

3-6-1996

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 03/06/1996

Sue Tirotta

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

Recommended Citation

Tirotta, Sue, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 03/06/1996" (1996). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 621.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/621>

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: Hugh Spall
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 Arlt, Jonville, Myers, Roberts, Saunders, Starbuck and Yeh.
Visitors: Charles McGehee, Elisa Paez, Michael Chinn, Beverly Heckart, Roger Yu, Fritz Glover, Laura Appleton, Nancy Howard, Anne Denman, Barbara Radke, Clara Richardson, Keith Lewis and Beverly Heckart.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

Add items to Communications and Chair's report.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the February 21, 1996, Faculty Senate meeting have not yet been distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS

-2/20/96 letter from Beverly Heckart, History, regarding Library Policy; see Chair's Report below.
-2/22/96 letter from Kent Richards, History, regarding Library Policy.
-2/22/96 memo from Thomas Moore, Provost/VP for Academic Affairs, recommending changes to Faculty Code concerning promotion; referred to Code Committee.
-3/5/96 memo from Gary Lewis, Dean of Library and Media Services, to the University Community concerning Library Policy.

REPORTS

1. **CHAIR**

ELECTION OF 1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

***MOTION NO. 3058** Ken Gamon moved and Lisa Weyandt seconded a motion to elect by acclamation Rob Perkins, Administrative Management and Business Education, as the 1996-97 Faculty Senate Chair. Motion passed.

***MOTION NO. 3059** Ken Gamon moved and Minerva Caples seconded a motion to elect by acclamation Bobby Cummings, English, as the 1996-97 Faculty Senate Vice Chair. Motion passed.

The following individuals were nominated to the positions of Secretary and/or At-Large Member: Terry De Vietti, Psychology; Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs; Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts; Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science; Ken Gamon, Math; and Charles Rubin, Geology. Ballots were distributed to Senators, and they were instructed to vote for three individuals; the nominee receiving the highest plurality of votes will become the Faculty Senate Secretary, and the other two nominees receiving the highest plurality of votes will become the two at-large members of the Executive Committee.

***MOTION NO. 3060** Chair Spall moved that the Faculty Senate accept the balloting results for the positions of Secretary and At-Large members, as calculated by Sidney Nesselroad and Lisa Weyandt of the 1995-96 Senate Executive Committee: Terry De Vietti, Secretary; Ken Gamon, At-Large Member; Jim Hawkins, At-Large Member. Motion passed.

1. CHAIR, continued

1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP [effective 6/15/96]

CHAIR: Rob Perkins, AMBE
 VICE CHAIR: Bobby Cummings, English
 SECRETARY: Terry DeVietti, Psychology
 AT-LARGE MEMBER: Ken Gamon, Math
 AT-LARGE MEMBER: Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
 PAST CHAIR: Hugh Spall, Business Administration

* * * * *

LIBRARY POLICY

Chair Spall drew the Senate's attention to the 2/20/96 letter from Beverly Heckart, History, printed on page 5 of the Senate agenda and to the proposed motion concerning the Library Policy printed on page 2 of the Senate agenda. Dr. Heckart's memo states that

"at the beginning of Spring quarter 1996, faculty lending privileges will change as follows: 1) Individuals will be able to check out only 25 books at any given time; 2) The normal lending period will be restricted to 30 days with the possibility of renewing books ten times by e-mail or in person. The new policy regarding fines has already gone into effect: \$2.00 per item when seven days overdue, an additional \$3.00 per item at fourteen days overdue, \$7.00 per item at twenty-one days overdue with a replacement cost assessment at twenty-one days overdue."

The Chair explained that a memo dated 3/5/96 from Gary Lewis, Dean of Library and Media Services, to the University Community subsequently suspended implementation of the Library Service Policy, at the request of the Provost, "in order to allow further consideration. The Library Service Policy will be forwarded to the Library Advisory Committee for review. That Committee will be asked to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate and the Dean of Library and Media Services." Chair Spall reported that comments on the Library Policy should be directed to the chair of the Library Advisory Committee: Paul James, Biology. The Senate Executive Committee plans to report again on this issue when it receives the recommendation of the Library Advisory Committee.

* * * * *

CAMPUS CLIMATE TASK FORCE REPORT

Chair Spall reported that the Board of Trustees will hold a study session on the Campus Climate Task Force Report on March 7, 1996. Representatives from the administration, staff and student body have been invited to meet with the Board, and Senate Executive Committee member Ken Gamon will attend the study session on behalf of the Faculty Senate. President Nelson stated that the following individuals have been invited to meet with the Board: Task Force Chair Bob Brown, the President, the Vice Presidents, the chair of the Academic Department Chairs' Organization, departmental representatives, the Faculty Senate Chair (or representative), students, administrative exempt staff, civil service staff, and Affirmative Action and Personnel representatives. He explained that the Board does not intend to resolve any issues during this initial study session but hopes to establish a committed direction for positive action. Chair Spall distributed an addendum to the Senate agenda comprising eight recommendation of the Campus Climate Task Force.

*MOTION NO. 3061 Ken Gamon moved and Hugh Spall seconded a motion that the Faculty Senate vote on the following individual recommendations of the Campus Climate Task Force Report (January 1996), indicating whether it approves or disapproves of the recommendation or whether the recommendation needs further study. Motion passed.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CAMPUS CLIMATE TASK FORCE

1. We strongly recommend that the issue of faculty salary scale compression be acknowledged as a potentially catastrophic problem, and that finding a solution to alleviate the problem be a high priority for the administration.

 APPROVE DISAPPROVE NEEDS STUDY

2. We strongly recommend the permanent establishment of a Board of Trustee's Lecture Series in which cutting-edge scholars are brought to campus to present lecture and participate in classes. Presentations based upon intellectually stimulating ideas and research findings could be followed by local faculty discussions/debates to increase involvement and interaction. These functions must be attended and sponsored by the highest levels of administration to demonstrate their commitment to and interest in the intellectual growth of the campus.
 APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**
3. We recommend that an ad hoc committee be assigned the task of assessing the level of interest in developing an organization and place where members of the faculty, the staff, and campus guests might gather.
 APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**
4. In order to provide evaluation of personnel at all levels in the university hierarchy, we recommend that the Board of Trustees commission an independent, outside evaluator to provide an objective assessment of the president's performance at least once during each biennium. The results of such an evaluation would not only be of value to the trustees, but could also encourage more confidence among university personnel, knowing that the president is also subject to professional evaluation.
 APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**
5. To ensure that a concern for climate is a continuing institutional priority, we recommend that a permanent Campus Climate Oversight Committee with rotating membership be established to gather and review information regarding campus climate and to make reports and recommendations to the Board of Trustees, the president, the faculty senate, and the Central community as appropriate.
 APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**
6. We recommend that the university employ a professional ombudsman (or alternative form of conflict resolution office) to ensure that complaints from students, faculty, and staff are both heard and addressed. This person, who would provide confidential, impartial, and independent consultation to all members of the campus community, would report directly to the president, or to the Board of Trustees in cases where the president is a party to the complaint.
 APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**
7. We strongly recommend that performance evaluation of all supervisory personnel include an assessment of the work climate in their respective areas of responsibility, as seen by their subordinates. Establishing a positive climate/work environment should be a fundamental aspect of performance effectiveness.
 APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**
8. A related curricular issue raised by women students and faculty is the content of the Douglas Honors College program, which focuses specifically on a body of literature regarded as the great classics of western civilization. Women students who have graduated from the college complain about the lack of inclusion of women authors and the dearth of works from other cultures. While there has been national debate about the dilemmas inherent in an "great books" curriculum, there has been little public discussion of these controversies at CWU. Given that the university's only honors program focuses almost exclusively on western civilization, the task force recommends that these issues be reexamined by the faculty.
 APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**

