true during the Fall quarter when many new students, many of whom are freshmen, are on campus and quite unfamiliar with the university.

Further, not all classes will have met on the first day of instruction since not all meet every day. It is not possible to set policy based on the first day of class because state law binds fees and refunds to days of instruction rather than to class days. Problems of the current policy (third day of instruction) conforming to odd schedules is handled on an ad hoc basis.

Considering these complicating factors, therefore, the Committee believes that it is unfair to penalize students for non-attendance on the first day.

The current policy permits faculty to drop students on the third day of instruction. Having rejected the first day, the Committee recommends no further changes. Since the third day of instruction is well within the limits of the five-day add-drop period, the difference between the end
of the second day and the beginning of the third day is minimal. At the beginning of the third day the instructor will have had two sessions to observe whether a student is going to appear or not and is free to admit another student at that point subject to notifying the Registrar. Students wanting to get into a class may, therefore, continue to come to class and simply wait. The Committee counsels patience for both the faculty and student.

The most significant problem, regardless which day the student drops the class, is notification of the Registrar's office. Ultimately, dropping a class is a matter of official record. The quickest, easiest way -- telephoning the Registrar's office -- is problematic in that (1) registration is an administratively hectic period where some eight thousand students are sorted into thousands of classes in a brief period with all manner of complications, and (2) under the best of circumstances, the Registrar's office is understaffed and overworked. The written word, therefore, is the only certain means for documenting faculty actions and students' rights.

Documentation through campus mail is at best slow, so the Committee recommends strongly that any documentation be faxed, e-mailed or delivered by hand to the Registrar the same day.

We believe that if the present rule were applied in a timely fashion, the problems noted by Prof. Pratz would be minimized. The Committee therefore recommends no change to the present policy.

Please advise us as to whether this should be presented to the Senate for debate and action or whether this response to the Executive Committee is sufficient.
TO: FACULTY SENATE CODE COMMITTEE:
Ethan Bergman, Home Economics (7565)
Beverly Heckart, History (7553) - CHAIR
Katarin Jurich, Sociology (7545)
David Majsterek, Education (7409)
Owen Pratz, Psychology (7575)

FACULTY SENATE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE:
Linda Beath, Education (7409)
Marco Bicchieri, Anthropology (7544)
Russ Schultz, Music (7458)
Libby Street, Psychology (7575) - CHAIR
Blaine Wilson, BEAM (7488)

FROM: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair
Faculty Senate

DATE: November 29, 1993

RE: UNIVERSITY MINORITY AND DIVERSITY ACTION PLAN

Please take action as described in the attached November 23, 1993, memo from Don Schliesman, Special Assistant to the Provost.

The Code and Personnel Committees should work together on this project to avoid duplication of effort and submit a joint report and/or recommendations on their findings to the Senate Executive Committee no later than April 10, 1994.

cc: Don Schliesman, Special Assistant to the Provost
    Thomas Moore, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

sft
MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 23, 1993

TO: Dr. Sidney Nesselroad
    Chair, Faculty Senate

FROM: Donald M. Schliesman
      Special Assistant to the Provost

RE: University Minority and Diversity Action Plan

You will recall that after considerable campus-wide discussions, the Board of Trustees adopted a University Minority Participation and Diversity Action Plan last spring. The Plan includes many goals, with strategies for achieving the goals. The strategy statements included names of university offices responsible for implementing them. Two strategies direct Provost Moore to request certain action of the Senate and he has asked that I bring them to your attention. Quote from the Plan:

"GOAL 6: Establish policies and procedures for tenure and promotions and insure they are applied equitably.

Strategies:

1. Request the Faculty Senate personnel and Faculty Senate Code Committees to review the faculty code and other university policies for provisions which would tend to make it more difficult for minority faculty to achieve tenure and receive promotion, and if such exist, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for policy which would eliminate such limitations (Provost, Deans, and Department Chairs) Fall Quarter, 1993.

2. Request the Faculty Senate personnel and Faculty Senate Code Committees to survey departments and deans to determine hiring and promotion criteria and procedures which would tend to make it more difficult for minority faculty to achieve tenure and promotion, and if such exist, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for policies which eliminate such limitations (Provost, Deans, and Department Chair) Fall Quarter, 1993."

Will you please ask the two committees to complete the tasks described in the two strategies quoted above and prepare a report of the investigation?

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Schliesman
Special Assistant to the Provost

c: Thomas D. Moore, Provost
TO:             Ken Gamon, Math\CLAS (7424)  
               Craig Rademacher, Leisure Services-PE\SPS (7572)  
               Connie Nott, Business Administration\B&E (7485)  

FROM:           Sidney Nesselroad, Chair  
                 Faculty Senate  

DATE:           December 10, 1993  

RE:              UNIVERSITY LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE  

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the University Legislative Committee.  

Attached is a copy of the December 6, 1993, memo from President Ivory Nelson establishing the committee and explaining its purpose. A representative from the Director of Governmental Relations' Office will be in touch with you regarding regular meeting times, which will begin next quarter. The legislative session begins on January 11, 1994.  

attachment  


c: Mary Marcy, Director of Governmental Relations  
   Ivory Nelson, President  
   Dan Ramsdell, Chair, Faculty Senate Public Affairs Committee  
   Stephen Hinthorne, Chair, Math  
   John Gregor, Chair, Physical Education  
   Gerald Gunn, Chair, Business Administration  
   Robert Brown, Dean of CLAS  
   Linda Murphy, Dean of SPS  
   David Dauwalder, Dean of B&E  

sft  

[c:\wpdocs\committe\ulegcomm.mar]
December 6, 1993

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 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

jm
TO: 1993-94 FACULTY SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:
Wayne Fairburn, Business Administration (B&E) - 7485
Wolfgang Franz, Economics (B&E) - 7486
Clara Baker, Accounting (B&E) - 7484
Linda Klug, Anthropology (CLAS) - 7544
Steve Olson, English (CLAS) - 7558
Wesley Van Tassel, Theatre Arts (CLAS) - 7460
Deloris Johns, Physical Education (SPS) - 7572
Dale LeFevre, Education (SPS) - 7409
Randall Butler, Aerospace Studies (SPS) - 7568
Gerard Hogan, Library (LIB) - 7548
John Brangwin, ASCWU/BOD - 7448

FROM: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair/Faculty Senate

DATE: January 4, 1994

RE: COMMITTEE CHARGE

Please consider the following requests and submit your recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee:

1) Guidelines for Use of Individual Study (-96)
Attached are a 12/10/93 letter from Don Schliesman, Special Assistant to the Provost; and an 8/24/88 memo from Don Schliesman (Dean of Undergraduate Studies) and Dale Comstock (Dean of Graduate Studies and Research) to Jimmie Applegate (Dean of School of Professional Studies), Robert Brown (Dean of College of Letters Arts and Sciences), and Gerald Cleveland (Dean of the School of Business and Economics).

Please review the Deans' Council's 12/9/93 recommendation for the addition of "Curriculum Planning and Procedures" guidelines concerning Individual Study curricula.

2) Add Director of Admissions and Academic Advising Services to membership of Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee
Attached are a 12/21/93 memo from James Pappas, Dean of Academic Services; and a 10/7/93 memo from William Swain, Director of Admissions/Academic Advising Services to James Pappas.

