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ROLL CALL:

Presiding Officer: Robert H. Perkins

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

CHANGES TO AGENDA: Revised General Education Proposal

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the February 26, 1997, Faculty Senate meeting were approved with the following corrections:

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING: March 12, 1997

ROLL CALL:

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Jim Beaghan, Melissa Bowers, Delores Cleary, Bobby Cummings, John Dugan, Michael Gleason, Sidney Nesselroad, Debra Frippe, James Roberts, Charles Rubin, James Sahlstrand, Hugh Spall, Carin Thomas

Visitors: Karen Adamson, Kim Black, Linda Clark-Santos; David Dauwalder, Barney Erickson, Fritz Grover, Nancy Howard, Robert Jacobs, Charles McChesee, Barbara Radke, Carolyn Wells

COMMUNICATIONS:

Richard Alumbaugh, Faculty Senate Representative, Washington Legislative Report, March 2, 1997. Kelly Egan, Council of Faculty Representatives Chair, Locke on Faculty Salaries, March 3, 1997

REPORTS:

1. CHAIR

Election of 1997/98 Faculty Senate Executive Committee

MOTION NO. 3103 Motion passed to elect by acclamation Robert Perkins, Administrative Management and Business Education, as the 1997-98 Faculty Senate Chair.

MOTION NO. 3104 Motion passed to elect by acclamation Bobby Cummings, English, as the 1997-98 Faculty Senate Vice Chair.

MOTION NO. 3105 Motion passed to elect by acclamation Terry DeVietti, Psychology, as the 1997-98 Faculty Senate Secretary.

The following individuals were nominated to the position of At-Large Member: Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts; Webster Hood, Philosophy; Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science; and Keith Lewis, Art. Ballots were distributed to Senators and they were instructed to vote for two individuals; the nominees receiving the highest plurality of votes will become the two at-large members of the Executive Committee.

MOTION NO. 3106 Chair Perkins moved that the Faculty Senate accept the following results for the positions of At-Large Members, as calculated by Hugh Spall and Terry DeVietti of the 1996-97 Senate Executive Committee: Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts; At-Large Member; Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science, At-Large Member. Motion passed.

1997/98 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Membership [effective 6/15/97]

CHAIR: Robert Perkins, AMBE
VICE CHAIR: Bobby Cummings, English
SECRETARY: Terry DeVietti, Psychology
AT-LARGE MEMBER: Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts
AT-LARGE MEMBER: Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science
PAST CHAIR: Sidney Nesselroad, Music

2. PRESIDENT

- No Report

3. ACADEMIC SUPPORT SYSTEMS PROJECT: Judy MacMillan

The purpose of the project is to provide a more user-friendly environment of computing at Central and to come up with some modern technology to have the systems based on. The scope is to replace the student system, financial system, alumni development system, human resource system and to replace the VAX's eventually with a hardware platform that is more modern and up to date. Some of the advantages are to provide access for students for registration, grades. Eventually faculty will do things on the Worldwide Web. There would be one source of data instead of the many sources now.

There are two groups overseeing the project, both made up of academic, administrative and technical representatives. The Policy Group is in charge of making the decisions about procedures. Gary Lewis, Dean of Library and Media Services, is the Chair, David Kaufman, Sociology, is a member. The Working Group membership includes Judy MacMillan, CT3: Kim Black, Provost’s Office; Barney Erickson, Math. There will be three vendor demonstrations: April 8-10, April 15-17, and May 5-7.

4. FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: No Report

BUDGET COMMITTEE

MOTION NO. 3107: Non-Tenure Track Faculty Salaries. Barry Donahue moved and Jim Hawkins seconded approval of the Recommendations. Motion passed.

Comment: Does Central expect to hire people at the salary levels recommended in the competitive market areas of Engineering, Computer Science, etc.

Gamon: The recommendations are minimums and are a big improvement over where they are presently. Also the recommendations but non-tenure track faculty in a position to receive raises with the tenured faculty.

Question: Is it the intent to include those positions which are issued in year-long contracts (School of Business & Economics has many) which are ranked positions.

Donahue: Yes. It would impact them in the future if the minimum goes up as the faculty salary scale goes up.

Howard: Getting non-tenure-track faculty on the salary scale certainly helps. However, how does this help those who have full-time, nine-month contracts? The formula proposed is based on step 1 at 100% for nine months if the person has a Ph.D. and if they teach 15 credits per quarter. A number of full-time, full-year appointments do not teach 15 credits each quarter but have other responsibilities within their departments, such as, committee work and, often times, some advising. Of 45 Degrees counted for non-tenure-track faculty, 11 had Ph.D.'s and 31 had Masters' Degrees (only 4 had B.A.'s). This means that the bulk of non-tenure-track faculty are looking at 80% of the minimum. 80% of step 1 for nine months, if a person were teaching 15 credits a quarter, comes out to $22,238/year. Currently, some civil service positions on campus, such as Administrative Assistant and Library Specialist, only require a High School Degree and four years of experience; Information Special Specialist, requires a Bachelor's Degree but no experience; and a Floor Layer, no experience but an apprenticeship program. The message we are sending non-tenure-track faculty by placing them so low on the salary scale is one of no recognition for their advance degrees and for the many years of service they have already put in at this institution. It is good to see a consideration of getting them on the salary scale, but it should be at a step that reflects more appropriately their educational qualifications and work experience.
The Faculty Code defines full-time in a non-tenure-track appointment as being 15 credits. Non-tenure-track faculty ought not to be performing committee duties nor advising. Also, we don’t want to be talking of putting non-tenure-track employees on the salary scale because they are hired from year-to-year or from quarter-to-quarter. What has been done in the recommendation is to tie the minimum to a position on the Faculty Salary Scale, but we cannot put year-to-year employees on the salary scale and suggest that they are to be hired or moved up on the salary scale unless such a policy were created.

This issue floats and nothing is ever done about it. From a dean’s point of view, an issue is that this minimum policy gives us, at least, a guidance/some kind of starting point. Otherwise, there is no starting point at all. But that should not be used to gloss over the very real issues.

Beverly Heckart has pointed out in the past that the AAUP recommendation (with the intention of avoiding this sort of second-class citizen status for non-tenure-track faculty) is a three-year limit to year-to-year employment on a non-tenure-track status.