Senator Gamon explained that the Executive Committee charged the Senate Chair with excerpting from the Task Force Report those recommendations pertaining most directly to faculty. He stated that the

1. CHAIR, continued

Senate's "straw vote" on the excerpted recommendations would provide him with a sense of the Senate's feelings on certain issues so that he could present them to the Board at the study session. In answer to questions, he explained that the Executive Committee did not intend to imply that these eight recommendations were more important than others contained in the Report, and they merely represent a starting point for discussion. Chair Spall stated that these eight recommendations were thought to most directly affect faculty members, and the scheduling of the Board's study session so soon after release of the Task Force Report made it difficult for the faculty to consider the entire body of recommendations in depth.

Senators and members of the Campus Climate Task Force criticized the Executive Committee for the short notice they received in reviewing these issues as well as the Executive Committee's apparent skirting of the more "sensitive" recommendations contained in the Report. It was generally agreed that a Senate vote of this nature would imply that only these eight recommendations were of importance to the faculty, and such a vote could therefore be misleading. Senators stated that it would be more meaningful and accurate for the Faculty Senate to endorse the entire Task Force Report, including all of its recommendations.

*** MOTION NO. 3062** Walter Kaminski moved and Bobby Cummings seconded a motion to suspend consideration of MOTION NO. 3061 and state that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendations of the Campus Climate Task Force and pledges to devote further study to the issues cited in the Task Force Report. Motion passed.

2. PRESIDENT

President Ivory Nelson reported that the State Legislative regular session ends on March 7, 1996. No agreement has yet been reached between the House and Senate concerning a 1996 supplemental budget. The President noted that significant policy differences exist between the House and Senate. He added that the supplemental budget, if passed, would include a \$1.29 million appropriation for the Cooperative Library Project, and C.W.U. has the second highest appropriation for this activity.

3. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY STUDENT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

[Membership: Laura Appleton, Sociology, - Chair; Michael Chinn, Art; Nancy Howard, Affirmative Action; Mark Krause, Student; Clara Richardson, Accounting]

Committee Chair Laura Appleton explained that

"in developing this policy, we have assumed that conflict of interest and appearance of fairness situations are likely to arise because of the very nature of our community. Living in a small, rural community, which is geographically isolated from urban areas, and where the university is the largest employer in the county, means that it is likely that faculty may encounter as undergraduate or graduate students their family members, financial partners in business enterprises, or their clients. Too, many faculty offer their professional services to the community as consultants and practitioners, and in some arenas and specialties there may not be alternative equivalent expertise available. Moreover, this development and maintenance of professional skills and knowledge, including authoring textbooks, is valued by the university as scholarship and professional development. Thus, in those instances where conflict of interest situations are unavoidable for faculty, we recommend the use of peer review and oversight to resolve such conflict and ensure fairness for both students and faculty."

Chair Appleton stated that the Committee submitted the policy draft to the Assistant Attorney General, and some sections will be strengthened or modified (e.g., add "serving on a thesis committee" to section 2.3).

*** FOR DISCUSSION ONLY ***

DRAFT POLICY ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN STUDENT-FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS**1. Statement of Philosophy**

Central Washington University is committed to ensuring a learning environment in which students have the right to equitable conditions and treatment. In particular, it is important to ensure

3. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY STUDENT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, continued

fair methods of evaluation and to eliminate any perceptions of bias arising out of personal and professional relationships between faculty and students. At the same time, there should be no unfair restrictions on the educational and employment opportunities of all students, nor on the reasonable freedom of association, interaction and access to services for faculty and students which is part of a healthy learning environment and integral to a democratic society. The following guidelines are intended to balance these objectives and apply the least restrictive means to address potential conflicts.

2. To Whom Does This Policy Apply?

- 2.1 While all members of the University community should avoid conflicts of interest, these guidelines are drafted specifically for students and faculty.
- 2.2 Students include those enrolled, or applying for admittance in a course or program offered by the University for credit.
- 2.3 Faculty includes anyone responsible for teaching, evaluation or academic supervision, including staff, graduate and undergraduate students.

3. What is a Conflict of Interest?

- 3.1 A conflict of interest may arise in situations in which there is a reasonable possibility that a particular relationship between a faculty member and a student may confer upon one of them an unfair advantage or subject one of them to an unfair disadvantage. Such relationships include, but are not limited to:
 - 3.1.1 close family relationships such as those between spouses or spousal equivalents, parents and children, siblings, in-laws, grandparents and grandchildren;
 - 3.1.2 amorous relationships;
 - 3.1.3 relationships between persons whose economic interests are closely interrelated;
 - 3.1.4 professional relationships outside the classroom, e.g., consultant-client, therapist-client.
- 3.2 It is not possible to specify all those situations in which there may be a conflict of interest or appearance of fairness. However, members of the University community are entitled to guidance in this respect.
- 3.3 A conflict of interest may arise in any situation where one person in such a relationship is in a position to make decisions or take actions that affect the other person. Such situations include, but are not limited to:
 - 3.3.1 the decision to admit a student to a program;
 - 3.3.2 the provision of instruction;
 - 3.3.3 the requirement of self-authored textbooks or materials which generate royalties or profits;
 - 3.3.4 the evaluation of a student;
 - 3.3.5 the awarding of prizes, scholarships, financial assistance and other benefits to students;
 - 3.3.6 the award of teaching or research assistantships or other remunerative employment, either within the University or using funds administered by the University;
 - 3.3.7 the acceptance of contracts or other remunerative employment from student clients.
- 3.4 Even in the absence of a conflict of interest as defined in this policy, faculty and students should be aware that since relationships between faculty and students involve trust and disparities in power, they may give rise to perceptions of bias, unfair advantage, or unfair treatment.

4. How are Conflicts to be Dealt With?

- 4.1 It is the responsibility of chairs, directors and deans to ensure compliance with this policy.
- 4.2 It is incumbent upon faculty members to be mindful of situations in which an appearance of

3. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY STUDENT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, continued

fairness issue could arise and to deal promptly with any conflict of interest that does arise.

- 4.3 Where a conflict of interest, as defined above, arises, the faculty must notify the relevant chair, director or dean.
- 4.4 Other persons who perceive a conflict of interest may also bring the matter to the attention of the appropriate chair, director or dean.
- 4.5 Where a conflict of interest may arise in a faculty member's instructional role, one or more of the following methods should be used to avoid or resolve such conflict.
 - 4.5.1 The faculty member should normally decline or terminate a supervisory, teaching, evaluative or decision-making role in which a conflict of interest arises, unless the chair, director or dean is of the view that this will create undue hardship to the student.
 - 4.5.2 In situations where the conflicts of interest involves teaching, supervision or evaluation and where alternative courses or supervision exist that are reasonable and appropriate to the student's program, the student should utilize those alternatives.
 - 4.5.3 Where no reasonable and appropriate alternative exists, the chair, director or dean shall ensure that a fair and unbiased mechanism of evaluation is put in place. This will normally require that another suitably qualified peer review all material submitted for evaluation, review the grades assigned, and report whether those grades are reasonable.
- 4.6 Where a conflict of interest may arise in a professional role, one or more of the following methods should be used to avoid or resolve such conflict.
 - 4.6.1 Before adopting a self-authored text or materials, one or more qualified peers should review the text and materials for quality and appropriateness for the course.
 - 4.6.2 When preexisting or ongoing professional relationships exist, a peer case review or oversight process should be used to help mediate the potential conflict of interest.

