

4-9-1997

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 04/09/1997

Marsha Brandt

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

Recommended Citation

Brandt, Marsha, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 04/09/1997" (1997). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 635.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/635>

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

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING: April 9, 1997

Presiding Officer: Robert H. Perkins
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 Walter Arlt, Jim Beaghan, John Burkhardt, Richard Mack, Ed Esbeck, Andrew Spencer, Carin Thomas, Marris Uebelacker
Visitors: Greg Alarid, Joan Cawley-Crane, Colby Clark, David Dauwalder, Fritz Glover, Beverly Heckart, Lad Holden, Keith Lewis, Charles McGehee, Jim Pappas, Barbara Radke, Sarah Shumate, Joanne Stevenson, Carolyn Thurston, Rolland Tollefson

CHANGES TO AGENDA: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the March 12, 1997, Faculty Senate meeting were not distributed in time for consideration and approval. They will be considered at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 30, 1997.

COMMUNICATIONS: None

REPORTS:

1. CHAIR
-Collective Bargaining Code of Conduct
"It is incumbent upon the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to ensure that the upcoming election process is conducted in a fair and open manner. Faculty must be allowed to debate this issue in good faith, to vote in a confidential manner free of coercion, and to determine the outcome through democratic processes without undue interference from the university's Board of administration. To this end, we request the (sic) all parties agree to the following code of conduct:
1. The Board and individual trustees will remain neutral, both publicly and in private, throughout the election campaign process.
 2. University funds will not be spent to campaign for or against the union.
 3. No faculty member will face reprisals of any nature as a result of support for or opposition to the union.
 4. The administration, Faculty Senate, and union will jointly issue a list of fair and unfair campaign practices, such as:
-No anonymous literature or other communications.
-All campaign materials must include appropriate documentation of source(s).
-Debate must focus on issues, not on personalities.
-No campaigning within 24 hours of the election.
 5. Any action taken by any of the parties which conflicts with these principles will be understood to be a violation of this good faith agreement."

Chair Perkins informed the Senate that the Senate Executive Committee has been diligently considering the process for Collective Bargaining, how the ballot will be shaped, and what information consortiums will take place. He reviewed the Collective Bargaining Code of Conduct printed on page 4 of the Senate agenda. This code of conduct was brought before the Executive Committee to create a fair and open debate. The Executive Committee must be neutral and informative in nature. To that end, information could be disseminated via mail or the internet answering a series of questions as they pertain to collective bargaining. The Executive Committee is in the process of gathering questions that they will then seek answers to. The Union, non-Union people, and possibly a third party may answer some of the questions. Another element is to create informational symposiums that will give information, possibly having debates throughout this time.

May 20th is the "tentative" day of election.

The possibility of absentee ballots is still to be considered, as well as the definition of who is eligible to vote, and what is the information to be taken to the Board of Trustees. At the last Board of Trustees meeting on April 4, Chair Perkins brought to their attention what the vote was in the Senate regarding moving toward the issue of holding an election and also tried to identify that the Executive Committee said that any one holding faculty rank as defined by the *Faculty Code* would get to vote. The issue currently being discussed in the Executive Committee is whether we want administrative positions that hold faculty rank to vote. The other issue on the table deals with part time and adjunct positions. It was agreed upon that simply teaching at Central at some time would not make one eligible to vote. Those who have a stronger interest in the university to vote. It is

also being considered to have a separation of the vote so that the Board of Trustees can see the thinking of the adjunct/part-time faculty who have a strong interest in the university as well. Those will be two separate ballots with two separate statistics attached to those ballots.

Gamon: There are approximately 100 part-time faculty and 300 tenure-track faculty.

-Collective Bargaining Process

1. Faculty as defined by the *Faculty Code*, excluding faculty holding administrative position.
2. Faculty teaching 50% in the current academic quarter and earning benefits."

Question: Since Non-tenure-track, full-time faculty are faculty according to the *Code*, would they be put in with the regular faculty?

Answer: Yes. There will be two ballots to see the difference between the tenure-track vote and the non-tenure-track vote.

Perkins: The statistics will go to the Board of Trustees.

McGehee: The Senate is absolutely bound by the *Faculty Code*. Sections 2.10 and 2.20 clearly define who is faculty and can vote versus who is not. The Senate is not free to violate the *Code*. The Union can do anything it wants to, but as long as the Senate is ratifying/verifying who may vote, the Senate has no choice but not to permit part-time faculty to vote and can allow administrative faculty to vote. We did this four years ago and it simply isn't an issue. If the Senate legitimates the vote, but violates its own *Code*, it would subject itself to grievance procedures and potential law suits.

Gamon: The League of Women Voters would be conducting the election, not the Senate.

Heckart: The following statement from three of the six members of the Faculty Senate Code Committee (2 members do not agree with the statement, one member could not be contacted) was read for inclusion in the minutes:

"In view of the potentially revolutionary nature of collective bargaining for the structures and processes of shared governance on this campus, it is desirable to follow the *Faculty Code*, Section 2.20, concerning the vote on collective bargaining. This section explicitly gives voting rights only to the full-time faculty in all faculty-wide votes. For the Faculty Senate to violate the provisions of the *Faculty Code* on this issue sends a clear signal to the administration and the Board of Trustees that they, at their convenience, may also violate the *Code* in other matters of importance to the faculty: sabbatical leaves, notice dates for probationers, teaching load, faculty input into curricular and personnel matters, and many other sections."

DeVietri: This is an issue that I think transcends the *Code*. The Board of Trustees has not seen fit to sanction the election so any vote taken is strictly informational. It should be partitioned into as many sub-groups as possible. There are people on campus in these classes. I think the world in general would be amazed to know that they aren't faculty by our *Faculty Code* definition. These people need to say what they think. As long as they have a separate ballot, it will be categorized as such. I think the *Code* needs to be set aside here and we need to see what's going on by people who teach classes.

