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CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE MEETING - April 24, 1996

Presiding Officer: Hugh Spall
Recording Secretary: Marsha Brandt

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

ROLL CALL
Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Karen Blair, Robert Myers, James Roberts, Kristan Starbuck (Keith Lewis came in stead of James and Margaret Sahlstrand)
Visitors: Clara Richardson, Philip Garrison, Patricia Garrison, Phil Backlund, Fritz Glover, David Dawualder, Barbara Radke, Patsy Callaghan, Barry Donahue, Robert Jacobs, Gerald Stacy, Joyce Mulliken, Martha Lindley, Carolyn Well, James Pappas

CHANGES TO AGENDA
Add State Representative Joyce Mulliken presentation and questions
Delete Chair Report: Reserve Courses in School of Business and Economics (resolved)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
*MOTION NO. 3065 Ken Gamon moved and Luetta Monson seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the April 3, 1996, Faculty Senate meeting as changed: page 1, Chair's Report: OLD WORDING- Susan Tirotta will be resigning from the Office of the Faculty Senate on April 30, and that Marsha Brandt will be taking her place on April 1. NEW WORDING: Susan Tirotta will be resigning from the Office of the Faculty Senate on April 30, and that Marsha Brandt will be working on April 1.
Motion passed.

COMMUNICATIONS
- Letter from President Nelson (Conflict of Interest Charge Extension, April 12, 1996)
- Preliminary Report from Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Survey of Administrators (April 16, 1996)
- Interoffice Communication from Acting Chair Michael Chinn (Revised Conflict of Interest Proposal, April 18, 1996)
- Letter from Corwin P. King (April 18, 1996)
- Interoffice Memo from Professor Philip Garrison (April 17, 1996)
- Letter from Ross Byrd, Chair of BEAM (Faculty Morale Report--Senate Version, April 18, 1996)

REPORTS
1. CHAIR
- Planning for the additional 370 students the legislature is willing to fund: because of the lateness in the year, course planning is urgent. Ideas should be mentioned to department chairs or deans.

*MOTION #3066 Morris Uebelacker moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion of the Faculty Senate to express its appreciation of the contribution of Sue Tirotta as Administrative Assistant to the Faculty Senate. The motion was passed unanimously.

2. PRESIDENT
- The legislature did fund Central for the additional students this biennium with the rider that the old enrollment cannot be used and the 370 students must come above the average annual. Central's enrollment for the last few years has been absolutely flat. (7337 FTE).
- Proposal for Higher Education Funding (Presented to the Governor's Task Force on Higher Education) March 11, 1996: The Governor has explained to the six university presidents the recommendation he would like to see. President Nelson distributed a chart comparing revenue growth with the Initiative 601 Limit. There is about a two billion dollar difference. Within the 601 limit, the growth rate of higher education would be about 1.8% out to the year 2010. The recommendation is to remove state public higher education funding from the state general fund and create an account with dedicated revenue sources. It is not guaranteed that the Legislature will approve this. President Nelson distributed a draft of an Opinion Editorial signed by all six university presidents asking for the debate to begin on this matter of a dedicated revenue for higher education.
State Representative Joyce Mulliken presentation and questions:

Representative Mulliken has spent the day at Central meeting with students and administrators and met with the Faculty Senate to gain input from faculty concerns. She mentioned that the entire legislature had the utmost respect for faculty and the work they do. The questions of funding for higher education through a dedicated revenue source was mentioned. Representative Mulliken responded that the general fund indeed has less for higher education (only 11% now) than in the past as more was going to criminal justice and social services. Although she felt something definitely had to be done, she was not sure exactly which revenue source The Governor's Task Force Committee will recommend by December of this year.

A senator mentioned assessment paperwork from the university administration and the HEC Board. Since daily grading is a form of assessment, the question was posed as to whether or not the additional requests were needed or even used. Representative Mulliken responded that the HEC Board provides a lot of information to the legislators, many times as a result of assessments. Policy decisions are based on this information which is very valuable. Although the information can be redundant, it is still very needed. The senator suggested the paperwork be minimized.

A senator mentioned that the nature of the business that we are in is the teachers. Things won't get better for the students until they get better for the teachers. Although buildings and equipment are looked forward to, teachers are the product.

Representative Mulliken noted that Central Washington University is doing an excellent job of meeting student contact hours and is exceptionally higher than most of the other institutions, all of the other regional and certainly more than the research institutions. A senator mentioned that when they reported they taught 65 to 70 hours, it was doubted. Representative Mulliken mentioned that "accountability" is the buzz word that has come out for everyone. With such large revenues, people are now wanting to know where their money is going. Rather than doubt, it may be a matter of just not knowing. A senator mentioned that new faculty are hired at a salary close to a long-time faculty member, but the workload does not decrease. Representative Mulliken responded that universities need the authority to manage the funding given to them by the Legislature. If the institution needs equipment or salary increases, the university needs to manage that.

Student concerns were discussed. Concerns about costs and getting through the programs in a timely manner. When questioning students, the ones who get through in a timely manner are those who hold down jobs and are better able to manage their time. It is not possible to get a baccalaureate degree in four years taking twelve credit hours a quarter. There has to be mutual accountability between the student and the institution in working toward that end. She has found that the students that do most of the complaining are those without jobs where mom and dad pay the bills.

A senator mentioned that if the increase in cost of living and the growth of the population of the state were factored into the state budget, you would find that the budget is the same now as it was twenty years ago. The figures were obtained from the almanac. Representative Mulliken responded that although it was difficult to question figures from the almanac, the legislature's information is that the budget has grown faster than rate of inflation and the population increase. Higher education's cut of the general fund has dropped from 23% to 11% because social services and criminal justice programs have increased. The question is what is the role of government — to educate people who will join the workforce and become part of the support of the necessary government programs OR to provide criminal institutions workout rooms, televisions and the amenities a lot of us don't have. We cannot fund it all, therefore, something has to give. What do we want to provide?

A senator mentioned that just to get basic equipment a department needs to be part of a new building. Science in particular needs equipment. Her department is using equipment she hadn't seen since she was a little girl. They are using the same style vacuum tubes her father used as an electrician. Representative Mulliken regretted that due to committee meeting overlaps, she was not as knowledgeable on capital budget matters as policy matters. She deferred to President Nelson who commented that it is a matter of availability and the amount of funds. Over the past four years CWU has cut 10.2% from its base. The cuts have been taken in equipment and travel. There are no more corners to cut. Central really needs a new funding situation. Senior faculty who have been here twenty-five and thirty years are at the top of the scale. It costs almost that much to recruit new faculty just to get them here.
**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**  
**FACTOR Y SENATE MEETING - April 24, 1996**

3. **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

*MOTION #3067* Susan Donahoe of the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee moved approval of the "International Studies & Programs Class Observation Policy" as follows:

**International Studies & Programs Class Observation Policy**

An important part of OISP programs involves visiting scholars and students enrolled in our UESL and AUAP programs attending classes in other academic departments. Visiting scholars occasionally attend Central classes, and the UESL and AUAP programs use classroom observation as an integral part of the pedagogy of their programs. These practices provide direct and indirect benefits to Central students and faculty by allowing the creation and maintenance of reciprocal exchange agreements, intellectual and cultural interaction with visitors from diverse backgrounds, and the development of superior contract programs. All participants are international faculty under contract or fee-paying students enrolled in our UESL and AUAP programs. Conditions for each affected group are given below.

**Visiting Scholars:**

Visiting scholars, as part of their employment contract with the OISP and/or the academic deans, are allowed to participate under the CWU Educational Benefits policy.

**UESL Students:**

UESL students enrolled in Level 5 (the highest level in the program) are allowed to observe classes. The supervised observations are arranged by the Director of the UESL program and are subject to the following conditions:

1. Attendance is subject to a space-available basis.
2. The consent of the professor or instructor is required.
3. Only UESL course credit is given, no academic credit is awarded by the University.
4. Students are concurrently enrolled in a non-credit UESL observation course. The fees for courses will be paid by the UESL program.

**AUAP Students:**

As part of the University's contractual obligation with Asia University to make a good faith effort to accommodate the needs of students participating in the AUAP program, AUAP students are allowed to participate in supervised classroom observations. Supervised observations are arranged by the Director of AUAP and are subject to the following considerations:

1. Attendance is subject to a space-available basis.
2. The consent of the professor or instructor is required.
3. Only AUAP course credit is given, no academic credit is awarded by the University.
4. Students are concurrently enrolled in a non-credit UESL observation course. The fees for the observation course will be paid by the AUAP program.

**Observation Course:**

The observation course will carry an ENG 100E designation and be taken concurrently with the existing visitation course in the UESL program. The respective programs will be charged the minimum tuition fee for the observation course (currently in-state tuition for the equivalent of two credits) and the tuition generated by the observation course will be deposited in the general tuition account of the University.

Motion passed.

*MOTION #3068* Susan Donahoe of the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee moved approval of the "College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) Credits" as follows:

**College-Level Examination Program Credits**

These credits will meet the General Education requirements in the appropriate areas. Students may also be awarded credit for Subject examinations as determined by appropriate academic departments at the time of application for credit.

No more than forty-five total quarter credits through CLEP or other sources of non-traditional credit may apply to graduation. Other sources of non-traditional credit include Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), military education experience or correspondence credit.
In addition, the Departments of English and Mathematics should review, respectively, the Composition and Mathematics General Examinations for either inclusion in the above policy or for use as placement instruments. Departments should review the Subject examinations in the same manner and with the same criteria that they currently review AP and IB examinations. As with AP and IB, these reviews would be done annually and coordinated by Academic Services.

