

4-5-1995

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 04/05/1995

Sue Tirotta

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Tirotta, Sue, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 04/05/1995" (1995). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 610.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/610>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

Presiding Officer: Sidney Nesselroad
 Recording Secretary: Susan Tirotta

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

ROLL CALL

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Chambers, Hawkins, Myers, Nott, Rubin, Starbuck and Yeh.
 Visitors: Barbara Radke.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

***MOTION NO. 3001** Eric Roth moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the March 8, 1995, Faculty Senate meeting as distributed. Motion passed.

COMMUNICATIONS

- 3/1/95 letter from Thomas Moore, Provost, regarding Provost's membership on the Faculty Senate; referred to Executive Committee.
- 3/6/95 memo from Allen Gulezian, Business Administration, regarding evaluation of teaching; referred to Executive Committee.
- 3/15/95 memo from Hugh Fleetwood, CFR Chair, regarding proposed resolution; see CFR report below.

REPORTS

1. **CHAIR**

***MOTION NO. 3002** Sidney Nesselroad moved that the individuals previously nominated to the 1995-96 Faculty Senate Executive Committee for the positions of Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary be elected by acclamation: Chair: Hugh Spall, Business Administration; Vice Chair: Bobby Cummings, English; Secretary: Charles Rubin, English. Motion passed.
Geology. GFT corrected 4/26/95

The following at-large members of the 1995-96 Faculty Senate Executive Committee were elected by written ballot from a pool of candidates for the positions: Ken Gamon, Math; Lisa Weyandt, Psychology.

1995-96 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

- CHAIR: Hugh Spall, Business Administration
- VICE CHAIR: Bobby Cummings, English
- SECRETARY: Charles Rubin, Geology
- AT-LARGE: Ken Gamon, Math
- AT-LARGE: Lisa Weyandt, Psychology
- PAST CHAIR: Sidney Nesselroad, Music

-Chair Nesselroad reported that he attended the Board of Trustees' meeting at SeaTac Center on March 29, 1995. The Chair transmitted to President Nelson on March 13, 1995, a letter containing the Senate's MOTION NO. 2996 [passed unanimously 2/22/95], which requested reconsideration of the Board's 1/27/95 rejection of the Faculty Senate's recommendation [see Faculty Senate MOTION NO. 2969 passed 6/1/94] to hold an election for faculty collective bargaining. The Board decided to place neither the Senate Chair's March 13 letter nor the Senate's MOTION NO. 2996 on its meeting agenda.

1. CHAIR, continued

Chair Nesselroad informed Board members that it is a matter of general faculty concern that the Board has failed to acknowledge a matter which the faculty consider to be important. Board chair Ron Dotzauer stated that the Board considers the faculty collective bargaining issue to be "closed at this time," but he plans to invite the Senate Chair to an upcoming Board retreat to examine how the Board and the faculty could communicate more effectively.

-Deans' Council plans to review and discuss the proposed changes to the Faculty Code, the proposal to reorganize the Senate Academic Affairs Committee, and the Senate Personnel Committee's draft proposal on faculty promotion and tenure.

-The Ad Hoc Committee on Consensual Relationships [Robert Jacobs, Political Science-CHAIR; Deborah Medlar, Accounting; Jim Ponzetti, Home Economics; Nancy Howard, Director of Affirmative Action; Anne Bulliung, Graduate Student] has submitted to the Senate Executive Committee its draft proposal for a policy on consensual relationships. The Executive Committee plans to bring a proposal on consensual relationships to the Faculty Senate for discussion before the end of the academic year.

2. PRESIDENT

President Ivory Nelson distributed information concerning the House and Senate budget proposals. He reported that the House budget proposes spending on the order of \$650 million below the cut-off allowed by Initiative 601, whereas the Senate proposal comes in at only \$26 million below the Initiative 601 cut-off. Dr. Nelson explained that the bulk of the difference between these two budgets is in funding for K-12 and higher education and salary increases for state employees. The difference in allocations for C.W.U. between the two budgets amounts to about \$7 million. The House and Senate have not yet established rules for the expected conference committee discussions that will lead to agreement on a final budget. President Nelson recommended that faculty members read and understand the budget information and act accordingly. He reminded faculty members that state employees are prohibited from using state facilities, equipment or time to influence political opinion.

Senators commented on the frustrations of swelling class sizes and increased faculty workloads prompted by expanding student FTEs. The President explained that C.W.U. needs the tuition funds generated by more FTE student numbers in order to minimize the effects of budgetary reductions, and he pointed out that universities in other states are experiencing similar pressures.

3. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES

CFR member Ken Gamon reported that the Council of Faculty Representative proposed the following resolution at its March 10, 1995, meeting:

DRAFT RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS the CFR has voted to form a committee whose purpose it will be to:

1. Prepare and recommend an organization more adequate to protect the interests and to conduct the business of the CFR.
2. Generate contributed funds from concerned faculty persons and to propose ways to responsibly protect, preserve and expend such funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, we the Faculty Senate of Central Washington University resolve to:

- a. Appoint a representative to the working committee of the CFR.
- b. Take vigorous steps to inform faculty constituents of these matters.
- c. Encourage and develop means whereby faculty members may pledge to contribute 2-4 dollars per pay period, which amount is to be deducted by the payroll office and deposited in an appropriate CFR account.
- d. Determine ways to generate a modest fund sufficient to defer expenses of the working committee chair during the organizational period.

The CFR pledges to provide regular reports of its activities and of the use of contributed funds. Every

3. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES, continued

effort will be made to ensure that necessary organizational work will be completed by the beginning of the fall quarter, 1996.