Roberts: This is a non-binding referendum -- there is no legal sanction/no binding legal effect.

Gamon: The Executive Committee's intent was to give the Board of Trustees as much information as possible. In doing so, it would not be combining votes, but working with two separate ballots.

Perkins: I understand, then, the Senate to say that it strongly feels it should follow the actual *Code* and how the *Code* is written. What is the Senate's sentiments regarding administrative faculty voting?

Question: Are there guidelines from other universities/state-wide organizations?

Perkins: There are a few. If the Board of Trustees said 'let the faculty decide regarding collective bargaining,' it would be a whole different process. This referendum is just to send a message to the Board of Trustees one way or the other. The faculty are defined in the *Code* and administrative personnel that hold faculty rank will be allowed to vote.

Nesselroad: Since the *Code* does define faculty who hold administrative positions as faculty, I don't see how they can be excluded. It looks like stacking. Let each category be identified for informational purposes.

McGehee: Last time many administrators chose not to vote.

Alsoszatai-Petheo: Since "faculty" was used in the initial motion and not "faculty as defined in the *Code*," the motion should be changed.

Lewis: The charge to the Executive Committee is to prepare a procedure, which includes wording. This may not be too late in the process to clarify the language of the motion.

Alsoszatai-Petheo: We are discussing and giving feedback to the we clarify the initial motion.

Perkins: The Executive Committee's intent is to continue to inform the Senate. Since there is not much time, any procedural-type matters will be ironed out and senators will be informed via e-mail.

-Chair Perkins encouraged all Senators to attend the Provost Candidate meetings.

2. **PRESIDENT:**

President Nelson reviewed Central's 1997-99 Budget Request, reiterating regarding Enhancement Packages that although Central requested 7.5%/7.5% Salary Increase, both the Senate and the House have approved 3.0%/0%. Both legislative bodies are proposing another 1% in the first year of the biennium and, perhaps, another 2% the second year of the biennium. The funding for such must come from Central, not the state. The House also stipulates that not only will the funds come from Central, but they cannot be included in the base. If Central does this, the next biennium Central will have a bi-wave because that amount of money is figured on other resources for the salary raises belongs to Central which cannot be included in calculations to submit as part of the base budget. That will come out of tuition dollars. The only place the state has provided funding is in enrollment increases. Central's enrollment has been absolutely flat for the past four years. When extended degree programs were moved back onto the academic unit, an over enrollment was created. Therefore, the funds received for "new" enrollments has been slowly eating up the over enrollment. In the future, enrollment must go up to get funding.

What is most important about all of the budget bills is performance measures indicators. The House has put specific numbers in the bill. There is an expectation that if you don't advance toward the measure over specific periods, we will lose funding. Performance measures are in all three bills. What Central has to do is prepare a plan for the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) approval. Then, at the end of the specified period, submit another plan indicating Central's success or failure against the measures. Depending on which bill is adopted, the conference committee will determine how much is held back. External pressures on Central to produce accountability and efficiency have arrived in a definite way and there are measures attached to it.

The Senate passed a bill that said tuition should follow CPI at 4% or less. The House passed a bill that said it can be raised 4% or lower it 4%. That has not been resolved to date.

The Governor signed the gender equity bill. As Central goes through its athletics questions, there are two issues to determine what Central will do with athletics, gender equity and dollars.

The House passed a supplemental bill for 95/97 which was worth \$100,000,000. \$75,000,000 of that is for K-12 construction. About \$12,000,000 is for the K-20 technology system which Central has a deep interest in for hooking up distance education.

Central has accomplished a mild breakthrough in the sense that in all of the budget bills, we have been given \$1,000,000 to work on improving the Lynnwood Center, authority to borrow \$3,000,000 to purchase the Sno-King building at the Lynnwood Center. If this comes to pass, Central would own a piece of real estate in Puget Sound area.

Question: Where is Central in relation to these goals?

Dauwalder: The four measures in budget bill are as follows: Undergraduate degrees as to FTE faculty (there is some problem as to just how these measures are being computed, i.e., FTEF: based on IPEDS/headcount [ratio 6.09], based on actual expenditure of resources [ratio 5.06]). The House bill as written, identified the target at 9. That means that by the end of next year, Central would have to accomplish 10% improvement. 9.0 is the target of the bill, 5.06 is the level of performance, 3.94 is the gap, and the new target would be 5.45. That means that about a 10% increase in graduates have numbers of full-time faculty remains constant or Central would be looking at about a 9.3% reduction in the number of full-time faculty if enrollment remained constant. The truth is somewhere in between.

Fall-Fall Retention: The target House bill is 90% of undergraduates by end of spring to return the next fall quarter with an adjustment for graduating students. Central was at 75.9%. The percentage has dropped about 1%/year over the last four years. Central would be targeted for a 1.5% increase over a current year. Central proposed to stop the 1% decline and beginning to turn that around.

Grad rates of native freshmen is another issue. The target in the House bill is 50%. Central's accomplishment in 95/96 was 14.5%. The graduate efficiency index target in the House bill is 95. Central's median index is 90.38. Central is arguing for more flexibility. The GEI's of all institutions are between 85 and 90.

The House also has a tuition bill in which it defines for the purposes of Central's being able to charge a higher tuition of students who don't get through their programs in as quick an order as possible. The tuition bill defines excessive credits as 125% of the students program and yet in the other bill there is only about a 3% margin.