A school back in Pennsylvania was called to see how they administer a clause in a union contract that is exactly like that. They don’t. People come to the end of the three-year limit and since they don’t have any larger labor pool than we do, and so they hire for a fourth, fifth and sixth year. It is lamentable what happens to non-tenure-track faculty, particularly the adjunct salaries are pitiful. In comparison to some of the tenure-track salaries, the salaries of the non-tenure-track faculty in the School of Business & Economics are quite high, even without Ph.D.’s which is a requirement for tenure-track. The tenure and tenure-track are the core of the university and we should be encouraging hires in that category which is what the AAUP does.

MOTION NO. 3108: Salary Inequity Recommendations: Barry Donahue moved to have an outside consultant do a gender equity study.

Comment: Curriculum & Supervision and College of Education & Professional Studies programs are not addressed.

Beverly Heckart, Chair, commented that the proposed Faculty Code changes will be mailed out on 4/1/97. The Hearing will be on April 16, 1997, in Barge 201 at 3:00 p.m.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - No Report

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - No Report

PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - No Report

MOTION NO. 3109: General Education Program Changes: Robert Jacobs, Chair, moved approval of minor editorial changes to the General Education Program as follows:

Course Criteria
1. How was, and is, the knowledge defined, validated, and challenged? --How are the received knowledge be, or how is it being challenged? How can this field illuminate, and be illuminated by, the current human experience in all its diversity?

BASIC SKILLS REQUIREMENT. All students must satisfy the following requirements in basic academic and intellectual skills:

(a) UNTY 100, Advising Seminar (1). Only required of students who enter Central with fewer than 45 credits. Credit will not be allowed toward meeting Bachelor's degree requirements;

(b) ENG 101 (3) and ENG 102 (3). Students must pass an Intermediate Writing Assessment examination in order to pass ENG 102;

(c) either MATH 102 (3) or qualification in an appropriate examination 101 (5), MATH 163 1 (5), MATH 163 2 (5), MATH 164 1 (2), or MATH 171 (2);

(d) either MATH 130 1 (2), MATH 132 (4), PHIL 201 (5) (amended version), or CS 105 (5) (Logical Basis of Computing);

(e) one year of college or university study of a single foreign language or two years of high school study of a single foreign language;

(f) students must either pass an examination in the fundamentals of computing prior to taking more than 60 credits at Central Washington University or take and pass one of the following classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMG 202</td>
<td>Microcomputer Applications (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSED 316</td>
<td>Education Technology (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 101</td>
<td>Computer Basics (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCS 316</td>
<td>Educational Technology (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BREADTH REQUIREMENT

I. ARTS AND HUMANITIES. Students must take at least one course from each of the three clusters groups. No more than one class from a single department may be counted toward this requirement.

III. THE NATURAL SCIENCES. The natural sciences provide basic methods for rigorously describing and comprehending the natural world. Inquiry-driven laboratory and field observations are an essential mode of teaching, learning, and practicing natural science. Students must take three courses (14 credits) at least one course outside their major department-one from each of the three groups. No more than one class from a single department may be counted toward this requirement. It may be advantageous for students to take courses from groups in the order they appear below. Students may not take more than one class from a single department.

Ken Gamon moved and Sharon Rosell seconded to waive the By Laws. Motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
Faculty Senate Budget Committee

RECOMMENDATIONS ON SALARY INEQUITY

Overview

There should be three stages to any plan to correct salary inequity.
1. Flagging
2. Review
3. Adjustment

Flagging. In the Flagging stage, individuals who may be victims of bias are identified. There may be many reasons, intentional or otherwise, which have led to a salary disparity large enough to flag as a potential bias. These may include class distinctions (race, gender, etc.), poor negotiation procedure upon hiring, market conditions, and so on. The flagging procedure should be robust enough to detect both class bias and individual bias.

Review. The Review stage provides a mechanism for assessing the likelihood that bias has actually occurred. It includes a study of the salary records, productivity, and other relevant information in order to determine if there is a legitimate claim of bias, and, if so, the amount of adjustment that is necessary to bring them to a position of parity within their department. In this stage, input from those in supervisory positions over the individual is critical to the decision.

Adjustment. Those faculty whose salary is found to require adjustment during the review stage have their salary increased by the amount determined to be appropriate during the review.

General Procedure

1. Each year the Provost shall conduct a study of faculty salaries. This study shall utilize two models:
   a. A Multiple Regression model. In order to obtain enough people for a statistically viable study, departments may be grouped together according to a combination of market and disciplinary factors. Only departments with comparable salary levels may be grouped together, and department chairs must be directly involved in the grouping decision. All individuals in a department/group who are members of a class which is a significant predictor (p < 0.05) of salary will be flagged.
   b. A Peer Institution Comparison model. A comparison of individual salaries with average faculty salaries from the same discipline at CWU peer institutions. Those whose salary difference places them in the upper 25% in difference from expected salary will be flagged.

2. Those faculty members flagged by either model will be considered by the Provost for salary adjustment. The Provost will notify all faculty who have been flagged that they are under consideration for salary adjustment and that they may submit their professional service record and/or other documentation in support of such an adjustment. This information should be submitted to the chair. The Provost will provide the following information to the chair and dean of each individual flagged: the model under which the individual was flagged, the individual's current salary, and the expected salary according to both models.

3. The appropriate department chair will complete a form in which he/she indicates whether the record and salary of the individual under consideration warrant making a salary adjustment. The evaluation of the individual's record will include a consideration of teaching, service, and research. This form will be sent to the dean together with the material submitted by the individual.

4. The appropriate dean will complete a form in which he/she indicates whether the record and salary of the individual under consideration warrant making a salary adjustment. The evaluation of the individual's record will include a consideration of teaching, service, and research. This form, together with the chair's form and the material submitted by the individual will be sent to the Provost.

5. The provost will review the recommendations of the chair and dean and make those salary adjustments he/she considers warranted within the restrictions of funding listed below. In a given year, no individual will receive more than a two step salary adjustment. Adjustments will not be retroactive.

6. Each year up to 10% of all salary savings money together with up to 10% of any general faculty salary increase (if any) will be available to fund salary adjustments. If the total amount of money is not required, equal percentages will be drawn from each source. In years with no general faculty salary increase, only the 10% salary savings money will be available.

Definitions and Restrictions

1. "CWU peer institutions" refers to those institutions defined by the Higher Education Coordinating Board as peer institutions for Central Washington University.