Dr. Gamon presented the following background information regarding the proposed resolution, as excerpted from a 3/15/95 memo by Hugh Fleetwood, Acting CFR Chair:

RESOLUTION BACKGROUND

"During the present legislative session a number of things have occurred which are of direct relevance to Higher Education Faculty. These include:

1. Dramatically increased influence of strongly conservative legislators who are in various degrees allied with the persons and the movement characterized as the Religious Right. This development appears unlikely to disappear in the foreseeable future, and is often characterized by hostility toward elites generally, and intellectual elites (e.g., Higher Education faculty) in particular.
2. The emergence in mid-session of legislation seeking to bring the state universities under the governance of a single board of regents represents a desire to more effectively control the universities, to impose a greater uniformity upon them, and, by implication, to reduce and limit such autonomy as they have.
3. Work-load and time to degree studies and legislative committee hearings on them represent a newer and higher level of legislative interest in these subjects. Related to this appears to be an increased willingness on the part of some legislators to micromanage the universities, even while professing to believe that it is unwise and that they must not do it.
4. A movement to limit the activities and influence of lobbyists which, although somewhat sporadic and uneven, seems nevertheless likely to be permanent. Closely related to this is an attack upon the appropriateness of state-funded lobbyists and, at the very least, an effort to dramatically limit their numbers. This, even when their central task is to provide information to legislators and committee staffs. It seems practically certain that legislative scrutiny will fall upon faculty legislative activities.

It seems likely that one response of university administrators will be to fund legislative activities out of non-appropriated funds. In general and as always, faculty governance has access to these funds only through administrations.

It is the belief of the Council of Faculty Representatives that these activities grow out of and reflect attitudes and initiatives which place in serious jeopardy universities as they historically have been and as many present faculty members have known them to be. To simplify, instead of communities of scholars, they seem increasingly to be becoming generators of diplomas, the value and function of which is to provide credentials for students seeking various occupations.

If such occurs, it appears likely that it will prove irreversible. Such an occurrence would constitute an enormous loss to our society and culture. Universities as exemplars, however imperfect, of rational discourse and truth-seeking enquiry will have disappeared. Were this to happen it would entail great changes in the life of an academic, arguably so great as to make the professorate a whole new, and much less valuable, thing.

The Council of Faculty Representatives was created to allow the faculties of the state universities and TESC to speak as a united, concerted, focused voice to issues of common academic concern. There can be no greater concern than to maintain the historic character and quality of the higher education institutions, and it is primarily the faculty of the institutions who are the natural protectors of these values.

Historically, the CFR has been grudgingly and erratically funded by the administrations of the universities. We believe that this must be changed. If the CFR is to be able to do the job which must be done, then it must be self-funded; that is, it must be funded by faculty members themselves, so as to avoid the strictures of the legislature and the whims of administrators. Most importantly, only

3. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES, continued

in this way can faculty give effective expression to the depth and strength of their concern and commitment."

Dr. Gamon stated that, although he agreed with Hugh Fleetwood that higher education is facing serious problems, removing CFR from university funding systems may not be the best solution. Dr. Gamon explained that CFR was originally created to bring together faculty from the six state institutions of higher education to share information and identify common concerns, and the organization has succeeded in providing this function. He pointed out that CFR has also traditionally served as an information resource for the state legislature, and approval of the proposed resolution would shift the organization's direction toward that of a lobbying or collective bargaining group.

Senators asked questions concerning CFR's current funding amount and sources. Dr. Gamon replied that CFR has Bylaws and a Constitution but no general budget or treasurer. Travel expenses are usually quite small and are normally funded for individual CFR members through their home institution's faculty governing organization. Funding for the CFR chair is more problematic and tentative and requires a larger commitment on the part of the chair's home institution. The CFR chair performs most clerical/secretarial functions (e.g., distribution of meeting agendas/minutes, etc.) for the organization at this time; although the use of email systems has improved internal communications and ameliorated some of this workload, support services for the organization could be better funded.

President Ivory Nelson pointed out that it is illegal for state employees to use state resources to influence political opinion, and the public and legislative inclination seems to be toward much stronger restrictions on legislative lobbying. Senators asked how private funding collected from faculty through payroll deductions would change the nature of the CFR. Dr. Gamon stated that one scenario might have the CFR chair relieved from state employee responsibilities and receiving a regular salary paid by the organization.

Senators chose to take the resolution to their departments for further discussion and include it for a vote on the Senate's April 26, 1995, meeting agenda.

4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

No report

5. BUDGET COMMITTEE

Budget Committee chair Don Cocheba reported that in trying to determine FTE staffing levels the Committee reached several conclusions: 1) the President supports and encourages an open budgeting process; 2) key administrators (e.g., Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs, Provost, Academic Accountant, President) have cooperated fully with the Committee in providing requested information; and 3) there is no way for the Budget Committee to understand the wide disparities in the budgetary figures obtained from the various administrators, the Office of Financial Management and other sources. President Nelson explained that the university, state agencies and the Higher Education Coordinating Board define FTE [full time equivalent] in different ways, and this can lead to confusion when trying to compare paperwork of diverse origins. Dr. Cocheba recommended that the internal definition of FTE be standardized and used consistently over time and that FTE definitions used by other agencies be available when necessary. President Nelson stated his similar concerns regarding internal record keeping and reported that he had charged development of a unified data system, and university groups are working steadily toward this goal.

Dr. Cocheba stated that some current records lead to the perception that staff numbers have increased while faculty numbers have remained the same or declined. President Nelson reported that faculty numbers declined slightly in his first year of employment with the university, but they have increased regularly since then. The Budget Committee recommended exempting the Library (Program 50) and Instructional (Program 10) portions of the university operating budget when faculty

5. BUDGET COMMITTEE, continued

numbers are increased. President Nelson and some Senators advocated viewing the university as a holistic system and acknowledged the need to fund support services, computing equipment and software, facilities and the other components of the university. Don Cocheba replied that trade-offs may have to be made because faculty are the "heart of the institution."

*MOTION NO. 3003 Dan Ramsdell moved and Morris Uebelacker seconded a motion that the Faculty Senate recommend that, in order to meet the servicing needs of the increased number of students, FTE faculty positions be increased during the next biennium.

Chair Nesselroad commented that this motion did not appear on the Senate's agenda, and stated that the Faculty Senate's Operating Procedures [MOTION NO. 2972, 12/12/94] hold that "As a general rule, substantive committee motions that do not accompany the agenda will not be discussed and voted on until a subsequent meeting." Dr. Cocheba contended that the text of MOTION NO. 3003 appeared in the Faculty Senate minutes of March 8, 1995, as part of the "draft motion" under the Budget Committee's report, and it is therefore not newly introduced material. Vote was held on MOTION NO. 3003; motion passed.

Dr. Cocheba reported that the Budget Committee will recommend the following motion at the April 26, 1995, Faculty Senate meeting: DRAFT MOTION: The Faculty Senate requests that the C.W.U. Administration define all categories of FTE and associated dollar amounts to allow accurate and understandable comparisons and use these figures consistently in budget discussions. Furthermore, any differences between these internal budget numbers and the numbers submitted to outside agencies should be reconciled and explained to the faculty.

