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ROLL CALL
Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Caples, Carbaugh, Chambers, Christie, Donahoe, Gleason, Myers, Roberts, Rubin, Sahlstrand and Uebelacker.

CHANGES TO AGENDA
Move report from Residence Hall Council to directly after Chair's report.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
*MOTION NO. 2998 Beverly Heckart moved and Lisa Weyandt seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the February 22, 1995, Faculty Senate meeting with the following change: page 4, MOTION NO. 2997, change "...be instructed to communication..." to "...be instructed to communicate..." Motion passed.

COMMUNICATIONS
None

REPORTS
1. CHAIR

*MOTION NO. 2999 Beverly Heckart moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to suspend Faculty Senate Bylaws section III.A. (Officers of the Senate, Procedures for Election), concerning election of officers at the final meeting of Winter quarter, until the first meeting of Spring quarter, April 5, 1995: "Principal officers of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the Senate at the last regular meeting of the Winter Quarter of each academic year. Only elected Senators, including those newly elected to a term beginning June 15, are eligible to serve as principal officers of the Senate. Principal officers to be nominated and elected, in the order named, shall be a Chair, a Vice Chair, a Secretary and two at-large Executive Committee members. No more than one principal officer shall be from any one department..." Motion passed.

-Chair Nesselroad reported that the following Senators have accepted nomination to the 1995-96 Faculty Senate Executive Committee: CHAIR - Hugh Spall, Business Administration; VICE CHAIR - Bobby Cummings, English; SECRETARY - Charles Rubin, Geology; AT LARGE MEMBERS (2) - Susan Donahoe, Education; Ken Gamon, Math; Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science; Rob Perkins, BEAM; Lisa Weyandt, Psychology; PAST CHAIR - Sidney Nesselroad, Music. The Chair asked for additional nominations from the floor. None were forthcoming.

*MOTION NO. 3000 Ken Gamon moved and Robert Fordan seconded a motion to close nominations for the 1995-96 Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Motion passed.

- Chair Nesselroad announced that the following faculty members have agreed to serve on the 1994-95 Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators: Dan Fennerty, Education (CPS); Allen Gulezian, Business Administration (SBE); Ken Hammond, Geography (CLAS). The Chair entertained any objections to this membership; none were forthcoming.

-Chair Nesselroad reported that he has nearly completed his communication to the Board of Trustees, as instructed by Faculty Senate Motion No. 2997 (2/22/95).
1. **CHAIR, continued**

The Chair reported that he attended the Western States Association of Faculty Governance (WSAFG) annual meeting in Denver, Colorado, from March 2-4. The conference was attended by about 100 faculty governance representatives from ten western states. There were presentations on a wide variety of current topics, including roles for faculty in influencing state legislation and public opinion on higher education as well as how faculty senates can become involved in university strategic planning, program assessment, pluralism and multiculturalism, and faculty development systems. The Chair recommended that Central's Faculty Senate become a regular member of the WSAFG, as this organization is becoming increasingly active and influential and has plans to begin an Internet communications bulletin board on faculty governance.

Chair Nesselroad reported that Deans' Council received a recommendation from James Pappas, Dean of Academic Services, that the university accept the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP). The Chair explained that CLEP grants college credit to students for learning that has been attained outside the traditional college or university setting. This credit-by-examination program is sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board and is successfully utilized at other universities. Chair Nesselroad explained that CLEP is also consonant with the legislative interest in time-to-degree. Provost Moore plans to distribute the CLEP recommendation to departments through their respective deans. After departmental review, it is expected that the proposal will be returned to Deans' Council and then be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for approval.

-Deans' Council is considering the Classroom Management and Scheduling Protocol draft recommended by the Classroom Management Protocol Committee (members: Phil Backlund, John Bull, Lin Douglas, John Lasik, John Ressler, Duane Skeen, Steve Varga, Carolyn Wells - Chair). Chair Nesselroad explained that the Senate Academic Affairs Committee was charged earlier this year with developing a scheduling protocol, but when it was found that another committee was already working on the project the charge to the Academic Affairs Committee was rescinded. Chair Nesselroad stated that although the new protocol would spread classes more evenly over the day, scheduling of departmental and university committee meetings might become extremely difficult. Deans' Council does not want to send the protocol to the Faculty Senate at this time. A Senator recalled that the last time the scheduling protocol was revised it was brought to the Faculty Senate from Deans' Council as a report.

-Chair Nesselroad reported that he received questions from some faculty members who were concerned regarding this year's procedure for consideration for promotion. The Chair stated that although Provost Moore has expressed a preference for replacing the current system of prioritization with a criterion-based system, the Provost has assured him that the provisions of the Faculty Code will be honored. The Chair added that it is the position of the Provost's Office that all who meet the criteria for promotion will be promoted, and budget considerations have not been and will not be a cause for limiting the number of promotions granted. President Nelson supported this statement and, in response to a Senator's question, stated that no promotions would be granted without an appropriate salary increment.

2. **RESIDENCE HALL COUNCIL**

Residence Hall Council chairman Logan Aimone distributed information and nomination forms concerning the National Residence Hall Honorary (NRHH). Mr. Aimone explained that C.W.U. affiliated with NRHH in December. The NRHH recognizes the top 1% of students (24 eligible at C.W.U.) who live in residence halls and have demonstrated outstanding service and leadership skills. Mr. Aimone asked for nominations from faculty members, with the following qualifications: 1) nominee must have a cumulative GPA of 2.5 or better at the end of at least two quarters at Central; 2) nominee must have resided in the residence halls during the past two quarters and must currently be residing in a Central residence hall; and 3) nominee must have exhibited outstanding leadership and service in the residence hall system or the community.

Registrar Carolyn Wells pointed out that student GPA is confidential information that cannot be released through the Registrar's office. Mr. Aimone stated that faculty may nominate any worthy student who is active in club or departmental activities, and the Residence Hall Council will take responsibility for contacting the student, determining their interest and basic eligibility, and sending them
2. **RESIDENCE HALL COUNCIL, continued**

A formal application. In response to questions, Mr. Aimone stated that selection criteria may be based on scholarship as well as leadership activities. Additional nomination forms are available in the Residence Hall Council office (Stephens-Whitney).