2. All tenured and tenure-track faculty (including those on leave) will be included in the study, with the following exceptions:
   a. Former CWU deans, provosts, and presidents.
   b. Faculty who will retire (full or phased) prior to the following academic year.

3. In consultation with the chairs and deans, the Provost's Office should develop a fair and consistent policy for evaluating prior service. Until such time as this policy is defined, prior service will not be used in the study. (It is assumed this definition will be completed and included in the 1997/98 review process.)

4. The factors of years of service, highest degree, rank, merit, prior service, and department should be considered in the Multiple Regression model. Factors will not be eliminated from the regression equation except for statistically valid reasons. Moreover, the model should be checked carefully for conditions such as multicollinearity that would tend to invalidate the model.

5. The Peer Institution Comparison model will compare the salary of each faculty member to the median salary of faculty in the same rank and of the same department in CWU peer institutions. Appropriate weights will be assigned for years in rank (above and below the median), prior service, and merit.

6. Each year the Provost's Office will obtain average salary by rank by department from CWU peer institutions for use in the models.

7. A faculty committee of no more than five members will be appointed to work with the Provost's Office in the development of the models described above. At least two members of this committee will have sufficient training and experience in statistical models to be considered to be experts. The other members of the committee will have the required training and experience in statistics to understand linear regression and other common statistics.

8. Salary offers to new faculty will be made only at market rates for CWU peer institutions.

Changes

Any substantive changes to these procedures will require consultation with the department chairs and the Faculty Senate.
FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, March 12, 1997
BARGE 412

AGENDA

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

IV. COMMUNICATIONS:
   Richard Alumbaugh, Faculty Senate Representative, Washington Legislative Report: March 2, 1997
   Kelly Egan, Council of Faculty Representatives Chair, Locke on Faculty Salaries, March 3, 1997

V. REPORTS:
   1. CHAIR
      Election of 97/98 Faculty Senate Executive Committee (attached)
   2. PRESIDENT - Out of Town
   3. ACADEMIC SUPPORT SYSTEMS - Judy MacMillan (15-20 min.)
   4. FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE REPORTS:
      ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Charles McGehee, Chair
         BUDGET COMMITTEE - Barry Donoho, Chair
         Report: Recommendations on Salary Inequity
      CODE COMMITTEE - Beverly Heckart, Chair
      CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - Clara Richardson, Chair
      PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Karen Adamson, Chair
      PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Bobby Cummings, Chair

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

***NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 9, 1997***

SUB 204-205
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll Call 1996-97 Meeting: 3-12-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hackenberger, Steven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffries, Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Lynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heckart, Beverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldridge, Aaron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Loretta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustain, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouts, Roger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurenka, Nancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, Roger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest, Kris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairburn, Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zetterberg, Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkholder, Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden, Ladd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue, Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghosh, Koushik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heesacker, Gary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock, Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauwalder, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertelson, Cathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caples, Minerva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, C. Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno, Stella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braunstein, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinthorne, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esbeck, Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boers, Geoffrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtz, Martha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alwin, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyandt, Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirth, Rex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schactler, Carolyn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ROSTERS\ROLLCALL.97 February 26, 1997)
3-12-97
Date

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.
Date: Mon, 03 Mar 1997 06:56:04 -0700 (PDT)
From: senate@cwu.EDU
To: Faculty Senators 8/9/96 -- ACQUISTO<ACQUISTO@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, ANDERSON<ANDERSON@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, ASCH<ASCH@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, BEAGHANJ<BEAGHANJ@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, BLAIRK<BLAIRK@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, CHARLIER<CHARLIER@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, CTHOMAS<CTHOMAS@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, CUMMINGS<CUMMINGS@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, DEVITTI<DEVITTI@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, DONAHOES<DONAHOES@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, EMANSC<EMANSC@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, FOGLEL<FOGLEL@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, FORDAH<FORDAH@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, GAMONK<GAMONK@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, GLEASON<GLEASON@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, GUNNQP<GUNNQP@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, HANKINS<HANKINS@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, HOOD<HOOD@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, JURICHK<JURICHK@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, KAMINSKI<KAMINSKI@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, KOWIELLM<KOWIELLM@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, MACKR<MACKR@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, MEDLARD<MEDLARD@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, MONSEL<MONSEL@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, MORRIS<MORRIS@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, NELSON<NELSON@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, NESSLER<NESSLER@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, OLSONS<OLSONS@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, PERKINSR<PERKINSR@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, PRIGGE<PRIGGE@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, ROBERTSJ<ROBERTSJ@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, ROMBOYD<ROMBOYD@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, ROSELLS<ROSELLS@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, SENATE<SENATE@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, SPALLH<SPALLH@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, SPENCERA<SPENCERA@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, SPIKEARLT<SPIKEARLT@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, WILLIAMW<WILLIAMW@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, WIRTHR<WIRTHR@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, WYATTM<WYATTM@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, YEHT<YEHT@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>
Cc: Members of Faculty Senate, Marsha* <senate@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, Robert Perkins <senate@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, Ken Gason <gason@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, Robert Benton <benton@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, Edington@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU
Subject: Legislative Report ( fwd)

-------- Forwarded message --------
Date: Sun, 02 Mar 1997 23:43:40 -0700 (PDT)
From: slumbaugh@cwu.EDU
To: cummings@cwu.EDU
Cc: Members of Faculty Senate, Marsha* <senate@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, Robert Perkins <senate@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, Ken Gason <gason@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, Robert Benton <benton@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU>, Edington@CLUSTER.CWU.EDU
Subject: Legislative Report

Washington Legislative Report: March 2, 1997
Richard Slumbaugh
Faculty Senate Representative

As previously reported to Bobby Cummins, legislators for 1997 session have emphasized the need for increased access and accountability in higher education. Members of the Senate and the House Higher Education Committees have stressed that regional and research universities need to increase their efficiency to reach more students and to decrease the time to graduation. Governor Locke has recently announced his plans for higher education - and there are positive trends in his proposals. Overall, CWU will fare well if his proposals, which externally have been supported on the westside, are taken seriously. Major opposition will likely focus on the cuts imposed on other state programs to pay for the increased FTEs, salaries, and other projects.