Please consider the appropriateness of adding the Director of Admissions/Academic Advising Services as an ex officio, non-voting member of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. I have forwarded the request for membership on the General Education Committee to the Dean of CLAS and the General Education Committee. The addition of this individual to the membership of the Curriculum Committee would require a change in section IV.B. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws (attached); Bylaws changes require a two-thirds majority vote of the Faculty Senate.

c: Don Schliesman, Special Assistant to the Provost
Thomas Moore, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
James Pappas, Dean of Academic Services
Bill Swain, Director of Admissions/Academic Advising Services

attachments
December 10, 1993

Dr. Sidney Nesselroad, Chair
Faculty Senate
Campus - 7509

Dear Dr. Nesselroad:

Attached you will find a copy of a 1988 correspondence dealing with the course "Individual Studies" (496). At that time the Deans' Council was concerned about the used and misuse of the course. As a result of reviewing the approved individual study permit cards, the "Guidelines for Use of Individual Study (496, 596)" were developed. We also developed the list of "Examples of Inappropriate Use of Individual Study".

If my memory is correct, I believe the guidelines were reviewed and supported by the then Undergraduate Council. I am uncertain as to whether or not the Graduate Council reviewed them. I believe the Faculty Senate did not review or consider the guidelines.

Yesterday the Deans' Council reviewed the document again and the members of that group join me in recommending that the guidelines be approved and added to the Curriculum Planning and Procedures Manual, which I believe is presently being revised by the Senate Curriculum Committee. It is important that all members of the faculty become aware of the guidelines as approved by the Senate, so as to stop any misuse of that curriculum entry.

I would be happy to meet with any Senate group to discuss this recommendation.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Schliesman
Special Assistant to the Provost

cc: Thomas D. Moore, Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs
August 24, 1988

Jimmie R. Applegate, Dean
Professional Studies

Robert H. Brown, Dean
College of Arts, Letters and Sciences

Gerald L. Cleveland, Dean
Business and Economics
CWU Campus

Colleagues:

As agreed during our recent meeting regarding the use of "Individual Study" (496, 596) we have attempted to summarize the comments of that meeting. We agreed to develop a set of guidelines for using Individual Study and to identify examples of inappropriate use. The results are given below.

Guidelines for Use of Individual Study (496, 596)

1. "Individual Study" provides an opportunity for students to study a topic which grows out of or is at a more advanced level than that covered in a course.

2. The content of "Individual Study" should be that which is not covered in other curricular offerings. It should not be used to substantially duplicate other curricular offerings.

3. Students should be approved for "Individual Study" only if they have adequate subject matter background to undertake the study, sufficient scholastic ability to succeed in the task and independent study skills sufficient to conduct the study.

4. The "Individual Study" is intended for individual students, not groups of students. If the learning experience is intended for a group of students, it shall be offered as a course under another number designation.

5. Regular courses, workshops, and seminars shall not be offered as "Individual Study."

6. Faculty may agree to supervise "Individual Study" only in those cases when the content of the study is in the subject area speciality of the faculty member.
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7. Faculty should restrict the number of "Individual Study" to be supervised at any one time (no more than one or two).

8. The Registrar will accept Individual Study Permit cards only if they are appropriately completed (including a description or outline of the study) and signed by the supervising faculty member and appropriate department chair/program director.

   **Examples of Inappropriate Use of Individual Study**

1. Groups of students doing identical individual studies.
2. Using Individual Study for internship.
4. Using Individual Study for instructional or laboratory assistance.
5. Using Individual Study for administrative assistance.
7. Teaching a course as Individual Study to one or more students. Courses, when offered on an individual basis, should be done on an "arranged course" basis.

   Please discuss the use/misuse of Individual Study (496 or 596) with the department chairs/program directors and faculty.

   Thank you.

   Sincerely,

   Donald M. Schliesman
   Dean of Undergraduate Studies

   Dale R. Comstock
   Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

c: Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
TO: Robert Brown, Dean  
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

Don Cummings, Chair  
General Education Committee

FROM: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair  
Faculty Senate

DATE: January 4, 1994

RE: GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

I recently received a recommendation from James Pappas, Dean of Academic Services, to add Bill Swain, Director of Admissions/Academic Advising Services, as an ex officio, non-voting member of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee and the General Education Committee. I have forwarded Dean Pappas' request concerning the Curriculum Committee to that body for action, but membership of the General Education Committee is outside the purview of the Faculty Senate.

The appropriate procedure for this portion of the request would be for the General Education Committee to review Dean Pappas' recommendation and make a formal recommendation to the administrator to which the Committee reports (i.e., the Dean of CLAS). If appropriate, the Dean of CLAS would then make a recommendation, including proposed timeline for change, to the Deans' Council, with ultimate authority for a change of committee membership resting with the Provost. Any change in the membership of the General Education Committee would be reported to the Faculty Senate by the Provost's Office. The membership change would be registered on the next University Standing Committee List (to be issued in Fall 1994).

c: James Pappas, Dean of Academic Services  
Bill Swain, Director of Admissions/Academic Advising Services

sft
MEMORANDUM

TO: James Pappas, Dean
    Academic Services

FROM: William Swain, Director
    Admissions and Academic Advising Services

DATE: October 7, 1993

SUBJECT: Appointment to General Education and Faculty Senate Curriculum Committees

Last April, you asked me to attend a meeting of the Deans Council to present the goals and objectives regarding academic advising that I had prepared as part of the strategic planning process. One of the objectives included the following action item: "Propose that the Director of Admissions and Academic Advising Services be approved as an ex officio, non-voting member of the General Education and Faculty Senate Curriculum Committees." At that time, there seemed to be consensus among the Deans and the President that this was a good idea.

This action item has become part of the final draft of the 1993-94 Strategic Plan along with the objective that provides its rational. I would appreciate your advice about pursuing the proposal.

Both the President and the Provost have indicated that there will be substantial movement toward General Education reform this year, and having immediate knowledge of the direction that the reform is taking seems essential for me to effectively plan next fall's early registration process. I am also concerned that the work we have begun with the Learning Communities Program be addressed and possibly continued as an integral part of the General Education Program -- both as part of its curriculum and as a means of facilitating students' coherent progress through the program.
Attached is a memo sent to me by Bill Swain. I attended the meeting of the Deans’ Council that he refers to, and my perception of the President and the Council's response is consistent with Bill's. I strongly recommend that the Director of Admissions and Academic Advising Services be approved as a member of the General Education and Faculty Curriculum Committees.

Bill has indicated that it would be more appropriate for Joanne Stevenson to sit in for him on most occasions, and I know that her extensive knowledge of the interrelationships of courses and programs as well as of curriculum approval procedures would be an asset for the Committee.
MEMORANDUM

Date: Mon. 12/20/93 15:47p.m.,

From: Terry Teale

To: Presidents: Jane Jervis
Mark Drummond
William Gerberding
Karen Morse
Ivory Nelson
Sam Smith

Subject: Governor Lowry's 1994 Budget Proposal

Mike Bigelow just dropped off the attached budget information. HE ASKS THAT WE NOT COMMENT TO THE PRESS UNTIL AFTER 10:00 A.M. TOMORROW.

Mike made special note of the following:

Health Benefits: The 1993-95 budget passed last session had projected an increase in the second year of the biennium for health benefits. This budget eliminates that increase.

This budget reflects benefit costs of $305 per month instead of the $323 assumed in the 1993-95 budget. No programmatic change is made to the health care benefit.

"Efficiency" Initiatives (Cuts):

Research Institutions 1.5%
Comprehensives 1.25%
Community & Tech 1.0%

When asked about the rationale for the differential cuts, Mike said that research institutions are assumed to have more ability to absorb the larger cuts because of size, availability of local funds, and staffing patterns.