6. CODE COMMITTEE

-Chair Nesselroad reported that more than five replies to the Faculty Code Hearing notice have been received, so the Hearing will be held as scheduled: FACULTY CODE HEARING: 3:00-5:00 p.m., April 12, SUB 206/207. He urged all faculty members to closely review the proposed changes, as many of them are substantive.

7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

No report

8. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

No report

9. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

No report

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

A Senator asked if the Faculty Senate could expect a report before the end of the year from the Campus Climate Task Force. President Nelson reported that the Task Force is working on a report at this time, and he will inform the campus community when the work is complete.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

*** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 26, 1995 ***

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING

3:10 p.m., Wednesday, April 5, 1995

SUB 204-205

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 8, 1995

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

-3/1/95 letter from Thomas Moore, Provost, re. Provost's membership on the Faculty Senate; referred to Executive Committee.

-3/6/95 memo from Allen Gulezian, Business Administration, re. evaluation of teaching; referred to Executive Committee.

-3/15/95 memo from Hugh Fleetwood, CFR Chair, re. proposed resolution; see CFR report below.

V. REPORTS

1. CHAIR

-Election of 1995-96 Faculty Senate Executive Committee [nominations attached]

2. PRESIDENT

3. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES - Ken Gamon

-Resolution on CFR funding [attached]

4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Charles McGehee, Chair)

5. BUDGET COMMITTEE (Don Cocheba, Chair)

6. CODE COMMITTEE (Beverly Heckart, Chair)

***FACULTY CODE HEARING: 3:00-5:00 p.m., April 12, SUB 206/207**

7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (Clara Baker, Chair)

8. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Rex Wirth, Chair)

9. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Bobby Cummings, Chair)

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

***** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 26, 1995 *****

CHAIR

ELECTION: 1995-96 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

<u>POSITION</u>	<u>NOMINEE</u>
<u>CHAIR:</u>	Hugh Spall, Business Administration
<u>VICE CHAIR:</u>	Bobby Cummings, English
<u>SECRETARY:</u>	Charles Rubin, Geology
<u>AT-LARGE MEMBERS (2):</u>	Susan Donahoe, Education Ken Gamon, Math Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science Rob Perkins, BEAM Lisa Weyandt, Psychology
<u>PAST CHAIR:</u>	Sidney Nesselroad, Music [automatic appointment]

COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES (CFR)

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS the CFR has voted to form a committee whose purpose it will be to:

1. Prepare and recommend an organization more adequate to protect the interests and to conduct the business of the CFR.
2. Generate contributed funds from concerned faculty persons and to propose ways to responsibly protect, preserve and expend such funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, we the Faculty Senate of Central Washington University resolve to:

- a. Appoint a representative to the working committee of the CFR.
- b. Take vigorous steps to inform faculty constituents of these matters.
- c. Encourage and develop means whereby faculty members may pledge to contribute 2-4 dollars per pay period, which amount is to be deducted by the payroll office and deposited in an appropriate CFR account.
- d. Determine ways to generate a modest fund sufficient to defer expenses of the working committee chair during the organizational period.

The CFR pledges to provide regular reports of its activities and of the use of contributed funds. Every effort will be made to ensure that necessary organizational work will be completed by the beginning of the fall quarter, 1996.

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING

AGENDA - April 5, 1995

Page 3

RESOLUTION BACKGROUND (from a 3/15/95 memo from Hugh Fleetwood, CFR Chair): During the present legislative session a number of things have occurred which are of direct relevance to Higher Education Faculty. These include:

1. Dramatically increased influence of strongly conservative legislators who are in various degrees allied with the persons and the movement characterized as the Religious Right. This development appears unlikely to disappear in the foreseeable future, and is often characterized by hostility toward elites generally, and intellectual elites (e.g., Higher Education faculty) in particular.
2. The emergence in mid-session of legislation seeking to bring the state universities under the governance of a single board of regents represents a desire to more effectively control the universities, to impose a greater uniformity upon them, and, by implication, to reduce and limit such autonomy as they have.
3. Work-load and time to degree studies and legislative committee hearings on them represent a newer and higher level of legislative interest in these subjects. Related to this appears to be an increased willingness on the part of some legislators to micromanage the universities, even while professing to believe that it is unwise and that they must not do it.
4. A movement to limit the activities and influence of lobbyists which, although somewhat sporadic and uneven, seems nevertheless likely to be permanent. Closely related to this is an attack upon the appropriateness of state-funded lobbyists and, at the very least, an effort to dramatically limit their numbers. This, even when their central task is to provide information to legislators and committee staffs. It seems practically certain that legislative scrutiny will fall upon faculty legislative activities.

It seems likely that one response of university administrators will be to fund legislative activities out of non-appropriated funds. In general and as always, faculty governance has access to these funds only through administrations.

It is the belief of the Council of Faculty Representatives that these activities grow out of and reflect attitudes and initiatives which place in serious jeopardy universities as they historically have been and as many present faculty members have known them to be. To simplify, instead of communities of scholars, they seem increasingly to be becoming generators of diplomas, the value and function of which is to provide credentials for students seeking various occupations.

If such occurs, it appears likely that it will prove irreversible. Such an occurrence would constitute an enormous loss to our society and culture. Universities as exemplars, however imperfect, of rational discourse and truth-seeking enquiry will have disappeared. Were this to happen it would entail great changes in the life of an academic, arguably so great as to make the professorate a whole new, and much less valuable, thing.

The Council of Faculty Representatives was created to allow the faculties of the state universities and TESC to speak as a united, concerted, focused voice to issues of common academic concern. There can be no greater concern than to maintain the historic character and quality of the higher education institutions, and it is primarily the faculty of the institutions who are the natural protectors of these values.

Historically, the CFR has been grudgingly and erratically funded by the administrations of the universities. We believe that this must be changed. If the CFR is to be able to do the job which must be done, then it must be self-funded; that is, it must be funded by faculty members themselves, so as to avoid the strictures of the legislature and the whims of administrators. Most importantly, only in this way can faculty give effective expression to the depth and strength of their concern and commitment.