I will briefly examine major legislation that has been passed out of committee along with Governor Locke's proposals:

Student Access
Several bills have passed out of committee which increases access of students to education. The following are typical of measures promoted in committee:

LOCKE'S PROPOSALS:

S HB 1055, a House bill which provides for creating undergraduate fellowships for needy and meritorious, has been passed on to Appropriations. Similarly, SB 55197 from the Senate has been sent to Ways and Means. Fellowships will be established with matching funding from each institution. The House bill calls for 10 million dollars to fund the fellowships.

SB bill, 1143, and Senate bill SB 5413 provide for advanced college tuition payment to reduce costs for prospective students (pay tuition at rate set when payment made). Considerable support in the House - some reservations in the Senate - but likely a compromise measure will pass.

HB 1124 - requiring information about state higher education support be given to students with their tuition and fee bills. Complaints from students have resulted in CWU bill that requires higher ed. institutions to specify what opportunities are present for students. Bill passed House Higher Ed. Comm. and placed on consent calendar.

HB 1647 - establishes a home tuition option for institutions - Tuition waivers can be granted to students who wish to attend Washington colleges and universities if there is some form of reciprocity. The bill is directed, especially, toward international students. Passed 8/9 in House Higher Ed. Comm. and placed on the consent calendar.

HB 1229 - exempting sales tax for textbooks required for courses - This bill and companion bill, SB 5475 have been passed on to Finance and Ways & Means, respectively.

HB 1109 - authorizes the HEC board to conduct pilot programs in alternative tuition setting for distance education, packaging tuition and fees, and enrollment agreements with other states. Clearly, the distance concept, in the extreme, can have significant effects on tuition income. The legislature has mandated the HEC board to propose funding alternatives where students enter into enrollment agreements with other states. Similar bill in Senate, SB 5199 passed on to Rules Committee.

HB 1255 - exempts leasehold excise tax for those organizations qualifying as student housing. To qualify, the organization must be nonprofit. Bill was referred to Finance committee, Joyce Mulliken, Vice Chair.

Substitute SB 5731 provides for child care grants for higher education. Bill had considerable support from student lobby. Passed on to Senate Ways and Means.

Governor Locke has requested $30 million to extend financial aid to 6,000 more students and includes $1.2 million for scholarships under the Washington Scholars Program and the Washington Award for Vocational Excellence. Financial aid will be heavily debated. There is sentiment in the House to make students acquiring grants and loans more accountable. Don Carlson, chair of House Higher Ed. Committee, is insisting that such monies will not be used for remediation. Support comes on the Senate side from Ken Jacobsen - but the Senate Higher Ed. Committee is not as enthusiastic about the accountability requirements recommended by Chair Carlson.

The Governor's recommendation on tuition calls for a 4 percent increase for 1997-1998 and 4.5 percent increase for 1998-1999. Likely, the 4 percent figure will be approved by the legislature.

To deal with the projected increase in students, Governor Locke recommended 54 FTEs be added to CWU for the 1998 academic year and 146 for year 1999 bringing the total 1999 FTE count to 7,456, 35 FTEs higher than budget submitted by Governor Lowry. Legislators are concerned that CWU did not meet its FTE enrollment projections for the current year.

Accountability
If CWU or other institutions do not meet their enrollment targets for 1998 and 1999, Governor Locke has proposed that the additional funding will be returned by the institution if not within 3 percent of the main campus target.

To improve graduation rates and easing transfer requirements between colleges, Governor Locke is proposing two percent of each institution's non-instructional funding be redirected to improve instructional efficiency. Specific goals are to be set and measured. Improved graduation rates, increase in degrees granted per instructional faculty,
and reduction in the number of credits students accumulate before getting a degree are targeted.

Earlier in the session, Susan Patrick, staff member of the HEC board, reviewed the three year average number of graduates for bachelor's level, master's level, and doctoral level programs. The purpose was to look for low output programs and programs that duplicated others. Other states have implemented similar studies and states such as Illinois have eliminated over 100 programs in response to such studies. Low-output was defined as an average of five graduates per year or less for bachelor's level programs and an average of three graduates or less per year for master's level programs. Of the 69 bachelor's programs offered at CWU, 20 were reported as low. Ten of the 20 master's programs were rated as low. CWU, again, ranked near the middle with the highest proportion of low-output programs at Eastern (39% overall) followed by WSU (32%), CWU (31%), WOU (28%), and UW (19%). On a measure of low-output and duplicate programs, CWU ranked on the bottom. Of the 30 programs considered low output at Central, 76% of the low-output programs were also considered duplicative (this includes both bachelor's and master's degree programs).

CWU administration have been sent a copy of this report and have been asked to respond by July 1, 1997, to the HEC board on how or whether these programs fit into its institutional plans. Several factors will be considered in final recommendations made to the legislature including quality, type of demand, history of the program, and regional considerations. I would strongly advise the faculty senate review the targeted programs - and make a case, one way or another, concerning the status of such programs.

Faculty salaries

Even though the proposed the 7.5% increase proposal recommended by virtually all interests groups will not be approved this session, sentiment by supporters in the legislature is increasing for a 5 percent increase for 1997-1998 and maybe a 5 percent increase for 1998-1999. I have asked legislators to indicate what is likely -- which was answered with smiles and no predictions. On the positive side, Chair Don Carlson told CWU supporters that "we should feel very good about 5 percent if it is offered." Other committee members have mentioned the 5 percent-figure for the first year and a lesser amount for the second year. On the Senate side, Senators were evasive - but recognized that higher education faces serious problems of retention if something is not done about salaries. Governor Locke is proposing $20.2 million dollars be spent to improve quality of instruction. Monies may be spent on salaries, which will "close the faculty salary gap by nearly 5 percentage points" or monies may be spent on other quality-improvements of instruction such as in equipment or technology, enhancements in distance learning, or other program development. The final salary figures for faculty will be determined in caucus, not necessarily public sessions. The political realities are clear. The Republicans will send their version of the final budget to Governor Locke - not like last session, where the Senate forced the House to compromise and give higher education increased FTEs. We must make our case in the Senate and House to avoid a compromise offer of less than the proposed 5 percent.

I discussed salaries last Friday with Senator Hochstatter. He told me that Senator West will have considerable say over the higher education budget.

Capital Funding

I was pleased that Senator Hochstatter was impressed by the case made for a new music building. Even though Governor Locke did not mention the music building in his budget, Senator Hochstatter indicated that careful consideration will be given to CWU's request. Other legislators are aware of our need. I could use your help. Please contact Representatives Mulliken and Chandler to see if one or both will provide the necessary push from CWU's home district to include our request in the final budget.