Capital Budget:

WSU: $9 million for Veterinary Medicine Equipment

UW: OFM is taking the $23 million from the Bothell Branch Campus account back into the custody of OFM for allocation to either the UW or SBCTC when co-location details are worked out.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UW</th>
<th>WSU</th>
<th>EWU</th>
<th>CWU</th>
<th>TESC</th>
<th>WWU</th>
<th>4 YR SUB</th>
<th>SBCTC</th>
<th>HECB</th>
<th>HI ED TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1993-95: 1994 Governor's Supplemental Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current 93-95 Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF-S</td>
<td>507,618</td>
<td>292,460</td>
<td>72,813</td>
<td>66,482</td>
<td>37,207</td>
<td>81,618</td>
<td>1,058,198</td>
<td>676,763</td>
<td>130,333</td>
<td>1,865,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Fees</td>
<td>171,928</td>
<td>86,848</td>
<td>31,085</td>
<td>23,791</td>
<td>17,944</td>
<td>35,161</td>
<td>366,757</td>
<td>189,067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>535,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Account</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>179,944</td>
<td>35,161</td>
<td>366,757</td>
<td>189,067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ. &amp; Train. Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9,036</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,036</td>
<td>11,415</td>
<td>7,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL 93-95 BUDGET</strong></td>
<td>694,382</td>
<td>380,708</td>
<td>104,098</td>
<td>90,413</td>
<td>55,151</td>
<td>116,979</td>
<td>1,441,731</td>
<td>912,365</td>
<td>140,105</td>
<td>2,494,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPLEMENTAL RECs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits Savings (GF-S)</td>
<td>-3,513</td>
<td>-1,991</td>
<td>-561</td>
<td>-479</td>
<td>-308</td>
<td>-530</td>
<td>-7,382</td>
<td>-4,755</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-12,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Initiatives (GF-S)</td>
<td>-7,614</td>
<td>-4,387</td>
<td>-910</td>
<td>-831</td>
<td>-465</td>
<td>-1,020</td>
<td>-15,227</td>
<td>-6,768</td>
<td>-21,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Tax Lab (O2K)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Envir. Health (608-609)</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Spill Sea Grant (217)</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective Rating Refund (OJK)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection Contracts (GF-S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christa McAuliffe Award (GF-S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Admin Reduction (GF-S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supplemental Changes</strong></td>
<td>-11,127</td>
<td>-6,378</td>
<td>-1,471</td>
<td>-1,310</td>
<td>-773</td>
<td>-1,550</td>
<td>-22,609</td>
<td>-11,444</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-33,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Account</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ. &amp; Train. Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CHANGES</strong></td>
<td>-10,624</td>
<td>-6,378</td>
<td>-1,471</td>
<td>-1,300</td>
<td>-773</td>
<td>-1,550</td>
<td>-22,096</td>
<td>-11,444</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-33,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVISED BUDGET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF-S</td>
<td>496,491</td>
<td>286,082</td>
<td>71,342</td>
<td>65,172</td>
<td>36,434</td>
<td>80,068</td>
<td>1,035,589</td>
<td>665,319</td>
<td>130,465</td>
<td>1,831,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Fees</td>
<td>171,928</td>
<td>86,848</td>
<td>31,085</td>
<td>23,791</td>
<td>17,944</td>
<td>35,161</td>
<td>366,757</td>
<td>189,067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>535,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Account</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>179,944</td>
<td>35,161</td>
<td>366,757</td>
<td>189,067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ. &amp; Train. Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9,539</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,549</td>
<td>11,415</td>
<td>7,542</td>
<td>28,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RECOMMENDATION</strong></td>
<td>683,758</td>
<td>374,330</td>
<td>102,627</td>
<td>89,113</td>
<td>54,437</td>
<td>115,429</td>
<td>1,419,635</td>
<td>900,921</td>
<td>140,237</td>
<td>2,460,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1994 Supplemental for Health Benefits
### Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund - State</th>
<th>FY94</th>
<th>FY95</th>
<th>Supplementa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEADCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($51.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Ed, Total</td>
<td>19,750</td>
<td>19,825</td>
<td>(12,166,206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Ed Coord Bd</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(29,457)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Wash</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>(560,904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Wash Univ</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>(479,284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen State</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>(308,067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wa Univ</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>(530,220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Wash</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td>(3,512,704)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash State Univ</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>(1,990,778)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Tech College</td>
<td>7,748</td>
<td>7,748</td>
<td>(4,754,793)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 95

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>351.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325.5</td>
<td>283.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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University of Washington

Recommendation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs in Thousands</th>
<th>Annual FTEs</th>
<th>General Fund-State</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983-85 Expenditure Authority</td>
<td>3,878.5</td>
<td>507,616</td>
<td>14,838</td>
<td>522,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Toxicology Lab</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Environmental Health</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Spill Account Seagrant Program</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,513)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,513)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Initiatives</td>
<td>(53.0)</td>
<td>(7,614)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,814)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Supplemental Changes</td>
<td>(50.7)</td>
<td>(11,127)</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>(10,624)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recommended Budget</td>
<td>3,825.8</td>
<td>490,461</td>
<td>15,338</td>
<td>511,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>(50.7)</td>
<td>(11,127)</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>(10,624)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change from Current Biennium</td>
<td>(1.3)%</td>
<td>(2.2)%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>(2.0)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Changes

State Toxicology Lab - Funding is provided for the increasing costs of testing and providing expert witness testimony. These funds support an additional toxicologist and supplies. (Death Investigation Account)

Dept of Environmental Health - This proposal includes $295,000 for the one-time lease and move costs and $110,430 for 2.0 FTE staff years and equipment for the previously funded biomonitoring lab. The department receives no state general funds. (Medical Aid Fund and Accident Fund)

Oil Spill Account Seagrant Program - Due to revenue shortfall in the Oil Spill Administration Account, this 20 percent reduction eliminates education support staff and production of education materials provided to the Seagrant program for oil spill education. Funds for workshops and coordination with other agencies are also reduced. (Oil Spill Administration Account)

Health Benefits Savings - This item reflects the savings in employee health benefits rates.

Efficiency Initiatives - Savings will be achieved through further reductions in administration, consolidation of programs, elimination of duplication, utilization of other resources, and increased productivity. It is intended that enrollments be maintained at budgeted levels.
## Recommendation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Washington State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Agency 363

### Recommendation Summary

**Washington State University**

**Dollars in Thousands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>1983-85 Expenditure Authority</th>
<th>Supplemental Changes</th>
<th>Health Benefits Savings</th>
<th>Efficiency Initiatives</th>
<th>Subtotal - Supplemental Changes</th>
<th>Total Recommended Budget</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent Change from Current Biennium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual FTEs</td>
<td>3,235.6</td>
<td>292,460</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>293,860</td>
<td>(28.5)</td>
<td>(4,387)</td>
<td>(4,387)</td>
<td>(28.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supplemental Changes

**Health Benefits Savings** - This item reflects the savings in employee health benefits rates.

**Efficiency Initiatives** - Savings will be achieved through further reductions in administration, consolidation of programs, elimination of duplication, utilization of other resources, and increased productivity. It is intended that enrollments be maintained at budgeted levels.
Eastern Washington University

Recommendation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual FTEs</th>
<th>General Fund-State</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993-94 Expenditure Authority</td>
<td>671.2</td>
<td>72,513</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>73,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supplemental Changes

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefit Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Initiative</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(910)</td>
<td>(910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Supplemental Changes</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(1,471)</td>
<td>(1,471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recommended Budget</td>
<td>684.2</td>
<td>71,342</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change from Current Biennium</td>
<td>(1.0)%</td>
<td>(2.0)%</td>
<td>(2.0)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplemental Changes**

**Health Benefit Savings** - This item reflects the savings in employee health benefit rates.

**Efficiency Initiative** - Savings will be achieved through further reductions in administration, consolidation of programs, elimination of duplication, utilization of other resources, and increased productivity. It is intended that enrollment be maintained at budgeted levels.
Central Washington University

Recommendation Summary

Dollars in Thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual FTEs</th>
<th>General Fund-Rate</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993-95 Expenditure Authority</td>
<td>546.8</td>
<td>66,452</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>66,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective Rating Refund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefit Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(479)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Initiatives</td>
<td>(5.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(831)</td>
<td>(831)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Supplemental Changes</td>
<td>(5.9)</td>
<td>(1,310)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recommended Budget</td>
<td>540.8</td>
<td>65,172</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>65,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>(5.9)</td>
<td>(1,310)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change from Current Biennium</td>
<td>(1.1)%</td>
<td>(2.0)%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>(2.0)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Changes

Retrospective Rating Refund - This proposal will enable the University to spend this refund for management of hazardous wastes.