Motion passed.

4. **BUDGET COMMITTEE**
   No Report

5. **CODE COMMITTEE**
   No Report

6. **CURRICULUM COMMITTEE** - The General Education Program Proposal was brought before the Senate for discussion. Chair Spall reminded the senators that the Senate Bylaws require that any substantive amendment must be in writing and ready for distribution or, upon objection, may be ruled out of order and not considered.

   A memorandum from Professor Philip Garrison of the English Department dated April 17, 1996, was distributed to the senators. Discussion ensued around the need for English 301 in the General Education Program. Professor Garrison argued in favor of keeping English 301 in the "Writing and Speaking Across the Curriculum." Robert Jacobs representing the General Education Committee pointed out that the Program Proposal passed the General Education Committee unanimously and has been unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee with some recommendations for further consideration. An additional mandatory college-level mathematics course, an additional course in computer logic, the foreign language requirement is expanded to all degrees (not just Bachelor of Arts degree), and required a computer qualification either by examination or by taking the course. There is still controversy about the natural science requirements as the chairs have not been able to agree on a central form of organization for the natural sciences.

   The Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee recommends the passage of the Proposal as it is and suggested that the General Education Committee continue or reconsider the issue of speech or oral competency, intermediate writing assessment (there will be a revised draft before the May 15 Faculty Senate meeting). The General Education Committee has prescribed an additional mathematics class. The science program in this proposal is stronger than the existing natural science requirement as it requires students to take at least one and probably two of the more fundamental sciences.

   If this proposal is accepted, the General Education Committee will continue discussions with the science chairs with regards to any issues which may continue to be outstanding. The normal limitation on general education that students may only opt for one class from a particular department has been lifted from sciences.

   The prerequisites in English 328 and 329 -- The Committee will work with the English Department to find a substitute non-prerequisite class whose purpose is to broaden the literature offerings to include elements of cultural and ethnic pluralism in literature to the curriculum.

   As to Writing Across the Curriculum, there is very little enthusiasm among the faculty at large outside the English Department. It was understood by the Committee that the English Department itself wished to abandon English 301 as a general education requirement.

   A senator mentioned that it was difficult to see how every individual class in the General Education Program Proposal is tied to the general education goals. Do the classes meet the general education requirements or are they simply a selection of classes developed by the department chairs without consideration of the general education goals.

   A senator mentioned that he had conversed with a former member of the General Education Committee, who stated that the Committee had requested syllabi of all of the courses which are in general education and that they were examined. Robert Jacobs responded that it would be disingenuous to imply that any member of the committee had read all of the syllabi, but the Committee has attempted to attend to the content of all the classes. With only two exceptions, Dr. Jacobs responded that he himself had read all those on the present list.

   The question was raised as to the impact on teaching loads. Professor Donohue responded that all the courses in the current program were looked at and did a two-year historical study of the number of students in the courses. They did the same thing with the proposed program to make sure there were enough seats in classes. With the possible exception
of the third area in natural sciences, that that is still the case. The impact would be minimal. If there are questions, there are pages of statistics.

A senator mentioned that Physics 103 hasn't even been taught for seven years. Robert Jacobs mentioned that the Committee had talked with Professor Sperry who hopes it will be taught.

In response to comments regarding classes which haven't been taught in years, specific student outcomes—if students are realizing their objectives, and whether or not the Committee can actually assess/monitor course content; Robert Jacobs commented that the General Education Program springs from the Faculty Senate. It makes recommendations. If the program is assessed, the results will be presumably one of the tools the Committee would have to decide on further recommendations. If selection of courses and content is concerned, the short answer is that the program is tighter. There is no hope for coherent of form on the bases as something as broad as the present program. The only tools to deal with are the present catalog and the present courses. If this program is accepted with its sharper focus, further progress will be much easier met.

One senator expressed concern as to the flexibility and reasonableness of the policy for future changes. The departments need to be dedicated to build courses to fit the objectives of the general education policy. The mission is in general education and is in the university's education, commitment to departments is not the whole world.

Robert Jacobs addressed the administrative structure of the General Education Committee. The establishment of a general education director was proposed with half-time off. Also a more coherent and defined role for the Committee. The Committee would still only recommend. The term of the members has been recommended to change from a three-years to a four-year term so that only a quarter of the Committee turns over each year.

7. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
   No Report

8. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
   No Report

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS
   -$100,000 for Faculty Development

ADJOURNMENT
Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

*** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: May 15, 1996 ***
FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, April 24, 1996
SUB 206-207 [Note Room Change]

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 3, 1996

IV. COMMUNICATIONS
   - Letter from President Nelson (Conflict of Interest, April 12, 1996)
   - Preliminary Report from Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Survey of
     Administrators (April 16, 1996)

V. REPORTS
1. CHAIR
   - Reserve Courses in School of Business and Economics (attachment)

2. PRESIDENT

3. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Charles McGehee, Chair
   - CLEP Credits (motion attached)
   - International Studies & Programs Class Observation Policy
     (motion attached)

4. BUDGET COMMITTEE - Barney Erickson, Chair
5. CODE COMMITTEE - Beverly Heckart, Chair
6. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - Clara Richardson, Chair
   - General Education Program Proposal (discussion only)
7. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Rex Wirth, Chair
8. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Bobby Cummings, Chair

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS
   -$100,000 for Faculty Development (motion attached)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

*** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: May 15, 1996 ***
CHAIR'S REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE REGARDING A SITUATION IN THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

INTRODUCTION

The Senate Executive Committee has requested that the Chair report on what may be a violation of University Curriculum Policies and the Faculty Code. The report appears below.

RELEVANT PORTIONS OF UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND THE FACULTY CODE

The University Curriculum Policy (adopted by the Senate on October 14, 1994) states in relevant part:

The word curriculum refers to individual courses or academic programs offered by the University. An academic program is a combination of courses related to a common theme, all of which contribute to a common purpose and lead to a specific goal (major, minor, certificate etc.).

1. Proposals for curriculum change may be initiated by students, faculty members, or deans, but the approval process begins at the department level, with approval by a majority of the full time faculty of the department.

The DARS policy (adopted by the Senate on November 29, 1995) states in relevant part:

5. Department Chairs are free to activate reserve courses or programs annually. A request for reinstatement must be resubmitted on a reinstatement form to the Office of the Registrar...

(emphasis added). 1

Section 3.10A of the Faculty Code states in relevant part:

The Faculty Senate shall have the following powers and duties:

A. to review and approve changes that the president, other administrators, departments and their chairs, and committees wish to initiate regarding educational policy, curricula, academic programs, and academic regulations and standards;

It is clear that a Dean does not have the power to impose curriculum changes on his or her departments without the approval of a majority of the faculty members that comprise those departments. It is equally clear that a Dean does not have the power to prevent a Department from removing a course or specialization from reserve if a majority of the full time faculty in the department want to remove the course or specialization from reserve. A dean also lacks the power to set educational policy and academic regulations and standards without the approval of the Faculty Senate. If these propositions are correct, and the above excerpts from the University Curriculum Policy, DARS Policy, and Faculty Code support these propositions, then a Dean lacks the power to eliminate curriculum by inserting a provision in a catalog stating that a Department will not accept students into a specialization until the Department revises the specialization unless the Department approves such action.

The Dean of the School of Business and Economics inserted a provision into the 1994-1996 catalog, without the approval of the Business Administration faculty, stating that the Department of Business Administration would not accept applicants into the International Business and Operational Management Information Systems specializations until

---

1 At the time that the Department of Business Administration voted to remove the two specializations at issue from reserve, the DARS policy was not in effect and had not even been proposed. There was, instead, an unwritten policy involving reserve courses and specializations. The policy allowed departments to place courses and specializations on reserve or remove them from reserve by a majority vote of the department's faculty. After a vote to remove a specialization from reserve, the department chair would inform the registrar of the removal by a written memorandum. The DARS policy, adopted by the Senate adopted on November 29, 1995, was apparently identical to this unwritten policy except that it in adopted a three year sunset provision for courses or programs that were placed on reserve, a provision that is apparently not relevant to this controversy.
the specializations were revised. He has refused to withdraw the language or take steps to change the wording in the next edition of the electronic catalog when the faculty refused to approve his actions.

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

September, 1992--The Business Administration Department, by faculty vote, places its International Business specialization and Operations Management Information Systems specialization on the reserve list at the request of Dean Gerald Cleveland in the belief that AACSB accreditation standards require the programs to be offered at all instruction sites. The individual courses comprising the specializations are not placed on the reserve list. Dean Cleveland apparently reports to President Nelson that the programs have been eliminated.

1993--CWU publishes the 1994-1996 catalog which does not list the International Business specialization and the Operations Management Information Systems as active specializations but lists the courses comprising the specializations as active courses.

January, 1994--A visiting AACSB person informs the Business Administration faculty that the program does not have to be offered at all sites in order to meet accreditation standards.


October, 1994--The Faculty Senate adopts the CWU Curriculum Policies and Procedures. The Policy and Procedures make no changes in the pre-existing policy of placing courses and programs on the reserve list or in removing them from the list.

April, 1995--Co-Chairman Gunn notifies Assistant Provost Schliesman and the Registrar, prior to the deadline for instituting changes in the 1996-1998 catalog, that the specializations should be removed from the reserve list and placed in the 1996-1998 catalog. The Department does not request additional resources to teach the courses comprising the specialization from the Dean.

