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CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING: May 14, 1997

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

Presiding Officer: Robert H. Perkins
Recording Secretary: Marsha Brandt

ROLL CALL:
Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except: Walter Arnt, Melissa Bowes, Don D'Acquisto, Robert Jordan, Michael Gleason, Gerald Onna, Webster Hood, James Roberts. Charles Rubin, Hugh Spull, Morris Ubelacker, Wendy Williams
Visitors: Coley Clark, David Daumalder, James DePape, Barney Erickson, Fritz Glover, Beverly Hickert, Charles McGeehe, Bill Owen, Barbara Radke, Wendy Rittereiser (speaker phone), Carolyn Wells, Blaine Wilson

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
The minutes of the April 30, 1997, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as corrected. Page 11, beginning at section ix. to the end of section x. on page 12 should not be printed in draft format but in final format.

REPORTS:
1. CHAIR:
- Introduced David Daumalder, as new provost/vice president of Academic Affairs.
- Coley Clark presented the Consolidated Bargaining Election web page on the CWU Faculty Senate Home Page.
- 1997/98 Faculty Senate Grievance Committee membership: postponed due to length of agenda.

2. PRESIDENT:
Enrollment: (Handout: Eastern’s Enrollment (Season PI 5/13/97) and Annual FTE Enrollments)
- Funding for Washington state universities is dependent on enrollment.
- Over enrollment will no longer meet expectations.
- Over enrollment received.
- A detailed presentation will be given by Blaine Wilson briefly presented the Ad Hoc Distance Learning Task Force Report of Michael Gleason, Gerald Gunn, Webster Hood, James Roberts, Colby Clark, James D'Pace, and James Rubins.
- The big difference in enrollment in the first half of fiscal year 1997, Faculty Senate received $600,000 for a light-control tower (speaker phone), Carolyn Wells, Blaine Wilson
- Funding for Washington state universities is dependent on enrollment.
- We do have to cut dollars from the budget.
- Total enrollment at Central has been flat for the past four years.
- President Nelson: Actually our extended degree centers enrollment is very avid.
- Barney Erickson moved approval of distribution of money for salary increase, effective July 1, 1997, as follows:

4. FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Charles McGeehe presented the proposal regarding assigning functions of the former Undergraduate Council to the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee.

BUDGET COMMITTEE
MOTION NO. 3112
Barney Erickson moved approval of distribution of money for salary increase, effective July 1, 1997, as follows:

SALARY DISTRIBUTION RECOMMENDATION

According to the best information we have received to date, the following seems to be the available money:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Money</th>
<th>Available Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Donations</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total amount of money available is $21,000,000. The Senate has determined that the following amounts should be distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary Increases</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining $5,000,000 will be used for future years as needed.
include those who are one-year continuing appointments.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

The motion passed in May 1994 be waived and that the 1% legislated be used for a general scale adjustment. This can be done in one of two ways (and perhaps others also): (a) a 3% shift across the board or (b) a lump sum adjustment. The difference being that in (a) everyone gets a 3% increase from what they are currently getting. This would mean that each step gets a different amount with those further up the scale getting more than those at the lower end. In (b) everyone would get the same amount regardless of where they are on the scale.

PROS AND CONS FOR EACH. (Some, perhaps not all)
(a): Pros: 1. Keeps the scale uniform for future work. 2. Keeps the scale spread out. 3. Rewards longevity. 4. Cons: 1. Gives those at the low end of the scale less when they probably need more.
(b): Pros: 1. Gives everyone an equal dollar amount. 2. Cons: 1. Disrupts the salary scale so there are no longer "nice" increments. 2. Does not recognize longevity.

RECOMMENDATION #2:
The 1% from internal funds be used to begin to implement the "merit" proposal passed by the Senate in May 1994. 
This proposal would be to identify all faculty eligible at level fund level 2 and fund these people at .5% (the first level in the multi-step proposal). If there is enough money, then fund the second phase of the multi-step proposal, otherwise use the leftover money to further adjust the salary scale. This would be a very small amount, but a start.

Note that if everyone is eligible for both level 1 and level 2 this would use up all the 1% money.

RECOMMENDATION #3:
The 2% money available for July 1, 1998 be used for another scale adjustment.

NOTE: The 1% money for July 1, 1997 and the 2% money for July 1, 1998 both need to be taken from existing funds. This was not appropriated by the legislature. This means that the money would need to come at the expense of something else. Do we really want to do this?