[The Ad Hoc Committee recommends adding text and/or a citation to the Faculty Code concerning this policy, but the Committee does not recommend what the specific Code wording should be.]

* * * * *

Senators stated that not all possible questions are or could be defined in the policy and questioned who would be responsible for making a final determination of what constitutes a conflict of interest. Chair Appleton responded that it is ultimately the faculty's responsibility to be aware of potential or existing conflicts of interest and to bring them to the attention of their immediate supervisor (e.g., department chair, dean, etc.), who would be responsible for making a final determination. She added that, in case a faculty member disagreed with the decision of their supervisor, the faculty member would be free to dispute the supervisor's decision through the regular faculty grievance procedure. She stated that there is no formal conflict of interest policy in place now, and decisions are made on a relatively arbitrary basis.

Some Senators questioned the need for a written policy on what appear to be issues concerning common sense and trust, and asked whether self-authored materials generated without a "profit motive" (e.g., donated profits or non-profit) would be subject to the policy. Chair Appleton pointed out that the "appearance of fairness" may be equally as important as an objective "conflict of interest," the Committee tried to make the policy as liberal and non-specific as possible, and this policy was not constructed as "window dressing" to address the recent concerns of the legislature but is intended to deal with the university's real problems. Senators pointed out that our increasingly litigious society makes it necessary to articulate in detail what behaviors are expected.

Chair Appleton stated that she would be off campus during Spring quarter, and Michael Chinn would assume the chairship of the Ad Hoc Committee. The Committee may decide to hold a public hearing on the policy proposal before bringing it before the Faculty Senate for a vote.

4. **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Chair Charles McGehee reported that the Academic Affairs Committee has met for two hours each week this year. The Committee is attempting to gather all academic policy into a single internal document and clarify and define decision making processes/circumstances.

5. **BUDGET COMMITTEE**

No report

6. **CODE COMMITTEE**

No report

7. **CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

No report

8. **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

No report

9. **PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Chair Bobby Cummings reported that the Public Affairs Committee is continuing to develop a plan to disseminate information concerning C.W.U. faculty. The Committee is considering development of an Internet "home page," printed fact sheet, videos, etc.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

***** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 3, 1996*****

***** CORRECTION - See Meeting Dates *****

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, ~~February 28, 1996~~ March 6, 1996
SUB 204-205

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 21, 1996

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

- 2/20/96 letter from Beverly Heckart, History, re. Library Policy; see Chair's Report below.
- 2/22/96 letter from Kent Richards, History, re. Library Policy.
- 2/22/96 memo from Thomas Moore, Provost/VP for Academic Affairs, re. proposed changes to Faculty Code concerning promotion; referred to Code Committee.

V. REPORTS

1. CHAIR

- Election of 1996-97 Faculty Senate Executive Committee [attached]
- Library Policy [letter and motion attached]

2. PRESIDENT

3. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY STUDENT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST [proposal attached -- for discussion only]

4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Charles McGehee, Chair

5. BUDGET COMMITTEE - Barney Erickson, Chair

6. CODE COMMITTEE - Beverly Heckart, Chair

7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - Clara Richardson, 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: ~~March 6, 1996~~ April 3, 1996*****

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, February 28, 1996
SUB 204-205

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 21, 1996

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

-2/20/96 letter from Beverly Heckart, History, re. Library Policy; see Chair's Report below.

-2/22/96 letter from Kent Richards, History, re. Library Policy.

-2/22/96 memo from Thomas Moore, Provost/VP for Academic Affairs, re. proposed changes to Faculty Code concerning promotion; referred to Code Committee.

V. REPORTS

1. CHAIR

-Election of 1996-97 Faculty Senate Executive Committee [attached]

-Library Policy [letter and motion attached]

2. PRESIDENT

3. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY STUDENT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST [proposal attached -- for discussion only]

4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Charles McGehee, Chair

5. BUDGET COMMITTEE - Barney Erickson, Chair

6. CODE COMMITTEE - Beverly Heckart, Chair

7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - Clara Richardson, 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: March 6, 1996 *****

CHAIR

1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

POSITIONS:

NOMINEES:

CHAIR:

[to be announced]

VICE CHAIR:

Bobby Cummings, English

**SECRETARY,
2 AT-LARGE
MEMBERS:**

**Terry DeVietti, Psychology
Susan Donahoe, Teacher Ed Programs
Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science**

PAST CHAIR:

Hugh Spall, Business Administration

*** * * * ***

LIBRARY POLICY

[see letter on page 5 of this agenda]

MOTION: The Faculty Senate recommends that the C.W.U. Library Policy on faculty lending privileges be amended so that no component of the policy is more restrictive than any component of the faculty lending policies of the University of Washington, Washington State University, Eastern Washington University, and Western Washington University, to wit:

"Faculty may check out a maximum of 100 books at a time for 90 days. Renewals are permitted. The total amount of fines imposed on an individual faculty member cannot exceed \$17.50. The Library may assess replacement costs against individual faculty members when the faculty member loses a book that he has checked out."

Central
Washington
University



Department of Sociology
Ellensburg, Washington 98926
(509) 963-1305

To: Hugh Spall, Chair
Faculty Senate

Re: Policy on Conflict of Interest in Student-Faculty Relationships

Date: February 27, 1996

From: Ad Hoc Committee on Conflict of Interest:

Laura Appleton, Chair
Michael Chinn Mark Krause
Nancy Howard Clara Richardson

We are hereby submitting our draft policy on Conflict of Interest in Student-Faculty Relationships to the Faculty Senate for review and comment.

In developing this policy, we have assumed that conflict of interest and appearance of fairness situations are likely to arise because of the very nature of our community. Living in a small, rural community, which is geographically isolated from urban areas, and where the university is the largest employer in the county, means that it is likely that faculty may encounter as undergraduate or graduate students their family members, financial partners in business enterprises, or their clients. Too, many faculty offer their professional services to the community as consultants and practitioners, and in some arenas and specialties there may not be alternative equivalent expertise available. Moreover, this development and maintenance of professional skills and knowledge, including authoring textbooks, is valued by the university as scholarship and professional development. Thus, in those instances where conflict of interest situations are unavoidable for faculty, we recommend the use of peer review and oversight to resolve such conflict and ensure fairness for both students and faculty.

DRAFT

[February 27, 1996]

POLICY ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST
IN STUDENT-FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS

1. Statement of Philosophy

Central Washington University is committed to ensuring a learning environment in which students have the right to equitable conditions and treatment. In particular, it is important to ensure fair methods of evaluation and to eliminate any perceptions of bias arising out of personal and professional relationships between faculty and students. At the same time, there should be no unfair restrictions on the educational and employment opportunities of all students, nor on the reasonable freedom of association, interaction and access to services for faculty and students which is part of a healthy learning environment and integral to a democratic society. The following guidelines are intended to balance these objectives and apply the least restrictive means to address potential conflicts.