October 3, 1995--Dean Dauwalder asks the Dean's Council to request that the proposed Degree Audit Reporting Systems Policy (DARS policy) be altered to require decanal approval prior to removing courses and specializations from reserve. He cites the Business Administration's action in removing specializations from reserve without his knowledge and approval as evidence of the need for such power.

October 6, 1995--The on-line catalog shows that the International Business and Operations Management Information Systems specializations are active specializations in the Department of Business Administration.

November 29, 1995--The Senate amends the proposed DARS policy to remove the decanal veto and forwards the DARS policy to the provost.

January 23, 1996--The Dean of SBE, after consultation with the President, and believing he had the approval of the Department Chair, inserts a statement in the 1996-1998 catalog stating that the International Business and Operations Management Information Systems specializations are undergoing revision and that the Department will not accept students until the revisions are complete. The Department, however, has established no committees or charged any individual department members with studying possible changes to the specializations. The proposal was not submitted to the faculty of the Business Administration Department for a vote.

March 1, 1996--The Department of Business Administration meets and the Dean appears, at the Department's request to explain the catalog's entry. Dean Dauwalder explains why he considers the action appropriate. He also tells Department that President Nelson initiated the action. After hearing the explanation, and discussing the issue with the
Dean, the Department votes by secret ballot that it disapproves of the decision to refuse to accept students in these two specializations until they are revised. The vote is 20 to 1 to disapprove the Dean's actions with respect to the International Business specialization and 21 to 1 to disapprove his actions with respect to the Operations Management Information Systems specialization. It also votes to establish committees to examine whether changes in the two specializations' content is warranted.

**STATUS OF COURSES COMPRISING THE SPECIALIZATIONS**

During 1995, the Department taught every course required for the International Business specialization at the Sea-Tac site. In Ellensburg, it taught every course required for the specialization save one. That particular course is scheduled to be taught during the forthcoming summer session. It could easily be taught during the regular academic year.

During 1995, the Department did not offer all of the courses required for the Operations Management Information Systems specializations. The on-site coordinator informed me that the courses necessary for the specialization could be offered at the Ellensburg with existing resources during the next two years if the specialization were returned to the catalog.

**EFFECT ON CAMPUS CLIMATE**

The effect on campus climate is obvious. If administrative decision makers do not comply with the written rules of the institution, how can the climate be good?

**THE EFFECT OF THE ELECTRONIC CATALOG**

Under the DARS policy, a decision to admit students to these specializations could be implemented in the September, 1997 electronic catalog if the decision were reported to the Registrar by March 1, 1997.

**OPTIONS**

The Senate's options include:

1. Decide that the university curriculum policy, DARS policy, and/or Faculty Code were not violated and do nothing;
2. Request that President Nelson take the necessary steps to remedy a violation of the University Curriculum Policies and Procedures and take further appropriate measures if the violation is not remedied. Such further action could include:
   a. Request that the State Auditor investigate and report whether university resources have been devoted to publishing a catalog that does not accurately reflect student options.
   b. Request that the Internal Auditor investigate and report whether university resources have been devoted to publishing a catalog that does not accurately reflect student options.
   c. Direct the Senate Chair to report the situation to the Board of Trustees and request appropriate action by the Board
3. Other action that the Senate might deem appropriate.

Submitted: Hugh M. Spall - Chair, Faculty Senate
FROM: Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee, Charles McGehee, Chair
DATE: April 8, 1996
RE: Recommendation on CLEP credits

In December, 1994, Bill Swain, Director of Admissions and Advising Services, recommended CWU award CLEP (College-Level Examination Program) credits. The Academic Affairs Committee has reviewed the issues, and concurs. The following analysis and recommendation is presented for your consideration. The wording is taken from Bill Swain's memo.

The College-Level Examination Program (CLEP), developed by the College Board, allows those who have learned about a subject in a non-traditional setting to demonstrate knowledge equivalent to that acquired by students who have satisfactorily completed introductory college courses. CLEP is endorsed by the American Council on Education (ACE), and more than 2,800 accredited colleges and universities, including WSU, TESC, and the twenty-seven Washington state community colleges, award academic credit based on CLEP test scores.

CLEP offers five General and thirty Subject examinations which are normed according to scores achieved by traditional students who have just completed courses for which CLEP credit might be awarded. The General examinations measure both acquired information and understanding in the broad areas of English Composition, Humanities, Social Science/History, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics; while the Subject examinations measure learning in more specific areas such as Calculus, American History, Microeconomics, Educational Psychology, and General Chemistry.

Currently, CWU awards credit based on Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) test scores, and allows transfer of CLEP credit if it was awarded as part of a Direct Transfer Agreement associate of arts degree. Extending these policies to include all CLEP participation acknowledges that college-level learning can take place outside a college classroom and recognizes that not all of our students will have similar backgrounds.

MOTION: After due consideration, the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee recommends the following policy:

Students will be awarded five college-level quarter credits for each score at the 50th percentile on the CLEP Humanities, Social Science/History, and Natural Sciences examinations. These credits will meet the General Education requirements in the appropriate areas. Students may also be awarded credit for Subject examinations as determined by appropriate academic departments at the time of application for credit.

No more than forty-five total quarter credits through CLEP or other sources of non-traditional credit may apply to graduation. Other sources of non-traditional credit include Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), military education experience or correspondence credit.

In addition, the Departments of English and Mathematics should review, respectively, the Composition and Mathematics General Examinations for either inclusion in the above policy or for use as placement instruments. Departments should review the Subject examinations in the same manner and with the same criteria that they currently review AP and IB examinations. As with AP and IB, these reviews would be done annually and coordinated by Academic Services.

End of recommendation.
MOTION:
The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee has considered the following proposal to allow international scholars and students to observe in classrooms. The Committee was concerned that any such observation be only with permission of the instructor and that it be on a space available basis. These considerations have been met. The Committee recommends, therefore, approval of the proposal.

Office of International Studies & Programs
Class Observation Policy

An important part of OISP programs involves visiting scholars and students enrolled in our UESL and AUAP programs attending classes in other academic departments. Visiting scholars occasionally attend Central classes, and the UESL and AUAP programs use classroom observation as an integral part of the pedagogy of their programs. These practices provide direct and indirect benefits to Central students and faculty by allowing the creation and maintenance of reciprocal exchange agreements, intellectual and cultural interaction with visitors from diverse backgrounds, and the development of superior contract programs. All participants are international faculty under contract or fee-paying students enrolled in our UESL and AUAP programs. Conditions for each affected group are given below.

Visiting Scholars

Visiting scholars, as part of their employment contract with the OISP and/or the academic deans, are allowed to participate under the CWU Educational Benefits policy.

UESL Students

UESL students enrolled in Level 5 (the highest level in the program) are allowed to observe classes. The supervised observations are arranged by the Director of the UESL program and are subject to the following conditions:

(1) Attendance is subject to a space available basis.
(2) The consent of the professor or instructor is required.
(3) Only UESL course credit is given, no academic credit is awarded by the University.
(4) Students are concurrently enrolled in a non-credit UESL observation course. The fees for the course will be paid by the UESL program.

AUAP Students

As part of the University's contractual obligation with Asia University to make a good faith effort to accommodate the needs of students participating in AUAP program, AUAP students are allowed to participate in supervised classroom observations. Supervised observations are arranged by the Director of AUAP and are subject to the following considerations:

(1) Attendance is subject to a space available basis.
(2) The consent of the professor or instructor is required.
(3) Only AUAP course credit is given, no academic credit is awarded by the University.
(4) Students are concurrently enrolled in a non-credit UESL observation course. The fees for the observation course will be paid by the AUAP program.

Observation Course

The observation course will carry a ENG 100E designation and be taken concurrently with the existing visitation course in the UESL program. The respective programs will be charged the minimum tuition fee for the observation course (currently in-state tuition for the equivalent of two credits) and the tuition generated by the observation course will be deposited in the general tuition account of the University.
NEW BUSINESS

-$100,000 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS
The following motions are based on recommendations received from the Faculty Development and Research Committee (2/23/96)

MOTION #1
The Faculty Senate recommends that all of the $100,000 made available for faculty development be devoted 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 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 would not be purchased with the limited faculty development money).
- The hiring of consultants for departmental visitation for curriculum development and/or reform.

MOTION #2
The Faculty Senate recommends that the funds made available for faculty development be distributed on a prorated basis based on the number of continuing, more than half-time faculty position per department (not to include adjuncts hired on a course-by-course basis). 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 instructional development purpose and to whom the funds are to be allocated.
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Michelle KIDWELL
Deborah MEDLAR
Luetta MONSON
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Ivory NELSON
Sidney NesselROAD
Vince NETHERY
Steve OLSON
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Dieter ROMBOY
James ROBERTS
Sharon ROSELL
Eric ROTH
Charles RUBIN
James SAHLSTRAND
Richard MACK(P. SAUNDERS F'96)
Hugh SPAll
Kristan STARBUCK
Carin THOMAS
Morris UEBELACKER
Lisa WeyANDT
Rex WIRTH
Marla WYATT
Thomas YEH

Stephen JEFFERIES
Dan RAMSDELL
Carol BUTTERFIELD
Loretta GRAY
Roger FOUTS
Dale OTTO
Roger GARRETT
James HARPER
Wayne FAIRBURN
Mark ZETTERBERG
Peter BURKHOLDER

Brue BARNES
George TOWN
Gary HEESACKER
Cindy EMMANS
Patrick OWENS
Thomas MOORE
Andrew SPENCER
Robert GREGSON
Terry MARTIN
Cathy BERTELSON
Stella MORENO
C. Wayne JOHNSTON
Michael BRAUNSTEIN
Geoffrey BOERS
James HINTHORNE
Margaret SAHLSTRAND
Wolfgang FRANZ
Ed ESBECK

Martha KURTZ
John ALWIN
Stephanie STEIN
Carolyn SCHACTLER

(ROSTERS\ROLLCALL.95 March 31, 1996)
Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hugh Spall, Chair
Faculty Senate

DATE: April 12, 1996

RE: Faculty/Faculty Conflicts of Interest

I understand that the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty/Student Conflicts of Interest recently shared its draft policy with the Faculty Senate at its March 6, 1996 meeting. I am encouraged that the policy will be adopted before the year is out. Please ask the committee to continue its good work and draft a policy which addresses conflict of interest in faculty-faculty relationships as well. The university’s Policy Manual (2-2.19) provides some guidance on this issue as it relates to employment of family members. However, the committee should feel free to address other aspects of faculty-faculty relationships which could lead to conflict of interest.