The recommendation to use this money in the above manner is for thought and discussion. We feel we need to look at the impact this would have on the instructional program vs. the monitary gains of the faculty.

There is some discussion about the 2%. Is it an addition 2% or is it the 1% this year and another 1% next year making a total of 2%?

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

*****

Budget Committee Chair Erickson commented that although some faculty may be affected July 1, 1997, most faculty would not be affected until July 1, 1998. The President stated that the money would be used across the board, .25% will be used to bring people up who are below the 20 percentile in the College & University Personnel Association (CUPA). Each vice president will have the discretion to use the % for merit, any other salary adjustments, and any other CUPA adjustments. Questions: If we would pass this motion today, have the provost and the deans agreed to get the merit process started as soon as possible? — within the next four weeks?

Erickson: No.

Comment: It seems that there is not enough time to deal with the merit process in a fair manner. Although it is "on the books," it has never been implemented. The 1% could be added to the 3% across the board or the 1% merit process could be postponed to next year.

Provost Dauwalder: It is a great concern that the faculty have sufficient time to prepare files and review them. Can the process be done Fall Quarter and then make back payments?

President Nelson: The 1% internal funding from enrollment tuition can be applied any time during the year and can be retroactive.

Question: Given declining enrollment, is it wise to use the 1%?

President Nelson: The money (1%+$267,000), has been set aside. It is part of the plan to use it. Every year, it is too late to use the merit plan. Let's start it and figure it out a way. For example, if the process can be completed by the end of the October when the presentation is given to the Board of Trustees, it can be done.

Comment: We should get back into motivating excellence through a system of merit.
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younger faculty who may have been more meritorious during the long "dry spell."

Comment: The merit plan has never been tested before. Under the best of circumstances, merit is very subjective. We need all the time possible to implement it. It should be put off until Fall.

Comment: It has been reported that the university as a whole is possibly in violation of the university accreditation by the fact that it has been more than 5 years since faculty evaluation has been done. If we are going to have to do faculty evaluation anyway, it would be nice to tie it to the merit process.

MOTION AMENDMENT NO. 3112A: Beverly Heckart moved and Ken Cannon seconded a motion to amend MOTION NO. 3112 as follows: "The merit process be initiated and completed by December 31, 1997, in such a way as to give departments, deans and the provost time to make reasonable and objective assessments."

Motion Amendment No. 3112A passed.

MOTION NO. 3112 passed [to be submitted to the Board of Trustees June 13, 1997].

(May 18, 1994, Faculty Senate Minutes regarding merit attached and to be mailed to departments and senators)

*MOTION NO. 3113:
Barney Erickson moved approval of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee Recommendation on Salary Inequality as follows:

SALARY INEQUALITY RECOMMENDATION

There should be three stages to any plan to correct salary inequality: 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, interalia or otherwise, which have led to a salary disparity large enough to flag as a potential bias. These may include caste 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 parties to 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.

General procedure for Group Bias:

At least once every five years, the Provost, in conjunction with the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee and the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, shall conduct a study of faculty salaries to determine if a group-based bias (race, age, disability, disabled veteran, Vietnam-era veteran, and sex) appears to be present. The first such study will take place during the 1997/98 academic year and will be completed no later than March 1, 1998. This study will be done by an outside consulting firm experienced in determining salary inequities. This consulting firm will be selected by the Provost, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee. If biases are present, a plan to ameliorate this problem will be developed within three months from the date of the acceptance of the study. Such a plan will allow no more than three years for correction of the bias. The Provost, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee will advise and oversee the work of the consultant. Funds to adjust salaries for group bias will come from sources other than general faculty salary increases approved by the legislature.

General Procedure for Salary Compression:

1. Each year the Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee, will conduct a peer institution salary study. This will be a comparison of individual salaries with average faculty salaries from the same discipline at CWU peer institutions. The first year this study will be done with the consulting firm identified above.

2. Once a compression-related disadvantage has been identified, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee and the Provost will determine a means by which the compression-related disadvantage can be remedied over a period of time. This will include a procedure to determine the compression of individual faculty, source of funds, and a time line for remedying the inequity.

Note: The President is committed to providing money to hire the consulting team.

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.
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2. "Group bias" will be defined as those categories listed in the Human Resource Data Base at CWU and includes: race, age, disability, disabled veteran, Vietnam-era veteran and sex.