3. **PRESIDENT**

President Ivory Nelson reported that legislative bills must pass out of their house of origin by March 15 to remain active. Two main tuition bills are being worked on: 1) HB 1909 would allow local tuition setting by the institutions with an annual cap set by the legislature, and 2) SB 5325 defines tuition in terms of "instructional costs" set by the legislature at a rate equal to the "growth of personal income" in the state while codifying a requirement that state general fund dollars be offset by the increase in tuition. There is still great concern among legislators regarding the length of time it takes a student to get through the universities and get a degree. Although the Higher Education Coordinating (HEC) Board and a panel from the research universities have tried to address the complex causes of the time-to-degree problems, this will likely remain an issue of concern to legislators, and they will continue to monitor the progress being made by the universities to shorten the time to degree. SSB 5924 would require higher tuition to be paid by any student who has credits in excess of 115% of the degree requirements, with the expectation that higher tuition will speed graduation. Legislators remain concerned regarding state funding of remedial education in higher education, and SHB 1336 would require universities to report remedial education enrollments in a uniform format to the HEC Board. HB 1845 would make optional the university's mandatory $25 student health care fee; since C.W.U.'s Health Center receives about 14,000 visits per year, funding could become a problem if this bill passes. SB 5605 would further restrict alcohol use within university housing but would present enforcement problems.

It is anticipated that the House budget will be released in mid-March and that it will contain greatly reduced operating allocations in comparison to the budget proposed by Governor Lowry. President Nelson pointed out that since capital budgets are a function of operating budget allocations, a reduction in operating budget would be reflected in capital projects. It is uncertain at this time whether the university's supplemental budget request will be approved.

4. **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

No report

5. **BUDGET COMMITTEE**

Budget Committee member Ken Gamon delivered the following report, recommendation and motion:

**RATIONALE AND RESULTING MOTION PASSED BY THE FACULTY SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE**

As compared to the 1994-95 fiscal budget, the C.W.U. Administration has requested a decrease of 6 FTE faculty positions for the 1995-96 fiscal year. Simultaneously, and again as compared to the 1994-95 fiscal year budget, the C.W.U. Administration has requested a net increase of 8 FTE professional and staff positions. This amounts to a 2.14% decrease in faculty positions and a 2.09% increase in professional and staff positions:

[see table on next page]
5. **BUDGET COMMITTEE, continued**

Comparison of Administration Requested 1995-96 Staffing Levels with 1994-95 Staffing Levels for C.W.U.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>1994-95</th>
<th>1995-96</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>% Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff &amp; Other Professionals*</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALARY (in thousands):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,964</td>
<td>$15,268</td>
<td>($696)</td>
<td>-4.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff &amp; Other Professionals*</td>
<td>$12,227</td>
<td>$12,533</td>
<td>$306</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Financial Management
* Classified Staff and Other Professionals are combined because shifts between these two categories are not relevant for the comparisons presented here.

The increase in professional and staff positions appears to be contrary to the State Legislature's intent that budget cuts should be made in professional and staff positions rather than in faculty positions. Furthermore, reducing faculty positions while increasing the number of students being served is contrary to good management principles and will hinder the long term potential for realizing C.W.U.'s goals. (From Fall quarter 1992 to Fall quarter 1993, C.W.U.'s student credit hours increased 11,802, approximately 11.6%). From Fall quarter 1993 to Fall quarter 1994, C.W.U.'s student credit hours increased an additional 1502, approximately 1.3%).

With these facts in mind, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee unanimously passed the following motion on March 2, 1995, and recommends that the Faculty Senate pass the same motion:

DRAFT MOTION: [The Faculty Senate Budget Committee] recommends that, in order to meet the servicing needs of the increased number of students, FTE faculty positions be increased during the next biennium, rather than decreased. Funding for these positions should be facilitated by a hiring freeze in professional and staff positions that are not a part of the instruction (Program 10) budget. Funding for these positions should not come from the Library (Program 50) budget. Furthermore, these changes should be real, i.e., creative accounting should not be used to just give the appearance of an absolute and relative increase in faculty positions.

President Ivory Nelson explained that the apparent increase in classified/professional staff compensation was accounted for by 1) mandatory salary step increases to eligible civil service employees as well as 2) a legislative requirement to move about 30 classified employees to administrative exempt rankings. The President recommended caution to those reaching conclusions based on budgeted amounts and stated that actual expenditures are more accurate. Senators questioned the soundness of the figures presented and whether the appearance that the university has hired administrators and staff at the expense of faculty could be an artifact of bookkeeping. Senator Gamon stated that the Budget Committee met with Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs Courtney Jones, Provost Thomas Moore and Assistant to the Provost Vern LaBay in compiling its figures, and the Committee feels confident with the conclusions reached. The President asked the members of the Budget Committee to meet with him before bringing their motion formally before the Senate, and he stated that if the Committee's concerns in this area proved genuine, they would be addressed.
6. **CODE COMMITTEE**

   Code Committee chair Beverly Heckart reported that there will be a public Code Hearing on Wednesday, April 12, 1995, from 3:00-5:00 p.m. in SUB 206/207. Notices of proposed Faculty Code changes will be mailed to all faculty members and administrators at least 10 calendar days before the hearing.

7. **CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

   No report

8. **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

   Personnel Committee chair Blaine Wilson presented for discussion the Committee's report on proposed tenure and promotion guidelines. He explained that the Personnel Committee was charged with development of criteria-based, rather than rank-ordered, guidelines for the granting of tenure and promotion.

   **DRAFT: TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES**

   **TENURE**

   **Definition:**

   Tenure is a means to certain ends, specifically (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability.

   Tenure entitles a faculty member to continuous appointment in a specific department or section of the university or in the university as a whole, and retention of rank without discriminatory reduction of salary and without dismissal except for adequate reason determined according to the requirements of due process as set forth in the Faculty Code.

   The granting of tenure is a discretionary decision. Tenure may be granted to faculty members of such character and ability that the university, so far as its needs, resources and state laws permit, can justifiably undertake to employ them for the rest of their academic careers. Such a decision must be considered carefully. The granting of tenure shall be a specific act, even more significant than promotion in academic rank, and should be exercised only after careful consideration of the faculty member's scholarly qualifications, teaching ability, character, and other qualifications, such as public service specifically related to the university's needs. Only ranked faculty members as listed in Section 4.20 of the Faculty Code are eligible for tenure.