ROLL CALL 1994-95

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 5, 1995

Walter ARLT
 Linda BEATH
 Minerva CAPLES
 Robert CARBAUGH
 Matt CHAMBERS
 Shawn CHRISTIE
 Bobby CUMMINGS
 Terry DeVIETTI
 Susan DONAHOE
 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 SCHAETLER
 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

April 5, 1995

Date

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

D Cochran
B. Radke

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost / Vice President
for Academic Affairs

March 1, 1995

RECEIVED
MAR 3 1995
CWU FACULTY SENATE

Dr. Sidney Nesselroad
Faculty Senate Chair
Campus -- 7509

Dear Chairman Nesselroad:

I write regarding our conversation during our regular meeting on Monday, February 27, 1995, in which you raised the issue of the Provost's membership on the Faculty Senate. As I indicated then, I have no interest in this becoming a contentious issue. I also point out that the issue of the Provost's membership is separate from the membership of the President. I regret that some continue to defend a governance system that does not recognize appropriate and shared academic values. I am chagrined that some faculty leaders continue to interpret the matter in terms of a need to maintain their own hegemony.

As I have continually said, however, this is a faculty matter and I have not, nor will I, provide any argument in support of a fuller, more expanded shared governance system that should be reflected in the University's chief governance body. In all of this, what is most distressing is that the best interests of the faculty are not well served.

Sincerely,

Thomas D. Moore
Provost/Vice President
for Academic Affairs

/kb

c: President Nelson
Dr. Beverly Heckart, Chair, Code Committee
Deans' Council

(95-035.PR.V)

MEMORANDUM

RECEIVED
MAR 8 1995
CWU FACULTY SENATE

TO: Sidney Nesselroad, FACULTY
FROM: Allen Gulezian, ^{a.k.a.} Business Administration
DATE: March 6, 1995
SUBJECT: Input to School of Business and Economic's
Faculty Policy Committee (FPC)

On the suggestion of Peter Saunders, Chair of the FPC, I am sending my comments to you regarding teaching evaluations.

4B

MEMO

TO: Professor Allen Gulezian, Business Administration.

FROM: Peter J. Saunders, Chair, FPC.

SUBJECT: Input to the Student Evaluation of Teaching.

Dear Allen,

Many thanks for all your input regarding the student evaluation of teaching. I appreciate your taking time to communicate your concerns. I distributed copies of your memo to all of the FPC members. The issues which you raised are certainly important. I am sure that some of these issues will be considered by this committee in the future. You might also consider pursuing these issues through the Senate. Once again, many thanks for all your help.

cc: David Dauwalder, Connie Nott, Gary Heesacker, Jim Nimnicht, Jay Forsyth.

TO: Members of the Faculty Policy Committee
Peter Saunders (Chair), Jay Forsyth, Gary Heesacker, Jim Nimnicht, Connie Nott

FROM: Allen Gulezian, Business Administration *A. K. G.*

DATE: February 13, 1995

SUBJECT: Response to Request for Input To Student Evaluation of Teaching

I wish to commend the committee for its on-going efforts to improve student evaluations of teaching effectiveness. What follows is some of my thinking which I hope will help you in your work.

As part of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness (TE), I see this as a package that involves many measures which cannot be developed in isolation from one another. Thus, the more and different measures the better in getting a well rounded picture of TE.

1. To me, TE means that students are well informed about the subject matter, and also better able to analyze and solve problems and issues as they confront them throughout life as a result of their higher education experience. What I am suggesting is that evaluations of the here and now are important but so is a delayed evaluation.
2. It would be constructive to have more information profiling the students in a class. How many are majors in SBE, what is their GPA, what quarter are they in higher education, are they a transfer student, a junior collage graduate and from what community college, what is their class ranking. This might better able the instructor to give more relevant examples, and gauge more accurately where a class may be in their abilities and skills.
3. What and how will the student evaluations be used. - administration, compensation, promotion, training and development etc. This might shape the instrument.
4. Continuing validity and reliability studies need be done. Each question answered by students presumes a standard.
5. As part of teaching evaluations, may the instructor evaluate his/her class - not only the grade for the course but on student behaviors. For instance did the students come on time, did they appear interested in the subject matter, were they respectful to the teacher and others in the class, did they respond to questions and participate in class discussions, were students supportive of the effort the instructor put in his/her course, was the instructor ever told when he/she did a very good job.
6. Is our mission to teach students and/or do research? Both?
7. Support staff should be evaluated by instructors - were instructors given the needed information about their class and students, was material typed accurately, were tests done on time, were messages given in a timely manner, were you given the help you needed to do a effective job at teaching.
8. As part of the student evaluations, perhaps increase the student's sense of responsibility for their own learning and encourage them to think about their educational goals by including such items as: I attend class regularly, I have created learning experiences for myself, I helped classmates learn, I gave relevant examples etc. One major flaw in student ratings is to focus upon the instructor as causal to all learning. Indeed, he/she should do a good job of setting the table, but only the diner can eat the meal.

9. Both the student and instructor should evaluate support services that they receive from the greater campus community. They could assess such things as library resources, registration, financial aid, safety, health services, teaching accommodations, scheduling, advising, living accommodations, parking, availability of courses etc.
10. To facilitate understanding and communications with students, the SBE Dean, Assistant Dean and appropriate Chairs should have a joint session quarterly with majors concerning mutual expectations concerning programs and behaviors.
11. Each quarter of the academic year, the SBE Dean, Assistant Dean and Chairs should be evaluated by students and faculty on their administrative performance supporting teaching effectiveness. In other words, students and operating people in the SBE, should evaluate higher ups once a year.
12. An Annual Report detailing the SBE should be distributed to students and faculty indicating how the school has done relative to past years. For example, a listing of publications, the total annual budget, faculty salaries, teaching loads, classes taught, number of classes offered, amount budgeted for teaching support and faculty development, number of students placed, number and hours of student internships, faculty internships, field trips, innovative methods in teaching, major objectives accomplished and those set for the coming year and longer term objectives for the SBE, members of the Board of Visitors and where they may be contacted, major private benefactors of the SBE, amount in the Foundation, how money was spent and what was obtained for it. A student handbook could be provided to majors outlining and clarifying programs and expectation from SBE faculty and administration. The handbook might also include relevant procedures and policies.