Health Benefit Savings - This item reflects the savings in employee health benefit rates.

Efficiency Initiatives - Savings will be achieved through further reductions in administration, consolidation of programs, elimination of duplication, utilization of other resources, and increased productivity. It is intended that enrollment be maintained at budgeted levels.
**Western Washington University**

**Recommendation Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual FTEs</th>
<th>General Fund-State</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983-85 Expenditure Authority</td>
<td>801.8</td>
<td>81,818</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>81,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefit Savings</td>
<td>(9.7)</td>
<td>(530)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Initiatives</td>
<td>(9.7)</td>
<td>(1,020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Supplemental Changes</strong></td>
<td>(9.7)</td>
<td>(1,550)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recommended Budget</td>
<td>885.1</td>
<td>80,068</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>80,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>(9.7)</td>
<td>(1,550)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change from Current Blennium</td>
<td>(7.7)%</td>
<td>(1.9)%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.9)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplemental Changes**

**Health Benefit Savings** - This item reflects the savings in employee health benefit rates.

**Efficiency Initiatives** - Savings will be achieved through further reductions in administration, consolidation of programs, elimination of duplication, utilization of other resources, and increased productivity. It is intended that enrollment be maintained at budgeted levels.
Community/Technical College System

Recommendation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Annual PTEs</th>
<th>Current Fund-Uses</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983-86 Expenditure Authority</td>
<td>8,612.4</td>
<td>676.783</td>
<td>46.535</td>
<td>723,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits Savings</td>
<td>(4,755)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4,755)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Initiatives</td>
<td>(57.5)</td>
<td>(8,758)</td>
<td>(57.5)</td>
<td>(11,444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Supplemental Changes</td>
<td>(57.5)</td>
<td>(11,444)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(11,444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recommended Budget</td>
<td>8,554.9</td>
<td>665,319</td>
<td>46,535</td>
<td>711,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>(57.5)</td>
<td>(11,444)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(11,444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change from Current Biennium</td>
<td>(.7)%</td>
<td>(1.7)%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Changes

Fire Protection Contracts - Funding is provided for fire protection contract costs for Bellingham, Whatcom, Walla Walla, and South Puget Sound community and technical colleges.

Health Benefits Savings - This item reflects the savings in employee health benefits rates.

Efficiency Initiatives - Savings will be achieved through further reductions in administration, consolidation of programs, elimination of duplication, utilization of other resources, and increased productivity. It is intended that enrollments be maintained at budgeted levels.
Higher Education Coordinating Board

Recommendation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency 343</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Dollars in Thousands

| 1993-95 Expenditure Authority | 52.2 | 130,333 | 9,772 | 140,105 |

Supplemental Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christs McAuliffe Educator’s Award</th>
<th>301</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration Reduction</td>
<td>(140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefit Savings</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Supplemental Changes</td>
<td>(132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recommended Budget</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>(1.7)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change from Current Biennium</td>
<td>(-1.7)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Changes

Christs McAuliffe Educator’s Award - This funding is necessary to address a shortfall in the Christs McAuliffe Educator’s Award for Excellence fund. The shortfall is due to insufficient funding to satisfy a statutorily required increase in award amounts and a statutorily established increase in the number of award receivers.

Program Administration Reduction - Program administration support in the Policy Coordination and Financial Aid programs is reduced.

Health Benefit Savings - This reflects the savings in the employee health benefit rate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Budget Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1995-1996</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1993-1994</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1990-1991</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1988-1989</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1987-1988</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1986-1987</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1985-1986</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1984-1985</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1983-1984</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1981-1982</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1979-1980</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1978-1979</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1977-1978</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Mntm</td>
<td>GLOW III Bldg</td>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

December 20, 1993
President's Budget
1993-95 Capital Budget
HIGHER EDUCATION 1994 SUPPLEMENTAL CAPITAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

- North King/South Snohomish Higher Education Site—The $23,000,000 appropriated to UW for design and construction of a Bothell branch campus transfers to OFM. OFM shall distribute the funds for land acquisition, design and construction to the appropriate agency or agencies when the site selection for the proposed collocated UW branch and new community colleges has been decided; and when agreement has been reached on issues including holder of the title of the proposed site and fiscal and construction agent for the new campus.

- WSU Veterinary Teaching Hospital—$8,950,500 purchases built-in equipment, laboratory equipment and furniture, permitting the teaching hospital to open in 1995.

- CWU Psychology Animal Research Facility—$200,000 in CWU local capital funds is added to cover legal expenses related to the construction of the facility.

- CWU Barge Hall Remodel and Hertz Hall Structural Repairs—Savings of $125,000 from the Barge Hall project are provided to correct concrete structural repairs in Hertz Hall.

- Infrastructure Project Savings—WWU and EWU are provided $1 and a proviso so savings in other projects may be transferred to infrastructure projects according to section 1014 in the capital budget bill.

OTHER EDUCATION 1994 SUPPLEMENTAL CAPITAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

- Capital Museum—$25,800 provides a new boiler.

- Eastern WA State Historical Society—$130,000 reappropriations authority is included to ensure completion of the Campbell House restoration.

- Eastern WA State Historical Society—$20,800 is provided for roof repairs at the Cheney Cowles Museum in Spokane.
Central Washington University
Information Resources
Memo

To: President Nelson

CC: Vice President Courtney Jones, Information Resources Staff, University Computing Committee, Proposers of Pervasive Information Technology Projects, Professor Earl Glauert

From: Jim Haskett
Director

Date: December 22, 1993

Subj: Pervasive Projects leading to Information Technology Literacy

President Nelson, You have asked me to identify some projects that will lead to the infusion of information technology literacy at Central Washington University. I issued memos to a wide variety of people and requested their input. After review, I propose the following, some of which will proceed at the same time, some of which are already underway, some of which I will take to the University Computing Committee (for prioritization) when people return from the holidays, some of which require funding, and some of which may be outside of the scope of your charge.

It is my judgement that the following numbered projects are very clearly the top priorities for pervasive infusion, maximum impact, and speediness of results. I urge you to adopt them. I will take the bulleted items to the UCC for prioritization.

I must call to your attention that a number of these projects require the Applications Group's involvement. We are attempting to use the following to prioritize projects for that group. With an open position and several other concerns effecting staffing, the group is at its limit and we need to be very careful about adding more to their task list or changing their priorities. The group can not take much more.

1 Required E-Mail Use by Faculty, Staff, and Administrators for Short Notes

This is a common technique for infusing computing into University life. It is suitable for short notes by even novice users. More experienced users can adapt it to longer messages.
2 “Hot Shots” for Senior Administrators

Adapting a technique from Professor Annette Lamb, Information Resources should schedule presenters for meetings of the President’s Cabinet with a kitchen timer set for a 10 minute presentation on one topic. When the timer chimes, the presenter immediately leaves. This will allow the Cabinet members to see what others are doing in information technology, will show that the Cabinet is serious about information technology, and will require only a tiny amount of time.