Very truly yours,

Ivy V. Nelson
President
DRAFT POLICY ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN STUDENT-FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS
Revised 4-21-96

Assumptions

In developing this policy, it is 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 undergraduate and graduate students, their family members, financial partners in business enterprises, or their clients in situations which may raise conflict of interest questions.

Many faculty offer their professional services to the community as consultants and practitioners, and in some areas and specialties, their may not be alternative and equivalent expertise available locally. In addition, the development and maintenance of professional skills and knowledge, including authoring textbooks, is valued by the university as scholarship and professional development.

Therefore, in those instances where conflict of interest situations are unavoidable for faculty, we recommend the use of peer review and oversight to resolve such conflicts and ensure fairness for both students and faculty.

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.
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 For faculty desiring to adopt a self-authored text or materials which generate royalties or profits for themselves, a committee of one or more qualified peers, selected by the department chair, should review the text and materials for quality and appropriateness and approve or deny the request in writing 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 address and mediate the potential conflict of interest.

4.6.3 Where third parties are concerned about a perceived conflict of interest, the faculty member, chair, director or dean should consider informing them that the conflict has been dealt with pursuant to these guidelines. Such a step is for the protection of the student, faculty member and the University.

4.7 A failure to comply with these guidelines constitutes unprofessional conduct. (Faculty Code citation?)
MEMORANDUM

Date: April 16, 1996

From: Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Survey of Administrators:
James Cadello, Philosophy
Lynn Richmond, Business Administration
Warren Street, Psychology

To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Subject: Preliminary Report

Our committee has met several times to consider the charge given to it in a memo of February 8, 1996. When our charge was originally issued, the Senate seemed eager to press forward with a revised evaluation instrument this year. In light of recent administrative personnel changes and the brief time remaining in the year, the Executive Committee may wish to reconsider the urgency of this task. In our charge, Hugh Spall, Chair of the Faculty Senate, suggested two concerns relating to the biennial faculty evaluation of administrators.

The first matter is the low rate of faculty participation in responding to the survey instrument. The rate of participation has ranged from 28% to 42%. According to texts in survey research by Christensen (1994), Drew, Hardman, and Weaver (1996), and Selltiz, Wrightsman, and Cook (1976), this rate of participation is within the normal range for questionnaire studies, but increased participation is obviously desirable. In our setting, return rates of 60% to 70% should be possible. The second concern is the questionable effectiveness of the survey in meeting any of its stated purposes.

To some extent, return rates can be increased by making the questionnaire shorter and easier to respond to, and by sending follow-up questionnaires. Other methods, such as making personal contacts and offering incentives, seem unfeasible. Our committee thinks, however, that the low rate of return is primarily a function of the second issue, the questionable effectiveness of the survey. That is, we contend that if the survey were an effective instrument, then the low rate of return would be improved. Thus, the revisions we propose will deal with the questionable effectiveness of the present survey instrument and modifications for its improvement.

In terms of the survey, “effectiveness” can be understood in at least three ways. First, effectiveness can be understood as “generating accurate feedback.” Second, effectiveness can be understood as “producing feedback on matters of relevance and importance.” Third, effectiveness can be understood as “serving as the basis of actual change.” We believe all these renderings of effectiveness are germane and significant.

I. Generating accurate feedback:

a. The present survey has for each administrator a list of questions that vary greatly. Some are vague and others seem to duplicate each other. Long surveys discourage
responding, so we propose deletion of some items. A list of the retained and deleted items for each administrator is appended to this memo.

b. Each item may be answered from different perspectives: Some faculty may base their judgments on their opinions or feelings about the administrator, stemming from a general, global evaluation of the person. Other faculty may answer the same question by knowing of some specific performance of the administrator. Administrators have told us that both kinds of information are valuable to them. Global impressions are important, for they pertain directly to matters of climate and perception, and it is obvious that faculty morale and the public's perception of the university are significant matters. Judgments based on specific incidents are valuable because they are based on real events that have influenced the parties involved and the life of the institution.

Our committee recommends that each item be accompanied by a way of indicating if the rating is based on an observation of the administrator's actual behavior. Ratings based on observations should be tabulated separately from those not based on observations and both sets should be included in the administrator's report. We also recommend that respondents who have no bases for judgments of an administrator show this on their surveys and return the surveys so their responses can be counted.

c. Because their positions are wide-ranging and their contacts with the faculty may be infrequent, we recommend that the President, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Vice President for Student Affairs be evaluated by independent outside examiners, with the proviso that the opinions and observations of the faculty be openly solicited during the evaluations and well represented in the final reports. We anticipate that suitable consultants will have academic histories that lend weight to their recommendations. The Faculty Senate should be joined by the Board of Trustees, administrators, the association of administrative-exempt personnel, and, perhaps, the civil service employee council, in sponsoring these evaluation efforts.

d. We recommend that an opportunity for freely written comments continue to be provided on the new survey forms. This will allow faculty members to elaborate on any issues about which they have more to say. Administrators seem to be unanimous in their dismay over the negative and derogatory tone of some of these comments. Positive emotional comments seem not to be a cause for equal dismay. Nevertheless, we recommend that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, or its appointees, objectively summarize the open-ended comments for each administrator. If there is a negative emotional tone to the comments, it can be described to the administrator without being inflicted on that person. This seems humane and responsible. The Senate should not legitimize anonymous hurtful messages through the medium of this evaluation procedure, whatever the basis of the writer's complaints.

II. Producing feedback on matters of relevance and importance:

The present survey, formulated by faculty, might well (and possibly rightly) be dismissed by administrators because of the administrators' claims that the questions do not accurately represent their tasks, duties, goals, and desired outcomes. To alleviate this
concern, this committee proposes that representative faculty groups meet with each administrator to collaboratively add relevant items to the survey. The selected questions should reflect both the administrator’s understanding of his or her own responsibilities and projects, and also the faculty’s concerns and aspirations. Each administrator’s evaluation would be formulated in this way; it would be revisited every time the evaluation was to be given to update the evaluation, reflecting shifting job responsibilities or changing expectations. This process would insure that both faculty and administrators have inputs into the evaluation and, as such, would encourage each party to incorporate the results of the evaluation into constructive development efforts.

It is probably too late in the current academic year to adopt a new procedure for administrator evaluation, but in the future, the process should begin by contacting administrators at the start of the academic year in which the survey will be administered.

III. Serving as the basis of actual change. This last issue is the stickiest, in that the faculty cannot, according to the present Faculty Code, take on administrative tasks, including responsibilities for structural or personnel matters. As such, there is no way the faculty can guarantee that actual change will result from any survey of administrators. However, if a modified survey instrument provides more accurate and relevant feedback, it is hoped that the results will produce opportunities for dialog and improvement.
Appendix
Proposed Survey Item Changes
(Retained, Added, and Deleted Items)

I. President, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Student Affairs
   A. Evaluation to be conducted by independent consultant, with assurance that the opinions and observations of the faculty be openly solicited during the evaluation and well-represented in the final report.

II. Deans
   A. College of the Sciences, College of Arts and Humanities, and School of Business and Economics (29 17 items)
      1. Stimulates imaginative and realistic plans for the future of the college.
      2. Inspires confidence in his or her ability to deal with problems.
      3. Focuses on basic and fundamental issues.
      4. Evidences respect and trust in the faculty to exercise good judgment.
      5. Supports a meaningful role for faculty in university governance.
      6. Maintains an "open door" atmosphere for faculty opinion.
      7. Communicates in a clear and organized manner.
      8. Actively utilizes faculty expertise for problem resolution.
      9. Provides advance notice of changes important to morale, teaching, research, and public service.
     10. When invited to do so, represents the College-academic-program effectively to the Board of Trustees.
     11. Projects a positive image of the university to the public.
     12. Deals effectively with chairs and departments.
     13. Is able to obtain an equitable share of university-wide resources.
     14. Deals fairly and impartially with faculty.
     15. Gives positive, constructive criticism.
     16. Anticipates and deals with problems rather than having to face them as a crisis.
     17. Bases decisions on stated university goals and procedures.
     18. Makes timely decisions in academic matters.
     19. Properly delegates responsibility and commensurate authority
     20. Rewards quality performance, given available resources.
     21. Demonstrates integrity and honesty in dealing with others.
     22. Actively supports a strong-intellectual-atmosphere.
     23. Actively supports quality in the academic programs.
24. Allocates resources effectively to maintain the long-range viability of academic programs.