These are some of my comments and concerns. I am willing to meet with the committee if there are any questions or if I can clarify any points. I also would welcome an opportunity to work with you on this and related projects. For instance, work needs to be done on student assessment and I would be glad to give you my ideas concerning this and help in any way possible.

c: Thomas Moore, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
David Dauwalder, Dean School of Business & Economics
Gerry Gunn, Chair Business Administration
Connie Roberts, Special Assistant to the Provost

COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES
c/o Western Washington University
Bellingham, WA 98225-9020

MEMORANDUM

March 15, 1995

TO: Members, the Council of Faculty Representatives, Chairs, Distributional Faculty Governance Bodies

FROM: Hugh Fleetwood, CFR Chair, and Chair-elect of the CFR Working Committee

Attached you will find in combined form a summary of my remarks to the CFR at the meeting of March 10, and a proposed resolution to be taken by CFR representatives to your respective faculty governments.

I have sought to put all of this in a manner which makes explicit that what is proposed is a strengthening of the CFR which is not in any way to supplant institutional faculty legislative representatives (no more than does the present CFR).

It is important that these matters receive careful, weighty attention, as opposed to hasty and casual acceptance. To this end I wish again to express my willingness to meet and discuss them with senates, senate executive committees, other faculty bodies. If such meetings seem advisable, I would envisage scheduling them during the Fall term of this year.

I will not be meeting with you all again as CFR Chair. I want again to say that I have enjoyed coming to know you, I will probably see you during the presentation of this present business, and I thank you for your generous expressions of gratitude and affection.

4C

Background

During the present legislative sessions a number of things have occurred which are of direct relevance to Higher Education Faculty. These include:

1. Dramatically increased influence of strongly conservative legislators who are in various degrees allied with the persons and the movement characterized as the Religious Right. This development appears unlikely to disappear in the foreseeable future, and is often characterized by hostility toward elites generally, and intellectual elites, e.g. Higher Education faculty in particular.
2. The emergence in mid-session of legislation seeking to bring the state universities under the governance of a single board of regents represents a desire to more effectively control the universities, to impose a greater uniformity upon them, and, by implication, to reduce and limit such autonomy as they have.
3. Work-load and time to degree studies and legislative committee hearings on them represent a newer and higher level of legislative interest in these subjects. Related to this appears to be an increased willingness on the part of some legislators to micromanage the universities, even while professing to believe that it is unwise and that they must not do it.
4. A movement, to limit the activities and influence of lobbyists which although somewhat sporadic and uneven, seems nevertheless likely to be permanent. Closely related to this is an attack upon the appropriateness of state-funded lobbyists and, at the very least, an effort to dramatically limit their numbers. This, even when their central task is to provide information to legislators and committee staffs. It seems practically certain that legislative scrutiny will fall upon faculty legislative activities.

It seems likely that one response of university administrations will be to fund legislative activities out of non-appropriated funds. In general and as always, faculty governance has access to these funds only through administrations.

It is the belief of the Council of Faculty Representatives that these activities grow out of and reflect attitudes and initiatives which place in serious jeopardy universities as they historically have been and as many present faculty members have known them to be. To simplify, instead of communities of scholars, they seem increasingly to be becoming generators of diplomas, the value and function of which is to provide credentials for students seeking various occupations.

If such occurs, it appears likely that it will prove irreversible. Such an occurrence would constitute an enormous loss to our society and culture. Universities as exemplars, however imperfect, of rational discourse and truth-seeking enquiry will have disappeared. Were this to happen it would entail great changes in the life of an academic, arguably so

great as to make the professorate a whole new, and much less valuable, thing.

The Council of Faculty Representatives was created to allow the faculties of the state universities and TESC to speak as a united, concerted, focused voice to issues of common academic concern. There can be no greater concern than to maintain the historic character and quality of the higher education institutions, and it is primarily the faculty of the institutions who are the natural protectors of these values.

Historically the CFR has been grudgingly and erratically funded by the administrations of the institutions. We believe that this must be changed. If the CFR is to be able to do the job which must be done, then it must be self-funded, that is, it must be funded by faculty members themselves, so as to avoid the strictures of the legislature and the whims of administrators. Most importantly, only in this way can faculty give effective expression to the depth and strength of their concern and commitment.

WHEREAS the CFR has voted to form a committee whose purpose it will be to:

1. Prepare and recommend an organization more adequate to protect the interests and to conduct the business of the CFR.
2. Generate contributed funds from concerned faculty persons and to propose ways to responsibly protect, preserve and expend such funds;

Now, therefore, we the Faculty Senate (or corresponding faculty governance body) of _____ resolve to:

- a. Appoint a representative to the working committee of the CFR.
- b. Take vigorous steps to inform faculty constituents of these matters.
- c. Encourage and develop means whereby faculty members may pledge to contribute 2 - 4 dollars per pay period, which amount is to be deducted by the payroll office and deposited in an appropriate CFR account.
- d. Determine ways to generate a modest fund sufficient to defer expenses of the working committee chair during the organizational period.

The CFR pledges to provide regular reports of its activities and of the use of contributed funds.

Every effort will be made to ensure that necessary organizational work will be completed by the beginning of the fall quarter, 1996.

From chasm@CWU.EDU Mon Mar 20 09:27:03 1995
Date: Fri, 17 Mar 1995 18:10:20 -0800 (PST)
From: Charles McGehee <chasm@CWU.EDU>
To: deans_council <deans_council@CWU.EDU>, dept_chairs <dept_chairs@CWU.EDU>
Subject: Undergraduate Council -> Academic Affairs Committee

M E M O

TO: Deans' Council, Department Chairs

FROM: Charles McGehee, Chair
Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee
Tel: 2005
Fax: 3215
E-mail: chasm

DATE: March 17, 1995

RE: Feasibility of Academic Affairs Committee assuming role of Undergraduate Council.

RECEIVED
MAR 20 1995
CWU FACULTY SENATE

In a memo dated January 4, 1995, Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee was charged to examine the feasibility of assigning to the Academic Affairs Committee the functions of the former Undergraduate Council which was abolished in 1992.

In response to this charge, the Academic Affairs Committee has formulated the following draft proposal. Please review it and send your comments to the Committee by the first week of the Spring quarter at the above addresses.

DRAFT #3 DRAFT #3 DRAFT #3 DRAFT #3

Since the abolition of both the position of Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Undergraduate Council, policy making and review has become fragmented and scattered in a number of places across campus.