Governor Locke has requested $1.1 million for additional student 'FTE capacity' for our CWU extended degree centers. Legislators are aware of our extended centers and there is support for growth. The governor's budget proposal places a good proportion of capital funding into branch-campus construction ($72.7 million out of a total capital budget of $543 million capital construction fund for 1997-99). His long-term plan over the next ten years calls for a total of $538.4 million directed toward branch-campus construction. A large proportion of the student population increase projected roughly 6 years from now is expected to attend branch campuses (17,192 FTEs are projected for year 2007).

Miscellaneous

The following bills are of interest:

SB 5517 requires that one student member serve on each state institution of higher education. CWU currently has the chair of the faculty senate and the student body president along with the chair of the association of administrators to serve as advisory members to our board of trustees. The bill, after considerable debate, was sent on to Rules Committee.

SB 51966 and SB 5044 corrects the tuition waiver programs for CWU (restricted to 6 percent) to a new limit of 10 percent - similar to other regionals. Bill passed out of House Committee.

Any comments or concerns about legislation or other matters, please contact me via e-mail (Alumbaugh@cwu.edu) or phone (206-439-1276) or fax (206-439-3809) or send mail to CWU Seafac Center, MS 7596.
The details of the Governor's budget and higher education were released today and a briefing held. I will divide these items into topics so you can choose which to read. First topic, near and dear to our hearts (and wallets) is faculty salaries. The good news is the Gov. has put into place the potential for a significant increase in faculty salaries over the next biennium. The bad news is the 'potential' has a number of hurdles to overcome, not all of which are within the control of the institutions or faculty.

'Quality,' 'efficiency,' and 'productivity/accountability' are all tied to salaries. The Locke budget also emphasizes flexibility and discretionary spending on the part of the institutions. Here's how it works:

The message that 'faculty should be treated differently' than other state workers has been received, as evidenced by the budget. While faculty will get the same 'cost-of-living-adjustment' as the rest of state workers (still unannounced but guessed to be approximately 2.5%/year of the prior year), the 'flexibility' will also hold the purse strings for year two are held until 'flexibility' is in place. This will help 'close the gap' between us and each of our peers.

Keep in mind that these are not guaranteed increases, just possible. The proposed possible 'average' salary increase, beyond the state employee's increase, for faculty ranges from an additional 4.30% at one school to 4.44%. While this would help 'close the gap' with peers, clearly, with such a similar increase for each, there would be no 'differential' increase for those who are lacking further behind than others; thus, the gaps remaining between each school and the 75th percentile of its peer institutions would range, in 1999, from 2.8% to 23.1%.

The Governor's reported rationale for this approach is that 'some schools have managed to preserve faculty salaries' in the face of cuts, and that they should not be penalized. This philosophy of attributing responsibility to the institution carries on to the rest of the plan for faculty salaries; the budget does not REQUIRE the institutions to use this money (if it is available) for faculty salaries. He does apparently expect, however, that if schools use this 'quality improvement' money in some other manner, that they not come back to the legislature and complain about faculty salaries in the future. This is an interesting shift of 'accountability' for faculty salaries from the legislature to the institutions.

If we received the full amount of the salary increase potential, with the approx. 2.5% state employees 'COLA', we could see an average salary increase of close to 5% for each year of the biennium, or about 9.4% for the two year budget time.

How do we become eligible to receive this potential money? Who is to control the purse strings? An organization called the HEC Board (Higher Education Control Board) was established by the legislature to oversee and coordinate programs. They have been increasingly involved in working on accountability and productivity measures; with the Locke budget, they will also hold the purse strings on much of the potential faculty salary money each school gets. Each institution would be required to develop and submit to the HEC Board goals for improvement in academic years 1997-98 and 1998-99 for 'efficiency indicators' as defined by the board largely based on undergraduate graduation rates (our 'through-put') Other goals may be proposed as well by the individual institution. Essentially, while 1/3 of the potential funds will be released to the institutions for use (however they see fit) at the beginning of the biennium, 1/3 will be kept in reserve at the universities. Funding for the first year's increase and its carryforward cost for year two are held until the HECB approves a plan for the use of the funds. The remaining third of the potential money will remain with the HECB and will be allocated to an institution on an 'incentive' basis: that is, depending on how the institution does (according to the HECB) in improving performance standards, etc., that money may actually be reallocated to ANOTHER institution.

Thus, folks, the availability of our potential salary money depends on how well (quantitatively and qualitatively) the HECB thinks our institutions have met their accountability standards. This may well be popular with the legislators as it puts the schools (and NOW the faculty) on notice that the coordinating 'arms' of the legislature will determine what goals are important. If this should go through, it would behoove faculty to be more seriously involved in whether or not our schools meet their goals--and I guess that is the point! It also greatly increases the power of the HECB, and it may increase competitiveness among the schools if the 'incentive' money can be distributed around to 'reward' or 'punish.' Finally, I think it brings us closer to our administrations since our salary increases will be more overtly dependent on their actions.

Other topics will follow: the general themes discussed above, however, apply also to tuition, access, enrollments. Think 'discretion,' 'flexibility,' 'accountability' and 'responsibility.' You've got it.

Kelly Egan, Chair
Counc. of Fac. Rep.s
General Education Program

General Education Committee draft submitted to the Faculty Senate, March 10, 1997

Course Criteria

2. What is the critical knowledge of the field?

How was, and is, the knowledge defined, validated, and challenged? How can the received knowledge be, or how is it being challenged? How can this field illuminate, and be illuminated by, the current human experience in all its diversity?

BASIC SKILLS REQUIREMENT. All students must satisfy the following requirements in basic academic and intellectual skills:

(a) UNIV 100, Advising Seminar (1). Only required of students who enter Central with fewer than 45 credits. Credit will not be allowed toward meeting Bachelor's degree requirements;

(b) ENG 101 (3) and ENG 102 (3). Students must pass an Intermediate Writing Assessment examination in order to pass ENG 102;

(c) either MATH 102 (3) or qualification in an appropriate examination 101 (5), MATH 163.1 (5), MATH 163.2 (5), MATH 164.1 (5), or MATH 172.1 (5);

(d) either MATH 120.1 (5), MATH 172.1, PHIL 201 (5) (amended version), or CS 105 (3) (Logical Basis of Computing);

(e) one year of college or university study of a single foreign language or two years of high school study of a single foreign language;

(f) students must either pass an examination in the fundamentals of computing prior to taking more than 60 credits at Central Washington University or take and pass one of the following classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMG 202</td>
<td>Microcomputer Applications (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSED 316</td>
<td>Education Technology (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 101</td>
<td>Computer Basics (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCS 316</td>
<td>Educational Technology (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BREADTH REQUIREMENT. Students must take a minimum of 14 credits from each of the three broad areas of the general education program.