CWU's equal opportunity statement includes the following categories: race, color, creed, religion, age, national origin, disabled veteran or Vietnam-era veteran status, disability, marital status, sex and sexual orientation. (See Policy Manual Parts 2-2.1.4 and 2.2.1.4 and 2.2.1.4)

3. All tenured and tenure-track faculty (excluding those on leave) will be included in the study, with the following exceptions:
   a. Present and former CWU deans, provosts, and presidents.
   b. Faculty who will retire (full or phased) prior to the following academic year.
   c. The consulting team together with the Provost, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee, the chairs of the academic departments and the academic deans will develop a fair and consistent policy for evaluating prior service (pre-CWU service). Until such time as this policy is defined, prior service will not be used in the study.
   d. 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 the CWU peer institutions.

   4. Each year the Provost's office will obtain average salary by rank and by department from the CWU peer institutions for use in the peer institution study.

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

President Nelson: The Budget Committee has set aside $50,000 to conduct the Salary Inequality Study (hoping it can be accomplished with less funding).

Chair Perkins: Both the Faculty Senate Budget and Personnel Committees have recommended an external study based on concerns regarding the results (if done internally) and their interpretation.

Question: Has funding from a grant source been done?

Chair Monson seconded a motion to withdraw MOTION NO. 3113A.

MOTION AMENDMENT NO 3113A: Andrew Spencer moved and Susan Donahoe seconded a motion to amend MOTION NO. 3113 as follows: "In addition to the group-bias groups, other groups to be studied would be as listed in CWU's equal opportunity statement."

Discussion:

Comment: I would like to speak in opposition to the amendment of the motion. What we mustn't change is the intention of the fact that there are two sentences that are different for very important reasons - differences in degree and differences in kind. To say that every particular group shall have an equal opportunity or a differential from the median is very different from saying, 'We seek to study these groups and give them additional stress in employment.' Therefore, we ought to interpret groups as the name now for affirmative action. If we add these two categories to the group bias, that means we are going to be recruiting members from those groups or additional focus of employment, that changes the nature of the motion.

President Nelson:

The Faculty Senate Budget and Personnel Committees will write a request for proposal (RFP) which will go out for bid which will require a definition of the work product. It can be written in the RFP, 'what would it cost if', then we can pick and choose.

James Roberts moved and Luetta Monson seconded a motion to amend MOTION NO. 3113A.

MOTION AMENDMENT NO 3113B: Andrew Spencer moved and Ken Green seconded a motion to amend MOTION NO. 3113 as follows: The request for proposal (RFP) will include language that would include a bid on all the groups covered as defined by CWU's equal opportunity statement."

Chair Perkins: Clarified that the RFP would cover the protected classes and additional groups.

Amendment passed, 1 opposed.

Comment:

The non-tenure-track, full-time (NTTFT) group is not in the study, but also when a minimum wage is set $22,000/year there are 47 NTTFT only one makes below that and that person has a bachelor's degree. That group, we did help the non-tenure-track part-time with that minimum wage study, but we did not help the NTTFT. There are a lot of the same inequities with them. They should be included in the study.

Response:

Since the intent of the study is to find individuals who may be victims of bias, the consultants will make further definitions.

MOTION AMENDMENT NO 3113C: Michelle Kidwell moved and Luetta Monson seconded a motion to amend MOTION NO. 3113 as follows: Definitions and Restrictions: Section 4. Strike "Until such time as this policy is defined, prior service will not be used in the study."

Beverly Heckart moved approval of changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure, as follows:

I. ISSUE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

2.30 General Responsibilities of Faculty

[First paragraph would stay the same.]

Faculty members shall familiarize themselves with the sections of the Central Washington University Policies Manual that relate to their duties, including the Policy on Sexual Harassment (2-2.1.12), Family Members Employment Policy (2-2.1.9), Policy on Gender Equity (2-2.1.3), the Clearance for Protection of Human Subjects (2-2.6), the Code of Ethics, Use of Animals in Research and Teaching (2-2.37), and the Drug and Alcohol Policy (2-2.38), and the Conflict of Interest in Student-Faculty Relationships (2-2.47).

Rationale: The Code Committee proposes this addition to the Faculty Code because it promised at the end of the academic year 1995-96 due once the Faculty Senate passed the Conflict of Interest Policy, that section of the Policies Manual would be referenced in the Faculty Code.