As a result, no one person or body has general oversight responsibilities over academic policy. This means that policy may be created, modified, ignored or abandoned without adequate discussion, review or coordination. It further means that faculty, students and administrators often do not know what university standards and expectations are or who is responsible for what, when and under what circumstances.

The Committee has discussed the matter within itself and met with the Dean of Academic Services, Jim Pappas, the Special Assistant to the Provost and former Dean of Undergraduate

4D

Studies, Don Schliesman as well as the Dean of Graduate Studies, Gerry Stacy. As the result of these deliberations the Academic Affairs Committee recommends the following:

1. The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee should assume role of the former Undergraduate Council thereby becoming the sole source of initiation, review and change of Academic Policy at CWU.

The current role and position of the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee is well-suited to taking on such an assignment. Its history has been one of periodic involvement in academic policy formulation and is therefore already well-known. Further, it enjoys a focal position within university governance. Expanding on the known and familiar, we believe, is speedier and potentially less disruptive than creating something totally new.

2. The current structure of the committee, as defined by the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, is appropriate in that we believe that each of the four schools and the student body should be represented. We believe, however, that certain administrative positions should also be represented on the committee ex officio (without vote), specifically, the Dean of Academic Services or representative and the Provost or representative. It is to be expected that various non-committee-member specialists or key functionaries, such as, the Director of Admissions, Registrar, et al., will be called from time to time to participate in discussions or provide information.
3. Continuity and familiarity with the structure and purpose of the committee is critical for understanding the history of the conditions that produced existing policy and procedures. Continuity is also essential for assessing committee goals as they relate to the mission of the university.

We therefore recommend that each of the faculty members be appointed for a term of three years with a maximum of two terms, and that the appointments be staggered so that about one-third of the panel will have been appointed or reappointed each year. The student member should be appointed with consideration given to the possibility of the person staying more than one year.

4. Since the task of the Academic Affairs Committee will be oriented to the university as a whole, we reaffirm the Senate Bylaws' provision that the structure of the committee should not be restricted to members of the Senate.
5. The Committee will report to the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate will act on the Committee's recommendations.
6. The Committee may receive charges from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the Committee may undertake activities on its own initiative. The Provost and the Dean of Academic Services may also make requests of the Committee directly. All others

must solicit Committee attention through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

7. The Committee will be responsible for all general university policy. Academic policy is defined as:

a statement or statements of principles designed to influence or determine decisions and actions of the University relative to fulfilling the instructional components of its mission.

Academic policy includes, but is not limited to, general standards for admission to the university, graduation, grading, and recording, calculating, validating and disseminating indices of student academic achievement and fulfillment of curricular and program requirements.

Academic policy is to be distinguished from curricular policy which applies only to specific programs and courses of instruction within the larger university setting.

General university policy establishes the minimum academic requirements for admission to, remaining within, graduation from, and conferring appellations by the university. Within this falls both undergraduate and graduate policy. Departments and the Graduate Council, however, establish the conditions for entering and completing their respective programs. Each may establish its own entrance and graduation requirements, though none may establish requirements less stringent than the general university policy.

8. Generally speaking, academic procedures do not fall within the purview of the Committee. Academic Procedures are defined as:

the formal steps by which policies are implemented and enforced. Procedures are to be distinguished from policy in that policy pre-exists and authorizes procedures as means for implementing the policy in question.

The Committee, however, may undertake review and recommend change in procedures in the event that procedures influence policy in ways inconsistent with the intent of the policy or otherwise to the detriment of the academic mission of the university.

9. The Faculty Senate, through the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, is responsible for approving all courses and program requirements for the undergraduate and graduate curricula upon recommendation by the departments and Graduate Council respectively. The Academic Affairs Committee will not actively be involved in such curricular or programmatic review and approval, though it will coordinate its own recommendations with departments, the Graduate Council, the General Education Committee, and the academic deans to insure smoothly functioning policy and procedures.
10. The new assignment of the Committee will require staff, however the resources of the Faculty Senate are not adequate for the task. We therefore propose that the staff

resources of either the Dean of Academic Services or the Provost be made available to the Committee as needed.

11. The charge asked the Committee to establish a compendium of existing academic policies and procedures and areas in which academic policy and procedures govern. Further, the Committee has been asked to identify individuals, positions, and bodies which currently make and implement policies and procedures and to search for gaps in policy and policy making.

The Committee believes that this component of the charge should not be carried out until the Senate decides whether the Committee's function should be redefined, and if so, the Committee membership has been established and affirmed.

12. In addition to the foregoing principles, the Academic Affairs Committee recommends the following specific actions be taken by the Faculty Senate:

Amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws to:

- a. add the positions of the Dean of Academic Services and the Provost to the membership of the Academic Affairs Committee ex officio (without vote.)
- b. provide for terms of three years for faculty members of the Academic Affairs Committee with a limitation of two consecutive terms. Stipulate that students who are able to serve longer than one year should be considered for the student position.
- c. require that faculty members' terms be staggered such that about one-third of the positions be filled each year in order to insure continuity.
- d. change the wording of the Faculty Senate Bylaws' description of the Committee's function to reflect that it is responsible for general academic planning on campus as outlined in this proposal.

Otherwise, we believe that current Faculty Senate Bylaws and Faculty Code wording is adequate and requires no further change.

End of report.

ACADPOL1.D3

Charles L. McGehee | Tel: 509-963-2005 |
Department of Sociology | Fax: 509-963-3215 |
Central Washington University | <chasm@cwu.edu> |
Ellensburg, WA 98926 USA | |

Date: Mon, 20 Mar 1995 12:40:44 -0800 (PST)

From: bentonr@CWU.EDU

To: Charles McGehee <chasm@CWU.EDU>

Cc: deans_council <deans_council@CWU.EDU>, dept_chairs <dept_chairs@CWU.EDU>

Subject: Re: Undergraduate Council -> Academic Affairs Committee

In response to the recommendation that the Academic Affairs Committee assume the role of the former Undergraduate Council, it seems to me totally logical and in keeping with many recent administrative changes--that of direct line responsibility. Determining and overseeing curriculum has been the traditional role for university faculty; therefore, policy belongs in a Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee. I also am very much in favor of including the Provost as a member of the committee. It should enable the committee to respond and take action much more quickly than any other arrangement.