I. ARTS AND HUMANITIES. Students must take at least one course from each of the three clusters groups. No more than one class from a single department may be counted toward this requirement.

III. THE NATURAL SCIENCES. The natural sciences provide basic methods for rigorously describing and comprehending the natural world. Inquiry-driven laboratory and field observations are an essential mode of teaching, learning, and practicing natural science. Students must take three courses (14 credits) at least one course outside their major department one from each of the three groups. No more than one class from a single department may be counted toward this requirement. It may be advantageous for students to take courses from categories groups in the order they appear below. Students may not take more than one class from a single department.
General Education Program

General Education Committee draft submitted to the Faculty Senate, March 10, 1997

Mission, Rationale, and Student Outcomes

The general education program offers our students a liberal education, an education intended to help them become liberated, or free, persons, able to make informed and enlightened choices. We assume that a free and liberally educated person has the following:

- basic competence in reasoning and communication;
- an awareness of the wide range and variety of human knowledge, scientific, humanistic, and artistic, including an awareness of at least some of the best that the human spirit has yet achieved;
- a sense of the interconnectedness of knowledge;
- a critical awareness of the ways in which knowledge is discovered and created;
- a critical awareness of the ways in which knowledge must and does evolve;

To these ends our general education program holds our students responsible for a high level of competency in the basic skills of reading, writing, speaking, and reasoning; it exposes them to a broad sampling of the range and variety of human knowledge and of the ways of knowing, and it attempts to instill a critical awareness of human knowledge and of its relationship to the human condition.

Course Criteria

Each general education course is expected to help our students to an informed and critical appreciation of the best and most valued creations of the human spirit. Each course is expected to engage the students in two different realms of knowledge:

- The first realm can be called received knowledge, the accepted, standard, and conventional knowledge of the methods and matter of the field represented by that course.
- The second realm can be called critical knowledge, which results from the critical examination of the field's received knowledge. This critical examination is from two main perspectives:
  (i) the criticism of the field's received knowledge as viewed against the nature of knowledge and truth in general;
  (ii) the criticism of the field's received methods and matter as viewed against the current human experience.

Each course is expected to address the following questions concerning received and critical knowledge:

1. What are the received methods and matter of the field?
   - How do practitioners in this field do their work? What skills and methods of reasoning define proficiency in this field? What skills and methods of communication are esteemed? What are the received informing principles of the field? What are some of the field's key findings and key works? Who are some of the field's esteemed figures?

2. What is the critical knowledge of the field?
   - How was, and is, the knowledge defined, validated, and challenged? How can the received knowledge be, or how is it being challenged? How can this field illuminate, and be illuminated by, the current human experience in all its diversity?

Assessment of the General Education Program

1. Students will be surveyed as to how well they think their courses address the mission of the general education program.
2. Instructors will be surveyed as to how well they think the course addressed the mission of general education.
3. Student achievement in general education classes will be evaluated regularly by means of examinations.

BASIC SKILLS REQUIREMENT. All students must satisfy the following requirements in basic academic and intellectual skills:

(a) UNIV 100, Advising Seminar (1). Only required of students who enter Central with fewer than 45 credits. Credit will not be allowed toward meeting Bachelor's degree requirements.
(b) ENG 101 (3) and ENG 102 (3). Students must pass an Intermediate Writing Assessment examination in order to pass ENG 102;
(c) either MATH 152 (3) or qualification in an appropriate examination (101 (5), MATH 163.1 (5), MATH 163.2 (5), MATH 164.1 (5), or MATH 172.1 (5).
(d) either MATH 130.1 (5), MATH 172.1, or PHIL 201 (5) (amended version), or
CS 105 (5) (Logical Basis of Computing);

(e) one year of college or university study of a single foreign language or two years of
high school study of a single foreign language;

(f) students must either pass an examination in the fundamentals of computing prior to
taking more than 60 credits at Central Washington University or take and pass one
of the following classes:

ADMG 202 Microcomputer Applications (3)
BSED 316 Education Technology (3)
CS 101 Computer Basics (4)
EDCS 316 Educational Technology (3)

BREADTH REQUIREMENT. Students must take a minimum of 14 credits from each of
the three broad areas of the general education program.

I. ARTS AND HUMANITIES. Students must take at least one course from each of the three
eleven groups. No more than one class from a single department may be counted toward this
requirement.

Literature and the Humanities.

ENG 105 The Literary Imagination: An Introduction to Literature (4)
ENG 328 World Literature I (4)
ENG 329 World Literature II (4)
HUM 101 Introduction to the Humanities (5)
HUM 102 Introduction to the Humanities (5)
HUM 103 Introduction to the Humanities (5)

The Aesthetic Experience.

ART 101 (5) Introduction to Art (5)
ART 357 (3) African and Oceanic Art (3)

ART 456 (4) History of Eastern Art (4)
MUS 101 (5) History of Jazz (5)
MUS 102 (5) Introduction to Music (5)
FE 161 (3) Cultural History of Dance (3)
TH 101 (3) Appreciation of Theatre (3)
TH 107 (4) Introduction to Theatre (4)
TH 382 (4) Ethnic Drama (4)

Philosophies and Cultures of the World.