   **Granting of Tenure:**

   Normally tenure should not be granted before the seventh year of employment—-a minimum of six years of professional experience is required. A decision on tenure must be made in the sixth year unless an extension is granted. (Extensions may be considered for such reasons as maternity leave, major illness, or other situations which required a faculty person's extended absence.)

   **Evaluation for Tenure:**

   Only tenured faculty may participate in tenure evaluations. Parameters, compatible with the existing salary adjustment criteria, shall be established by the university community which describe the general tenure criteria. Departments will establish specific criteria within the university parameters. Tenure criteria will be made available to faculty candidates during the selection process.

   Granting of tenure is the responsibility of an academic community. As such, it must be overt. All letters and supporting documents submitted by members of the academic community (including students who wish to participate) must be signed.
8. **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE, continued**

**Peer Review:**
A schedule for the completion of tasks shall be included in the *Faculty Code*.

Deans will maintain the official file on all candidates for tenure at the school or college level.

Each year during the probationary period, after required student evaluations (all classes all year) have been completed, Deans will inform departments of the status of tenure track members and request that the updating of the official files be completed by established deadlines.

Deans will inform candidates that their files for the current year are ready for inspection.

Before files are submitted for peer review, candidates review files and submit additional material as desired.

Each year during the probationary period all tenured members of the department who vote or wish to vote on a candidacy must review the record and prepare a written evaluation. Evaluations are to be based on established departmental criteria and should explicitly address the question of excellence. Departments inform candidates, in writing, and candidates respond in writing as desired.

Department or committee meet to make renewal/tenure decision.

All materials submitted in the course of the peer review are forwarded to the Dean by the department chair. The chair's only function at this point is to transmit the information. Any substantive input by the chair must come as part of the peer review.

The decision on renewal and tenure rests with the department. Deans review the file for completeness and may raise questions involving equity or due process, but on substantive questions the outcome of the peer review is final.

While the hiring, granting of career status (or tenure) and promotion in rank are functions of the university administration and define the legal relationship between the institution and the employee, at the department level tenure retains its collegial meaning. When a department recommends the hiring of a candidate, it certifies to the administration that it accepts the finding of the discipline that the candidate is fully qualified to enter the field of specialization and that they, as a scholarly community, would welcome the applicant as a member. In so doing, the community of scholars assumes a responsibility to bring the new employee to full membership in the community. It is the responsibility of the tenured faculty to help the new member effectively progress toward tenure. This is the essence of peer review which, at the end of the university's official probationary period, should see the new employee fully integrated into the department as an active contributing member.

If the initial assessment of a candidate should prove to be incompatible with the standards of the academic community, it is imperative for the candidate, the department, and the university that it be discovered and dealt with as soon as possible. For this reason a third year comprehensive review will be required. The task will be assigned to a member or committee and a report will be prepared. The objective is to pull together the discreet information generated during each of the first three years so that trends over time can be discovered and taken into account. The report will be distributed to all tenured faculty, who are eligible to vote, and each will either endorse the report or submit a written response. On the basis of the comprehensive review, the personnel committee or department will meet and make an interim recommendation. It is expected that any mistakes in hiring will be corrected at this point. When the
8. **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE, continued**

interim review reveals remediable problems, the department must establish a mentoring program and inform the candidate and the dean.

**PROMOTION**

Since promotion to Associate Professor normally coincides with the granting of tenure, the evaluation process for promotion is part of the tenure evaluation process at the departmental level.

Once tenure has been granted, the official files for each faculty member will be maintained at the school or college level and they will be updated on a continuing basis through an institutionalized data reporting/gathering process.

When a faculty member has met minimum time in rank requirements as specified in the *Faculty Code*, the Dean will notify the department by letter and inform the campus community by circulating a list of those eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

Candidates for promotion examine, correct and amend official files.

Departments conduct a peer review based upon established departmental criteria

Majority position of the department is drafted, approved and forwarded to the Dean.

Deans review the files of those recommended and receive appeals.

Deans meet with department representatives to verify that approved candidates meet all university and college requirements.

Deans submit list of approved candidates to Provost.

Provost reviews lists and prepares cost analysis.

Provost informs candidates:

1) Promotion approved
2) Promotion recommended but delayed due to budgetary constraints.
3) Not recommended with detailed explanation to candidate and department.

President and Board of Trustees approve.

* * * * *

Dr. Wilson explained that the major differences between the proposed policy and current policy are 1) extensions for granting of tenure beyond the sixth year of employment could be accepted under certain conditions (e.g., maternity leave, major illness); 2) only tenured faculty would participate in tenure evaluations; 3) each department member, including the department chair, would be limited to one vote in the peer review process; and 4) a stronger commitment to the peer mentoring and review processes would be encouraged. President Nelson reminded the Senate that Washington state does not recognize de facto tenure after six years of employment. Code Committee Chair Beverly Heckart reported that the following Faculty Code change (as well as several other changes concerning tenure and promotion) will be proposed at the April 12, 1995, Code hearing: section 5.25.C. - (add words) "As a general rule, faculty members
8. **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE, continued**

appointed to the academic rank of Assistant Professor or higher who, at the time of appointment, have completed three (3) years of full-time service at the rank of instructor or higher at other institutions of higher learning, or three (3) years full-time service in other appropriate work, may be granted tenure effective at the beginning of the academic year following a three (3) year probationary period.  

Dr. Wilson requested that Senators distribute the draft report to their departments for comments.

Dr. Wilson reported that he will be on research leave during Spring quarter, so written comments on the draft should be sent to Personnel Committee chair-elect Rex Wirth, Political Science (Mailstop 7578).

9. **PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

No report

10. **UNIVERSITY COMPUTING COMMITTEE**

University Computing Committee chair David Kaufman, Sociology, reported that university records show 27 faculty members without computers. He explained that the records do not take into account those using sub-standard software or hardware or show availability of VAX/Internet access. The Provost's Ad Hoc Instructional Computing Committee (Charles Rubin, Geology, Chair) recommended earlier this year that support be strengthened for development of courses utilizing computing technology.

In response to questions, Dr. Kaufman explained that the Provost's Ad Hoc Committee was assembled to complete specific tasks of fund distribution and establishment of evaluation criteria for instructional computing requests, and the Committee was disbanded after those goals were accomplished.