2. To Whom Does This Policy Apply?

- 2.1 While all members of the University community should avoid conflicts of interest, these guidelines are drafted specifically for students and faculty.
- 2.2 Students include those enrolled, or applying for admittance in a course or program offered by the University for credit.
- 2.3 Faculty includes anyone responsible for teaching, evaluation or academic supervision, including staff, graduate and undergraduate students.

3. What is a Conflict of Interest?

- 3.1 A conflict of interest may arise in situations in which there is a reasonable possibility that a particular relationship between a faculty member and a student may confer upon one of them an unfair advantage or subject one of them to an unfair disadvantage. Such relationships include, but are not limited to:
 - 3.1.1 close family relationships such as those between spouses or spousal equivalents, parents and children, siblings, in-laws, grandparents and grandchildren;
 - 3.1.2 amorous relationships;

- 3.1.3 relationships between persons whose economic interests are closely interrelated;
- 3.1.4 professional relationships outside the classroom, e.g., consultant-client, therapist-client.
- 3.2 It is not possible to specify all those situations in which there may be a conflict of interest or appearance of fairness. However, members of the University community are entitled to guidance in this respect.
- 3.3 A conflict of interest may arise in any situation where one person in such a relationship is in a position to make decisions or take actions that affect the other person. Such situations include, but are not limited to:
 - 3.3.1 the decision to admit a student to a program;
 - 3.3.2 the provision of instruction;
 - 3.3.3 the requirement of self-authored textbooks or materials which generate royalties or profits;
 - 3.3.4 the evaluation of a student;
 - 3.3.5 the awarding of prizes, scholarships, financial assistance and other benefits to students;
 - 3.3.6 the award of teaching or research assistantships or other remunerative employment, either within the University or using funds administered by the University;
 - 3.3.7 the acceptance of contracts or other remunerative employment from student clients.
- 3.4 Even in the absence of a conflict of interest as defined in this policy, faculty and students should be aware that since relationships between faculty and students involve trust and disparities in power, they may give rise to perceptions of bias, unfair advantage, or unfair treatment.

4. How are Conflicts to be Dealt With?

- 4.1 It is the responsibility of chairs, directors and deans to ensure compliance with this policy.
- 4.2 It is incumbent upon faculty members to be mindful of situations in which an appearance of fairness issue could arise and to deal promptly with any conflict of interest that does arise.

- 4.3 Where a conflict of interest, as defined above, arises, the faculty must notify the relevant chair, director or dean.
- 4.4 Other persons who perceive a conflict of interest may also bring the matter to the attention of the appropriate chair, director or dean.
- 4.5 Where a conflict of interest may arise in a faculty member's instructional role, one or more of the following methods should be used to avoid or resolve such conflict.
 - 4.5.1 The faculty member should normally decline or terminate a supervisory, teaching, evaluative or decision-making role in which a conflict of interest arises, unless the chair, director or dean is of the view that this will create undue hardship to the student.
 - 4.5.2 In situations where the conflicts of interest involves teaching, supervision or evaluation and where alternative courses or supervision exist that are reasonable and appropriate to the student's program, the student should utilize those alternatives.
 - 4.5.3 Where no reasonable and appropriate alternative exists, the chair, director or dean shall ensure that a fair and unbiased mechanism of evaluation is put in place. This will normally require that another suitably qualified peer review all material submitted for evaluation, review the grades assigned, and report whether those grades are reasonable.
- 4.6 Where a conflict of interest may arise in a professional role, one or more of the following methods should be used to avoid or resolve such conflict.
 - 4.6.1 Before adopting a self-authored text or materials, one or more qualified peers should review the text and materials for quality and appropriateness for the course.
 - 4.6.2 When preexisting or ongoing professional relationships exist, a peer case review or oversight process should be used to help mediate the potential conflict of interest.

[The Ad Hoc Committee recommends adding text and/or a citation to the Faculty Code concerning this policy, but the Committee does not recommend what the specific Code wording should be.]

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
AGENDA - March 6, 1996

Page 5



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Department of History

February 20, 1996

Mr. Hugh Spall, Chair
Faculty Senate
Campus--7509

Dear Hugh:

With this letter I respectfully request that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee consult with the Senate in the very near future in order either to ratify or to protest the proposed change in the faculty lending privileges for the CWU library that is slated for the beginning of spring quarter, 1996.

Few faculty are aware that at the beginning of spring quarter, faculty lending privileges will change as follows: 1) Individuals will be able to check out only 25 books at any given time; 2) The normal lending period will be restricted to 30 days with the possibility of renewing books ten times by e-mail or in person. The new policy regarding fines has already gone into effect: \$2.00 per item when seven days overdue, an additional \$3.00 per item at fourteen days overdue, \$7.00 per item at twenty-one days overdue with a replacement cost assessment at twenty-one days overdue.

This policy was approved by the deans' council on February 21, 1995. At that time, the complete change in the policy was not printed in the deans' council minutes. It was noted only as a summary report with recommendations. So much for open communications inside the university.

In view of the lending policies for faculty at other public universities in our state, the new CWU policy seems unduly restrictive. At Western Washington faculty may check out up to 100 books at a time for 90 days with no fines assessed. At Eastern Washington, there is no limit on the number of books that can be borrowed for 90 days, also with no faculty fines. At the University of Washington, there is no limit on the number of books that can be checked out for 90 days at Suzzallo Library. Fines are assessed but cannot exceed \$15.00. At WSU, there is no limit on the number of books that can be checked out for one semester at the Holland Library. Fines over \$17.50 cannot be assessed.

At all these other institutions, renewals can take place and some

RECEIVED

FEB 20 1996

CWU FACULTY SENATE

Mr. Hugh Spall, Chair
Faculty Senate
Page 2

schools assess replacement costs when a book is lost. It is noteworthy that the basic lending policy for faculty, however, remains more generous than the policy slated to go into effect at CWU.

At a time when a Campus Climate Report describes faculty morale to be at an all-time low, when greater demands are being placed on faculty to perform more research and publish/deliver more scholarly papers in order to achieve tenure and promotion, when faculty pay raises are non-existent even though the numbers of students taught continues to increase, the change in the library's lending policy for faculty seems aggravating at best and perverse at worst. This change will affect the most productive faculty members adversely and seems unnecessarily punitive for the vast majority of faculty.

For all these reasons it is desirable that the Faculty Senate deliberate and take a position on the new policy before it goes into effect at the beginning of spring quarter.

Sincerely,

Beverly Heckart
Beverly Heckart
Chair, History Department

**FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
ADDENDUM TO AGENDA - March 6, 1996**

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate will vote on the following individual recommendations of the Campus Climate Task Force Report (January 1996), indicating whether it approves or disapproves of the recommendation or whether the recommendation needs further study.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CAMPUS CLIMATE TASK FORCE

1. We strongly recommend that the issue of faculty salary scale compression be acknowledged as a potentially catastrophic problem, and that finding a solution to alleviate the problem be a high priority for the administration.

APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**

2. We strongly recommend the permanent establishment of a Board of Trustee's Lecture Series in which cutting-edge scholars are brought to campus to present lecture and participate in classes. Presentations based upon intellectually stimulating ideas and research findings could be followed by local faculty discussions/debates to increase involvement and interaction. These functions must be attended and sponsored by the highest levels of administration to demonstrate their commitment to and interest in the intellectual growth of the campus.

APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**

3. We recommend that an ad hoc committee be assigned the task of assessing the level of interest in developing an organization and place where members of the faculty, the staff, and campus guests might gather.

APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**

4. In order to provide evaluation of personnel at all levels in the university hierarchy, we recommend that the Board of Trustees commission an independent, outside evaluator to provide an objective assessment of the president's performance at least once during each biennium. The results of such an evaluation would not only be of value to the trustees, but could also encourage more confidence among university personnel, knowing that the president is also subject to professional evaluation.

APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**

5. To ensure that a concern for climate is a continuing institutional priority, we recommend that a permanent Campus Climate Oversight Committee with rotating membership be established to gather and review information regarding campus climate and to make reports and recommendations to the Board of Trustees, the president, the faculty senate, and the Central community as appropriate.

APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**

6. We recommend that the university employ a professional ombudsman (or alternative form of conflict resolution office) to ensure that complaints from students, faculty, and staff are both heard and addressed. This person, who would provide confidential, impartial, and independent consultation to all members of the campus community, would report directly to the president, or to the Board of Trustees in cases where the president is a party to the complaint.

APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**

7. We strongly recommend that performance evaluation of all supervisory personnel include an assessment of the work climate in their respective areas of responsibility, as seen by their subordinates. Establishing a positive climate/work environment should be a fundamental aspect of performance effectiveness.

APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**

8. A related curricular issue raised by women students and faculty is the content of the Douglas Honors College program, which focuses specifically on a body of literature regarded as the great classics of western civilization. Women students who have graduated from the college complain about the lack of inclusion of women authors and the dearth of works from other cultures. While there has been national debate about the dilemmas inherent in an "great books" curriculum, there has been little public discussion of these controversies at CWU. Given that the university's only honors program focuses almost exclusively on western civilization, the task force recommends that these issues be reexamined by the faculty.

APPROVE **DISAPPROVE** **NEEDS STUDY**

<input type="checkbox"/> Walter ARLT	<input type="checkbox"/> Stephen JEFFERIES
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen BLAIR	<input type="checkbox"/> Dan RAMSDELL
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John BURKHARDT	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minerva CAPLES	<input type="checkbox"/> Carol BUTTERFIELD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bobby CUMMINGS	<input type="checkbox"/> Loretta GRAY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terry DeVIETTI	<input type="checkbox"/> Roger FOUTS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Susan DONAHOE	<input type="checkbox"/> Dale OTTO
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Robert FORDAN	<input type="checkbox"/> Roger GARRETT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken GAMON	<input type="checkbox"/> James HARPER
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael GLEASON	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gerald GUNN	<input type="checkbox"/> Wayne FAIRBURN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim HAWKINS	<input type="checkbox"/> Mark ZETTERBERG
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Webster HOOD	<input type="checkbox"/> Peter BURKHOLDER
<input type="checkbox"/> Paulette JONVILLE	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Katarin JURICH	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Walter KAMINSKI	<input type="checkbox"/> Brue BARNES
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michelle KIDWELL	<input type="checkbox"/> George TOWN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deborah MEDLAR	<input type="checkbox"/> Gary HEESACKER
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luetta MONSON	<input type="checkbox"/> Cindy EMMANS
<input type="checkbox"/> Robert MYERS	<input type="checkbox"/> Patrick OWENS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ivory NELSON	<input type="checkbox"/> Thomas MOORE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sidney NESSELROAD	<input type="checkbox"/> Andrew SPENCER
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vince NETHERY	<input type="checkbox"/> Robert GREGSON
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steve OLSON	<input type="checkbox"/> Terry MARTIN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rob PERKINS	<input type="checkbox"/> Cathy BERTELSON
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dieter ROMBOY	<input type="checkbox"/> Stella MORENO
<input type="checkbox"/> James ROBERTS	<input type="checkbox"/> C. Wayne JOHNSTON
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sharon ROSELL	<input type="checkbox"/> Michael BRAUNSTEIN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eric ROTH	<input type="checkbox"/> Geoffrey BOERS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charles RUBIN	<input type="checkbox"/> James HINTHORNE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> James SAHLSTRAND	<input type="checkbox"/> Margaret SAHLSTRAND
<input type="checkbox"/> Peter SAUNDERS	<input type="checkbox"/> Wolfgang FRANZ
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hugh SPALL	<input type="checkbox"/> Ed ESBECK
<input type="checkbox"/> Kristan STARBUCK	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carin THOMAS	<input type="checkbox"/> Martha KURTZ
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Morris UEBELACKER	<input type="checkbox"/> John ALWIN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lisa WEYANDT	<input type="checkbox"/> Stephanie STEIN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rex WIRTH	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marla WYATT	<input type="checkbox"/> Carolyn SCHAETLER
<input type="checkbox"/> Thomas YEH	

March 6, 1996

Date

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Charles McBehee - Sociology - Acad Affairs Committee
Elin Páez - sociology student Campus Climate Task Force
Michael Glenn - Art - Conflict of Interest committee
Beverly Heckard History
Roger Ya - physics
Ziffy Glover - BOT

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



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

RECEIVED
MAR 05 1996
CWU FACULTY SENATE

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Community

FROM: Gary A. Lewis, Dean
Library and Media Services

SUBJ: Suspension of Implementation of Library Service Policy

DATE: March 5, 1996

At the request of Provost Moore, we have suspended implementation of the Library Service Policy in order to allow further consideration. The Library Service Policy will be forwarded to the Library Advisory Committee for review. That committee will be asked to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate and the Dean of Library and Media Services.

/kb

c: Provost Moore
Senate Chair Spall



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Office of Graduate Studies and Research

Memorandum

Date: February 23, 1996

To: Tom Moore/Deans' Council

From: Ray Riznyk, Chair
Faculty Development and Research Committee

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1996
CWU FACULTY SENATE

Re: Faculty Research Leaves
\$100K Faculty Development Fund

At the request of the Provost, the Faculty Development and Research Committee met to discuss two separate issues:

- 1) To consider amending the policy concerning faculty research leave reimbursement.
- 2) To provide a working definition of faculty development and to recommend in a prioritized manner how the \$100,000 set aside for development activities be expended.

Faculty Research Leaves

In order to increase the number of research leaves awarded each year, the Faculty Development and Research Committee recommends that the policy of reimbursement be amended. Rather than reimburse the respective school or college with the entire quarter salary of the faculty member awarded a research leave, it is proposed that only those funds needed to hire an adjunct to teach the necessary courses offered by the on-leave faculty member be reimbursed. This reimbursement would amount to approximately \$500 per credit hour to hire part-time adjuncts.

Definition of Faculty Development

The Committee is of the opinion that faculty development is a broad-based concept. As such, it includes ***any activity or set of activities that enables a faculty member to better perform his/her job vis a vis instruction, research/creative activity, and/or public service.***

①

Expenditure Prioritization

On a prioritized basis, instructional development ranks first and foremost at CWU. Therefore, the Committee recommends that all of the \$100,000 made available for faculty development be restricted to improvement of classroom instruction. Examples of instructional development activities include, but are not limited to:

- Instruction-related travel, e.g. to workshops and conferences that have direct application to the enhancement of classroom performance.
- The hiring of consultants for departmental visitations for curriculum development and/or reform.
- The purchase of software to bolster teaching and to aid in the use of educational technology in the classroom.
- The purchase of materials and resources for the department or for the library which can enhance instruction including videotapes and CD-ROMs. (Major pieces of equipment and computers should not be purchased with the limited faculty development money).