II. ISSUE OF PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND AWARDS OF TENURE

5.10 Reappraisements - Procedures

A. Following review of the candidate's Professional Record, each tenured and tenure-track faculty member in a candidate's department may submit a statement in the appropriate dean indicating his/her recommendation regarding reappointment.

B. Each department shall submit a departmental recommendation from tenured and tenure-track faculty regarding reappointment, using an established written committee procedure of the committee of reappointment that limits the committee to tenured and tenure-track faculty. The candidate and the department chair shall receive a copy of the departmental recommendation.

C. Each Department Chair shall submit to the appropriate dean or director his/her independent recommendations regarding reappointments. It is the responsibility of the probationer's performance submitted by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department.

D. Individual faculty members under consideration shall submit an updated Professional Record and other materials helpful to an adequate consideration of their circumstances regarding reappointment to the tenured and tenure-track faculty of their departments, to their department chair and school dean. The material provided shall be available for review by the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the probationer's department at least one month in advance of the date for submission of the departmental and chair's recommendations for reappointment. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to make sure the Professional Record and other materials are complete at the time of submission.
Probationary Periods

5.25 Acquisition of Tenure - Rationale: The changes proposed above would encourage consistency or the addition of a variety of reasons, need to have their salaries pro-rated.

Pay Periods

It is proposed that faculty members may be granted tenure at the time of original appointment; such appointment shall ordinarily be upon recommendation of the appropriate academic department and administrators.

A. The faculty member may, when circumstances make it justifiable, be granted tenure by the Board of Trustees, effective at a specified time prior to the expiration of a six (6) year probationary period with the university. As a general rule, faculty members appointed to the academic rank of Assistant Professor or higher, who, at the time of appointment, have completed three (3) years of full-time service at the rank of Instructor or higher at other institutions of higher learning, or three (3) years of service in other appropriate work, or three (3) years of combined teaching and other appropriate work, shall serve in a probationary period of four (4) years, such provision to be made in the faculty member's original letter of appointment. Extensions may be considered for such reasons as major illness or other situations which require a faculty member's extended absence from full-time service. Faculty members occasionally may be granted tenure at the time of original appointment; such appointments shall ordinarily be upon recommendation of the appropriate academic department and administrators.

1. The provost or vice president for academic affairs and the deans of the schools and colleges will publish guidelines for determining how other appropriate work, including part-time teaching, will be calculated toward prior service in the determination of the length of the probationary period. Appropriate work considered as prior service must be related to the appointment at Central and enhance the teaching capabilities of the faculty member.

2. Faculty members occasionally may be granted tenure at the time of original appointment; such appointment shall ordinarily be upon recommendation of the appropriate academic department and administrators.

3. Extensions of the probationary period may be considered for such reasons as major illness or other situations which require a faculty member's extended absence from full-time service.

[This section continues with further details about the probationary period and tenure acquisition process.]

ISSUE OF SALARY POLICIES

8.48 Salary Policies for Miscellaneous Appointments

G. In cases of separation from the university payroll before the completion of any contract period of academic quarter, or for personal leaves, the state policy of prorating earned income on a daily basis will be followed. Working days are considered to be the annual total of all instructional, registration, and final examination days for teaching faculty and department chairs in the academic year (Section 2.03B).

8.55 Pay Periods and Salary Payment Policies

A. The salary for faculty members whose academic contract year comprises the three (3) regular quarters (fall, winter, spring) shall be paid as determined by the State Legislature and/or the Governor of the state of Washington. The salary for faculty members whose academic contract year comprises two (2) academic quarters and a summer assignment may be paid beginning with the quarter in which the actual assignment begins. The university cannot make payments in advance of work to be completed. Faculty as defined in Section 2.10 of this Faculty Code who are on contract as the basis of academic year as defined in Section 2.05 of this Faculty Code shall be paid one-third of the academic year salary each quarter.

B. In cases of separation from the university payroll before the completion of any academic quarter contract period, or for personal leaves, the state policy of prorating earned income on a daily basis will be followed. Working days are considered to be the annual total of all instructional, registration, and final examination days in the academic year (Section 2.03B), unless as provided otherwise in this code.

Rationale: These proposed changes to the Faculty Code would bring the code in line with the psychology of most faculty members and eliminate burdensome calculations in the deans' offices. They will also introduce consistent treatment across quarters of fiscal who, for a variety of reasons, need to have their salaries pro-rated.
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members with less than full-time appointments.

C. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are eligible for unpaid family leave subject to the following conditions:

1. Tenured faculty members who have completed four years (48 months) of service at Central are eligible for unpaid family leave of eighteen (18) calendar months with retention of full employment status.

2. Faculty members on probationary appointments who have completed less than six (6) years of service at Central are eligible for unpaid family leave with retention of full employment status.

   a. Eight (8) calendar months for those who hold 9-month contracts.

   b. Nine (9) calendar months for those who hold contracts for longer than 9 months.

D. An eligible husband and wife who are both faculty members at Central are each entitled to family leave according to the terms and conditions of this section. However, their combined leave per incident of birth, adoption, foster care and care of a non-owning parent or parent may not exceed, for tenured faculty members, eighteen (18) months of unpaid leave with retention of full employment status. Eligible husbands and wives who are non-tenured faculty members and hold 9-month contracts are eligible for a combined total of eight (8) months of unpaid family leave with retention of full employment status. Eligible husbands and wives who are non-tenured faculty members who hold contracts for more than 9 months are eligible for a combined total of nine (9) months of unpaid family leave with retention of full employment status.

E. Faculty members on family leave shall make a concerted effort to inform the department chair and the dean in writing of their ability to return to work at least four (4) weeks in advance of their intention to do so.

Rationale: A family leave policy is desirable in order for the university to comply with the federal and state Family Leave Acts and to establish guidelines as we employ increasing numbers of new and young faculty.

9.71 Leave for Family Catastrophe

Leave for Family Catastrophe entitles eligible faculty members to the benefits of leave as prescribed by state law, to protection from discharge for the time of leave, and to the right to return to the same or an equivalent position upon returning from leave.

All faculty members as defined in Section 2.10 of the Faculty Code shall be eligible to receive leave for family catastrophe, subject to the following limitations and exceptions:

A. Faculty members generally shall be eligible for leave for family catastrophe only when they are on the payroll or would have been on the payroll but for the family catastrophe, and faculty members who need to care for a family member during a time when they are temporarily off the payroll shall be eligible for benefits from the time they would have been placed again on the payroll.

B. The university shall have the prerogative, in its exercise of, to require verification of the family member’s critical condition by one or more licensed physicians that it chooses at any time. Failure to submit to such verification shall result in the cessation of benefits under this policy within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of the institution’s request for verification.

C. In the event that individuals with full-time non-tenure-track appointments (e.g., "term appointments") experience a family catastrophe, they are eligible for paid leave under the terms of this section until the end of the quarter in which the catastrophe occurs.

D. Faculty members with less than full-time appointments (e.g., half-time) are not eligible to receive leave for family catastrophe.

E. Faculty members as defined in Section 2.10 of the Faculty Code shall be eligible for leave for family catastrophe according to the following terms:

1. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are eligible for three (3) months of paid leave for family catastrophe during any one (1) academic year.

2. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are eligible for unpaid leave for family catastrophe subject to the following conditions:
   a. Tenured faculty members who have completed four years (48 months) of service at Central are eligible for unpaid leave for family catastrophe for fifteen (15) calendar months with retention of full employment status.
   b. Faculty members on probationary appointments who have completed less than six (6) years of service at Central are eligible for unpaid leave for family catastrophe with retention of full employment status.

   i. five (5) calendar months for those who hold 9-month contracts.

   ii. six (6) calendar months for those who hold contracts for longer than 9 months.

F. An eligible husband and wife who are both faculty members at Central are each entitled to family leave according to the terms and conditions of this section. However, their combined leave per incident of catastrophe may not exceed a total of three (3) months of full-time leave and, for tenured faculty members who have completed forty-eight (48) months of service with Central, fifteen (15) months of unpaid leave with retention of full employment status. Eligible husbands and wives who are non-tenured faculty members who hold contracts for more than 9 months are eligible for a combined total of nine (9) months of unpaid leave with retention of full employment status.

G. Faculty members on family leave shall make a concerted effort to inform the department chair and the dean in writing of their ability to return to work at least four (4) weeks in advance of their intention to do so.

Rationale: Leave for family catastrophe is desirable.