3 Creation of a University Gopher Server (Currently Underway)

We should develop a gopher server, a system that provides easy access to University data and selected systems such as the library OPAC, the base budget system, etc. (This concept has also been called a University BBS, i.e. an electronic bulletin board system.) This will allow students, faculty, and staff to easily access vast amounts of information in a very user friendly manner.

4 Online Purchase Requisitions (Currently Being Scheduled)

This will allow departments to enter purchase requisitions electronically.

5 SIS Enhancements (Currently Being Scheduled)

This will add enhancements to SIS. The SIS policy committee has decided against the installation of SIS+.

- Campus-Wide Calendar

This should be part of the University gopher and would allow departments to view the current calendar and schedule their own events with awareness of other University activities.

- Distribute Monthly Accounting Statements Electronically Only

Monthly accounting statements are now distributed on paper. The paper and the handling of the paper is costly.

- Degree Audit

Create a system that allows advisors to tell students what courses they must take to complete their degree requirements.

- Separate Academic Computing and Administrative Computing

In ways that I do not understand the proposer suggests that separating academic and administrative computing resources will allow the relaxation of security concerns for the academic resources and thus academic people will become computer literate.
- Enhance the Alumni and Development Systems

Our Development system was purchased as a stop gap measure and the same data must be entered into this and the Alumni system. The proposer suggests integrating the systems. I have suggested an alternate, less desirable, method to address this problem in the short term.

- Add CD-ROM drives to the Macintoshes in Black Hall.
- Upgrade Harvard Graphics in the Shaw/Smyser Labs
- Purchase LaserDisks for disk players that are currently at the University. $20,000 - $35,000.
- Purchase CD-ROMs $10,000 - $20,000.
- Purchase additional software for the computer labs. $12,000.
- Revive the DCSC as the Educational and Computer Resources Support Center to support faculty in developing instructional software and techniques
- Hire Professor Annette Lamb
- Publicize development tools and opportunities for faculty
- Upgrade the AutoCad Lab
- Install an automated library system in the Pre-Service Center
- On-line telephone and other directory services (part of the CWU gopher)
- On-line budget call
- On-line fixed assets management.
- On-line position control
December 28, 1993

TO: Deans’ Council

FROM: Thomas D. Moore, Provost

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

STATE OF WASHINGTON

Office of Financial Management

Box 43113 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3113 • (206) 733-3450

Sid Nesselroad
Faculty Senate
7509

December 23, 1993

TO: Agency Directors

FROM: Ruta Fanning
Director

SUBJECT: TAX AND FEE PROVISIONS OF INITIATIVE 601

A number of agencies have requested information from the Office of Financial Management (OFM) on provisions of Initiative 601 that impose new restrictions on certain tax and fee increases during the current biennium. All state agencies, colleges, and universities should be aware of these provisions and plan accordingly. The two sections of the law, which became effective December 2, 1993, read as follows:

Section 8
"No fee may increase in any fiscal year by a percentage in excess of the fiscal growth factor for that fiscal year without prior legislative approval."

Section 13
"(1) After the effective date of this section, the state may raise existing taxes, impose new taxes as authorized by law, or make revenue-neutral tax shifts only with approval of a majority of the voters at a November general election. The requirement for a vote at a November general election is in addition to any other requirements established by law. (2) This section expires on July 1, 1995."

Based on a preliminary review of the initiative, the Office of the Attorney General has advised OFM that the courts will likely interpret these sections to apply to all taxes and fees, not just to those that contribute to the state General Fund. Agencies should be especially cautious about raising non-budgeted fees, since any fee increase in excess of the fiscal growth factor that has not received legislative approval may be not be authorized under the initiative. Questions about whether specific charges must be defined as taxes or fees under Initiative 601 should be directed to the agency Assistant Attorney General.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Thomas Moore, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
    Mr. Courtney Jones, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
    Mr. Mark Young, Vice President for University Advancement
    Dr. Greg Trujillo, Vice President for Student Affairs
    Ms. Agnes Canedo, Special Assistant to the President
    Dr. Mary Marcy, Director of Governmental Relations
    Dr. Robert Brown, Acting Dean, College of Letters, Arts & Science
    Dr. Dave Dauwalder, Dean, School of Business & Economics
    Dr. Linda Murphy, Dean, School of Professional Studies
    Dr. Gerry Stacy, Dean of Graduate Studies & Research
    Dr. James Pappas, Dean of Academic Services
    Dr. Gary Lewis, Dean of Library Services
    Ms. Joan Mosebar, Acting Dean of Continuing Education

SUBJECT: Selected Freeze on Faculty and Staff Employment.

As you know, the Governor has released his budget. In that budget, he recommends that Central Washington University decrease 5.9 from its Annual FTE, and reduces our appropriations for 1994-95 by $831,000. Additionally, the Governor writes the following:

"Savings will be achieved through further reductions in administration, consolidation of programs, elimination of duplication, utilization of other resources, and increased productivity. It is intended that enrollment be maintained at budgeted levels."

Until we determine how we will effectively implement the proposed cuts if passed, all positions currently being advertised must be reviewed with me prior to making any employment commitment. I would like for us to establish some decision criteria at the Cabinet level to determine which faculty and staff positions are absolutely needed.

In reference to faculty positions, remember that next year we will only have four (4) faculty on leave while this year we had a total of twelve (12). Additionally, we must identify specific faculty needs vis-a-vis requirements for majors or our increasing need for tenure track at our lower division level. Your input, consultation, and help is needed so that we can make this next cut less traumatic.
Memorandum
December 29, 1993
Page 2

We have obviously exhausted any relatively easy alternatives for cuts we may have had. Through program review, we now must have our strategic planning process provide the necessary information to assist us in making some difficult programmatic reductions as we proceed.

Thank you very much for your continuing dedication and hard work.

Ivory V. Nelson
President

ge
December 1, 1993

Dr. Sidney Nesselroad  
Chair, Faculty Senate  
C.W.U.

Dear Sid:

The General Education Committee met and discussed our representation on the ad hoc committee dealing with the Speaking and Writing Across the Curriculum program. Tim Yoxtheimer and I will represent General Education. I may well prove to be a temporary representative, since I believe that it would be good for the committee to get as much representation as possible from outside the English Department, and I will be involved in SWAC in various ways anyhow. So perhaps later I will be able to convince some other member of the General Education Committee to replace me, but for now it is Tim and I.

Sincerely,

D. W. Cummings  
Professor English  
Chair, University General Education Committee
MEMORANDUM

TO:       Sue Tirotta, Administrative Assistant
           Faculty Senate

FROM:     Mark A. Young
           Vice President

DATE:     November 22, 1993

RE:       Faculty Senate Agenda Item for January 12

I understand from Barbara Radke that the Faculty Senate has a meeting scheduled for January 12. If possible, I would like to be placed on the agenda for that meeting so that I can present the "University Initiative Process." It would be helpful for the Faculty Senate to have an understanding of the need and the process we are establishing to conduct fund raising for university programs. Please confirm the date with Marilyn in my office.

mm
Memorandum

TO: Department Chairs, Unit Directors, Deans and Principal Budget Administrators

DATE: January 10, 1994

SUBJECT: Strategic Planning for 1994-2001

Our campus is beginning the second year of university wide Strategic Planning. A solid foundation was established last year and to the extent possible we have incorporated your comments and suggestions on the Strategic Planning process to simplify, integrate and provide for a comprehensive Strategic Plan with all of the planning components. With your suggestions and this comprehensive approach, we hope to build on last year’s work and establish a yearly updating process of the Strategic Plan which will become more effective, integrated and a routine matter.