Disbursement of Faculty Development Funds

The Faculty Development and Research Committee strongly recommends that the distribution of the \$100,000 be prorated based on the number of continuing, more than half-time faculty positions per department (not to include adjuncts hired on a course-by-course basis). We feel that all CWU faculty should have access to these funds to enhance their instructional capabilities, not just those faculty of departments which profit from large class enrollments during the summer quarter. However, each Department/Program receiving their prorated share for instructional development should decide for what purpose and to whom the funds are to be allocated.

copy:

Ivory Nelson, President
Hugh Spall, Chair of Faculty Senate ✓
Associate Deans



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate

TO: Ray Riznyk, Associate Dean/Graduate Studies and Research
Chair, Faculty Development and Research Committee

FROM: Hugh Spall, Chair
Faculty Senate

DATE: February 7, 1996

RE: **FACULTY DEVELOPMENT** *HS*

President Nelson has decided to make \$100,000 available for faculty development provided that the university achieves the revenues and costs projected in the summer school budget. He wants the Faculty Senate to determine the allocation of these funds among possible faculty development activities. It would be acceptable to recommend that the entire sum be spent on one activity--e.g. travel. It would also be acceptable to recommend allocation of the funds between two activities or among more than two activities.

As I understand the constraints, the \$100,000 will be allocated among the Colleges and Schools according to the existing formula for allocating summer school profits. The Schools and Colleges will further divide their share among existing departments and programs according to their existing internal allocation formulas. The Senate's task is to specify how these funds would be spent once the funds get to the department and program level. It would be acceptable to recommend that the decision on spending the funds be made by the departments and programs instead of the Senate provided that the use of the funds is reported to someone and the data is consolidated and reported to the President.

The President is seeking input about faculty priorities for faculty development. The faculty, by allocating funds, will provide information to the President concerning their priorities. Please recommend an allocation of this \$100,000 to the Senate no later than **February 27, 1996**.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

c: Gerald Stacy, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research (7510)
Ivory Nelson, President (7501)
Thomas Moore, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs (7503)

HS:sft

[c:\wpdocs\agendas\96-2-7.dev]



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Department of History

February 20, 1996

RECEIVED

Mr. Hugh Spall, Chair
Faculty Senate
Campus--7509

FEB 20 1996
CWU FACULTY SENATE

Dear Hugh:

With this letter I respectfully request that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee consult with the Senate in the very near future in order either to ratify or to protest the proposed change in the faculty lending privileges for the CWU library that is slated for the beginning of spring quarter, 1996.

Few faculty are aware that at the beginning of spring quarter, faculty lending privileges will change as follows: 1) Individuals will be able to check out only 25 books at any given time; 2) The normal lending period will be restricted to 30 days with the possibility of renewing books ten times by e-mail or in person. The new policy regarding fines has already gone into effect: \$2.00 per item when seven days overdue, an additional \$3.00 per item at fourteen days overdue, \$7.00 per item at twenty-one days overdue with a replacement cost assessment at twenty-one days overdue.

This policy was approved by the deans' council on February 21, 1995. At that time, the complete change in the policy was not printed in the deans' council minutes. It was noted only as a summary report with recommendations. So much for open communications inside the university.

In view of the lending policies for faculty at other public universities in our state, the new CWU policy seems unduly restrictive. At Western Washington faculty may check out up to 100 books at a time for 90 days with no fines assessed. At Eastern Washington, there is no limit on the number of books that can be borrowed for 90 days, also with no faculty fines. At the University of Washington, there is no limit on the number of books that can be checked out for 90 days at Suzzallo Library. Fines are assessed but cannot exceed \$15.00. At WSU, there is no limit on the number of books that can be checked out for one semester at the Holland Library. Fines over \$17.50 cannot be assessed.

At all these other institutions, renewals can take place and some

5

Mr. Hugh Spall, Chair
Faculty Senate
Page 2

schools assess replacement costs when a book is lost. It is noteworthy that the basic lending policy for faculty, however, remains more generous than the policy slated to go into effect at CWU.

At a time when a Campus Climate Report describes faculty morale to be at an all-time low, when greater demands are being placed on faculty to perform more research and publish/deliver more scholarly papers in order to achieve tenure and promotion, when faculty pay raises are non-existent even though the numbers of students taught continues to increase, the change in the library's lending policy for faculty seems aggravating at best and perverse at worst. This change will affect the most productive faculty members adversely and seems unnecessarily punitive for the vast majority of faculty.

For all these reasons it is desirable that the Faculty Senate deliberate and take a position on the new policy before it goes into effect at the beginning of spring quarter.

Sincerely,



Beverly Heckart
Chair, History Department

Date: Wed, 21 Feb 1996 13:12:09 -0700 (PDT)
From: Willard Sperry <sperryw@cwu.edu>
To: spallh@CWU.EDU
Cc: senators@CWU.EDU, lewisg@CWU.EDU, heckartb@CWU.EDU
Subject: library lending

RECEIVED

FEB 22 1996

CWU FACULTY SENATE

Hu

I certainly agree with Beverly that there should be no limit to the number of books faculty may borrow from the library.

Regarding fines I have suggestions. Could it be possible to keep fines in place and have a renewal or return system which would make it less likely that I would forget to return or renew. Perhaps if all my library books were due on the same day, it could be a different day for everyone, I could get it all done at once. Computers are perfect for doing organizational tasks like this. They might even send out an automated email telling each faculty that his or her books are due tomorrow or such.

Cheers, Bill

Willard Sperry; Chair
Dept. of Physics
Central Washington University
Ellensburg, WA 98926-7422

sperryw@cwu.edu
(509) 963 2759 phone & voice mail



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Department of History

RECEIVED
FEB 23 1996
CWU FACULTY SENATE

February 22, 1996

Hugh Spall, Chair
Faculty Senate
Campus--7509

Dear Hugh:

I am writing regarding the policies previously imposed and pending regarding faculty library privileges. As far as I am aware, these policies have been instigated without consultation with the faculty. Certainly, I became aware of them only inadvertently.

This restrictions placed on faculty use of the library are another example, and perhaps the most blatant, of this university (so-called) paying lip-service to faculty research, and increasingly demanding it of faculty, yet placing obstacles in the way of its accomplishment. It is a certainty that few, and I doubt any, "real" universities have lending practices as restrictive as those implement or suggested for CWU. Indeed, I would venture to predict that even community colleges are not so draconian.

I urge the Faculty Senate to give careful consideration to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kent D. Richards
Professor

c. Provost Moore



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Department of History

RECEIVED

FEB 27 1996

CWU FACULTY SENATE

February 23, 1996

Mr. Thomas Moore, Provost
Office of Academic Affairs
Campus--7503

Dear Tom:

Because of inquiries the Faculty Senate Code Committee has received regarding the application of Code Sections 5.10 and 5.25 F to those who began their probationary periods before written criteria for tenure became mandatory in 1995, it has devised the accompanying interpretation of the Faculty Code. The Code Committee has no objections to this interpretation being distributed to members of the Faculty Senate, to departments and to deans. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Beverly Heckart
Chair, Faculty Senate Code Committee

cc. Hugh Spall, Chair
Faculty Senate

Interpretation concerning Faculty Code Sections 5.10 and 5.25 F

Because of concerns expressed regarding the application of Sections 5.10 and 5.25 F, the Faculty Senate Code Committee submits the following interpretation.