25. Consistently follows known procedures.

26. Supports faculty positions when appropriate.

27. Supports students’ positions when appropriate.

28. Actively encourages diversity in staffing.

29. Actively encourages diversity in student recruitment.

B. College of Professional Studies (34 19 items)

1. Stimulates imaginative and realistic plans for the future of the college.

2. Inspires confidence in his or her ability to deal with problems.

3. Focuses on basic and fundamental issues.

4. Evidences respect and trust in the faculty to exercise good judgment.

5. Supports a meaningful role for faculty in university governance.

6. Maintains an "open door" atmosphere for faculty opinion.

7. Communicates in a clear and organized manner.

8. Actively utilizes faculty expertise for problem resolution.

9. Provides advance notice of changes important to morale, teaching, research, and public service.

10. When invited to do so, represents the College-academic program effectively to the Board of Trustees.

11. Projects a positive image of the university to the public.

12. Deals effectively with chairs and departments.

13. Is able to obtain an equitable share of university-wide resources.

14. Deals fairly and impartially with faculty.

15. Gives positive, constructive criticism.

16. Anticipates and deals with problems rather than having to face them as a crisis.

17. Bases decisions on stated university goals and procedures.

18. Makes timely decisions in academic matters.

19. Properly delegates responsibility and commensurate authority

20. Rewards quality performance, given available resources.

21. Demonstrates integrity and honesty in dealing with others.

22. Actively supports a strong-intellectual atmosphere.

23. Actively supports quality in the academic programs.

24. Allocates resources effectively to maintain the long-range viability of academic programs.

25. Consistently follows known procedures.

26. Supports faculty positions when appropriate.

27. Supports students’ positions when appropriate.

28. Actively encourages diversity in staffing.

29. Actively encourages diversity in student recruitment.
30. Monitors all pertinent certification and accrediting bodies.
31. Provides leadership to the Center for the Preparation of School Personnel.
32. Actively encourages and supports faculty professional development.
33. Actively encourages and supports faculty professional development.

C. Graduate Studies and Research (24 13 items)
   1. Inspires confidence in his or her ability to deal with problems.
   2. Evidences respect and trust in the faculty to exercise good judgment.
   3. Supports a meaningful role for faculty in university governance.
   4. Maintains an "open door" atmosphere for faculty opinion.
   5. Communicates in a clear and organized manner.
   6. Actively utilizes faculty expertise for problem resolution.
   7. Provides advance notice of changes important to morale, teaching, research, and public service.
   8. Supports faculty positions when appropriate.
   9. Supports students' positions when appropriate.
  10. Projects a positive image of the university to the public.
  11. Anticipates and deals with problems rather than having to face them as a crisis.
  12. Bases decisions on stated university goals and procedures.
  13. Demonstrates integrity and honesty in dealing with others.
  14. Actively supports a strong intellectual atmosphere quality in the academic programs.
  15. Actively encourages diversity in staffing.
  17. Encourages full participation by faculty in decision making.
  18. Encourages the development and utilization of teamwork.
  19. Fosters positive working relationships.
  20. Demonstrates commitment to continuous quality improvement throughout the university.
  21. Actively encourages and supports faculty professional development.

D. Academic Services (29 19 items)
   1. Inspires confidence in his or her ability to deal with problems.
   2. Inspires enthusiasm for university goals.
   3. Evidences respect and trust in the faculty to exercise good judgment.
   4. Supports a meaningful role for faculty in university governance.
   5. Encourages full participation by faculty in decision making.
   6. Encourages the development and utilization of teamwork.
   7. Maintains an "open door" atmosphere for faculty opinion.
   8. Maintains an "open door" atmosphere for students.
9. Consistently follows known procedures.
10. Supports faculty positions when appropriate.
11. Supports students' positions when appropriate.
12. Communicates in a clear and organized manner.
13. Communicates important information in a timely manner.
15. Provides advance notice of changes important to morale, teaching, research, and public service.
16. Anticipates and deals with problems rather than having to face them as a crisis.
17. Bases decisions on stated university goals and procedures.
18. Demonstrates integrity and honesty in dealing with others.
19. Actively supports a strong intellectual atmosphere.
20. Actively encourages diversity in staffing.
21. Encourages full participation by the faculty in decision making.
22. Fosters positive working relationships.
23. Demonstrates commitment to continuous quality improvement throughout the university.
24. Performs effectively the task of recruitment of students.
25. Performs effectively the task of retention of students.
26. Performs effectively the task of resolution of student problems.
27. Deals effectively with chairs and departments.
28. Provides leadership and coordination of general academic advising.
29. Provides leadership and coordination of academic skills program.

E. Continuing Education (20 12 items)
1. Inspires confidence in his or her ability to deal with problems.
2. Evidences respect and trust in the faculty to exercise good judgment.
3. Supports a meaningful role for faculty in university governance.
4. Communicates in a clear and organized manner.
5. Actively utilizes faculty expertise for problem resolution.
6. Provides advance notice of changes important to morale, teaching, research, and public service.
7. Works effectively to obtain non-state support for university projects.
8. Projects a positive image of the university to the public.
9. Anticipates and deals with problems rather than having to face them as a crisis.
10. Bases decisions on stated university goals and procedures.
11. Properly delegates responsibility and commensurate authority.
12. Demonstrates integrity and honesty in dealing with others.
13. Actively supports a strong intellectual atmosphere.
14. Allocates resources effectively to maintain the long-range viability of academic programs.
15. Actively encourages diversity in staffing.
17. Encourages full participation by faculty in decision making.
18. Encourages the development and utilization of teamwork.
19. Fosters positive working relationships.
20. Demonstrates commitment to continuous quality improvement throughout the university.
21. Supports students' positions when appropriate.

F. (26 16 items)
1. Stimulates imaginative and realistic plans for the future of the library.
2. Inspires confidence in his or her ability to deal with problems.
3. Focuses on basic and fundamental issues.
4. Evidences respect and trust in the faculty to exercise good judgment.
5. Maintains an "open door" atmosphere for faculty opinion.
6. Communicates in a clear and organized manner.
7. Actively utilizes faculty expertise for problem resolution.
8. Provides advance notice of changes important to morale, teaching, research, and public service.
9. When invited to do so, represents the Library effectively to the Board of Trustees.
10. Projects a positive image of the university to the public.
11. Deals effectively with departments.
12. Is able to obtain an equitable share of the university-wide resources.
13. Deals fairly and impartially with faculty.
15. Anticipates and deals with problems rather than having to face them as a crisis.
16. Bases decisions on stated university goals and procedures.
17. Properly delegates responsibility and commensurate authority.
19. Demonstrates integrity and honesty in dealing with others.
20. Actively supports a strong intellectual atmosphere.
22. Allocates resources effectively to maintain the long-range viability of the Library.
23. Consistently follows known procedures.
24. Supports faculty positions when appropriate.
25. Supports students' positions when appropriate.
27. Actively encourages and supports faculty professional development.
INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

DATE: April 18, 1996

TO: Hugh Spall, Chair
CWU Faculty Senate

FROM: Michael Chinn, Acting Chair
Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty-Student Conflict of Interest

RE: Revised Conflict of Interest Proposal

On behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty-Student Conflict of Interest, I am submitting this revised draft of the proposed policy. In keeping with Faculty Senate procedures for policy adoption, I have met with the Deans Council and the Academic Department Chairs Organization to seek their input. Therefore, this revised policy includes suggestions brought forth from those groups. This document also includes suggestions made by Assistant Attorney General, Teresa Kulik, via committee chair Laura Appleton prior to her departure.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

cc: Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty-Student Conflict of Interest
Laura Appleton (7545)
Clara Richardson (7484)
Mark Krause (7573)
Nancy Howard (7497)
The Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee met on Thursday April 18, 1996 to discuss the proposal for General Education. A quorum was present.

After extensive discussion, the following motion passed unanimously.

Accept the general education proposal. The structure of the proposal adds definition and coherence to the curriculum; however, the General Education Committee or its successor committee should work on these areas of concern:

**Basic skills**
1. Lack of oral competency requirement.
2. Redefine the alternative to failing immediate writing assessment.
3. Rework math so that at least one math above high school equivalency is required (omit Philosophy course as math equivalent).

**Breadth**
4. Resolve the general sciences dispute.
5. Allow at most 3 courses from any single department in satisfaction of general education.
6. Encourage other departments to develop courses for general education areas, especially Arts & Humanities section 3.
7. Rethink the place of first year foreign language courses in Arts & Humanities section 3. (A second language is an alternate culture.)
8. Allow NO hidden prerequisites, e.g. English 327 and 328.
Joyce Mulliken Visit to
Central Washington University Campus
April 24-25, 1996

10:00- Distance Education Demonstration, Library. Prof. Dale LeFevre, Special Education Class. Technical explanation of the distance education system- Bill Craig Co-operative Library Project- Dean, Gary Lewis

11:00- Music Education-Hertz Hall
Visit one or more music classes (Teaching Methods, Analytical Techniques, Piano Literature, Choir). Speak with students and Department Chair, Russ Schultz.

12:00- Lunch at the Grill House with Dean of College of Education and Professional Studies, Dr. Linda Murphy, Associate Dean Lin Douglas, and Martha Lindley.

1:00- "Fireside Chat with Joyce" - ASCWU Board of Directors and any interested students in the ASCWU Offices in the SUB.

2:00- Academic Services, Mitchell Hall. Meeting with Dean, Jim Pappas and his staff regarding admissions, block classes, academic advising, time to degree, remediation, and retention programs

3:30- Faculty Senate. Introduction to Faculty Senate and time for questions and answers.

4:15- Student Services. Meeting with Vice President, Dr. Sarah Shumate and staff regarding student services. (Financial Aid, Residence Living, Health Care, Substance Abuse Programs, Student Activities, ADA, and Career Development)

5:00- Meeting with President Nelson.