I suppose I must add that the major source of frustration for me regarding academic policy comes when campus committees enact policy without thinking of its relationship to all CWU sites.

Bob Benton, Lynnwood

Date: Mon, 20 Mar 1995 12:17:15 -0800 (PST)
From: "David E. Kaufman" <kaufman@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>
To: senate <senate@CWU.EDU>
Subject: Evaluation of Instructional Computing (fwd)

I want this memo to Provost Moore today. If you have any comments or suggestions please advise.

David

-----\//-----snip-----\//-----snip-----\//-----
oo oo oo

Subject: Evaluation of Instructional Computing

MEMO

To: Tom Moore, Provost
From: David E. Kaufman
Date: March 20, 1995

Re: Role of University Computing Committee in the evaluation of instructional computing

At my request, the University Computing Committee has discussed at several meetings the evaluation guidelines written by Charlie Rubin. I can assure you the committee has no fundamental disagreement with the prioritization plan, evaluation criteria, and types of requests for computer resources identified in the document. However, there is very little interest on the part of the members to participate in the actual prioritization work, if and when funds for computer equipment purchases become available, e.g, at the end of the biennium. The feeling among members is that it is the function of the strategic plan process to promote department and program computing goals and objectives and for the deans to prioritize requests.

If utilized properly, the existing evaluation criteria should adequately serve the prioritization process at the school and college level. The committee would be glad to assist with the final selection, if additional input appears to be needed after this point in the process, although we are not quite sure why this would be necessary.

x	David E. Kaufman, Chair	
x	Department of Sociology	
x	Central Washington University	
x	Ellensburg, WA 98926-7547	
x	(e-mail)KAUFMAN@CWU.EDU	
x	(voice)509.963.1305 (fax)509.963.3215	

4E

**1995-97 GF-S
BALANCE SHEET**

**1995-97 Biennium
Estimated Expenditures and Revenues
General Fund-State
Dollars in Millions**

	<u>SENATE</u>	<u>HOUSE</u>
<u>REVENUES</u>		
March Revenue Forecast	\$17,945	\$17,945
Tax Reductions	(264)	(738)
Other Revenue Legislation	(25)	(59)
Budget Driven Revenue	24	9
Total Revised Revenues	\$17,680	\$17,157
INITIATIVE 601 SPENDING LIMIT	\$17,921	\$17,921
<u>EXPENDITURES</u>		
TOTAL OPERATING BUDGET EXPENDITURES	17,895	17,271
Other Appropriation Legislation	0.2	0
Total Expenditures	17,895	17,271
<u>BALANCES</u>		
Beginning Balance	541	424
ENDING BALANCE	\$326	\$310
Expenditures Under the Spending Limit	(\$26)	(\$650)

is included for increased financial aid administered by the institutions.

ASSISTANCE TO DISPLACED WORKERS — \$8.3 MILLION EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING TRUST FUND

Funding is provided for extended unemployment benefits and job placement assistance for displaced workers at the Community and Technical Colleges.

**1995-97 Proposed Senate Operating Budget
Higher Education Enrollments**

	Base	FY 1996		FY 1997	
		New	Total	New	Total
University of Washington	31,290	258	31,548	261	31,809
Main Campus	29,826	31	29,857	31	29,888
Seattle-Evening Degree	525	-45	570	47	617
Tacoma Branch	490	98	588	99	687
Bothell Branch	449	84	533	84	617
Washington State University	17,385	378	17,763	369	18,132
Main Campus	15,991	220	16,211	208	16,419
Spokane Branch	258	25	283	25	308
Tri-Cities Branch	541	53	594	53	647
Vancouver Branch	595	80	675	83	758
Central Washington University	6,810	93	6,903	94	6,997
Eastern Washington University	7,573	65	7,638	66	7,704
The Evergreen State College	3,258	19	3,277	21	3,298
Western Washington University	9,360	102	9,462	104	9,566
HECB Timber Workers	50	0	50	0	50
Community and Technical Colleges	104,886	100	104,986	100	105,086
Timber Enrollments	500	0	500	0	500
Total Comm/Tech Colleges	105,386	100	105,486	100	105,586
Workforce Training	5,000	840	5,840	840	6,680
STATEWIDE TOTAL	186,112	1,855	187,967	1,855	189,822

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
1995-97 BUDGET REQUEST

(000's of dollars)

*Difference-
Latest version*

	<u>CWU</u>	<u>HECB</u>	<u>Governor</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Conference</u>	<u>& CWU</u>
1993-95 Expenditure Authority	65,967		65,966	65,966	65,966		(1)
Bond Payments	(214)		(214)	(214)	(214)		
Benefits changes	(20)		(20)	(20)	(20)		
Health Insurance rate change	(172)		(172)	(172)	(172)		
2nd yr. enrollment increase	1,003		1,003	1,003	1,003		
2nd yr. tuition increase	(2,234)		(2,234)	(2,235)	(2,235)		(1)
Current Authorized Level (CAL)	64,330		64,330	64,328	64,328		(2)
Postal Increase	24		24				(24)
Revolving Funds	(138)		(138)	(138)	(138)		
Inflation	574		574	574			(574)
Benefits changes	13		4	4			(13)
Pension Rate					146		146
Health Insurance rate change	779		779	329	499		(280)
Essential Requirements Level (ERL)	65,582	64,962	65,573	65,097	64,835		(747)
<i>Policy Changes:</i>							
Remove Inflation			(574)	(574)			
Legislative Reductions		(1,600)	(1,600)	(302)	(1,584)		(1,584)
Salary Increase	3,100	1,600	1,600	1,483	3,450		350
Health Payment Co-payment				(452)			
Pro-rate Employee Health Benefits				(148)			
Eliminate Assessment Funding				(372)			
<i>Request Packages:</i>							
Equitable Funding Of Current Enrollment.	5,526	4,500		512			(5,526)
Computing	1,114						(1,114)
Higher Education Library Information Network	1,276	1,300					(1,276)
Inst. Financial Aid. 3.5%					371		371
Net SB 5325 Higher Ed Funding					1,778		
Enrollment Increase	3,542	2,160	335	499	1,161		(2,381)
	<i>250/500 FTE</i>	<i>133/265 FTE</i>	<i>23/46 FTE</i>	<i>63/126 FTE</i>	<i>93/187 FTE</i>		
<i>Funding Changes:</i>							
Graduate Assistant Health Ins.				140			
Tuition Increase				(2,046)			
TOTAL REQUEST	\$80,140	\$72,922	\$65,334	\$63,837	\$70,011		(10,129)