Nelson: The House has designated target enrollments which means that targets must be met. For every FTE below that target, \$4,000 will be reduced. As you know Eastern's enrollment has fallen from 7700 down to 6900 FTE. In the House budget bill, they will take about \$3.3 million each year of the biennium from Eastern, set it aside, and the only way that Eastern can get refunded is to increase the enrollment. Eastern's 95/97 funding is based on 7700 FTE

There is a new mood in the legislature. The external forces will affect Central.

Faculty Senate Meeting: 4/9/97

3. **TECHNOLOGY FEE COMMITTEE** The Technology Fee Strategic Plan was presented by Colby Clark, Student Chair, Sarah Shumate, Vice President for Student Affairs, and Rolland Tollefson, Acting Director of Computing & Telecommunication Services.

The ASCWU brought forward an agreement that provided for a phased-in plan that began this last fall with all freshmen being responsible for paying a \$5.00 mandatory fee. This coming fall it will move to include sophomores and then all students will be paying that fee in the fall of 1998. The revenue generated from this fee has to be used for technology resources of a general nature, not for a specific student use. Any changes in the fee have to be agreed upon by both the student government association as well as the Board of Trustees. The student government association is responsible for approving the annual expenditure plan.

4. **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE** - Charles McGehee, Chair, withdrew the Course Repetition Policy until the 4/30/97 Senate Meeting.

5. **BUDGET COMMITTEE** - No Report
Senator Yeh announced that Barney Erickson will chair the Budget Committee during Spring Quarter instead of Barry Donahue who is on leave.

6. **CODE COMMITTEE** - Beverly Heckart, Chair, reminded the Senate that the proposed Faculty Code changes have been mailed out and that the Code Hearing will be on April 16, 1997, in Barge 201 at 3:00 p.m.

7. **CURRICULUM COMMITTEE** - No Report

8. **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE** - No Report

9. **PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE** - No Report

OLD BUSINESS: The motion on Salary Inequity was tabled, to be sent back to Budget Committee for discussion at the April 30 meeting and vote at the May 14 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: APRIL 30, 1997

BARGE 412

Faculty Senate Meeting: 4/9/97

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, April 9, 1997
*****SUB 204-205*****

AGENDA

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS:
- V. REPORTS:
 1. CHAIR
 - Collective Bargaining Code of Conduct
 - Collective Bargaining Process
 2. PRESIDENT
 3. TECHNOLOGY FEE COMMITTEE
 - Technology Fee Strategic Plan
 - Colby Clark, Sarah Shumate, Rolland Tollefson
 3. FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE REPORTS:
 - ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Charles McGehee, Chair
 - Course Repetition Policy
 - BUDGET COMMITTEE - Barry Donohue, Chair
 - 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 30, 1997
BARGE 412

MEMO

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee
Charles McGehee, Chair

DATE: March 4, 1997

RE: Course repetition policy

The Registrar has raised concerns about excessive repetition of some courses by some students. Collectively, some 2,500 courses are being repeated in an academic year. Many of these are multiple repeats, often five times, and even as many as nine times. Not all repeats are responses to F's; about 35% are in response to failures. In some cases students simply try to better an already passing grade, and in some cases fail the repeated class.

Faculty express frustration at their inability to stop or even counsel students about their academic progress and repeating courses since students are free to take a course as many times as they wish. As a result, already limited facilities are restricted even further and students are being denied access to the classroom. Further, faculty are frustrated at having students return repeatedly when there seems little or no hope of improvement.

The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee has studied the problem, and while we felt that courses should not be taken more than three times, we were persuaded that occasions may arise where that would be desirable. We did not want to second guess instructors as to the advisability of letting a student take a course more often. At the same time we wanted to insure that students were not abandoned to their fate and that faculty were not helpless to intervene when necessary.

Therefore, we recommend that students be permitted to take a course twice. A third attempt, however, would require permission of the instructor and department chair, and any additional repetitions would require additionally the permission of the dean. It is to be hoped that such intervention would compel the student to take seriously any deficiencies while providing the faculty with the support necessary to say when "enough is enough."

The Academic Affairs Committee, therefore, makes the following proposal. The existing policy, which was passed by the Senate on 5/17/89, is not being changed but new wording is being added. The proposed new wording is in *italic upper-case letters*:

Some courses are approved for repetition with credit awarded each time the course is taken and passed. Such approval is indicated in the course description in the catalogue. Full tuition is assessed for all repeated courses. Other courses may be repeated under the following conditions:

- *STUDENTS ARE ALLOWED TO TAKE A COURSE A SECOND TIME. STUDENTS ATTEMPTING TO TAKE THE SAME COURSE A THIRD TIME MAY DO SO ONLY WITH PERMISSION OF THE COURSE INSTRUCTOR AND THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR. UNLESS OTHERWISE DESIGNATED AS REPEATABLE, COURSES MAY NOT BE TAKEN MORE THAN THREE TIMES WITHOUT PERMISSION OF DEAN OF THE COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT CHAIR.*
- Credit will be awarded only once. It is the student's responsibility to notify the Registrar of the repeat at the time of registration. The conditions also apply to transfer courses that are repeated at Central.
- When a course is repeated, only the last grade earned will be used in the computation of the cumulative grade point average. However, all grades will remain in the student's official record.

Major grade averages will also be computed on the basis of the last grade earned when major courses are repeated.