April 25, 1996

9:00- Chimposium
10:00- Meet with Roger and Debbie Fouts
Hugh Spall, Chair  
Faculty Senate  
Campus  

Dear Hugh:

I have just read the "Proposed General Education Program" prepared by the General Education Committee for the Faculty Senate. It seems that despite my testimony at the January 23 meeting, and that of others since, the committee remains unwilling to include any oral communication courses in the Gen. Ed. Program.

So be it. I, for one, am tired of arguing about it and would prefer to move on. I do believe, however, that we should be honest and also exclude oral communication from the "Mission" portion of the Gen. Ed. proposal.

Currently, the proposal reads that "Our general education program holds our students responsible for a high level of competency in the basic skills of reading, writing, speaking, and reasoning." (emphasis mine) Since there are no speaking courses included in the gen. ed. program, this seems patently untrue.

The proposal does suggest that departments "include guided writing and/or speaking assignments in their general education classes" (emphasis mine), but this is a poor substitute for real speech training, especially when it's only an option. I would liken it to throwing a few assignments on "figuring" into courses and calling it math.

The fact is that no matter how we try to trick it out, oral communication is the only gen. ed. subject we propose to teach without an explicit course. That should give us an indication of our commitment to it, and how much we value it.

So again I say, let's be honest. Let's admit that at Central "communication" means only writing, and a "liberal education" doesn't require speaking (or listening!) ability. To do less is to deceive our students, and worse, ourselves.

Sincerely,

Corwin P. King  
Professor of Communication
In a memo to Robert Jacobs dated February 21, 1996, Philip Backlund urges Jacobs to “stick to the original idea of deleting English 301” from the revised General Ed proposal. His primary reason is that “[s]tudents will learn more.” And, in one sense, this statement has some validity. Of course students will learn more about the subject matter of any discipline-specific upper division course that requires writing. To learn how to put a complex general idea into words is, in some sense, to understand it. Research, experience and common sense all support this claim. However, students may not learn very quickly how to write clear, concise sentences and coherent paragraphs, even for an audience of experts in their own discipline, unless they get the kind of specialized feedback that English can provide. Often, it is obvious that something ails a piece of writing, but how does one tell the student how to fix it? Consider the following paragraphs:

Rough Draft:
The secret of how a person can look so sick and then later appear as when he was well is a secret that morticians seem to want to keep to themselves, according to Mitford. It is hard to find any book explaining how morticians prepare bodies, and nobody in the family is allowed to view the preparation, although in the past a person from the deceased’s family would always be sure to be present as the body was prepared. There may be many reasons for not allowing the family to view the preparation besides the second thoughts that knowledge of the procedures used might cause. Even family members who are aware of the specific activities involved might find it hard to watch the body being mutilated and refurbished during the process of replacing the blood and being sure that the person is dead.

Revised:
Morticians want to keep the secret of how they make the dead look healthy, according to Mitford. Few books explain how they prepare bodies. And, unlike in the past, today’s mortician will not let relatives watch the procedure for fear they might have second thoughts. Even a relative who has seen violence and gore on TV might wince to see a loved one’s body drained of blood, mutilated and refurbished.

Clearly the second is better. But would you know what to say in the margins of a student paper, or what to say in a conference, to get such an improvement? Even someone who knows how to write well may not know how to teach writing. Of course, one could learn, but it can take years. Our TA’s spend a two-year apprenticeship tutoring in the Skills Center and teaching 101 under careful supervision. Backlund concedes that, “departments will need ... assistance [sic] in developing and evaluating assignments, assessing results, and other related issues.” But that is
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hugh Spall
FROM: Ross Byrd
DATE: April 18, 1996
SUBJECT: Faculty Morale Report--Senate Version

Hugh, thanks for all your work in attempting to summarize responses from some senators about faculty morale factors in their departments. As you implied in the introduction in the April 3 Faculty Senate minutes, it would be difficult to suggest that the summary has a great deal of validity due to a lack of knowledge of the number of responses to each item.

Might I also suggest that the summary report lacks validity due to lack of representativeness. As you noted, we really don’t know “how many” faculty perceived a given morale factor was important. Is it possible that in some or many departments only persons with negative perceptions responded to their senator’s inquiries? While I understand that you are caught “in the middle” as Chair of the Senate, it is unfortunate that the Senate finds itself in the position of producing a report that may be no more representative than the original report. As you know, many faculty had serious concerns about the possibility (probability?) that the original report was seriously skewed.

The faculty in this department were requested to provide information about morale under the following two headings: Life is Good and Life Could Be Improved. Nine of 12 persons responded—anonymously—to the Chair of our Personnel Committee. His tally of the attached responses resulted in 101 Life is Good statements and 38 Life Could Be Improved statements. Interestingly, 3 of the Life Could Be Improved responses were negative comments about the original climate report.

The Senate summary report (without taking the time to count the items) has about 1/4 a page of positive morale statements and almost 2 full pages of negative statements. Are the faculty in this department merely different? weird?

By the way, Hugh, I am not suggesting that there is no validity in some of the concerns raised in the original morale report or in the Senate summary. Certainly lack of legislative support for salary increases represents one major problem.

pc Rob Perkins
The following statements were compiled from anonymous comments provided by nine of the twelve full-time faculty and staff from the Administrative Management and Business Education Department. To insure maximum anonymity, the comments were randomly sorted into the order presented below. The comments are not prioritized. Minor editing was done: eliminating names, grammatical structure, personal references, punctuation, and spelling.

LIFE IS GOOD

1. The majority of CWU's employees (faculty and staff) want to be here and work together as a "team" to make this a good university.

2. The majority of the employees (faculty and staff) like the students and want to help them get a good education.

3. The majority of the students are fine young people.

4. Interdepartmental program (Fashion Mdsg) and Ed Tech (with Ed Dept) (Regular opportunities to work with faculty from other departments).

5. Status of the department in the College.

6. Involvement of faculty on campus committees.

7. There are many positive role models for students and often student role models for us.

8. This is a beautiful campus.

9. Departmental secretary's commitment to students.

10. We receive many, many benefits other than our paychecks (medical benefits, dental benefits, life insurance, disability, retirement).

11. I hear daily positive comments about our department's staff as far as their openness to students' willingness to sit down and spend time with them, interest in their personal lives.

12. I work with the best faculty anywhere on campus.

13. Our department people care about one another.

14. The campus community brings in art and culture (plays, concerts, etc.) otherwise not available in such a small community.
Good working relationships in the department among most staff. Helpfulness of most persons to share ideas and materials.

Ability to "discuss" concerns openly with the department chair.

Thankful we are in a department that provides summer employment on a regular basis.

Small classes.

This is the best place in Ellensburg to work (financially and otherwise).

There are many, many nice, caring people who work here (faculty, staff, administrators).

Efficiency in office operation.

We live in a good community.

Some entrepreneurial opportunities.

University of a size that permits personal contacts and interaction across campus.

Availability of Continuing Education for special offerings.

Dean who is very open about budgets and decision making.

Strong relationship with SPI.

Reputation of our teacher education programs in the state and nation.

Interaction with teachers in the state.

Professional leadership opportunities.

Satisfaction of tracking our graduates in their careers—primarily teacher education.

It's a very satisfying career.

Dean who tries to be fair.

The business community is supportive of campus activities.

Allowing faculty to teach courses in the way they see appropriate—as experts in an area.
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Adequate vacation times to recharge.

Faculty teaching load assignment are consistent with Faculty Code guidelines.

Facilities (classrooms, offices, department office) are excellent.

Departmental offerings (curriculum) attracts students.

Faculty is supported by department chair to grow professionally.

Dean who is supportive of department and programs.

Good mix of expertise in our departmental faculty.

Congenial and talented departmental faculty.

Equitable disbursement of limited departmental funds for travel, etc.

Funding for technology improvements.

Life is good in the Department because of the genuine, caring friendships I have built with several of the members.

A caring attitude exists within the Department.

Life is good because, for the most part, members of the Department are willing to work with one another for the good of the Department. There is not a "cut throat" attitude whereby individuals step over others to better themselves. We are willing to help one another out when needed.

Life is good because we have a sense of humor—sometimes sick—but a sense of humor!

Curriculum always changing—always learning—the mind doesn't get stale.

Leadership roles of faculty on campus.

Life is good because our chair is very willing to accommodate all our wacky schedules and preferences when he is setting up the class schedules.

Provost who believes in getting resources back to the deans and departments.

Life is good because we have an extremely talented Department.

I enjoy the students. Majority of students want to learn.
Majority of majors committed to performing at high level.

69 Students appreciate teachers' commitment to quality teaching and advising.

70 President who is supportive of professional preparation programs.

71 Graduate students (during the year and summer) are a joy to work with (Competent, goal oriented, committed professionally)

73 Stimulating environment--faculty perspectives and interaction.

74 Quality teaching the faculty's first priority.

75 Opportunities to teach summer school.

76 Input on teaching load, class scheduling, and course offerings.

77 Routing of announcements, minutes, etc.

78 General commitment to quality advising.

Commitment to students' success.

80 New department photocopier.

81 Commitment to the department and institution in terms of service at the department and institutional level.

82 Good senses of humor--it's an enjoyable environment.

83 Generally good support from microcomputer lab assistants during classes.

84 Great departmental facilities (offices, conference room, etc.).

85 Up-to-date technology that supports teaching in lecture rooms and 214.

86 Adequate technology that supports teaching in other three labs.

87 Up-to-date microcomputers and software in offices.

88 Access to Internet and the WWW.

89 Up-to-date micros and software in labs.

Support of Computer Services in terms of getting new software as it is available.
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Availability of Continuing Ed and summer school profits for departmental use.