Senators asked questions concerning the mechanism for fund allocation for instructional versus non-instructional computing. President Nelson responded that requests for computing funds are developed under the Computing and Telecommunication Services (CTS) strategic plan and forwarded to the University Budget Committee for review. Instructional computing allocations are largely based on the Provost's request for funding. Dr. Kaufman suggested that departments review the evaluation criteria for instructional computing requests distributed to them by the Provost's Ad Hoc Committee during Fall quarter and include an instructional computing element in the development of departmental strategic plans.

Dr. Kaufman asked Senators for specific questions they would like to have addressed by the University Computing Committee. Senators asked 1) if any organized evaluation is being made of the level of student and faculty computing skills, 2) how many faculty members take advantage of, or are realistically able to take advantage of, computing instruction offered through CTS and whether this training is effective, 3) if work is under way to establish an office (with instructional technologists) to support faculty in developing courses that utilize computing technology, 4) how faculty can keep abreast of current computing technology and avoid deterioration of their computing skills, 5) how faculty can obtain the released time necessary for development of sophisticated courses that utilize computing, 6) how remedial computing work for those students who require it can best be supported and accomplished, and 7) how faculty who are currently well versed in instructional computing can be utilized as an internal university resource to help support their peers.

**OLD BUSINESS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS**

None

**ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

* * * * * NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 5, 1995 * * * * *
I. ROLL CALL
II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 22, 1995
IV. COMMUNICATIONS
V. REPORTS

1. CHAIR
   - MOTION: SUSPEND BYLAWS (attached)
   - Nominations to 1995-96 Faculty Senate Executive Committee (updated roster attached)

2. PRESIDENT

3. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Charles McGehee, Chair)

4. BUDGET COMMITTEE (Don Cocheba, Chair)

5. CODE COMMITTEE (Beverly Heckart, Chair)

6. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (Clara Baker, Chair)

7. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Blaine Wilson, Chair)
   - Draft Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - for discussion and comment only (handout at meeting)

8. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Bobby Cummings, Chair)

9. UNIVERSITY COMPUTING COMMITTEE (David Kaufman, Chair)

10. RESIDENCE HALL COUNCIL (Logan Aimone)
    - National Residence Hall Honorary

VI. OLD BUSINESS
VII. NEW BUSINESS
VIII. ADJOURNMENT

*** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 5, 1995 ***
MOTION: Suspend Faculty Senate Bylaws section III.A. (Officers of the Senate, Procedures for Election), concerning election of officers at the final meeting of Winter quarter, until the first meeting of Spring quarter, April 5, 1995:

"Principal officers of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the Senate at the last regular meeting of the Winter Quarter of each academic year. Only elected Senators, including those newly elected to a term beginning June 15, are eligible to serve as principal officers of the Senate. Principal officers to be nominated and elected, in the order named, shall be a Chair, a Vice Chair, a Secretary and two at-large Executive Committee members. No more than one principal officer shall be from any one department."

Current Executive Committee members:
Sidney Nesselroad (Music), CHAIR
Bobby Cummings (English), VICE CHAIR
Dieter Romboy (Foreign Languages), SECRETARY
Barry Donahue (Computer Science), AT-LARGE MEMBER
Charles Rubin (Geology), AT-LARGE MEMBER
# 1995-96 FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Years to Serve</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deborah Medlar</td>
<td>Gary Heesacker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>James Sahlstrand</td>
<td>Margaret Sahlstrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Michael Glcason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hugh Spall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Connie Nott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rob Perkins</td>
<td>Catherine Bertelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Robert Fordan</td>
<td>George Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Michelle Kidwell</td>
<td>Wolfgang Franz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peter Saunders</td>
<td>Cindy Emmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Luetta Monson</td>
<td>Dale Otto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Susan Donahoe</td>
<td>Carol Butterfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minerva Caples</td>
<td>Loretta Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bobby Cummings</td>
<td>Terry Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Steven Olson</td>
<td>Stella Moreno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Morris Uebelacker</td>
<td>John Alvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Charles Rubin</td>
<td>James Hinthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dan Ramsdell</td>
<td>Beverly Heckart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carolyn Schactler</td>
<td>Carolyn Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Walter Kaminski</td>
<td>Bruce Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Justice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>James Roberts</td>
<td>C. Wayne Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thomas Yeh</td>
<td>Gerard Hogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Robert Myers</td>
<td>Patrick Owens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ken Gamon</td>
<td>Jim Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sidney Nesselroad</td>
<td>Andrew Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eric Roth</td>
<td>Geoffrey Boers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Webster Hood</td>
<td>Peter Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vince Nethery</td>
<td>Robert Gregson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Walter Arlt</td>
<td>Stephen Jeffries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sharon Rosell</td>
<td>Michael Braunstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Terry DeVietti</td>
<td>Roger Fouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lisa Weyandt</td>
<td>Stephanie Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>William Benson</td>
<td>Katarin Jurich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jim Hawkins</td>
<td>Mark Zetterberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ivory Nelson</td>
<td>Thomas Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCWU/BOD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Chambers</td>
<td>Greg Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shawn Christie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristan Starbuck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(February 27, 1995 2ROSTER.95)
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☑ Walter ARLT
☑ Linda BEATH
☐ Minerva CAPLES
☐ Robert CARBAUGH
☐ Matt CHAMBERS
☐ Shawn CHRISTIE
☑ Bobby CUMMINGS
☐ Terry DeVIETTI
☐ Susan DONAHUE
☐ Barry DONAHUE
☐ Robert FORDAN
☐ Ken GAMON
☐ Michael GLEASON
☐ Jim HAWKINS
☐ Webster HOOD
☐ Walter KAMINSKI
☐ Charles MCGEHEE
☐ Deborah MEDLAR
☐ Robert MYERS
☐ Ivory NELSON
☐ Connie NOTT
☐ Sidney NESSELROAD
☐ Vince NETHERY
☐ Steve OLSON
☐ Rob PERKINS
☐ Dan RAMSDELL
☐ Dieter ROMBOY
☐ James ROBERTS
☐ Sharon ROSELL
☐ Eric ROTH
☐ Charles RUBIN
☐ James SAHLSTRAND
☐ Carolyn SCHACTLER
☐ Hugh SPALL
☐ Kristan STARBUCK
☐ Morris UEBELACKER
☐ Lisa WEYANDT [pron. Y'-ANT]
☐ Rex WIRTH
☐ Thomas YEH