RECEIVED
APR 01 1997
CWU FACULTY SENATE

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CODE OF CONDUCT

It is incumbent upon the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to ensure that the upcoming election process is conducted in a fair and open manner. Faculty must be allowed to debate this issue in good faith, to vote in a confidential manner free of coercion, and to determine the outcome through democratic processes without undue interference from the university's Board or administration. To this end, we request the all parties agree to the following code of conduct:

1. The Board and individual trustees will remain neutral, both publicly and in private, throughout the election campaign process.
2. University funds will not be spent to campaign for or against the union.
3. No faculty member will face reprisals of any nature as a result of support for or opposition to the union.
4. The administration, Faculty Senate, and union will jointly issue a list of fair and unfair campaign practices, such as:
 - No anonymous literature or other communications.
 - All campaign materials must include appropriate documentation of source(s).
 - Debate must focus on issues, not on personalities.
 - No campaigning within 24 hours of the election.
5. Any action taken by any of the parties which conflicts with these principles will be understood to be a violation of this good faith agreement.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS

1. Faculty as defined by the *Faculty Code*, excluding faculty holding administrative positions.
2. Faculty teaching 50% in the current academic quarter and earning benefits.

2. PRESIDENT:

President Nelson reviewed Central's 1997-99 Budget Request, reiterating regarding Enhancement Packages that although Central requested 7.5%/7.5% Salary Increase, both the Senate and the House have approved 3.0%/0%. Both legislative bodies are proposing another 1% in the first year of the biennium and, perhaps, another 2% the second year of the biennium. The funding for such must come from Central, not the state. The House also stipulates that not only will the funds come from Central, but they cannot be included in the base. If Central does this, the next biennium Central will have a bi-wave because that amount of money is figured on other resources for the salary raises belongs to Central which cannot be included in calculations to submit as part of the base budget. That will come out of tuition dollars. The only place the state has provided funding is in enrollment increases. Central's enrollment has been absolutely flat for the past four years. When extended degree programs were moved back onto the academic unit, an over enrollment was created. Therefore, the funds received for "new" enrollments has been slowly eating up the over enrollment. In the future, enrollment must go up to get funding.

What is most important about all of the budget bills is performance measures indicators. The House has put specific numbers in the bill. There is an expectation that if you don't advance toward the ~~specific~~ specific periods, ~~we~~ we will lose funding. Performance measures are in all three bills. What Central has to do is prepare a plan for the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) approval. Then, at the end of the specified period, submit another plan indicating Central's success or failure against the measures. Depending on which bill is adopted the conference committee will determine how much is held back. External pressures on Central to produce accountability and efficiency have arrived in a definite way and there are measures attached to it ~~follow~~.

The Senate passed a bill that said tuition should reflect ~~some cost of~~ CPI 4% or less. The House passed a bill that said it can be raised 4% or lower it 4%. That ~~is~~ not resolved to date.

The Governor signed the gender equity bill. As Central goes through its athletics questions, there are two issues to determine what Central will do with athletics, gender equity and dollars.

The House passed a supplemental bill for 95/97 which was worth \$100,000,000. \$75,000,000 of that is for K-12 construction. About \$12,000,000 is for the K-20 technology system which Central has a deep interest in for hooking up distance education.

Central has accomplished a mild breakthrough in the sense that in all of the budget bills, we have been given \$1,000,000 to work on improving the Lynnwood Center; authority to borrow \$3,000,000 to purchase the Sno-King building at the Lynnwood Center. If this comes to pass, Central would own a piece of real estate in Puget Sound area.

Question: Where is Central in relation to these goals?

Dauwalder: The four measures in budget bill are as follows: Undergraduate degrees as to FTE faculty (there is some problem as to just how these measures are being computed, i.e., FTEF: based on IPEDS/headcount [ratio 6.09], based on actual expenditure of resources [ratio 5.06]). The House bill as written, identified the

target at 9. That means that by the end of next year, Central would have to accomplish 10% improvement. 9.0 is the target of the bill, 5.06 is the level of performance, 3.94 is the gap, and the new target would be 5.45. That means that about a 10% increase in graduates have numbers of full-time faculty remains constant or Central would be looking at about a 9.3% reduction in the number of full-time faculty if enrollment remained constant. The truth is somewhere in between.

Fall-Fall Retention: The target House bill is 90% of undergraduates by end of spring to return the next fall quarter with an adjustment for graduating students. Central was at 75.9%. The percentage has dropped about 1%/year over the last four years. Central would be targeted for a 1.5% increase over a current year. Central proposed to stop the 1% decline and beginning to turn that around.

Grad rates of native freshmen is another issue. The target in the House bill is 50%. Central's accomplishment in 95/96 was 14.5%. The graduate efficiency index target in the House bill is 95. Central's median index is 90.38. Central is arguing for more flexibility. The GEI's of all institutions are between 85 and 90.

The House also has a tuition bill in which it defines for the purposes of Central's being able to charge a higher tuition of students who don't get through their programs in as quick an order as possible. The tuition bill defines excessive credits as 125% of the students program and yet in the other bill there is only about a 5% margin.

Nelson: The House has designated target enrollments which means that ~~that~~ targets must be met. For every FTE below that target, \$4,000 will be reduced. As you know Eastern's enrollment has fallen from 7700 down to 6900 FTE. In the House budget bill, they will take about \$3.3 million each year of the biennium from Eastern, set it aside, and the only way that Eastern can get refunded is to increase the enrollment. Eastern's 95/97 funding is based on 7700 FTE

There is a new mood in the legislature. The ~~the~~ external forces will affect Central.