92 The department chair promotes faculty interests.

93 Colleagues are pleasant and supportive.

94 Excellent student assistants.

95 Good support from computer/audio-visual/CTS support persons.

96 Facilities are outstanding.

97 Students are one of the joys of my life, we have great ones.

98 The faculty position is a wonderful profession, I would choose this career path again without question.

99 The University has an excellent physical plant that is well maintained.

100 Support services via Library, registrar, information resources are good.

101 Availability of grants from SPI, graduate office, etc.

1 Computer support is good and improving.

103 Jean is an outstanding and caring department secretary. She plays a vital role in the department. Students identify with her.

104 I am grateful I chose CWU and CWU chose me.

105 The chair spends many hours beyond the norm in promoting Business Education.

107 Supportive in the fact that, if possible, staff will offer to step in for other staff members to assist with classes, finals, etc. supportive in the fact that chair understands when family or personal situations necessitate our being gone from a class.

110 Our incredibly helpful, friendly, efficient, and supportive office staff!

111 When differences are expressed (i.e. staff meetings) and sometimes "heatedly" so, but when all is said and done no animosity or grudges seem to be held. Again, comfortable feeling of being able to express honestly.

114 I am overall happy with my department family.

1 Enjoy faculty with whom I work.
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110 Students are great.

117 Classrooms conducive to teaching.

118 In the department, faculty work together very well.

119 Climate within this department, I feel, is positive and supportive. Very comfortable with being able to express any concern with faculty and/or chair.

121 For the most, classes are assigned that faculty want to teach.
Life Could Be Improved

Better understanding of administrators about use of time required for teaching so that other demands are not overwhelming.

Not so many departmental meetings. Meet when absolutely necessary--send e-mail information otherwise.

Require small departmental groups (those highly involved) to prepare written reports to the department when decisions need to be made. Then the entire department can come together with appropriate information on which to make final decisions without involving so much meeting time for everyone. In some cases, reports need to include a clear discussion of the question to be solved with rationale for the suggested decision (from all angles).

When more than one person teaches a class, develop a stated set of objectives to be reached and similarities on grading/evaluating end results. (No matter how many meetings we have about the topic, nothing ever seems to be accomplished. What else can we do to avoid such problems that result from each person doing his/her own thing.

The department chair needs to be careful to maintain his position as chair of the entire department not just Business Education. "The tail sometimes wags the dog."

Time is needed for faculty to interact and plan curriculum.

Because I seem to keep very busy in our department, I haven't noticed the "campus climate." personally, most campus areas I am involved with are great! Dining services (during business hours and for outside groups), the music department community performances, and the theater groups.

Short range and immediate needs are the focus without time for long range planning.

Money is needed to support faculty for curriculum development and major projects. (Many faculty are involved in major projects without time or money allocations.)

Teaching schedules should be set for the academic year. (This would give better planning time for faculty and students.)

Consistency of courses assignments is needed.

A quarter time each quarter should be rotated among faculty for professional development and research.

When projects (money) are available, faculty need the opportunity to express interest.

An index in living raise would be nice each year. (UNDERSTATEMENT)
During department meetings, the department chair needs to chair the meeting and be less directive in his position. When he has an agenda item that he has ownership he tends to use he chair position in a non-professional and manipulative way.

Administrators work with legislators (and other higher education boards/committees) to better present the work done by faculty and the need to reduce other requirements besides teaching loads.

Pay which would keep up with the cost of living.

The seemingly "unsolvable" inequity of hours in class vs. pay across campus.

Petty question: why was faculty required to report to work the Friday classes were canceled?

Female faculty members are not treated the same as the male faculty members of the Department. For example, I do not see the men put under the same "scrutiny" as the women are when it comes to attire. When was the last time a man in this Department was "encouraged" to dress more professionally?

This isn't a problem within the Department itself but it does affect the women, the students treat the women differently.

Inadequate state funding for salary increases

The report was a hatchet job by a questionably selected group who had an agenda to bring the CWU campus into alignment with other "cutting-edge institutions." The purpose, obviously, was to nudge, if not shove, the campus into the currently popular anti-racist/sexist/homophobic attitudes so common on some of the larger campuses.

A male prof can be a little tougher in student expectations or grading; yet, a female is often labeled a "bitch."

The pay scale is far from equitable. Quite frankly, it is discouraging when you have been here and see new people come in one step below you or at the same step which took you several years to obtain. However, these new people have "experience" which is better than yours and therefore justifies the salary which they receive. What is the incentive to stay here or the incentive to be productive? It appears the only way to get ahead is to move on to greener pastures.

Eliminate present merit system. The system is not valid nor reliable.

Adjust salaries of long-term faculty members to reflect current market conditions.

Rather than find commonalities to bring the campus and larger community together, the report only serves to drive a wedge among many groups, promoting, if you will, a nation-within-a nation of hyphenated Americans. For those who have an historic view, the report is thinly veiled propaganda. The purpose? To further the warm and fuzzy school of self esteem. Why? To defer a real education and
maturity. The balkanization of the country is a possibility if such nitwitttery comes to pass.

60 Adjust female salaries to match the salaries of similarly qualified males.

61 Provide more funds and release time for professional growth, travel, curriculum development, and faculty development.

63 Reduce the number of campus committees, task forces, etc. Too much time is spent on such functions reducing time to prepare for classes and work with students.

65 Professors and staff who really don't want to be a part of the university, don't care about students' and are just freeloaders because they have tenure or are protected by civil service rights.

67 Standards for promotion are not equitable for a couple of reasons. First, the track record which got a person promoted just a couple of years ago may not be adequate today. It seems that those trying to get promoted keep having the criteria raised. Could those who have been promoted meet the criteria today? Also, because we have such quality people in our Department, it seems that what we consider "average" would be considered "above average" in other departments on this campus. Yet, "average" is not considered good enough in this Department. A reality check as to what is expected is needed.

73 No official policy established regarding the President's authority to give "administrative" leave to all personnel in an emergency situation.

75 Inadequate state/institutional funding for departmental operations

76 Revise general education requirements. (The proposed revisions will do little to improve general education.)

78 The Campus Climate diatribe is nothing more than a list of solutions looking for problems, an effort to define any kind of dissent as bigotry, an effort based on deeply flawed ethics and an attempt to load a significant part of the campus and community with a burden of collective guilt for another's misfortune, inability, or failure.

82 Lack of funding for more faculty and updated equipment.
Senate Motion

I move that the Faculty Senate vote to express its appreciation of Sue Tirotta’s twelve years of outstanding service to the Senate office. In expressing our appreciation, we recognize that Sue has given far more than was required or for which she was compensated. We further recognize that she has done so with consummate skill and efficiency.

Let it also be recorded that Sue has always performed her duties in a diplomatic manner, mindful of the often sensitive nature of issues which pass through the Senate office. The Senate commends her for her resourcefulness, her adaptability, and her thoroughness—all of which have constituted a major part of the Senate’s ability to function with continuity through changes in Senate leadership and within a changing University environment.

Finally, let it be noted that the Senate wishes Sue the greatest of success and fulfillment in the new endeavors to which she now moves forward.
Memorandum

Date: February 23, 1996

To: Tom Moore/Deans' Council

From: Ray Riznyk, Chair
Faculty Development and Research Committee

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.
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
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)
Date: Tue, 23 Jan 1996 08:41:42 +0000
From: Caroline Onstot <onstotc@cwu.edu>
To: cabinet@cwu.edu, dept_chairs@cwu.edu, dean_council@cwu.edu,
     uhead@cwu.edu, senators@cwu.edu, howardn@cwu.edu, thompson@cwu.edu,
     lindleym@cwu.edu
Subject: Budget Hearing for 96 Summer School

Budget Hearing for 96 Summer School

Barge 304
3:45 p.m.
January 16, 1996

Committee:
President Nelson, Provost Moore, Vice President Jones, Executive Assistant
to the President Agnes Canedo, Faculty Senate Chair Hugh Spall, (Vice
President Shumate absent).

Guests:
Lin Douglas, Vern LaBay, David Dauwalder, Anne Denman, Fritz Glover,
Joe Antonich, Shelly Johnson, Robert Brown, Phil Backlund, Barney
Erickson, Don Schliesman, James Pappas, Ken Gamon, Greg Trujillo,
Ginger Linnell

Summer school budget only topic of meeting. Will go to Board of Trustess
for action at the February 2 board meeting

Provost Moore reviewed the fee structure noting the increases for each
category: $70-75 - undergraduate degree; $80-85 - post baccalaurate degree;
$98-110 - master degree; $40-45 - registration. He noted CWU is lower or
competitive with other state institutions. He pointed out that fixed costs wer
based on added cost for personnel (4% salary increase). This proposal was
reviewed and adjusted with Dean's council prior to this budget hearing.

President Nelson introduced concept of designating a line item of $100,000 fo
set-aside for faculty development.

Discussion on the fact that funds for faculty development are already being
funded in significant measure through amounts turned back to Deans.
It was concluded that greater visibility of these amounts is needed.

The President requested a Faculty Senate recommendation for distribution
of the $100,000 and cover letter from the Deans describing what has been
done with prior turn-back money related to faculty development. These items
are to be attached to the Board's information packet for February 2 meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05.
In reading the Faculty Senate minutes from January 31, 1996, one statement presented in the report on page 2 of the $100,000 available for faculty development funding seemed inaccurate to me. The statement follows:

"The Schools and Colleges would 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."