This packet includes a Strategic Planning Calendar and the five components of our comprehensive Strategic Plan that you previously would have received from different administrators with various deadlines. The five Strategic Plan components are (1) Mission, Goals and Objectives; (2) Assessment; (3) Annual Budget Request (1994-95); (4) Biennial Budget Request (1995-97) and (5) Capital Request (1995-2001).

In view of the extensive operational data each department and unit collected last year and the ongoing work of the Management Information Systems (MIS) Committee, we are not asking you to provide departmental/unit data (except for budget) this year. However, please provide the MIS Committee with information on your specific departmental data needs for effective evaluation, and productivity/cost analysis (Agnes Canedo, Chair, 963-2111).

In the development of your Strategic Plan, we ask that consideration of your departmental direction (Mission, Goals and Objectives) form the basis for your planning. The other four components should reflect the practical translation and implementation of your departmental/unit Mission, Goals and Objectives.

Because of time constraints, we ask that you submit the Capital Component by the end of January so that the preliminary budget and the feasibility work for Capital can be completed in time for campus-wide consideration. The other four components of the Strategic Plan are due to your Dean or Principal Budget Administrator on March 18, 1994.

It is expected that your faculty and staff will participate in developing each component of the Strategic Plan. Thank you very much for your hard work and patience in helping us to implement a participatory Strategic Plan.

Very truly yours,

Ivory V. Nelson
President

cc Vice Presidents
Central Washington University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Cuts</th>
<th>1991-93</th>
<th>1993-95</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Increase</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td>-1.25%</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Increase</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tuition Rate-Setting Authority

In the last legislative session, higher education institutions were given local control of tuition. Previously, tuition had gone directly into the state general fund budget; now, it is retained by the institutions. However, the legislature still retains its authority to set tuition rates. There has been discussion that rate-setting authority should be moved from the legislature to the institutions, and Representative Ken Jacobsen is considering introducing a bill to that effect.

Points for consideration:

Local rate-setting authority firmly moves control of tuition away from the Legislature and toward institutions. It would give institutions the flexibility to charge different tuition rates for different courses or for different types of students (i.e., resident/nonresident, graduate/undergraduate) separate from the current legislative guidelines.

The relationship of tuition to Initiative 601 is still unclear. Tuition may, but does not necessarily, fall under the 601 restrictions. An Attorney General's opinion on this issue is expected within the next few months.

If institutions can gain rate-setting authority, and it is ruled they can raise tuition without 601 restrictions, the Legislature may falter in its commitment to supporting public higher education. Tuition could be involuntarily driven up as state monies become more scarce, the Legislature rationalizing that institutions could deflect the impact of state budget cuts with tuition hikes. This would raise serious questions about the nature of public and private higher education.

Senator Nita Rinehart is one of several prominent members of the Legislature who believe tuition rates should be set by the Legislature. A bill aimed at local rate-setting authority would have to get through her committee.

Central's Preliminary Position:
Central will not take a definitive stand on local rate-setting authority until the session begins. It is difficult to know whether 601 restrictions apply, and the political tenor of this legislative session suggests a cautious approach is wise. WSU is aggressively pursuing the issue; other institutions are using an approach similar to CWU's.
Contracting-Out Services

The Governor is preparing a civil service reform bill as a follow up to the reform bill he passed last session. It will contain some contracting-out provisions for state government, which will probably include higher education. WSU is also considering introducing a bill which will allow higher ed institutions to contract out.

**Central's Preliminary Position**

Central is in favor of legislation which would allow institutions to contract out, and will support the Governor's bill if it contains such provisions. However, administration and the unions worked closely together on initiatives 601 and 602, and we will continue a dialogue with the unions on any issues that directly impact them, including contracting out.

Contractor Bid Limits

Institutions of higher education currently are allowed to do work "in house" (with their own workers without putting a project up for competitive external bidding) if the project is under $25,000. There are expected to be two bills which will either raise or eliminate bid limits for higher education.

**Central's Preliminary Position**

Central supports the raising or elimination of bid limits. Elimination of bid limits would allow for small projects to be done quickly without going through a bidding process. Institutions could still contract out for projects when it was financially beneficial, but the increased discretion offered to managers would make the institutions more efficient and responsive.

Students on Governing Boards

The Washington Student Lobby is again expected to present a bill that would require that each institution of higher education have a student on its Board of Trustees or Board of Regents. Last year (and in several preceding years) a similar bill passed the State House by a large margin, but was stopped in the Senate Higher Education Committee. However, the Senate Higher Education Committee will have two new members this year, as Jim Jesernig and Peter Von Reichbauer have moved to other governmental positions.

**Central's Preliminary Position**

Central opposes the requirement of placing students on governing boards (as do all other public 4 year institutions), but will not testify against the legislation. The placing of students on governing boards is in direct conflict with the stated purpose of having an objective, removed citizen board rather than a board of...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. submits request to Dean/PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deans/PBA to V.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.P. to Budget Office/Evaluation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>Dept to Dean/PBA</td>
<td>Dept to Dean/PBA</td>
<td>Dept to Dean/PBA</td>
<td>Dept to Dean/PBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7</td>
<td>Dean/PBA to V.P.</td>
<td>Dept to Dean/PBA</td>
<td>Dept to V.P.</td>
<td>Dept to V.P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility Analysis presented President's Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20</td>
<td>V.P. to Strategic Planning Committee</td>
<td>Provost to Assessment Committee and V.P.s to responsible person</td>
<td>V.P to Budget Office</td>
<td>V.P to Budget Office</td>
<td>Hearings with Deans/PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Committee Forums</td>
<td>Assessment Committee Forums</td>
<td>May 6 Operating Budget Hearing</td>
<td>May 6 Operating Budget Hearing</td>
<td>April 29 Capital Budget Hearings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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interest groups. In many cases, students would have a conflict of interest if they were to serve on a board, particularly if institutions are given tuition rate-setting authority. In addition, it is likely that if students were given a guaranteed position on boards, other groups including faculty, civil service and administrative staff would also want a position on the board.

Native American Residency Requirements
A number of Native American tribes have traditional land domain in Washington state. A bill is expected to be introduced which would ensure that a member of a tribe whose traditional lands are in Washington is entitled to receive resident tuition rates at any institution of higher education in Washington, even if that tribal member does not live in Washington.

Central’s Preliminary Position
Central supports this legislation as a matter of equity and commitment to diversity.

Faculty Early Retirement
Several institutions, including Central, have discussed sponsoring legislation that would allow institutions to provide greater incentives for faculty early retirement.

Central’s Preliminary Position
Central supports any legislation allowing for more incentive and flexibility in this area. However, it is not clear that enough work has been done in the interim to have a bill move through the short supplemental session.

Faculty Collective Bargaining
Representative Heavey is again expected to sponsor a bill that would enable faculty to bargain collectively.

Central’s Preliminary Position
As in the past, Central opposes collective bargaining for faculty. Collective bargaining more often than not creates an adversarial climate between faculty and administration, rather than reinforcing the process of shared governance. In addition, the fiscal note attached to last year’s bill indicated that collective bargaining would cost state universities $2.4 million in the first biennium of its implementation, as institutions prepared for a more litigious approach to university governance.
MEMORANDUM

Date: December 23, 1993

To: Management Information System Committee

Subject: Examples of Basic Departmental Data Needs

The following are examples of **BASIC DATA** each department should have to conduct the usual departmental business:

**Basic Departmental Data - Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer**

A. **Students.**

1. Tenth day freeze report each quarter.
2. Number of majors each quarter.
3. Number of graduates each quarter.
4. Number of sections taught each quarter.
5. Number of students per section each quarter.
6. Number of small classes each quarter.
7. Number of non-majors taught each quarter.
8. Number of native students each quarter.
9. Number of transfer students each quarter.
10. Number of general education courses taught each quarter.
11. Number of major courses taught each quarter.
12. Number of service courses taught each quarter.
13. Number of graduate students by department each quarter.