gm
OK

MEETING: 4-9-97

ALSOSZATAI-PETHEO, John
 ARLT, Walter
 BEAGHAN, Jim
 BLAIR, Karen
 BOWERS, Melissa
 BRODERSEN, Bret
 BURKHARDT, John
 CLEARY, Delores
 CUMMINGS, Bobby
 D'ACQUISTO, Leo
 DeVIETTI, Terry
 DONAHOE, Susan
 EMMANS, Cindy
 FORDAN, Robert
 GAMON, Ken
 GLEASON, Michael
 GUNN, Gerald
 HAWKINS, Jim
 HOOD, Webster
 KAMINSKI, Walter
 KIDWELL, Michelle
 MACK, Richard
 MEDLAR, Deborah
 MONSON, Luetta
 NELSON, Ivory
 NESSELROAD, Sidney
 OLSON, Steve
 PERKINS, Rob
 PRIGGE, Debra
 ROBERTS, James
 ROMBOY, Dieter
 ROSELL, Sharon
 RUBIN, Charles
 SAHLSTRAND, James
 SPALL, Hugh
 SPENCER, Andrew
 THOMAS, Carin
 UEBELACKER, Morris
 WILLIAMS, Wendy
 Schaefer, Todd
 WYATT, Marla
 YEH, Thomas

HACKENBERGER, Steven
 JEFFERIES, Stephen
 RICHMOND, Lynn
 HECKART, Beverly

 ELDRIDGE, Aaron
 BENSON, William
 GRAY, Loretta
 MUSTAIN, Wendy
 FOUTS, Roger
 JURENKA, Nancy
 ROBERTS, Neil
 GARRETT, Roger
 HARPER, James
 ERNEST, Kris
 FAIRBURN, Wayne
 ZETTERBERG, Mark
 BURKHOLDER, Peter
 HOLDEN, LAD
 ~~DONAHUE, Barry~~ *Pollenbeck*
 GHOSH, Koushik
 HEESACKER, Gary
 WOODCOCK, Don
 DAUWALDER, David

 MARTIN, Terry
 BERTELSON, Cathy
 CAPLES, Minerva
 JOHNSTON, C. Wayne
 MORENO, Stella
 BRAUNSTEIN, Michael
 HINTHORNE, James
 LEWIS, Keith
 ESBECK, Ed
 BOERS, Geoffrey
 KURTZ, Martha
 ALWIN, John
 WEYANDT, Lisa
 WIRTH, Rex
 SCHACTLER, Carolyn

4-9-97

Date

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Joan M. Cawley Crane

~~John A. Kuro~~

Barbara Radke

Joanne Stevenson

LAD HOLDER

Beverly Heckart

Sarah B. Skumale

Colby Clark

Roland Tollyson

Wanda W. Blue

Warwelder

Candyn Thompson

Greg Alford

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

In view of the potentially revolutionary nature of collective bargaining for the structures and processes of shared governance on this campus, it is desirable to follow the Faculty Code, Section 2.20, concerning the vote on collective bargaining. This section explicitly gives voting rights only to the full-time faculty in all faculty-wide votes. For the Faculty Senate to violate the provisions of the Faculty Code on this issue sends a clear signal to the administration and the Board of Trustees that they, at their convenience, may also violate the Code in other matters of importance to the faculty: sabbatical leaves, notice dates for probationers, teaching load, faculty input into curricular and personnel matters, and many other sections.

Dept: Student Affairs/CTS

Date: March 18, 1997

Student Computing Technology Fee Committee

Mission

Support a relationship between the students' need for computing and technology and the university's responsibility to provide a quality education, so that all students benefit.

Goals

To provide access to computing technology resources for all students.

To ensure computing resources are maintained, kept current, and future technological advances are explored.

To ensure that offering access to computing resources facilitates the "student centered approach to learning".

To allow students to realize the university's goals of achieving computer proficiency as part of a quality education.

To work collaboratively with the University in planning new technology resources.

To assess the mandated student technology fee relative to the success or failures of its' mission, goals, and objectives, and develop strategies to improve programs and services.

Dept: Student Affairs/CTS

Date: March 18, 1997

Technology Fee Priorities

Provide increased access to student computing lab facilities. Establish a 24 hour student only lab in the SUB by fall quarter 1997. Working with the University, establish plans for student lab use.

Provide technology resources so that all students can send and receive electronic mail.

Develop a budget that provides the operations essential to maintaining current student access to computing resources and the flexibility to realize new student technology needs.

In support of the student technology fee and as agreed to by the CWU Board of Trustees, the University must keep its commitment to technology by funding two additional full time technology service employees in CTS, to support student computing needs.

Work with the University and CTS to continue the commitment to create, update, and replace student computer labs.

Provide technology resources so that students can utilize computing lab equipment regardless of location.

Develop strategies that emphasize and promote change to a student oriented approach to technology at the University.

Dept: Student Affairs/CTS

Date: March 18, 1997

Technology Fee Accomplishments

Established the Technology fee committee with appropriate CWU representation and excellent student leadership.

Established the mandatory student technology fee for freshman 1996-97 academic year and a program to phase in all students by academic year 1998-99.

Established e-mail computer accounts for all freshman.

Expanded student e-mail accounts by 33% from winter quarter 96 to near 2,800 accounts for winter quarter 97.

Established a student technology fee schedule that treats all students fairly.

Established a student technology fee mailing distribution list that has greatly increased the awareness of the student technology committees presence at CWU.

Working with CTS management established an account structure to capture and report revenue and expenses of the student tech fee.

Given power to the students to take control over their education.

Awakened the campus to the changing needs of students as they relate to technology.