5. ISSUE OF PHASED RETIREMENT

5.92 Phased Retirement for Faculty

B. Faculty members will be paid on a pro-rated basis of their adjusted salary as their assignments are completed. Phased retirees participating in the Washington State Teachers’ Retirement Systems (WSTRS) I, II, and III are responsible for complying with the requirements of those systems.

H. The university academic administrators will make every effort to arrange teaching schedules to accommodate the reduced loads and personal plans of the phased-retirees and the phased-retiree’s right to teach up to 40% (15 credit hours) per academic year or any portion of the academic year in which the faculty member is officially on phased retirement.

1. FACULTY MEMBERS WHO ELECT PHASED RETIREMENT AS OF DECEMBER 31 OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR WILL BE ELIGIBLE TO TEACH 40% (15 CREDIT HOURS) OF A FULL TEACHING LOAD, AS DEFINED IN SECTION 7.20 OF THIS CODE, DURING THE ENTIRE ACADeMIC YEAR.

2. FACULTY MEMBERS WHO ELECT PHASED RETIREMENT AS OF DECEMBER 31 OR MARCH 31 OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR WILL BE ELIGIBLE TO TEACH 40% (10 CREDIT HOURS) OR LESS, AS DEFINED IN SECTION 7.20 OF THIS CODE, DURING THE ENTIRE ACADEMIC YEAR IN WHICH THEY RETIRE. IF INDIVIDUALS ELECT PHASED RETIREMENT AS OF DECEMBER 31, 40% (10 CREDIT HOURS) OF THE REMAINING LOAD CAN BE TAUGHT IN ONE QUARTER OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR IN WHICH THEY RETIRE.

Rationale: These proposed sections to the Faculty Code will, in the instance of 9.92B make explicit a practice that has existed since the phased retirement policy went into effect. A small portion of faculty members participate in the Washington State Teachers’ Retirement Systems that have different rules concerning the payments of pension than does TIAA-CREF.

VI. HOUSEKEEPING

4.30 B. 1. a. Assistant Professor

The doctoral degree, as recognized by United States accrediting associations, or equivalent (i.e., standards established by recognized United States accrediting associations) and two (2) years of professional academic experience.

Rationale: The proposed change would simply eliminate from the Faculty Code a fossil from the days when the university hired people at the rank of instructor. Currently, assistant professors come to the university directly from graduate school and have not had time to accumulate this experience.
4.60 A. They may serve on the Faculty Senate only after six consecutive years of continuous employment as a full-time non-tenure-track faculty member.

Rationale: This change is a housekeeping item that more closely reflects the contracts of full-time non-tenure-track faculty.

8.40 A. Promotions in rank, provided that a faculty member promoted during any given biennium shall receive at least the current minimum salary for the new rank and a salary increase of two (2) steps on the salary scale and simultaneously attain at least the current minimum salary step for the new rank even if such increase exceeds two steps; provided further that if the promotion comes at a time of a scale adjustment, the faculty member shall benefit from the scale adjustment.

Rationale: The rewording of 8.40 A. would simply clarify the terms of salary increases at the time of promotion.

8.65 A. The university benefits when faculty members individually and collectively increase in professional competence. The university, by whatever means possible, should encourage and assist each faculty member in his/her efforts to improve professionally.

E. The contents of each faculty member's personnel file will be available for his or her inspection at any time, with the exception of the original letters of recommendation.

Rationale: The above changes are housekeeping items that will maintain neutrality of gender language in the Code.

8.66 C. A faculty member considered for professional improvement may be required to supply evidence for each of the above criteria, consistent with the type of professional improvement desired (Section 8.70 B. and 8.75 A.).

Rationale: This proposed change would encourage a proper academic review of faculty members for merit and promotion.

******

Code Committee Chair Heckart reported that, in making these proposals, the Code Committee held a public hearing, received and considered written responses, consulted with the deans and the Senate Personnel and Budget Committees, and held two discussions with the President and Interim Provost.

Discussion ensued concerning "unpaid" family leave. The circumstance was highlighted of a woman who is the sole support of her family. Unpaid family leave for such a person is an option - no one will take "unpaid" family leave if they cannot support their family. Considering this woman, she is probably 31 years old when she graduates, perhaps 25 after a Ph.D. degree, or two post-doctorates brings her to age 29, and after working six years probation at Central, she can now have a child at age 35. If she is not so efficient in getting degrees, she may be 40 years old before Central makes it "hospitalable" for her to have a child. The option was expressed that the "unpaid" family leave section is hostile to women's issues.