Foreign Languages 251, 252, or 253 Second year foreign language (same as
studied in high school) (5)
or
Foreign Languages 151, 152 or 153 First year foreign language (different than the one
used to meet the two-year admission
requirements (5)

PHIL 101 Introduction to Philosophy (5)
PHIL 302 Ethics (5)
PHIL 310 Philosophies of India (5)
PHIL 352 Western Philosophy I (5)
PHIL 353 Western Philosophy II (5)
PHIL 354 Western Philosophy III (5)
RELS 101 Introduction to Religion (5)
RELS 201 Sacred Books of the World (5)

II. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES. Students must take at least one course from
each of the three groups. No more than one class from a single department may be counted

Perspectives on the Cultures and Experiences of the United States. An introduction to
the institutions, cultures, and traditions of the United States intended to encourage a
critical and analytical understanding of how the past affects the present and the future. An
introduction to the complexities of social, economic, and political processes, issues, and
events in the United States intended to provide a context for informed decision-making
and citizenship.
III. THE NATURAL SCIENCES. The natural sciences provide basic methods for rigorously describing and comprehending the natural world. Inquiry-driven laboratory and field observations are an essential mode of teaching, learning, and practicing natural science. Students must take three courses (14 credits) at least one course outside their major department one from each of the three groups. No more than one class from a single department may be counted toward this requirement. It may be advantageous for students to take courses from categories groups in the order they appear below. Students may not take more than one class from a single department.

Fundamental Disciplines of Physical and Biological Sciences. An introduction to those sciences that study the fundamentals of physical and life systems.

- BISC 104: Fundamentals of Biology (5)
- CHEM 111/111.1: Introduction to Chemistry and Lab (5)
- CHEM 181/181.1: General Chemistry and Lab (5)
- GEOL 145/145.1: Physical Geology and Lab (5)
- PHYS 111: Introductory Physics (5)
- PHYS 211: General Physics (5)

Patterns and Connections in the Natural World. Those sciences that use a knowledge of basic scientific disciplines to examine large and complex physical and life systems.

- ANTH 110/110.1: Introduction to Biological Anthropology and Lab (5)
- BISC 385: Introduction to Evolution (5)
- B OT 211: Plants in the Modern World (5)
- ENST 301: Earth as an Ecosystem (5)
- GEOL 107: Introduction to Physical Geography (5)
- GEOL 150/145.1: Geology of National Parks and Lab (5)
- GEOL 170: Earthquakes, Volcanoes and Climate Change (5)
- PHYS 101: Astronomy (5)
- ZOOI 270: Human Physiology (5)

Applications of Natural Science. These courses explicitly treat social, economic, technological, ethical or other implications of natural phenomena, of human influence on natural systems, or of responsive scientific inquiry.

- ANTH 314: Human Variation and Adaptation in Living Populations (4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BISC 302</td>
<td>Human Ecology (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 101</td>
<td>Contemporary Chemistry (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENST 302</td>
<td>Ecosystems, Resources, Population and Culture (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCSN 245</td>
<td>Basic Nutrition (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL 380</td>
<td>Environmental Geology (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 103</td>
<td>Sound, Musical Sound and Musical Instruments (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS ON NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY SALARIES

1. The minimum salary for non-tenure-track ranked positions, lecturers, and adjuncts should be tied to the Faculty Salary Scale. The new rates will be phased in over a period not to exceed four years in roughly equal portions per year. Funding for these salary increases will come from Salary Savings and other sources deemed appropriate by the Provost with the exception that appropriations for general faculty salary increases will not be used for this purpose.

   a. The minimum rate for non-tenure-track appointees with a doctoral degree should be equivalent to step one of the Faculty Salary Scale, the rate per credit being the 9-month step one salary divided by 45 (currently $618).

   b. The minimum rate for non-tenure-track appointees without a doctoral degree should be 80% of the amount in (a) above (currently $494).

2. The Provost, in consultation with the chairs and deans, will develop an effective procedure for determining proper salaries for non-tenure-track faculty which includes giving adequate credit for prior service and which includes clearly defined evaluative procedures.
RECOMMENDATIONS ON SALARY INEQUITY

Overview

There should be three stages to any plan to correct salary inequity.
1. Flagging
2. Review
3. Adjustment

Flagging. In the Flagging stage, individuals who may be victims of bias are identified. There may be many reasons, intentional or otherwise, which have led to a salary disparity large enough to flag as a potential bias. These may include class distinctions (race, gender, etc.), poor negotiation procedure upon hiring, market conditions, and so on. The flagging procedure should be robust enough to detect both class bias and individual bias.

Review. The Review stage provides a mechanism for assessing the likelihood that bias has actually occurred. It enables the candidates for salary adjustment to be examined in light of their salary, productivity, and other relevant information in order to determine if there is a legitimate claim of bias, and, if so, the amount of adjustment that is necessary to bring them to a position of parity within their department. In this stage, input from those in supervisory positions over the individual is critical to the decision.

Adjustment. Those faculty whose salary is found to require adjustment during the review stage have their salary increased by the amount determined to be appropriate during the review.

Procedure for Gender and Race Inequity

1. At least once every five years, the Provost shall conduct a study of faculty salaries to determine if inequity based on gender or race appears to be present.

2. The first gender and race inequity study will take place during the 1997/98 academic year and will be completed no later than March 1, 1998. This initial study will be done by a consulting firm experienced in gender/race inequity detection in universities. This study will establish a procedure for future studies which may be conducted by the university rather than a consultant.

3. If gender and/or race based inequity is present, a plan to ameliorate this problem will be developed within three months from the date of acceptance of the study. Such a plan will allow no more than three years for correction of the inequity.

4. Funds to adjust salaries to resolve gender and race inequity will come from sources other than general faculty salary increases approved by the legislature.

5. The Provost will appoint a committee of no more than five faculty to advise and oversee the work of the consultant and/or assist the Provost if the university conducts its own studies in the future.

Procedure for Other Forms of Inequity

1. Each year the Provost will conduct a peer institution salary study. This study will compare the salary of each faculty member to the average salary of faculty in the same rank and of the same department in CWU peer institutions (as defined by the Higher Education Coordinating Board). Each year the Provost will obtain average salary by rank by department from CWU peer institutions for use in the study. Appropriate weights will be assigned for years in rank (above and below the average), prior service, and merit. Those whose salary difference is greater than one standard deviation above the mean of differences will be flagged.

2. Those faculty members flagged will be considered by the Provost for salary adjustment. The Provost will notify all faculty who have been flagged that they are under consideration for salary adjustment and that they may submit their professional service record and/or other documentation in support of such an adjustment. This information should be submitted to the chair. The provost will provide the following information to the chair and dean of each individual flagged: the individual's salary difference, the mean salary difference for CWU, one standard deviation above the mean salary difference for CWU (i.e., the flagging threshold).

3. The appropriate department chair will complete a form in which he/she indicates whether the record and salary of the individual under consideration warrant making a salary adjustment. The evaluation of the individual's record will include a consideration of teaching, service, and research. This form will be sent to the dean together with the material submitted by the individual.