Sections 5.10 and 5.25 F shall apply to all probationary faculty, including those appointed before June 1995. Probationers shall be evaluated on the basis of the written departmental criteria required by these sections. In applying written criteria to probationers, departmental faculty, departmental personnel committees, chairs, deans and the provost should guard against making recommendations for or against tenure in an arbitrary and capricious manner.

Faculty Code Section 5.15 B has set forward the following criteria for the award of tenure for at least the last twenty years. All current probationers, their departments, deans and the provost are responsible for complying with the requirements of this section.

The granting of tenure is a discretionary decision. Tenure should 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. Specifically, all individuals and committees responsible for tenure recommendation shall apply in such recommendations strong positive evidence of effective teaching, clearly demonstrated ability to produce solid research or work of sound scholarship or high artistic merit, and a record of effective and significant contribution to the proper functioning of the university and the educational needs of students. [Code Committee emphasis]



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost / Vice President
for Academic Affairs

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kim Black, Provost's Office
Michelle Kidman, Computer Science
John Lasik, School of Business & Economics
Hugh Spall, Faculty Senate
Rosco Tolman, Foreign Languages
Greg Trujillo, Institutional Studies

FROM: Thomas D. Moore *Thomas D. Moore*
Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJ: Search and Screening Committee
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

DATE: February 23, 1996

I want to thank each of you for your willingness to serve on the search and screening committee for the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. Dr. Gerald Stacy, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research has agreed to serve as the committee's chair.

I am anxious, as I am sure you all are, to get the process started and will have my office call to schedule the first committee meeting. We hope to set the first meeting for Thursday, February 29, 1996, 3:00 p.m. in Barge 410. I will be discussing my views of the position and provide a draft position description and announcement for your review. Ms. Staci Layman from the Affirmative Action Office, has also been invited to the meeting in order to go over the university's affirmative action policies.

Again, thank you for being of service to the university and your colleagues as we proceed with this important task.

/kb

c: Dr. Stacy
Ms. Layman

(96-032.PR.V)

8D

Date: Mon, 26 Feb 1996 15:06:01 -0700 (PDT)
From: "Warren R. Street, Central Washington University"
<warren@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>
To: Administrator Evaluation Committee -- cadelloj <cadelloj@CWU.EDU>, richmond <richmond@CWU.EDU>, warren <warren@CWU.EDU>
Cc: senate <senate@CWU.EDU>
Subject: Admin Evaluation Meeting

Hi, Lynn -- Jim Cadello and I had a warning that you might not be able to mosh across the pass last Friday, so we went ahead with our first meeting. It looks like next Friday won't be a good time for you to meet, but we wanted to have a second meeting before the end of the quarter. Can you suggest a good afternoon? I'll be free Friday (3/1) after about 3, and anytime in the afternoon during the last week of classes.

Jim and I discussed the apparent difficulties with the current instrument: (1) It doesn't seem to provide information relevant to its intended purpose (subdifficulty 1a: What is its intended purpose?), (2) administrators may view it as a collection of global personal impressions, little more than a beauty contest, and (3) the rate of return has been unsatisfactory.

We're going to pursue a plan that may remedy some of these difficulties. We're going to start with a proposal for a 3-part questionnaire that shouldn't be any longer than the present instrument.

Part I will be items measuring global personal impressions of the administrator. If some of the current items are like that, let's be honest about them and let administrators know what these are.

Part II will be ratings of a set of 3 or 4 specific accomplishments or duties of the last 2 years, provided by the administrator. We'll encourage respondents to use a "No basis for judgment" category whenever appropriate. These items should focus on activities that execute the stated responsibilities of the administrator's position.

Part III will be reserved for the written responses of each respondent.

We will encourage two forms of faculty responses: Faculty can submit individual responses, as they do now, and faculty can submit group responses resulting from a department meeting convened for this purpose. We will encourage every department to hold an administrator evaluation meeting. Such a meeting once every 2 years doesn't seem too burdensome.

We thought we would write up our idea (hmmmm - I think I've just done my homework!) and submit it very soon to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, some of the members of past ad hoc committees, and a sample of administrators, to see if the plan is worth pursuing. If we get discouraging responses, we might try a different approach without investing more time in this first plan.

Let us know what you think and a convenient meeting day. Jim (cadelloj) and I are both email users, so we can keep in touch easily.

Best wishes,
Warren

Warren R. Street
Department of Psychology
Central Washington University
Ellensburg, WA 98926-7575

JE

BC: Personnel Comm.
Code Comm.



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost / Vice President
for Academic Affairs

MEMORANDUM

RECEIVED
FEB 22 1996
CWU FACULTY SENATE

To: Hugh Spall, Chair
Faculty Senate

From: Thomas D. Moore *Tom Moore*
Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date: February 22, 1996

Subject: Proposed Changes to the Faculty Code

The Deans' Council has considered and endorsed the following suggested changes to the Faculty Code. The Provost supports the Council's decision and recommends them to the Faculty Senate.

1. Remove the provision in Section 8.70.C.4 which requires the school/college dean to prepare priority lists of faculty who are being recommended for promotion. Consideration for promotion ought to be based on how well a professor meets the established criteria for promotion not where he/she is placed in a priority order. Faculty are either qualified or not qualified and if qualified, ought to be promoted. There should be no quotas in academic ranks.
2. Remove the provision in Section 8.70.C.2 which requires deans to prepare lists of faculty eligible for promotion. Replace it with a statement which encourages faculty to apply for promotion when they believe they have met department, college and university criteria.
3. It is suggested that the paragraph below more clearly state what is intended by the paragraph in Section 8.95.

Academic departments and schools/colleges are encouraged to develop criteria which supplement and support provisions of this code, but which fit more exactly the needs of specific disciplines or academic areas. Criteria which vary from the provisions of this code (either "slightly" or a lot!) must be approved by the appropriate dean, the provost/vice president for academic affairs, the Faculty Senate and the president before implementation.

Thank you for your consideration.

/nlb

cc Deans' Council

8F



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

RECEIVED
MAR 05 1996
CWU FACULTY SENATE

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Community

FROM: Gary A. Lewis, Dean
Library and Media Services

SUBJ: Suspension of Implementation of Library Service Policy

DATE: March 5, 1996

At the request of Provost Moore, we have suspended implementation of the Library Service Policy in order to allow further consideration. The Library Service Policy will be forwarded to the Library Advisory Committee for review. That committee will be asked to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate and the Dean of Library and Media Services.

/kb

c: Provost Moore
Senate Chair Spall



REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

RECEIVED
MAR 05 1996
CWU FACULTY SENATE

TO: Dr. Gary Lewis
Dean of Library Services

FROM: Ezzat Mina *EM*
Director of Auditing and Control

DATE: February 17, 1994

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation - Library Books and Materials

The Department of Auditing and Control received a complaint alleging an abuse of public property and waste of public funds because of the Library practice of lending books, publications, documents etc. to University faculty without proper follow-up procedures for returning or renewing overdue materials.