Chair Heckart pointed out that disability leave under the Code (section 9.45) is available for pregnancies and "entitles eligible faculty members to the benefits of salary...".

MOTION NO. 3114 passed with one opposed to be submitted to the Board of Trustees June 13, 1997.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - No Report
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - No Report
PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - No Report

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

LAST REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: JUNE 4, 1997
MOTION NO. 2963
Libby Street moved that "The amount of money available from the legislature for salary adjustment (less that necessary for promotion) shall be divided by the number of individuals eligible at level 1 plus the number of individuals eligible at level 2. The amount derived from this calculation shall establish the unit of increment except that units shall always represent a minimum of a nominal 1% (technically 4.99%) salary adjustment or a multiple of 1%. Available money between multiples of 1% and/or available money in excess of that necessary to ensure a full step (3%) increase for each level earned shall be distributed as a scale adjustment." Ratification: The 1% figure is viewed as a minimum only and would not forever freeze the actual distribution per level except in those cases where the legislature’s intent to the university for salary adjustment is in the neighborhood of a 1% increase overall. Let’s suppose that every person in the university met the minimum criteria at level 1 and that half met the criteria at level 2. If the group meeting the criteria at level 2 were equally distributed across the salary range, money would be diverted to salary and scale adjustment only when the senate from the legislature exceeded approximately 4.99% of current salaries for salary adjustment. The essential effect of this implementation is that each step will become a salary range instead of a fixed salary. Such step-bands become a salary range with six possible salaries that are separated by 0.5%. So, for example, a person at step 19 who receives a 0.5% unit increase would be at step 19.5. Step 19.5 would represent a 2.5% increment after which an additional 0.5% unit would move the salary to step 20.

MOTION NO. 2965
John Bengtson moved and Kristin Starbeck seconded a motion to table MOTION NO. 2964. Motion to table defeated.

President Honey Newton stated that if merit award salaries were allocated before necessary equity adjustments were made, those adjustments might not be made. Libby Street and others stated that "equity adjustments" are not mandated and have been vaguely labeled and unilaterally defined in the past to include "market adjustments" as well as correction of inequities. In response to question, President Newton and Code Committee chair Beverly Hackart explained that incremental process through which equity adjustments are initiated and granted and stated that the President makes the final award determinations. Dr. Hackart pointed out that Faculty Code section 4.40 is specific regarding the priority order for the three types of salary adjustments: 1) promotions in ranks, 2) scale adjustments, and 3) merit (including special salary awards for correction of salary inequities).

AMENDMENT NO. 2965A
Charles McGeehan moved and Eric Ruth seconded a motion that the Personnel Committee be instructed to study equity issues and define "equity adjustments." AMENDMENT NO. 2965A passed.

MOTION NO. 2964 as amended by MOTION NO. 2964A passed (18 y 5, 13 no, 0 abstentions).

MOTION NO. 2966
Libby Street moved that "Each faculty member will be independently evaluated by the department chair, a department personnel committee, and the school dean using common criteria; any disagreements will be resolved in a meeting between the chair, the personnel committee, and the dean."

Ratification: Consensus by several parties helps to ensure the validity of the process. Because the recommended system requires only a checklist and documentation, evaluation of this should be relatively specific and not an undue burden on individual faculty members. In the previous ranking system, some departments as large as 22 people asked each member to review the files of all other department members. Thus, "a personnel committee" may be interpreted as a department committee of the whole. The meeting to resolve disagreements ensures that interpretations of data and documentation can be shared to the benefit of individual faculty members and of the university.

MOTION NO. 2966 passed (3 abstentions).

Seans reviewed and discussed the Committee’s recommendation for a special University Wide Appeals Process to hear grievances regarding salary adjustment decisions. The Faculty Senate decided that the current appeals structure is adequate and appropriate to fill this need. The Senate also decided to refer the issue of evaluation of full-time department chairs in next year’s Personnel and Code Committees.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MEETING - May 18, 1994
I. ROLL CALL
II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 30, 1997

IV. COMMUNICATIONS
- 4/25/97 memo from Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee re: Proposal regarding assigning functions of the former Undergraduate Council to the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee; see Academic Affairs Committee report below.