Central Washington University
(Dollars in Thousands)

	GF-S	Senate Tuition-N	Total	GF-S	House Tuition-N	Total	GF-S	Difference Tuition-N	Total
1993-95 Expenditure Authority	65,966	23,792	112,146	65,966	23,792	112,146	0	0	0
Biennialize Current Biennium Changes	-1,638	2,448	810	-1,638	2,448	810	0	0	0
Inflation & Other Rate Adjustments	-138	0	-138	195	0	195	-333	0	-333
Changes in Service Delivery									
1. Other Funds Adjustment	0	0	3,140	0	0	3,140	0	0	0
2. Graduate Assitant Health Insurance	0	0	0	140	0	0	-140	0	0
3. Retrospective Insurance Rate Refund	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	0	0
Program Reductions									
4. Health Benefits Co-payment	0	0	0	-452	0	-452	452	0	452
5. Pro-rate Employee Health Benefits	0	0	0	-148	0	-148	148	0	148
6. Eliminate Assessment Funding	0	0	0	-372	0	-372	372	0	372
7. Administrative Reduction (2.4%/2%)	0	0	0	-302	0	-302	302	0	302
Program Enhancements									
8. Enrollment Increase	1,161	617	1,778	499	400	899	662	217	879
9. Instructional Support Enhancement	0	0	0	512	0	512	-512	0	-512
10. State Employee COLA Increase	0	0	0	1,483	0	1,483	-1,483	0	-1,483
11. SB 5325 Higher Education Funding	4,660	1,894	6,554	0	0	0	4,660	1,894	6,554
12. Tuition Increase *	0	0	0	-2,046	2,046	0	2,046	-2,046	0
1995-97 Proposed Budget	70,011	28,751	124,300	63,837	28,686	117,921	6,174	65	6,379
Fiscal Year 1996 Totals	33,916	13,888	60,573	31,859	13,918	58,476	2,057	-30	2,097
Fiscal Year 1997 Totals	36,095	14,863	63,727	31,978	14,768	59,445	4,117	95	4,282
Difference from 1993-95	4,045	4,959	12,154	-2,129	4,894	5,775			
Percent Change from 1993-95	6.1%	20.8%	10.8%	-3.2%	20.6%	5.1%			

Comments:

1. Other Funds Adjustment - Adjustment of non-appropriated funds to expected expenditure levels.

2. Graduate Assitant Health Insurance - The House budget switches funding for graduate assistant health insurance from the Health Services Account to the General

TO: Agnes
Dunbar
Per [unclear]

PART VI
HIGHER EDUCATION

1
2
3 NEW SECTION. Sec. 601. The appropriations in sections 602 through
4 610 of this act are subject to the following conditions and
5 limitations:

6 (1) "Institutions of higher education" means the institutions
7 receiving appropriations under sections 602 through 608 of this act.

8 (2) Resources made available under Substitute Senate Bill No. 5325
9 that are not used to meet authorized salary increases and other
10 mandated expenses shall be invested in measures which (a) reduce the
11 time-to-degree, (b) provide additional access to postsecondary
12 education, (c) improve the quality of undergraduate education, (d)
13 provide improved access to courses and programs that meet core program
14 requirements and are consistent with needs of the state labor market,
15 (e) provide up-to-date equipment and facilities for training in current
16 technologies, (f) expand the integration between the K-12 and
17 postsecondary systems and among the higher education institutions, (g)
18 provide additional access to postsecondary education for place-bound
19 and remote students, and (h) improve teaching and research capability
20 through the funding of distinguished professors. By December 15, 1995,
21 the higher education coordinating board and the state board for
22 community and technical colleges shall report to the appropriate
23 committees of the legislature regarding the actions and plans that have
24 been instituted in response to the directives in this subsection.

25 (3) The salary increases provided or referenced in this subsection
26 shall be the maximum allowable salary increases provided at
27 institutions of higher education, excluding increases associated with
28 normally occurring promotions and increases related to faculty and
29 professional staff retention.

30 (a) No more than \$300,000 of the appropriations provided in
31 sections 602 through 608 of this act may be expended for purposes
32 designated in sections 911 and 912 of this act.

33 (b) Each institution of higher education shall provide to each
34 classified staff employee as defined by the office of financial
35 management a salary increase of 5.0 percent on July 1, 1995. Each
36 institution of higher education shall provide to instructional and

1 research faculty, exempt professional staff, academic administrators,
 2 academic librarians, counselors, teaching and research assistants as
 3 classified by the office of financial management and all other
 4 nonclassified staff, including those employees under RCW 28B.16.015, a.
 5 average salary increase of 5.0 percent on July 1, 1995. Funding
 6 provided for these salary increases in sections 602 through 608 of this
 7 act reflect the savings achieved as a result of the budget reductions
 8 required by section 601(3), chapter 6, Laws of 1994 sp. sess.

9 (c) Funds under section 718 of this act are in addition to any
 10 increases provided in (a) and (b) of this subsection. Specific salary
 11 increases authorized in sections 602 and 603 of this act are in
 12 addition to any salary increase provided in this subsection.

13 (4) The appropriations in sections 602 through 608 of this act
 14 provide state general fund or employment and training trust account
 15 support for student full-time equivalent enrollments at each
 16 institution of higher education. Listed below are the annual full-time
 17 equivalent student enrollments by institution assumed in this act.

	1995-96	1996-97
	Annual	Annual
	Average	Average
	FTE	FTE
22 University of Washington		
23 Main campus	29,857	29,888
24 Evening Degree Program	570	617
25 Tacoma branch	588*	687**
26 Bothell branch	533	617
27 Washington State University		
28 Main campus	16,211	16,419
29 Spokane branch	283	308
30 Tri-Cities branch	594	647
31 Vancouver branch	675	758
32 Central Washington University	6,903	6,997
33 Eastern Washington University	7,638	7,704
34 The Evergreen State College	3,277	3,298
35 Western Washington University	9,462	9,566
36 State Board for Community and		
37 Technical Colleges	111,326	112,266