Established a more inclusive process for advancement of technology.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

1997-99 BUDGET REQUEST

(000's of dollars)

General Fund State

Difference

Operating	CWU	HECB				OFM Lowry	OFM Locke	Senate	House	Conference	W/ CWU
		Essential	Value Added	Enhancmnt	TOTAL						
1995-97 Expenditure Authority	69,886.0	69,886.0			69,886.0	69,886.0	69,886.0	69,886.0	69,886.0		
Adjust Yr. 1 to meet Yr. 2	1,728.0				1,728.0	1,728.0	1,728.0	1,728.0	1,728.0		
Bond Payments	20.0				20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0		
Changes in Retirement Contrib.	2.0				2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0		
Health Insurance rate change	5.0				5.0	5.0	(5.0)	5.0	5.0		
2nd yr. enrollment increase	89.0				89.0	89.0	89.0	89.0	89.0		
Delete one time Funding	(886.0)				(886.0)	(886.0)	(886.0)	(886.0)	(886.0)		
Carryforward: Not defined		1,500.0			1,500.0						
Total Carry-Forward Budget	70,844.0	71,386.0			71,386.0	70,844.0	70,844.0	70,834.0	70,844.0		
Compensation Changes	32.0				(11.0)	(11.0)					(32)
Bond Payments					5.0	7.0	5.0		(3.0)		(3)
Inflation	334.0	300.0		300.0	334.0	334.0	334.0	334.0	334.0		
Square Ft. Increase	951.0	1,000.0		1,000.0	951.0	951.0	951.0	951.0	951.0		
K-20/WHEN	1,625.0										(1,625)
Benefits Rate (Sup. Budget)	182.0				96.0	96.0	96.0	96.0	96.0		(96)
Health Benefits Increase					407.0	406.0	295.0	247.0	247.0		247
Revolving Funds					(285.0)	(285.0)	(288.0)	(285.0)	(285.0)		(285)
Mandatory Lease Adj.	322.9				180.0	180.0	180.0	180.0	180.0		(143)
Maintenance Level Budget	74,300.9	72,686.0		72,686.0	72,521.0	72,522.0	72,407.0	72,364.0	72,364.0		(1,937)
Policy Changes:											
Remove Inflation					(334.0)	(334.0)	(334.0)	(334.0)	(334.0)		(334)
Enhancement Packages:											
Salary Increase 7.5/7.5	9,100.0	2,6/2.7 3,000.0	5.0/5.0 1,400.0		4,400.0	2,6/2.7 2,964.0	2,5/2.5 2,886.0	3.0/0 2,284.0	3.0/0 2,284.0		(6,816)
Faculty Retention									102.0		102
Acad Support System Project	2,908.4		Moved to Technology								(2,908)
Enrollment Increase(001/149)	2,211.4	2,000.0	220.0		2,220.0	632.0	966.0	1,474.0	1,292.0		(919)
*Inc \$220,657 Disabled Student Svc.	150/300 F28	150/300	150/300	150/300		15/195	54/200	108/108	90/100		Fd 001 Portion
Grad Asst. Health Benes (Was fund 760)							140.0	140.0	Funding removed in Fd 760		
Instructional Efficiencies							(403.0)		(403.0)		(403)
Quality Improvements							850.0				
Quality											
Faculty Training/Adv. Tech. Unit/Instructional Systems/Scientific Equipment						231.0					
Technology	6,567.0										(6,567)
ASSP				2,900.0	2,900.0						
Fac/Curr Development			2,500.0	4,100.0	6,600.0						
Electronic Database				200.0	200.0						
K-20			3,600.0		3,600.0						
Inst. Program Enhancements	2,515.0										(2,515)
Instructional Pgm Enhance				2,500.0	2,500.0						
Library Database	200.0										(200)
New Facilities: Costs not Covered by Formula	1,870.4										(1,870)
TOTAL GENERAL FUND	99,673.1	77,686.0	7,720.0	11,600.0	97,006.0	76,014.0	76,627.0	75,971.0	75,305.0		(24,368)

CENTRAL WASHING UNIVERSITY
1997-99 BUDGET REQUEST
(000's of dollars)

Operating	CWU	HECB				OFM Lowrey	OFM Locke	Senate	House	Conference	Difference W/ CWU
		Essential	Value Added	Enhancement	TOTAL						
1995-97 Expenditure Authority	28,366.0					28,366.0	28,366.0	28,366.0	28,366.0		
Adjust Yr. 1 to meet Yr. 2	1,270.0					1,270.0	1,270.0	1,270.0	1,270.0		
Bond Payments						-20.0		(20.0)	(20.0)		(20)
Tuition Increase	26.0					26.0	26.0	26.0	26.0		
Health Insurance rate change											
2nd yr. enrollment increase											
Delete one time Funding											
Carryforward: Not defined											
Total Carry-Forward Budget	29,662.0					29,642.0	29,662.0	29,642.0	29,642.0		(20)
Bond Payments						(5.0)	(5.0)	(5.0)	(5.0)		(5)
Maintenance Level Budget	29,662.0					29,637.0	29,657.0	29,637.0	29,637.0		(25)
<i>Enhancement Packages:</i>											
Enrollment Increase	958.8					364.0	566.0	728.0	615.0		(344)
*Inc \$220,657 Disabled Student Svc.	150/390 FTE					47 FTE	50/146	108/108	90/100		
Tuition Increase							1,928.0	1,865.0	1,221.0		1,221
Quality											
Faculty Training/Adv. Tech. Unit/Instructional Systems/Scientific Equipment						1,845.0					
TOTAL OPERATING FEE	30,620.8					31,846.0	32,151.0	32,230.0	30,252.0		(369)
TOTAL REQUEST	130,233.9					107,860.0	108,778.0	108,201.0	105,557.0		(24,737)

*Actual General Fund Request \$90,573,169 (Excludes Salary Increase Amount)

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

1997-99 BUDGET REQUEST

(000's of dollars)