B. **Faculty.**

1. Number of sections taught by each faculty member each quarter.
E. Library.

1. Number of volumes/serials/etc. for each program each year.
2. Status of library by program each year.

I am sure there are other items that are required. Please continue to define the additional needs.

Ivory V. Nelson
President

gc
MEMORANDUM

TO: Management Information System Committee
    Strategic Planning Committee
    Unified Personnel Committee

SUBJECT: Data Administration at Central Washington University

The Management Information System Committee has expressed concern over who is responsible for university data. In an open university atmosphere one office or individual does not have the responsibility for all data needs or distribution. Thus, it is necessary that I repeat who is responsible for designated components of data management.

The following individuals have primary responsibility for specific university operating systems:

Alumni System: Mark Young
Development Records System: Mark Young
Financial Aid Management System: Donna Croft
Financial Records System: Joe Antonich
Human Resources System: Ona Youmans
Loan Management System: Joe Antonich
On-line Library Catalog: Gary Lewis
On-line University Catalog: Carolyn Wells
Student Information System: Carolyn Wells

These data administrators are responsible for the accuracy of the data and for maintaining the security required by each system. Additionally, each is responsible for reporting needed data to external agencies, and they serve as the primary contact for assuring consistency in data taken from the system for which they are responsible. Institutional reports requiring data from multiple operating systems or multiple offices (IPEDS, etc.) will be prepared by Institutional Research with the assistance of the relevant data manager.

To facilitate the Management Information System review, the Management Information System Committee must consider the following basic data and information needs of the university:

1. Determine basic data requirements for each department/unit to conduct the business of the university. Define "basic" as data that every academic department or administrative unit must have. (Later we can define specific common needs for groups of units.)
October 20, 1993

MEMORANDUM

TO:    Ms. Kim Black
       Dr. Don Cocheba
       Mr. Rich Corona
       Ms. Donna Croft
       Dr. Connie Roberts
       Ms. Ona Youmans

SUBJECT: Unified Personnel System.

In order to strengthen our ability to make timely, informed decisions concerning university personnel, it is evident that we need to move to a more efficient system of data storage and retrieval. The present system whereby several offices establish and maintain personnel files appears to need improvement. To that end, I wish to establish a unified personnel system for the university.

I am pleased that each of you has agreed to serve on a task force to draft a design for an integrated personnel system and appoint Rich Corona as Chair.

Your draft plan should contain the recommendations concerning the following elements of such a system:

• Identify the office to be responsible for all personnel records.

• Determine the office which should accomplish data entry on personnel actions.

• Develop procedures for identifying the type of information needed for a comprehensive data base concerning part-time faculty, part-time staff, full-time faculty, and full-time staff at the time of initial employment.

• Determine where the official files or records of all personnel should be maintained.

• Resolve the issue of who should have access to what information concerning personnel.
Purpose: As a comprehensive university it behooves CWU to have a coordinated fundraising program in order to successfully accomplish its objectives. This fundraising initiative process is created to assist the university and its various components to be successful in its fundraising efforts. At the same time, it is designed to encourage a greater understanding and appreciation for the complex field of fundraising. One of its primary objectives is to reduce multiple solicitations on behalf of the University to its various constituencies thereby reducing frustration on behalf of donors and prospects and increasing successful solicitation ratio. It is intended that this process be accomplished in approximately six (6) weeks.

Assumptions: This initiative process assumes the proposed fundraising project is attempting to raise $10,000 or more. Projects needing fewer than $10,000 must only have approval of their respective dean or appropriate vice president. Generally, projects in excess of $10,000 will extend beyond a singular audience and require a longer timeframe. Use of any alumni or donor lists for any fundraising will require the approval of the Vice President for Advancement.

Step 1
The project initiator needs to develop a viable case statement that accurately describes the purpose of the project and how it links to the University mission and priorities. A brief case should be articulated within one paragraph. This is one of the most critical aspects of developing a meaningful fundraising project.

Step 2
Once a case statement is prepared it should be submitted on the required "Fundraising Request Form" to the Vice President for University Advancement to measure it against the University strategic plan and institutional mission and priorities. It will also be reviewed to determine the anticipated appeal and success relative to other funding needs.

Step 3
The vice president then consults with the appropriate dean, vice president or provost to validate its priority and constituent appeal. Also, the president reviews the request for appropriateness of mission and scope. Once validated by the appropriate administrator(s) the request with case statement is forwarded to the President's Cabinet for approval.

-- continued on reverse --
Step 4
Congruent with Step 3, project initiator identifies 3-4 potential volunteers suitable to lend advice, direction and support to the project. These must be specifically identified prior to moving to Step 5.

Step 5
Using appropriate development resources, prospect research and set asides, an evaluation of community perception and social interpretation is conducted by the Advancement Council.

Step 6
Key volunteer leadership (3-4 people) are identified and approved for initial contact by appropriate University personnel.

Step 7
With input from other administrative personnel, the Vice President for Advancement polishes case statement to blend with University priorities and presents final case statement to President.

Step 8
This is the time at which the president approves final case statement and determines who the appropriate person is to make the ask to volunteer leadership for their support and guidance.

Step 9
The CWU Foundation Development Committee evaluates the role of the foundation in the project and confirms whether it is worthy as a focus group, target interest group or other level of fundraising project. It is also determined if the foundation is required to allocate resources or expertise for the project. A recommendation is made to the CWU Foundation Board.

Step 10
The CWU Foundation Board considers the recommendation of the Development Committee as to the foundation's role in the fundraising project. Once approved by the CWU Foundation, the project initiator is informed as to what course of action is most suitable for resource acquisition and allocation of personnel and/or resources.

Step 11
Appropriate personnel make the ask to volunteers for their financial support and leadership for the project. If all volunteers respond affirmatively, the project follows its plan of action and timetable as previously approved.

Step 12
If one or more key leaders respond negatively, then project initiator goes back to Step 5 for further consideration of additional volunteers.

** Approved by President's Cabinet, November 8, 1993 **
FUNDRAISING INITIATIVE PROCESS

**Step 1**
What is the case?

No → Drop

**Step 2**
VP-Advancement review for strategic plan, mission, appeal

**Step 3**
Dean/VP/Provost Review

**Step 4**
Who are your 3 potential lead volunteers?

**Step 5**
President's Cabinet Review

Review through:
1) set aside of key individuals
2) research potential to make/get lead gift
3) community perception of project
4) advancement council review of social interpretation
5) preliminary determination for classification - define "if statements"

**Step 6**
Have you validated your 3 potential lead volunteers?

**Step 7**
Review and polish case

Finalize case statement

**Step 8**
Tentative Approval for Fundraising Initiative

**Step 9**
CWU Foundation Development Committee to confirm
1) focus group
2) target
3) other
and to determine resource acquisition or allocation

**Step 10**
Foundation Board Approval

**Step 11**
Make the ask

**Step 12**
Re-visit key prospects

No → Make the ask

Approved by President's Cabinet on November 8, 1993
MEMORANDUM

TO: Management Information System Committee  
   Strategic Planning Committee  
   Unified Personnel Committee

SUBJECT: Data Administration at Central Washington University

The Management Information System Committee has expressed concern over who is responsible for university data. In an open university atmosphere one office or individual does not have the responsibility for all data needs or distribution. Thus, it is necessary that I repeat who is responsible for designated components of data management.