☐ Stephen JEFFERIES
☐ Dan FENNERTY
☐ Carol BUTTERFIELD
☐ Don COCHEBA
☐ Greg CARLSON

☐ Roger FOUTS
☐ Dale OTTO
☐ George TOWN

☐ James HARPER

☐ Mark ZETTERBERG
☐ Peter BURKHOLDER
☐ Brue BARNES
☐ David KAUFMAN
☐ Gary HEESACKER
☐ Patrick OWENS
☐ Thomas MOORE

☐ Andrew SPENCER
☐ Robert GREGSON
☐ Terry MARTIN
☐ Cathy BERTELSON
☐ Beverly HECKART
☐ Stella MORENO
☐ C. Wayne JOHNSTON
☐ Michael BRAUNSTEIN
☐ Geoffrey BOERS
☐ James HINTHORNE
☐ Margaret SAHLSTRAND
☐ Carolyn THOMAS

☐ John ALWIN
☐ Roger FOUTS

☐ Jerry HOGAN

(ROSTERS/ROLLCALL.94; February 1, 1995)
March 8, 1995

Date

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Logan Aimone  student
Jim Hackett
Carolyn Willet
Barbara Radke
Regency Steward
David Kaufman

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.
NOMINATIONS FOR NEW NRHH MEMBERS ARE BEING ACCEPTED NOW!

For those of you who might be unfamiliar with the function and purpose of NRHH, let me clarify what this honorary does and who it recognizes.

The purpose of NRHH is to provide recognition for those students who live in the residence halls who have demonstrated outstanding service in the residence hall system, and who have provided opportunities which encourage leadership skills and qualities in other residents. In addition, NRHH is an active honorary society which holds regular meetings every month, plans fundraisers, and organizes activities that recognize other student leaders. NRHH sponsors the "Of The Month" competition by choosing a program, student, resident advisor, and resident director to represent Central in regional competition each month. NRHH members also present programs at conferences, and have the opportunity to attend other leadership conferences where they can meet other student leaders from all over the United States.

In making your nominations, please keep these following qualifications in mind:

1.) The nominee must have a cumulative G.P.A. of 2.5 or better at the end of at least two quarters at Central.
2.) The nominee must have resided in the residence halls during the past two quarters and must currently be residing in a Central residence hall.
3.) The nominee must have exhibited outstanding leadership and service in the residence hall system or the community.

Nominations may be submitted by current NRHH members, Faculty and Staff Members, Residence Living Staff, and anyone living in the Central residence halls. All nominations must be made on the approved nomination forms provided by NRHH. Additional forms may be attained from the RHC drawer in Button Hall. Self-nominations will not be accepted. The nomination forms must be returned to the RHC box in Button Hall by 5:00 pm on Friday, April 7th.

Thank you for taking the time to make your nominations. We are confident that your participation in this process will ensure that Central's chapter of NRHH will recognize its student leaders. If you have any questions, please feel free to call the RHC office @ 963-7210.
NRHH Nomination Form

Name of Nominee: ____________________________

Campus Address of Nominee: ____________________________ Phone: __________

Briefly describe why you, as a nominator, feel this person deserves to be in NRHH.

Name of Nominator: ____________________________ Position: __________

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________

NRHH Nomination Form

Name of Nominee: ____________________________

Campus Address of Nominee: ____________________________ Phone: __________

Briefly describe why you, as a nominator, feel this person deserves to be in NRHH.

Name of Nominator: ____________________________ Position: __________

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________
LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AT THE HALFWAY POINT

We have now passed the first two cutoffs. If a bill has not passed out of committee and, if necessary, passed the appropriation’s committee, it is dead. Those bills still alive must pass out of their house of origin by the 15th or they are dead. This week both Houses are in session constantly (or recessed and in caucuses) trying to pass as much as possible and send it on to the other House before the deadline on the 15th of March.

As things stand now, these remain the areas of greatest effort;

TUITION

There are two main bills; each has a very different philosophical basis. House Bill 1909 would allow local tuition setting by the institutions with an annual cap set by the Legislature. This is the bill supported by all of the state universitates except Evergreen. Senate Bill 5325, sponsored by Senator Nita Rinehart, has the tuition defined by “instructional costs” set by the legislature at a rate equal to the “growth of personal income” in the state. This bill also codifies a requirement that state general fund dollars not be offset by the increase in tuition.

It is our understanding that HB 1909 will undergo changes before being passed out of the House. One rumored change is that there will be a required annual minimum increase in tuition.

TIME TO DEGREE

As you know there is great concern among legislators for the length of time it takes a student to get through the university and get a degree. There is no simple answer to this complex problem. The HECB study and a panel from the research universities tried to address the many causes of the problems. It is fair to say that this remains an issue of concern to the legislators and they will continue to monitor the progress being made by the universities to shorten the time to degree.

TUITION SURCHARGES-One legislative effort being made to directly address “time to degree” is SSB 5924, sponsored by Senator Kohl, which would require higher tuition to be paid by any student who has credits in excess of 115% of the degree requirements. The expectation is that higher tuition will speed graduation.

REMEDIAL EDUCATION-There is great concern among legislators that the state should not fund remedial education in Higher Education; they have paid for the education at the K-12 level and should not pay for it twice. Several bills were floated. The only currently surviving bill (SHB 1336) would require the universities to report remedial education enrollments in a uniform format to the HECB.
FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY

The HECB study was reported to the legislature. There is still a lack of understanding on the part of some legislators as to the nature of faculty workloads, i.e., why teaching five hours per week in the classroom may constitute “full-time” work. When you look at CWU’s graduation rate per faculty member, our “faculty productivity” is great. Stay tuned; this will remain a hot issue next year.

BUDGET- We are waiting on the release of the Republican House Budgets; they are expected to be out around the 15th of March.

OPERATING- Rumors abound. Rumor is that the Republican Budget goal is to come in $1 Billion or $1.3 Billion under the Governor’s Budget. That level of budget cutting would surely mean greater cuts to Higher Ed.

CAPITAL- The Capital Budget may be affected by operating budget figures. It will depend on the level of debt service left in the Operating Budget. There are rumors that the Capital Budget will be significantly cut.

SUPPLEMENTAL- There is a major Higher Ed project in this year’s supplemental budget—the cooperative library project. We are still hopeful that the funding will be released.