State Building Construction/CWU Capital Projects Fund

CAPITAL	CWU	HECB				QFM L. Locke	QFM Locke	Senate	House	Conference	Difference W/ CWU
		Essential	Value Added	Enhancement	TOTAL						
057 Music Facility	44,686.0		3,061.0		3,061.0						(14,686)
057 SeaTac Center	662.5	662.5			662.5	662.5	662.5	662.5	662.5		
057 Chilled Water System Improvements	1,770.0	1,770.0			1,770.0	1,770.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0		(770)
057 Expand Boiler Plant	1,450.0	1,450.0			1,450.0	1,450.0	1,450.0	1,450.0	1,450.0		
057 Dean Remodel	275.0	275.0			275.0						(275)
057 Lynnwood Extended Degree Center	4,900.0	4,900.0			4,900.0	4,900.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0		(3,900)
063 Extended Degree Centers (SeaTac & Yakima)	300.0	200.0			200.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0		(150)
063 McConnell Stage & Classroom Upgrade	1,721.0	1,721.0			1,721.0						(1,721)
057 Electrical Utility Upgrades Phases I, II	3,370.0	3,370.0			3,370.0	2,500.0	2,500.0	2,500.0	2,500.0		(870)
063 Steamline Replacement Phases VI, VII, VIII, IX, X	1,580.0	1,580.0			1,580.0	1,450.0	1,110.0	1,110.0	1,110.0		(470)
057 Steamline Replacement Phases VI, VII, VIII, IX, X							340.0	340.0	340.0		340
063 Omnibus Projects - Preservation	3,475.0	3,475.0			3,475.0	2,600.0	3,163.0	3,163.0	3,163.0		(312)
063 Omnibus Projects - Program	4,089.5	4,089.5			4,089.5	3,000.0	2,382.0	2,382.0	2,382.0		(1,708)
063 Hogue Tech. Mechanical Improvements	1,325.0										(1,325)
063 Flight Technology Center	623.0										(623)
063 Hebelier A/C & Remodel	824.0										(824)
063 Building Indoor Air Quality Improvement	727.0					429.0	429.0	429.0	429.0		(298)
063 Science: Contaminated Soil						510.0	510.0	510.0	510.0		510
Total: 1997-99 ONLY	71,778.0	23,493.0	3,061.0		26,554.0	14,521.5	14,696.5	14,696.5	14,696.5		(57,002)

REAPPROPRIATIONS

NOT IN THOUSANDS

Fnd			
248	Shaw/Smyser Hall -Renovation	70,578	70,578
063	Minor Works Preservation	600,000	859,679
063	Science Facility	4,000,000	4,000,000
057	Science Facility	35,040,026	45,047,550
063	Minor Works - Program	152,276	152,276
063	Black Hall	575,000	575,000
057	Black Hall	24,325,179	25,393,593
057	Asbestos Aba/Demo/Steam	50,000	94,768
063	Minor Works - Infrastructure	530,000	530,000
057	Minor Works - Infrastructure	660,000	1,156,975
057	Infrastructure Savings	1	1
063	Minor Works - Preservation	2,200,000	2,200,000
057	Hertz Hall Addn	12,000	
063	Minor Works - Program	1,000,000	1,000,000
	Total Reappropriations:	69,215,060	81,080,420

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

1997-99 BIENNIAL OPERATING BUDGET

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS

Instructional Efficiency: Redirection of Existing General Fund Base

Each institution, at the direction of the higher education coordinating board, shall submit to the board strategies for achieving measurable and specific improvements in academic years 1997-98 and 1998-99 for the following four performance and accountability measures and the state-wide performance goal for each:

A) Undergraduate degrees granted per full-time equivalent (FTE) instructional faculty:
Comprehensive universities: Goal 9

B) Undergraduate Student Retention: The proportion of freshmen entering in Sept. and returning the following Sept. Goal 90%

C) Graduation rates: The percent of an entering freshman class at each institution that graduates within four years. Goal 50%

D) Undergraduate graduation efficiency index. Goal 95

Salary Increase

7/1/1997: Funded from General Fund-State

3% Across the board to classified staff and 3% Average to professionals and faculty

Funding undefined

An additional 1% average may be given to professionals and faculty July 1, 1997

An additional 2% average may be given to professionals and faculty July 1, 1998

These raises **shall NOT be** included in the institutions salary base.

Tuition Rate

House: 2.5% and 2.7% Respectfully

Enrollment Targets will be used as a benchmark for funding. Dollars will be placed in reserve if the following targets are not met: 7126 in FY 1998 and 7223 in FY 1999. For each student below the target \$4,607 in 1998 and \$4,550 in 1999 shall be placed in reserve with OFM.

Provisos

\$186,000 of the general fund appropriation for each fiscal year shall be spent on

assessment of student outcomes.

\$70,000 of the general fund appropriation for each fiscal year shall be spent to recruit and retain minority students and faculty.

Faculty Retention

\$51,000 per year has been provided for faculty salary offers to help preserve instructional and research quality.

Higher Education Coordinating Board – Policy Coordination and Administration

This funding is provided to carry out the accountability, performance measurement, policy coordination, planning studies and administrative functions of the board and are subject to the following:

- 1) The board shall, in consultation with the institutions, develop accountability plans for achieving the four performance and accountability measures previously defined for academic year 1997-98. Academic year 1995-96 shall act as the baseline for measurement. The difference between state-wide performance and the individual institutions performance shall be calculated to measure the "gap" for each measure. Each institution shall close this "gap" by ten percent in academic year 1997-98. The board shall review and recommend changes, if necessary, to the 1997-98 plans at its Sept. 97 meeting.
- 2) \$6,396,000 for fiscal year 1999 is provided solely for incentive grants to institutions for achievement of the performance targets set in the plans for academic year 1997-98 and for submission of accountability plans for achieving the performance targets for academic year 98-99.