The following individuals have primary responsibility for specific university operating systems:

- Alumni System: Mark Young  
- Development Records System: Mark Young  
- Financial Aid Management System: Donna Croft  
- Financial Records System: Joe Antonich  
- Human Resources System: Ona Youmans  
- Loan Management System: Joe Antonich  
- On-line Library Catalog: Gary Lewis  
- On-line University Catalog: Carolyn Wells  
- Student Information System: Carolyn Wells

These data administrators are responsible for the accuracy of the data and for maintaining the security required by each system. Additionally, each is responsible for reporting needed data to external agencies, and they serve as the primary contact for assuring consistency in data taken from the system for which they are responsible. Institutional reports requiring data from multiple operating systems or multiple offices (IPEDS, etc.) will be prepared by Institutional Research with the assistance of the relevant data manager.

To facilitate the Management Information System review, the Management Information System Committee must consider the following basic data and information needs of the university:

1. Determine basic data requirements for each department/unit to conduct the business of the university. Define "basic" as data that every academic department or administrative unit must have. (Later we can define specific common needs for groups of units.)
2. Determine how often each department/unit needs this basic data to conduct the business of the university.

3. Determine which data administrator has responsibility for the needed data.

4. Establish a quarterly schedule whereby the data administrator will create a frozen file and download the basic data to create a MIS database.

Once the frozen file is downloaded, the primary repository for the data is Institutional Research. This data will then be more available to everyone. Institutional Research is responsible for conducting studies, preparing reports, and maintaining an information file on disk and hard copy for administrators and other users. The frozen files become the "official" university information.

Institutional Research will also conduct studies to determine what additional information or data is needed for all academic and administrative units to make informed decisions. The Management Information System (MIS) Committee will identify possible areas for Institutional Research to study over the next year. Data needs identified through Institutional Research studies will be reviewed by the MIS Committee. After MIS Committee review, the process to deliver the identified data will be the same as the process for developing the basic data needs.

The role of Information Resources in this process is to provide technical advice and to assist data administrators in implementation, enabling them to deliver downloaded material for identified basic and additional needs. Information Resources will identify and assist in a design or delivery mode that is cost effective and simple to use. In addition, they should determine the feasibility of storing MIS on the VAX.

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a mechanism to produce the data needed to make informed decisions in an easy to use and accessible format. At the same time, we will not compromise the integrity of the data or the security of the operating systems. If this information needs further clarification or explanation, I am available.

Thank you very much for your hard work on this most important issue.

Ivy V. Nelson
President

cc:
Dr. Tom Moore, Provost
Dr. Greg Trujillo, Vice President Student Affairs
Dr. Sidney Nesselroad, Chair Faculty Senate
Mr. Mark Young, Vice President University Advancement
Mr. Courtney Jones, Vice President Business Affairs
Deans
Department Chairs
Directors
MIS Committee Meeting
January 10, 1994
Information Resources
Jim Haskett

What is the internet? It is hardware and software that forms a world wide computer network that you can use knowing very little about it or how it works.

What can I do with it? You can send and receive electronic mail, transfer simple and even very complex files, login to distant computers where you have an account, access library card catalogs, download databases and free software, and locate that old school chum you've lost track of. In particular, you can access so much information that you will special software (e.g. a Gopher) to help you handle it.

How much does it cost me to use it? Nothing! The Graduate School, the Library, Information Resources, and NSF are baring all of the costs. Special thanks goes also to Professor Charlie Rubin.

How do I use it? Get a VAX account from Information Resources in Naneum, get a book (e.g. The Internet Passport at The University Store or enter "gopher gopher.NWNet.net" on the VAXs and look for the on-line Passport), but most importantly, Just Do It!

What is a Gopher? A Gopher server is a bunch of computer files and some software that knows where those files are stored. A Gopher client is some software that tells the server what information you want to see and displays it in a simple manner.

Does CWU have a Gopher? We already have a client for the VAXs. We are now building a prototype server. See your Dean if you'd like to be involved in the prototype.

What will our Gopher server be used for? It is our intention to build a server so that each University department will "own" part of the server to use as it sees fit. It will someday soon allow you to see the Library card catalog, the base budget system, and maybe even the phone book. You will be able to download the MIS data.

What hardware and software do I have to have to use the Gopher and Internet? The oldest terminal or microcomputer that you can find that can be connected to the VAXs will work. Everything we do today can be done with the simplest equipment.
A Typical Gopher Server Menu

Internet Gopher Information Client 2.0 pl10

Root gopher server: gopher2.tc.umn.edu

--> 1. Information About Gopher/
   2. Computer Information/
   3. Discussion Groups/
   4. Fun & Games/
   5. Internet file server (ftp) sites/
   6. Libraries/
   7. News/
   8. Other Gopher and Information Servers/
   9. Phone Books/
  10. Search Gopher Titles at the University of Minnesota <?>
  11. Search lots of places at the University of Minnesota <?>
  12. University of Minnesota Campus Information/

Press ? for Help, q to Quit

Using the Central Washington University Experimental Gopher Client to Download Data to the VAXs from The Chronicle of Higher Education

The Computer Types the following: You reply:
(blank) Login to the CWU VAXs
$ dir
$ gopher UWIN.U.Washington.Edu
9
1
2
5
s
<Return>
[PageDown: <SPACE>] [Help: ?] [Exit: u]
Press ? for Help, q to Quit, u to go up a menu
Really quit (y/n)? y
$ dir
ALMANAC: type ALMANAC:

The CWU Gopher Client is still being tested. Use it at your own risk. We do not guarantee it and will support it only after it is announced.
A Mockup of the Internal Prototype
Central Washington University Gopher Server

Internet Gopher Information Client 2.0 pl10

Root gopher server: gopher.CWU.Edu

1. THE RULES FOR USING THE CWU GOPHER/
2. News/
3. Information about Gopher/
5. Libraries and Reference Information/
--> 6. About CWU/

Press ? for Help, q to Quit  Page: 1/1

Internet Gopher Information Client 2.0 pl10

About CWU

1. Information About the University/
--> 2. The Management Information System/

Press ? for Help, q to Quit  Page: 1/1

Internet Gopher Information Client 2.0 pl10

The Management Information System

--> 1. About the Information Provider/
2. 10th Day Freeze/
3. Base Budget.

Press ? for Help, q to Quit  Page: 1/1
Using the
Central Washington University
Experimental Gopher Client
to View to
The Chronicle of Higher Education

The Computer Types the following:

You reply:

(blank)

$ 9
9. Other Gopher Servers/
1. All the Gopher Servers in the World/
2. ACADEME THIS WEEK (Chronicle of Higher Education)/
6. JOB OPENINGS in Academe
1. SEARCH using The Chronicle's list of jobs/
1. Faculty and research positions/
1. Humanities/
6. Philosophy/
7. Multiple Positions -- Kenyon College -- OH.
Press ? for Help, q to Quit, u to go up a menu

The CWU Gopher Client is still under development. Use it at your own risk. We do not guarantee it and will support it only after it is publicly announced.

To Use the
Library of Congress

The Computer Types the following:

You reply:

(blank)

$ 1
1. Library of Congress Catalog
1. BOOKS: English language books
TO SEARCH, USE FIRST WORDS OF: EXAMPLES:
subject -----------------> browse solar energy b clymer
B06+Clymer A-cars//(TITL=1) quit
1.2
12 Comments and Logoff
1.2 To logoff.