The Senate budget will be out about a week after the House Budget.

We anticipate a long conference committee process.

THERE ARE A COUPLE OF BILLS DIRECTED AT STUDENTS THAT WILL HAVE A CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY WIDE IMPACT.

HEALTH CARE FEE-HB 1845 would make the (now mandatory)$25 per quarter health care fee optional to students if they provide proof of current health care coverage. Our health care fee funds the student health center. The center provides mental and physical health care to students (14,000 visits per year) in an extremely cost effective way. The center also provides health information and education and helps to manage health crisis such as the measles epidemic at WWU which could have spilled over to our campus.

An optional fee would cause an unpredictable revenue flow and would likely close the Student Health Center. All of the Higher Ed’s lobbyists are working hard to keep this Bill in the House rules committee and off the floor:

ALCOHOL IN CAMPUS HOUSING-SSB 55605 is aimed at keeping liquor and illegal drugs out of campus housing. The intent is admirable. However, the bill is poorly drafted and would be an administrative nightmare to enforce. To enter a student’s room without permission requires a search warrant. The bill states that the use of liquor (even by those over 21) would be prohibited in state-owned, university housing where “a predominant number of the residents are minors.” Would this mean that the university would have to accommodate students who wish to move to a new dorm as soon as they reach 21? Would it segregate dorms by age? Would it simply drive students and drinking into off campus housing? There are a number of concerns which we are raising with members of the Senate Rules committee to keep it off the floor. If it reaches the floor, it is likely to pass.
Rationale and Resulting Motion Passed by the Faculty Senate Budget Committee

As compared to the 1994-95 fiscal year budget, the CWU Administration has requested a decrease of 6 FTE faculty positions for the 1995-96 fiscal year. Simultaneously, and again as compared to the 1994-95 fiscal year budget, the CWU Administration has requested a net increase of 8 FTE professional and staff positions. This amounts to a 2.14% decrease in faculty positions and a 2.09% increase in professional and staff positions. (See the table below for additional information.)

The increase in professional and staff positions appears to be contrary to the State Legislature's intent that budget cuts should be made in professional and staff rather than in faculty positions.

Furthermore, reducing faculty positions while increasing the number of students being served is contrary to good management principles and will hinder the long term potential for realizing CWU's goals. (From Fall Quarter 1992 to Fall Quarter 1993, CWU's student credit hours increased 11,802 approximately 11.6%. From Fall Quarter 1993 to Fall Quarter 1994, CWU's student credit hours increased an additional 1520, approximately 1.3%.)

With these facts in mind the Faculty Senate Budget Committee unanimously passed the following motion on March 2, 1995 and recommends that the Faculty Senate pass the same motion. Motion: We recommend that, in order to meet the servicing needs of the increased number of students, a faculty position be increased during the next biennium, rather than decreased. Funding for these positions should be facilitated by a hiring freeze in professional and staff positions that are not a part of the instruction (Program 10) budget. Funding for these positions should not come from the Library (Program 50) budget. Furthermore, these changes should be real, i.e., creative accounting should not be used to just give the appearance of an absolute and relative increase in faculty positions.

Comparison of Administration Requested 1995-96 Staffing Levels with 1994-95 Staffing Levels For CWU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE:</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 1994-95</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 1995-96</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>% Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Instructors</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff &amp; Other Professionals</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALARY (in thousands):</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 1994-95</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 1995-96</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>% Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Instructors</td>
<td>$15,964</td>
<td>$15,268</td>
<td>($696)</td>
<td>-4.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff &amp; Other Professionals</td>
<td>$12,227</td>
<td>$12,533</td>
<td>$306</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Financial Management

1 Classified Staff & Other Professional are combined because shifts between these two categories are not relevant for the comparisons presented here.
The following is an agenda item on the 3/7/95 Deans’ Council meeting. Please review and come prepared to discuss.

---

From: IN%"senate@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU" 28-FEB-1995 10:43:07.57
To: IN%"mooret@CWU.EDU" "mooret"
CC:.
Subj: PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERING PROMOTIONS

Dr. Moore,

Some faculty are becoming concerned about things they are hearing regarding the way in which consideration for promotion will or will not be done this year. In all probability, they are trying to superimpose procedures which are being discussed for possible adoption onto procedures currently encoded and becoming very confused.

Specifically, there is concern about whether prioritized lists from department personnel committees, department chairs, and school deans will be followed, or even used at all. I know that the abolishment of the presently used system of prioritization and its replacement with a criterion referenced system is the basic thrust of work now under way in the Senate Personnel Committee. However, until the new policy is ready for approval, we are still under the current provisions of Section 8.70 of the Faculty Code, which seems, literally, to mandate prioritization. I refer to item C.3 as it relates to the department, and item C.4 as it relates to the dean.

The item which is least clear is item C.5, which relates to the Provost. This item does not use the word, "priority," but refers only to a list by rank. I would appreciate hearing from you as to how you will be going about your considerations, because I fear some loud protest if certain things are perceived incorrectly. It would seem that, for the time being, prioritization is required, at least through the level of the deans.

With that being the case, the faculty who have spoken to me seem to be concerned that those priorities might be reversed or ignored by the Provost.

All of this is very much an echo of the past, a time of total mistrust of "administrators" and the devious things they might do. In my mind, it also builds a better case all the time for the direction in which we are
trying move to improve policy relating to the whole matter and make it consistent in its application. It also points to the flaw in the appeal process as it is outlined in the current Code policy, resulting in the sense that whatever you may choose to do is beyond anybody's ability to challenge, therefore something to be regarded with suspicion from the outset.

I will use anything you would be willing to share with me to try to settle people's nerves, and also to try to appeal to their support for the consistency of the direction we are moving.

Thanks.

Sid
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

*** DRAFT (2-27-95) ***

TENURE

Definition:
Tenure is a means to certain ends, specifically (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability.

Tenure entitles a faculty member to continuous appointment in a specific department or section of the university or in the university as a whole, and retention of rank without discriminatory reduction of salary and without dismissal except for adequate reason determined according to the requirements of due process as set forth in the Faculty Code.