As a result of this complaint, we conducted an investigation of the Library's Circulation Policies, procedures and practices regarding returning of overdue materials, assessment of service charges and replacement cost of lost or unreturned items. The objective of this investigation was to determine the validity of this allegation.

Present Circulation Policies require service charges to be assessed to ALL borrowers. According to Library policy a service charge and current replacement cost should be assessed for items not returned within fourteen days of the due date. During our review of the Circulation operation, we noted the following:

- A. Students were assessed overdue charges for overdue and lost materials. Replacement costs and these charges were billed and collected through the Student Information System (SIS).
- B. Up to December 1992, Library practice did not include a follow-up procedure or assessment of service charges to faculty for overdue and not returned books and documents. Our review indicated that on February 9, 1994 there were fifty-seven

faculty currently holding over 600 books with assessed replacement cost in excess of \$20,000.00. This does not reflect the actual replacement cost because the Library uses a flat rate of \$30.00 for books not listed in Books in Print. This rate was determined by practice and is not documented by approved Library Policy.

An example of faculty that have items overdue since December 31, 1992 include:

Items	Cost	Faculty
120	\$5,904.51	"A"
24	\$1,416.62	"B"
52	\$1,696.70	"C"
46	\$1,425.38	"D"

- C. As a result of our initial review, we determined the Library computer system did not provide for monitoring and ageing of past due materials and sending additional follow-up notices. Also, the system does not provide replacement costs; therefore these are determined manually using Books in Print or a flat fee. Our estimate of the current replacement cost according to the library lists for materials currently overdue exceeds \$50,000.00 We based this estimate on the Blackwell Approved Program Coverage and Cost Study. This is a more accurate current market price than the flat rate used by the Library.
- D. Some of these books and materials were loaned to faculty who terminated employment with the University without returning these books. This occurred because Academic Departments are not requiring terminating faculty to complete an Employee Checkout Slip.

The forgoing conditions indicate inconsistent practices and weak controls. It also could result in a loss of state funds because it did allow faculty to leave campus with state property. This practice could be considered as gratuitous expenditure and an extension of the State's credit, which violates Article 8 Section 5 of the State Constitution.

State Laws and regulation also require safeguarding of State assets and prohibit the use of public funds or property for personal use. These policies and regulations read as follows:

Article 8 Section 5 of the State Constitution: Credit not to be loaned. The credit of the state shall not in any manner be given or loaned to or in aid of, any individual, association, company or corporation.

The Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 42.18.217: No state employee may employ or use any person, money or property under the employee's official

✓ control or direction or in his or her official custody for the private benefit or gain of the employee or another.

The Governor's Executive Order 93-02: State property, equipment, personnel, money, services or time are for public purposes only and shall not be appropriated for personal or private use. This prohibition includes use of office space, typewriters, computers and related supplies and systems, paper, pens and pencils, telephones, postage, stationary, photocopying, vehicles and other state resources.

Office of Financial Management (6.2.2.1.9e): Supplies, Inventories, and Fixed Assets. Effective control procedures are to be established to ensure that state supplies and fixed assets are used properly and for authorized purposes. In addition, controls are to be established so that state property does not leave the possession of the state except under proper authorization.

Office of Financial Management (3.2.1.2.4): Inventory Protection. The agency head and inventory officer are responsible for safeguarding inventory assets. Appropriate measures are to be instituted to accomplish this task. In some instances, restricted access to the inventory is necessary.

Our review indicated the Library is taking action to enforce their present policy and recover overdue materials from faculty. However, to improve control and prevent loss of state property, we recommend that:

1. The Library should update and enforce their Circulation Policy. This policy should be approved by University Management, the Board of Trustees, if needed.
2. The Library should consider upgrading the present computer system to properly manage patrons with overdue materials. The system should generate follow-up overdue notices in a timely manner and include service charges and replacement costs. This should result in minimizing manual effort to execute this function.
3. The Library should make every effort to collect all overdue books from faculty and staff who have terminated employment. This could be accomplished with the cooperation of the AG Office, Student Services and collection agencies, if needed.
4. Academic Departments should enforce University policy and require completion of the Employee Checkout Slip for terminating faculty to insure the return of all University property.

Dr. Gary Lewis
February 17, 1994
Page 4

The results of our investigation were discussed with you. However, should you have any questions or comments concerning this report, we will be happy to discuss them with you at your convenience. We request a response addressing the action you have taken or plan to take to implement the recommendations and to improve controls.

We wish to express our appreciation for the cooperation and assistance we received during our investigation.

c: Ivory Nelson, President
Thomas Moore, Provost
Courtney Jones, VP for Business & Financial Affairs
Joseph Antonich, Controller



Bills 100
Attachment C 91

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY SERVICES
Office of the Dean

To: Mr. Ezzat Mina, Director of Auditing and Control
From: Dr. Gary A. Lewis, Dean of Library Services 
Date: March 10, 1994
Subject: **Reply to Audit of Circulation Procedures**

Thank you for your memo of February 17, 1994 which reported the results of your audit of the follow-up procedures in the Circulation Department. It was also a pleasure to me with you and Ms. Lewis on February 17, 1994 to discuss this matter and your findings.

The library staff and I share your concern about faculty who have seriously abused the Library's lending services. This has been a matter of particular concern for Ms. Gelenaw and myself for the last year. Action on this matter has been pending for some time because of the highly political nature of the issue and the perceived need of ensuring total administrative backing before taking action against these faculty who abuse our system. We feel that many faculty will object to any stringent enforcement of overdues and fines, feeling that we have reduced service to them.

In January, we began work on a new, comprehensive service policy for Library/IMC operations. That document includes formal statement of many of our policies which have not been placed in writing. We also recommend many changes to correct problems such as the inability to collect faculty overdues. We will make sure that your specific recommendations are incorporated into the revised policies and procedures. It is our intention to present the draft policy to the Provost by the end of this month. I will recommend that the policy be discussed and reviewed by a variety of offices and agencies at the University, including your office.

I want to express my sincere thanks for the assistance your office has provided in this matter. I believe that your report will be very valuable in helping us to create new policies and procedures which comply with state guidelines and laws and are consistent with effective and efficient business practice.

c: Dr. Ivory Nelson, President
Dr. Thomas Moore, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mr. Courtney Jones, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
Mr. Joseph Antonich, Controller

TALLY

1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

|||| | | | | | | | |

Terry DeVietti, Psychology

TOTAL: 25 *

|||| | | | |

Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs

TOTAL: 15

|||| | | | | | | | |

Ken Gamon, Math

TOTAL: 20 *

|||| | | | | | |

Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts

TOTAL: 17 *

|||| | | | |

Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science

TOTAL: 11

|||| | | | |

Charlie Rubin, Geology

TOTAL: 10

(write-in)

TOTAL: _____

(write-in)

TOTAL: _____

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Terry DeVietti, Psychology

Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs

Ken Gamon, Math

Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts

Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science

Charlie Rubin, Geology

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Terry DeVietti, Psychology

Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs

Ken Gamon, Math

Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts

Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science

Charlie Rubin, Geology

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***

BALLOT
1996-97 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 6, 1996

SECRETARY & TWO AT-LARGE POSITIONS

- Terry DeVietti, Psychology
- Susan Donahoe, Teacher Education Programs
- Ken Gamon, Math
- Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
- Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
- Charlie Rubin, Geology
- _____

*** check three ***