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
1997-99 BIENNIAL OPERATING BUDGET
SENATE WAYS & MEANS VERSION**

Instructional Efficiency: Redirection of Existing General Fund Base
2% of the Non-Instructional Base shall be redirected to Instruction

2% GF-S Reduction Target	<u>\$672,000</u>	
40% of GF-S Reduction Target	\$269,000	Efficiency in 1st Year
60% of GF-S Reduction Target	\$403,000	Efficiency in 2nd Year

Efficiency Indicators:

1. Undergraduate degrees granted per full-time equivalent instructional faculty
2. Undergraduate graduation efficiency index
3. Graduation rates

Funds Retained in Reserve Pending Accountability Assurance
through HECB (Per SSB 5927)

Ways & Means Proposed Budget FY 1999

General Fund Enrollment Funding	\$976,702
10% Enrollment Retainage	\$97,670

Salary Increase

7/1/1997: Funded from General Fund-State

3% Across the board to classified staff and 3% Average to professionals and faculty

Funded from Tuition Increase or Internal Reallocation

An additional 1% average may be given to professionals and faculty July 1, 1997

An additional 2% average may be given to professionals and faculty July 1, 1998

**Report to the Trustees
1997 Legislative Session
March 24, 1997**

The following is an update on the issues we identified prior to the beginning of the session (*see Item 32b*). Governor Locke and the Senate have released their budgets; the House budgets will be released later this week. This report will be updated at the Board meeting April 4.

TUITION

The Senate Higher Education Committee took the lead in developing a long-term tuition policy. There was excellent bipartisan cooperation and input from all of the higher education community in developing the policy.

Key components of E2SSB 5927 are:

- Tuition and General Fund support are linked. Undergraduate students at CWU would not pay more than 35% of the cost of instruction. GF/S would make up the remainder of the cost of instruction. The tuition at all of the regional universities would be the same.
- Annual tuition increases would be tied to the state personal per capita income and would increase at the rate of increase of that indicator or 4% whichever is lower.
- Enrollments would be based on a "caseload" model. If the Caseload Forecast Council (to be created) projected that students would be coming, they would be funded by the legislature.
- Accountability is the watchword. Ten percent of the new enrollment money is set aside and cannot be expended until the HECB certifies that we have achieved certain levels of accountability and efficiency.

Although the House budget has not yet been released, we have some advance warning that the House does not support the approach of the Senate. We understand that the House will completely separate the institutions' tuition levels and leave the amount of tuition to the Board of Trustees to set. The House model will set a mid-point and allow the Trustees to go up to 5% above or below that amount for resident undergraduate students and plus or minus 10% for all other students. The House budget is not expected to link State General Fund and Tuition dollars.

FACULTY/STAFF SALARY

Governor Locke's budget would provide a 2.5% increase the first year and 2.5% the second year for all classified staff; the university could give an average increase of

2.5% each year to faculty and staff. Additionally, "quality improvement" monies are diverted to the HECB and may be reallocated to the university if we meet certain quality improvements. This money may be used to provide additional salary increases to faculty.

The Senate budget provides a one time 3% cost of living increase on July 1, 1997 to all higher education employees. Faculty and staff may receive an additional 1% increase the first year and 2% pay increase the second year if the Trustees choose to use tuition money or "efficiency" money for that purpose. (Both the tuition money and the efficiency money is internal to the institution. It is not state funding.)

We do not yet know the House proposal. However, it is clear that none of the budgets will provide the 7.5%% per year increase which we sought.

TUITION WAIVERS

House Bill 1966 passed the House and is in the Senate. It will increase our tuition waiver amount from 8% to 10% and will allow us greater flexibility in attracting students.

UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEES ATTENDING CLASS

University employees who work half-time or more will be eligible for tuition waivers if SHB 1047, which has passed the House, passes in the Senate and is signed by the Governor.

GENDER EQUITY

The gender equity bill has passed the Senate and is in the House. It is expected to pass both Houses and be signed by the Governor in time for the 25th Anniversary of Title IX which is later this month.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT EXCHANGE

A bill which would allow students to pay "home tuition" when attending an institution outside of the state or the country has passed the House and is in the Senate. It has broad support and expected to pass this session.

ENROLLMENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Governor Locke's budget recommended 54 FTE for FY 98 and an additional 146 FTE the second year. The Senate budget provides for 108 FTE each year of the biennium.

The Senate budget funds the FTE at a higher level per FTE than the Governor. The Senate budget would provide \$976,702 for new FTE.

FINANCIAL AID

The Governor's budget provides the higher level of support for financial aid. His budget increases funding for the State Need Grant program by \$25 million and adds \$5 million to the Work Study program. There has been a long-standing policy of providing general fund money equivalent to 24% of tuition revenue into the State Need Grant program. This year the amount provided, if SB 6076 passes, would be 30% of tuition revenue. That is expected to be an additional \$18.6 Million.

In addition to the Financial Aid program, the House and Senate both support the creation of a prepaid tuition program. The plan will allow future tuition to be purchased at today's prices and set aside for later use; it is expected to be used by parents, grandparents, and employers.

CAPITAL BUDGET

This is an extremely tight year for capital projects; the state debt capacity is small. In the next two biennia the debt capacity will increase dramatically as the bonds for buildings built in the early 1970's are paid. In spite of the active support of our legislative delegation and heavy lobbying by Trustees, students, administration and alumni, both the Governor and the Senate failed to provide funding for the Music Building. However, the Governor's ten-year capital plan does provide for design money in the next biennia and construction the following biennia. We did receive funding for the SeaTac Center and the Lynnwood Center in both budgets.

K-20 TECHNOLOGY

The Senate Budget includes \$12.6 million in the Supplemental Budget to complete Phase I and at least part of Phase II of the K-20 Network.

CWU continues to be an active participant in K-20. We are likely to be a participant in a HECB pilot program for an interstate distance education project.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

We await the House Operating budget later this week and the Capital budget at the beginning of next week. You will be updated at the Board of Trustees Meeting.