The granting of tenure is a discretionary decision. Tenure may be granted to faculty members of such character and ability that the university, so far as its needs, resources and state laws permit, can justifiably undertake to employ them for the rest of their academic careers. Such a decision must be considered carefully. The granting of tenure shall be a specific act, even more significant than promotion in academic rank, and should be exercised only after careful consideration of the faculty member's scholarly qualifications, teaching ability, character, and other qualifications, such as public service specifically related to the university's needs. Only ranked faculty members as listed in Section 4.20 of the Faculty Code are eligible for tenure.

Granting of Tenure:
Normally tenure should not be granted before the seventh year of employment--a minimum of six years of professional experience is required. A decision on tenure must be made in the sixth year unless an extension is granted. (Extensions may be considered for such reasons as maternity leave, major illness, or other situations which required a faculty person's extended absence.)

Evaluation for Tenure:
Only tenured faculty may participate in tenure evaluations. Parameters, compatible with the existing salary adjustment criteria, shall be established by the university community which describe the general tenure criteria. Departments will establish specific criteria within the university parameters. Tenure criteria will be made available to faculty candidates during the selection process.

Granting of tenure is the responsibility of an academic community. As such, it must be overt. All letters and supporting documents submitted by members of the academic community (including students who wish to participate) must be signed.

Peer Review:
A schedule for the completion of tasks shall be included in the Faculty Code.

Deans will maintain the official file on all candidates for tenure at the school or college level.

Each year during the probationary period, after required student evaluations (all classes all year)
have been completed, Deans will inform departments of the status of tenure track members and request that the updating of the official files be completed by established deadlines.

Deans will inform candidates that their files for the current year are ready for inspection.

Before files are submitted for peer review, candidates review files and submit additional material as desired.

Each year during the probationary period all tenured members of the department who vote or wish to vote on a candidacy must review the record and prepare a written evaluation. Evaluations are to be based on established departmental criteria and should explicitly address the question of excellence. Departments inform candidates, in writing, and candidates respond in writing as desired.

Department or committee meet to make renewal/tenure decision.

All materials submitted in the course of the peer review are forwarded to the Dean by the department chair. The chair’s only function at this point is to transmit the information. Any substantive input by the chair must come as part of the peer review.

The decision on renewal and tenure rests with the department. Deans review the file for completeness and may raise questions involving equity or due process, but on substantive questions the outcome of the peer review is final.

While the hiring, granting of career status (or tenure) and promotion in rank are functions of the university administration and define the legal relationship between the institution and the employee, at the department level tenure retains its collegial meaning. When a department recommends the hiring of a candidate, it certifies to the administration that it accepts the finding of the discipline that the candidate is fully qualified to enter the field of specialization and that they, as a scholarly community, would welcome the applicant as a member. In so doing, the community of scholars assumes a responsibility to bring the new employee to full membership in the community. It is the responsibility of the tenured faculty to help the new member effectively progress toward tenure. This is the essence of peer review which, at the end of the university's official probationary period, should see the new employee fully integrated into the department as an active contributing member.

If the initial assessment of a candidate should prove to be incompatible with the standards of the academic community, it is imperative for the candidate, the department, and the university that it be discovered and dealt with as soon as possible. For this reason a third year comprehensive review will be required. The task will be assigned to a member or committee and a report will be prepared. The objective is to pull together the discreet information generated during each of the first three years so that trends over time can be discovered and taken into account. The report will be distributed to all tenured faculty, who are eligible to vote, and each will either endorse the report or submit a written response. On the basis of the comprehensive review, the personnel committee or department will meet and make an interim recommendation. It is expected that any mistakes in hiring will be corrected at this point. When the interim review reveals remediable problems, the department must establish a mentoring program and inform the candidate and the dean.
PROMOTION

Since promotion to Associate Professor normally coincides with the granting of tenure, the evaluation process for promotion is part of the tenure evaluation process at the departmental level.

Once tenure has been granted, the official files for each faculty member will be maintained at the school or college level and they will be updated on a continuing basis through an institutionalized data reporting/gathering process.

When a faculty member has met minimum time in rank requirements as specified in the Faculty Code, the Dean will notify the department by letter and inform the campus community by circulating a list of those eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

Candidates for promotion examine, correct and amend official files.

Departments conduct a peer review based upon established departmental criteria.

Majority position of the department is drafted, approved and forwarded to the Dean.

Deans review the files of those recommended and receive appeals.

Deans meet with department representatives to verify that approved candidates met all university and college requirements.

Deans submit list of approved candidates to Provost.

Provost reviews lists and prepares cost analysis.

Provost informs candidates:
(1) Promotion approved
(2) Promotion recommended but delayed due to budgetary constraints.
(3) Not recommended with detailed explanation to candidate and department.

President and Board of Trustees approve.
**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES**

*** DRAFT (2-27-95) ***

**TENURE**

**Definition:**
Tenure is a means to certain ends, specifically (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability.

Tenure entitles a faculty member to continuous appointment in a specific department or section of the university or in the university as a whole, and retention of rank without discriminatory reduction of salary and without dismissal except for adequate reason determined according to the requirements of due process as set forth in the *Faculty Code*.

The granting of tenure is a discretionary decision. Tenure may be granted to faculty members of such character and ability that the university, so far as its needs, resources and state laws permit, can justifiably undertake to employ them for the rest of their academic careers. Such a decision must be considered carefully. The granting of tenure shall be a specific act, even more significant than promotion in academic rank, and should be exercised only after careful consideration of the faculty member's scholarly qualifications, teaching ability, character, and other qualifications, such as public service specifically related to the university's needs. Only ranked faculty members as listed in Section 4.20 of the *Faculty Code* are eligible for tenure.

**Granting of Tenure:**
Normally tenure should not be granted before the seventh year of employment—a minimum of six years of professional experience is required. A decision on tenure must be made in the sixth year unless an extension is granted. (Extensions may be considered for such reasons as maternity leave, major illness, or other situations which required a faculty person's extended absence.)

**Evaluation for Tenure:**
Only tenured faculty may participate in tenure evaluations. Parameters, compatible with the existing salary adjustment criteria, shall be established by the university community which describe the general tenure criteria. Departments will establish specific criteria within the university parameters. Tenure criteria will be made available to faculty candidates during the selection process.

Granting of tenure is the responsibility of an academic community. As such, it must be overt. All letters and supporting documents submitted by members of the academic community (including students who wish to participate) must be signed.

**Peer Review:**
A schedule for the completion of tasks shall be included in the *Faculty Code*.

Deans will maintain the official file on all candidates for tenure at the school or college level.