4. The appropriate dean will complete a form in which he/she indicates whether the record and salary of the individual under consideration warrant making a salary adjustment. The evaluation of the individual's record will include a consideration of teaching, service, and research. This form, together with the chair's form and the material submitted by the individual, will be sent to the Provost.

5. The provost will review the recommendations of the chair and dean and make those salary adjustments he/she considers warranted within the restrictions of funding listed below. In a given year, no individual will receive more than a two step salary adjustment. Adjustments will not be retroactive.

6. Each year up to 10% of all salary savings money together with up to 10% of any general faculty salary increase (if any) will be available to fund salary adjustments. If the total amount of money is not required, equal percentages will be drawn from each source. In years with no general faculty salary increase, only the 10% salary savings money will be available.

Restrictions

1. In consultation with the chairs and deans, the Provost shall develop a fair and consistent policy for evaluating prior service. Until such time as this policy is defined, prior service will not be used in either study. (It is assumed this definition will be completed and included in the 1997/98 review process.)

2. Salary offers to new faculty will be made only at market rates for CWU peer institutions.

Changes

Any substantive changes to these procedures will require consultation with the department chairs and the Faculty Senate.
MEMORANDUM

TO: University Community
FROM: Academic Support System Policy Group
       Dr. Gary A. Lewis, Chair
       Judy MacMillan, Project Lead
DATE: February 6, 1997
SUBJECT: Executive Summary Computing Direction

Communication is important! As an outgrowth of the strategic plan at Central Washington University, several important projects are in progress. This document addresses the computing projects underway and the impact they have on the University community. The purpose is to communicate status and actively seek your input. Now is the time to be engaged in the change - to understand the direction and offer comments.

Goal seven of the University Strategic Plan is to improve the level of computer literacy and technological sophistication of students, faculty, and staff. Goal ten is to use human and fiscal resources to most effectively support University priorities. The computing direction of the University has been established by the University Computing Committee's (UCC) mission to provide computing that supports the information needs of all university constituents and fosters the use of that technology. The first goal of the UCC plan is to provide friendly and secure computing based upon reliable technology. The second goal is to ensure access to computing for the entire University.

Several projects, currently underway or planned, point to the University's goals of increasing computer use and efficiency, while providing more effective support services.

- Campus Local Area Network Infrastructure project (CLIP) addresses the need for a campus-wide network for computers. When complete, an infrastructure will be in place to connect all buildings and sites.
- IMC Broad Band project will allow instructors to schedule electronic delivery of video to any classroom.
- Internet access for all instructional buildings, offices, and dorms will connect the campus to the outside world.
- Computer bulletin boards with password access are currently available to allow exchange of assignments and papers.
- Unified Web Server now provides a single powerful computer (server) for student, faculty and staff home pages. Plans are being drafted to provide access/update to a variety of databases through the World Wide Web.
- Unified mail system project will provide a single e-mail account for each user (removing the unpredictable aspect of e-mail formats).
• Unified calendar project will provide campus-wide access to a single calendar system.
• Unified logon project will allow a single point of access for all systems that an individual can use.

The Academic Support System Project (ASSP), another project currently underway, will help meet the above mentioned University goals. The project team is now at the point of selecting a product. The goal of the project is to provide user-friendly access to data and information for informed decision making, and to provide a modern operating system for institutional support functions. The immediate scope of the project will include replacing the current systems for registration, admissions, financial aid, billing and receivables, human resources, accounting, budgeting, accounts payable, purchasing, and alumni/donor development, and includes rebuilding the infrastructure that supports these systems: new client/server hardware platforms and installation of a relational database management system.

The new Academic Support System will focus on the following goals.
• Provide improved service to students.
• Provide user-friendly access for students, faculty, administrators and staff to allow more efficient and responsible job performance with direct accountability.
• Provide immediate access to data with easy and attractive report writing functions.
• Provide computing functions that surpass the current systems ability to process University transactions.
• Provide flexibility through rule-driven processes that will allow University policy rather than technology determine institutional procedures.

Students will have easy access to information and processes such as registration, financial aid and student accounts through the World Wide Web, Kiosks and Voice Response. A single relational database with query and report writer tools will allow trend analysis, comparisons, and projections that we cannot do currently. The open system will allow users appropriate access to data and powerful, easy to use computer tools.

We hope this helps to clarify the direction of computing at Central Washington University. Please feel free to communicate your ideas and/or concerns to the University Computing Committee (kaufman@cwu.edu or http://www.cwu.edu/~kaufman/ucc.html). or members of the Academic Support System Policy Group (lewisg@cwu.edu or http://www.cwu.edu/~macmilla/assp.htmlx).
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Academic Support Systems Project On-Campus Demonstrations

Three vendors will be coming to Central Washington University to present demonstrations of their Academic Support System software. The presentations are scheduled for:
April 8 - 10 Peoplesoft, April 15 - 17 SCT Banner, May 6 - 8 Datatel

The campus community is invited to observe and evaluate the software. The technical session will feature the detailed computing infrastructure and is geared to computing representatives who will support the systems. The overview session is the most important session for the majority of the campus to attend. A few of the topics presented at the overview session will be vendor stability and commitment to higher education, user-friendly environment, easy access to data, and World Wide Web features. The remaining sessions are functional sessions and will demonstrate the operations of the major systems - Financial, Budget, Admissions, Student Records, Financial Aid, Billing/Receivables, Human Resource and Alumni Development.

The daily demonstrations will be held in Barge 412, with the exception of April 17th when the demonstration will be held in Shaw Smyser 112. The Alumni Development demonstration will be held concurrently with Human Resource. The Alumni Development presentation will be held in Bouillion 202. The demonstrations will be held from 8 - 5 with an optional time for lunch with the vendors on Wednesday and Thursday.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>System Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Optional working lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Optional working lunch w/vendor</td>
<td>Optional working lunch w/vendor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Overview Session</td>
<td>Admissions Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Records Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Systems Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALLOT
1997-98 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 12, 1997

AT-LARGE POSITION #1

☐ Terry DeVietti, Psychology

☐ Ken Gamon, Math

19 ☐ Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts

14 ☐ Webster Hood, Philosophy

23 ☐ Michelle Kidwell, Computer Science

☐ Keith Lewis, Art

*check one*

Total Ballots = 29

---
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