1. I remember no mention of "existing internal allocation formulas" at the University Budget Committee meeting.

2. I remember no mention at that meeting of the Senate's task being defined as how funds are spent at the department and program level. I seem to remember hearing simply that the deans would be responsible for administering the funds according to the criteria, or definition, of "faculty development" forwarded by the Faculty Senate.

Is my memory accurate? If so, is this statement could be a problem?

In Summer 1995, the SBE through agreement of our among the dean, department chairs, and assistant dean used nearly $11,000 to fund a school-based summer research and instructional development grant program. It was a school-based approach with a selection committee formed across departmental lines. I wouldn't want to be prevented from using a system such as this because of what may be a more narrowly interpreted outcome from a meeting at which a different concept was actually considered.

Dave Dauwalder
GF-S REVENUE GROWTH FORECAST
INITIATIVE 601 CALCULATION FORECAST
NET DIFFERENCE

$17.473 Billion

$15.443 Billion

$2.03 Billion
Opinion Editorial:

PREDICTABLE & STABLE FUNDING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

There has been much recent public discussion of the crisis of access to higher education in Washington. That discussion is important, and the crisis is real. But until recently, clear solutions to the problem were not on the table. Now, due to the work of the Governor’s Task Force on Higher Education, some solutions to the crisis are being proposed. Specifically, the Governor’s Task Force is proposing that the State of Washington dedicate a special fund to higher education. This fund would be directed specifically at the primary concerns that the state’s citizens have identified for higher education: access and quality.

The Council of Presidents supports this proposal for a dedicated fund. We believe it is important to the future of Washington’s citizens, and therefore to the future of the State. By identifying a stable funding source that will assist in providing access to quality higher education for Washington’s citizens, the Task force is offering a means of responding to the very serious challenges facing higher education. Let us tell you why we believe this proposal for a dedicated fund is so important.

Providing a better future for our children is an important part of the American dream. That better future includes access to quality higher education. Fulfilling that dream for Washington citizens is about to become much more difficult. Soon, the question of whether or not we will be able to provide our children with the opportunity to attend a public college or university within this state will be answered by a startling “probably not”. Scarce resources are colliding with the very large number of children of the “baby-boom” generation. The numbers speak for themselves:

- Between 1995 and 2020, there will be 300,000 more 17-29 year olds.
- To keep pace, the community and technical colleges and the four-year colleges will have to add about 6,000 new students each year through 2010 (about five percent each year).
- To fund that growth, state general fund spending on higher education would have to be $900 million higher in FY 2011 than it is in FY 1997.

But,

- Higher education’s share of the state general fund has fallen from 16 percent in 1979 to 11 percent in 1996, and it looks like this trend will continue.
If general fund spending for other critical areas such as corrections, health care, long term care, and K-12 continue to grow at the same rate as over the last five years, all other programs in the general fund (including higher education) would be allowed to grow an average of only 1.8 percent through 2011.

Dismal outlook? We think so. But we are heartened by the work of the Governor’s Task Force on Higher Education Funding and members of the Legislature who are attempting to develop a plan for stability and predictability. A proposal to establish a dedicated “higher education fund” could provide higher education with stable funding. We support this idea, and we think it ought to receive serious consideration.

The obvious benefit to the people of Washington is that higher education would receive predictable and stable state funding and could provide access to our young people and to displaced workers without competing for general fund dollars with other important areas of government. The framers of Initiative 601 consistently stated that they did not want the spending limitation to hurt education or higher education. They may have anticipated that there would be good reasons (like the new demographic realities) to dedicate funds. The initiative clearly allows for dedicated funds outside of the general fund, and exempts those funds from the spending limitation.

The Task Force is sensitive to public sentiment about taxes. Their proposal to dedicate existing funds to higher education does not require any new taxes or any increase in current taxes. In fact, if economic projections are correct, modest tax reductions could still occur.

Over the next couple of months the Governor’s Task Force on Higher Education Funding will debate this proposal. Everyone in this state has a stake in this debate. Your ability and the ability of your children to participate in quality public higher education in this state is at risk.

We urge you to become familiar with the proposal of the Governor’s Task Force, and to make your views about this important issue known.

Sincerely,
Higher Education Funding Proposal

Presented to the Governor’s Task Force on Higher Education

March 11, 1996
Framework for Proposal

• State resources are constrained now and through the year 2010.

• Access to higher education upper division and graduate education in Washington is low.

• Access to higher education must be significantly expanded. HECB recommends an additional 84,100 ft es by 2010. WFTECB recommends 10,123 more by 2000.

• State, institutions, and students must cooperatively work to improve quality and productivity of the higher education system.
Why Act Now?

• The age 17-29 population is expected to increase by 300,000 between 1995 and 2020.

• To keep pace with population growth, the two and four year institutions each have to add about 5,000 to 6,000 student ftes each biennium through the 2009-2011 biennium.

• To fund enrollment growth, state general fund spending on higher education would have to be $900 million higher in FY 2011 compared to FY 1997 ($200 million without inflation).

• Students borrowing more and more to attend college.

• If K-12 education, debt service, corrections, health care, and long term care budgets grow at the rate of the last 5 years, all other programs in the general fund would be allowed to grow an average of 1.8% per year through 2011 under I-601. (Higher education spending needs to grow about 5% per year to keep pace with population growth)

• If higher education spending growth was limited to 1.8% per year, spending would be about $665 million less in FY 2011 than needed to maintain current participation rates.

• If tuition revenues were used to fill the gap, tuition revenues per student would have to rise an average of about 9 percent per year through FY 2011, including 12 to 14 percent per year in the early years.
Important Assumptions

- HECB enrollment plan funded (84,100 ftes by 2010).
- WTECB enrollment plan recommended (10,123 ftes by 2000 and another 9,722 ftes by 2010).
- Additional financial aid required.
- Institutions must become more efficient.
- State, institutions, and students will be held more accountable.
- Institutional base budgets will be stable.
Student Access
Recommendations

- HECB enrollment plan funded (84,100 ftes by 2010).
- HECB allocates new student enrollments & funding for 4-year institutions.
- Financial aid increased through state need grant program (funding for up to 65% of median family income).
- Worker retraining continues under the provisions of HB 1988.
- Technology is used to increase student access and college productivity.
- Branch campuses continue to be built.
- Running start and certificate of mastery students generate "incentive pool."
Efficiency of Operations

Recommendation

• Base budgets assumed to become 10% more efficient by 2007 (1%/yr). Savings would be used to help fund additional students.
Accountability Recommendations

- Accountability measures mandated to be developed by the HECB with cooperation from public and private higher education institutions.
- SBCTC develops academic accountability measures in conjunction with the HECB and vocational accountability measures are developed by the Workforce Training and Education Board in conjunction with SBCTC.
- Budgets tied, in part, to progress on performance measures.
Budget Stability Recommendations

- State public higher education funding removed from state general fund. Create higher education account with dedicated revenue sources.
- Base operating budgets and student tuition increases tied to changes in the implicit price deflator (same inflation factor used to inflate non-employee related costs in k-12).
Faculty Senators
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putting it mildly. Just “assessing results” can be quite time consuming, even for those who have been trained to do it. A five-to-seven page student theme may take about fifteen minutes to read, then an additional ten minutes or so to diagnose and comment on. Multiply that by twenty-five papers, three times a quarter. For the student, English 301 is worth three credits, but it counts as a four-credit class for instructors, in recognition of the extra work required to grade the papers.

Naturally, one can distribute this work over several sections, but the more people who teach writing, the harder it will be to maintain a consistent set of standards and avoid giving students conflicting and confusing feedback. Even within the English department, where we all more or less agree on terminology and instructional objectives, some students still complain that grades seem too subjective and arbitrary. What will they say when Music professor X disagrees with Music professor Y about the “right” way to cast a particular sentence, especially when neither is really a qualified expert?

Moreover, the project will be expensive. Last year, the thirty-six sections of 301 we offered cost only about $77,220. Creating more positions in other departments for people who have not been trained specifically to teach writing, then training them, will surely cost a lot more, especially if classes are limited to enrollments of twenty-five. Such writing programs can work, and do work very well. But these programs cost a lot more than we are currently spending. And we can get almost the same results simply by making better use of the personnel we have. The easiest most cost efficient way to get content into a writing course, and writing into a content course, is to link them. Some faculty in English have already formed successful links with courses in other departments, simply by making our own arrangements. A lot more could be done along these lines with just a little more administrative help.

Not that we would discourage those in other departments from making writing assignments—in both upper and lower division classes. The more writing students do for others, the more they can see the relevance of what we teach. Moreover, those departments that feel strongly about designing 301 substitutes should do so. We can give them as much assistance as they want or need. But doing away with 301 altogether only makes sense if one accepts, as Backlund does, two questionable assumptions: First, that the English department cannot design linked writing courses that would be sufficiently discipline-specific, and, second, that the ability to write for one’s fellow mathematicians or biologists is far more valuable than the ability to communicate with an interdisciplinary audience. The first assumption has never been tested. The second is errant nonsense. These days, students are being told not to count on having just one job all their lives, but to plan on making at least a few career changes as businesses respond to the pressures of a global economy. And even if they do stay within a given field, they may find themselves isolated and misunderstood if they can’t communicate effectively with various kinds of laymen. Backlund’s memo itself is not discipline specific. Students who can’t step outside the jargon of their own fields, who can’t paraphrase well enough to see relationships between disciplines, are just as embarrassing as those who can’t spell. If our goal is to turn out, not just psychologists or teachers, but versatile, thoughtful, well spoken individuals, cutting 301 is not the answer.