Each year during the probationary period, after required student evaluations (all classes all year)
have been completed, Deans will inform departments of the status of tenure track members and request that the updating of the official files be completed by established deadlines.

Deans will inform candidates that their files for the current year are ready for inspection.

Before files are submitted for peer review, candidates review files and submit additional material as desired.

Each year during the probationary period all tenured members of the department who vote or wish to vote on a candidacy must review the record and prepare a written evaluation. Evaluations are to be based on established departmental criteria and should explicitly address the question of excellence. Departments inform candidates, in writing, and candidates respond in writing as desired.

Department or committee meet to make renewal/tenure decision.

All materials submitted in the course of the peer review are forwarded to the Dean by the department chair. The chair's only function at this point is to transmit the information. Any substantive input by the chair must come as part of the peer review.

The decision on renewal and tenure rests with the department. Deans review the file for completeness and may raise questions involving equity or due process, but on substantive questions the outcome of the peer review is final.

While the hiring, granting of career status (or tenure) and promotion in rank are functions of the university administration and define the legal relationship between the institution and the employee, at the department level tenure retains its collegial meaning. When a department recommends the hiring of a candidate, it certifies to the administration that it accepts the finding of the discipline that the candidate is fully qualified to enter the field of specialization and that they, as a scholarly community, would welcome the applicant as a member. In so doing, the community of scholars assumes a responsibility to bring the new employee to full membership in the community. It is the responsibility of the tenured faculty to help the new member effectively progress toward tenure. This is the essence of peer review which, at the end of the university's official probationary period, should see the new employee fully integrated into the department as an active contributing member.

If the initial assessment of a candidate should prove to be incompatible with the standards of the academic community, it is imperative for the candidate, the department, and the university that it be discovered and dealt with as soon as possible. For this reason a third year comprehensive review will be required. The task will be assigned to a member or committee and a report will be prepared. The objective is to pull together the discreet information generated during each of the first three years so that trends over time can be discovered and taken into account. The report will be distributed to all tenured faculty, who are eligible to vote, and each will either endorse the report or submit a written response. On the basis of the comprehensive review, the personnel committee or department will meet and make an interim recommendation. It is expected that any mistakes in hiring will be corrected at this point. When the interim review reveals remediable problems, the department must establish a mentoring program and inform the candidate and the dean.
PROMOTION

Since promotion to Associate Professor normally coincides with the granting of tenure, the evaluation process for promotion is part of the tenure evaluation process at the departmental level.

Once tenure has been granted, the official files for each faculty member will be maintained at the school or college level and they will be updated on a continuing basis through an institutionalized data reporting/gathering process.

When a faculty member has met minimum time in rank requirements as specified in the Faculty Code, the Dean will notify the department by letter and inform the campus community by circulating a list of those eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

Candidates for promotion examine, correct and amend official files.

Departments conduct a peer review based upon established departmental criteria.

Majority position of the department is drafted, approved and forwarded to the Dean.

Deans review the files of those recommended and receive appeals.

Deans meet with department representatives to verify that approved candidates met all university and college requirements.

Deans submit list of approved candidates to Provost.

Provost reviews lists and prepares cost analysis.

Provost informs candidates:
(1) Promotion approved
(2) Promotion recommended but delayed due to budgetary constraints.
(3) Not recommended with detailed explanation to candidate and department.

President and Board of Trustees approve.
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We are trying to gather information in order to prioritize instructional computing needs. Please send specific information on curricular applications for student computing in your department and provide us with any relevant documentation.

The objective of the instructional computing program is to encourage and support development or enhancement of computer laboratories which improve the education of undergraduates. We seek requests for the development of basic and innovative methods for using computers to improve student understanding of basic principles and for use of modern computer technology or new applications for computer technology in the classroom. Requests should focus on improving the quality of undergraduate education and faculty scholarship through improved computer resources.

Activities such as:
* Introductory laboratories;
* Laboratories for majors;
* Small research facilities for faculty;
* Upgrading or replacing obsolete or unreliable equipment with new equipment that will expose students to concepts and/or techniques that were not previously available;
* Access by students to computer networks that provide greater instructional capabilities than are available locally;
* Courses that acquaint non-science students with principles and methods of science and mathematics, and technology.

Each request must outline how the request will improve the present program of undergraduate instruction. Each request should demonstrate that
* Informed, realistic planning has taken place;
* The computing equipment will benefit the entire department or specific research groups;
* The faculty are capable of using and providing direction for the instructional computing facility.

The following guidelines may be helpful in outlining or preparing your request.

(1) What are the curricular or scholarly goals that drive your need for instructional computers?
(2) How will it affect your students if instructional or research computers are integrated into your curriculum?
(3) What are you doing now to address these needs?
(4) What computer resources are required?

A good proposal begins with a clear idea of the goals and objectives of the project. In addition, a good proposal will have a sense of why it will be a significant improvement over what is already being done. A better proposal is likely to result if the goals are clear before resources are considered in any detail. Equipment requests should balance these competing
priorities: only a limited amount of funding is available to all of academic affairs, yet sufficient resources needed to solve the problem should be requested. Items #1 and 2 will be most important in prioritizing requests from different departments. We are not looking for a laundry list of computer needs; we are looking for specific programmatic motivation.

The instructional computing requests will be prioritized by the Ad hoc Instructional Computing Committee on a competitive basis. If your proposal is unsuccessful, consider the committee evaluation and reviews. Evaluations of all computer requests will be sent to all requesters. If we can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to call any of the committee members. Thank you for your cooperation.
Evaluation criteria for instructional computing requests

1. Are the goals and objectives well-developed and realistic?

2. Are the plans and procedures for achieving the goals well thought out and realistic?

3. How does the proposal affect existing or proposed courses and laboratories?

4. Does it benefit the department as a whole?

5. How inadequate is the current situation?

4. Were alternative solutions considered?

5. Are the requested computers suitable for the project? Would other, less expensive ones, be less suitable?

6. Are there department resources for long-term support (paper, toner, students, etc.)? Please estimate and itemize long-term department resources needed to support your project.*

7. Does the project diversify the curriculum?

8. Is the proposal supported by the involvement of capable faculty or include recommendations from people with computer expertise?

9. Although the number of students affected by a given proposal are important, proposals will be primarily judged by merit.