V. REPORTS:
1. CHAIR
   - 1997/98 Faculty Senate Grievance Committee membership (attached)
2. PRESIDENT
3. Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education - Blaine R. Wilson
   [proposal attached - for discussion only]
4. Retirement and Insurance Committee - Bill Owen

5. FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE REPORTS:
   ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Charles McGehee, Chair
   Proposal regarding assigning functions of the former Undergraduate Council to the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee (Motion #3022, 5/31/95) (attached)

   BUDGET COMMITTEE - Barney Erickson, Chair
   - MOTION: Salary increase (attached)
   - MOTION: Salary inequity (attached)

   CODE COMMITTEE - Beverly Heckart, Chair
   - MOTION(S): Proposed Faculty Code changes (attached)

   CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - Clara Richardson, Chair
   PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Karen Adamson, Chair
   PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Bobby Cummings, Chair

VI. OLD BUSINESS
VII. NEW BUSINESS
VIII. ADJOURNMENT

***LAST REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: June 4, 1997***
BARGE 412
The ad hoc Distance Learning Task force was charged by the faculty senate chair, Robert Perkins, to recommend positions on each of the following issues related to distance learning.

1. Who makes the hiring or assigning of faculty decision related to distance learning?
2. What should be CWU's credit transfer policy related to distance learning courses taught at other institutions?
3. What impact, if any, will distance learning systems have on the tenure and promotion decision?
4. What should the position of CWU be regarding working with the public and private K-12 schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges and universities in sharing distance learning resources and opportunities?
5. What should the position of CWU be regarding financial aid support for courses and programs taken in a distance learning setting?
6. How will the offering of distance learning courses affect CWU graduation requirements?
7. What position should the institution take regarding the promotion and development of distance learning opportunities?
8. Who owns courses and related instructional materials developed for distance learning delivery?
9. How will faculty be compensated when assigned to teach a distance learning course?
10. What should the faculty load and remuneration considerations be for Internet and telecourse based instruction?

After six months of deliberation the Distance Learning Ad hoc committee composed of Margaret Badgley, James DePaepe (ex officio), Charles McGehee, James Nimricht, Linda Clark-Santos (ex officio), Libby Street, and Blaine R. Wilson (chair) recommend the following position statements as the basis of policy to govern the development and operation of distance learning at Central Washington University.

Who makes the hiring or assigning of faculty decision related to distance learning?

Whether instruction is delivered on campus, off-campus, or through distance education strategies, faculty selection decisions are made at the department level and hiring recommendations are forwarded to the appropriate dean.

What should be CWU's credit transfer policy related to distance learning courses taught at other institutions?

There will be no distinction in credit transfer policy between distance education courses and other courses that are submitted for transfer. The policy in the catalog regarding transfer credit applies equally to all courses submitted for credit transfer.

What impact, if any, will distance learning systems have on the tenure and promotion decision?

The time demands associated with distance education are such that individual departments are encouraged to consider an instructor's distance learning activities as they relate to service, instruction, and scholarship when merit, tenure, and/or promotion decisions are being made.

What should the position of CWU be regarding working with the public and private K-12 schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges and universities in sharing distance learning resources and opportunities?

Central Washington University should enter into consortia with selected public and private two- and four-year institutions to share facilities, faculty, courses, and fees. Central Washington University should cooperate with public and private P-12 schools and Educational Service Districts in matters of mutual interest as regards distance learning.

What should the position of CWU be regarding financial aid support for courses and programs taken in a distance learning setting?

Distance education students should receive the same consideration for financial aid as on-campus students.

How will the offering of distance learning courses affect CWU graduation requirements?

It is the policy of Central Washington University that courses of the university offered through distance technologies will be counted toward graduation in exactly the same manner as on-campus versions of the same courses. The implications of this policy are that all courses slated for distance delivery must meet the same standards and be approved through the same process as courses slated for on-campus delivery, and that credit evaluators will treat the courses identically.
I. ISSUE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

2.30 General Responsibilities of Faculty

Faculty members shall familiarize themselves with the sections of the Central Washington University Policies Manual that relate to their duties, including the Policy on Sexual Harassment (2-2.12), Family Members Employment Policy (2-2.19), Policy on Gender Equity (2-2.13), the Clearance for Protection of Human Subjects (2-2.6), the Code of Ethics, Use of Animals in Research and Teaching (2-2.37), and Use of State Property (2-2.38), and the Drug and Alcohol Policy (2-2.13), and Conflict of Interest in Student-Faculty Relationships (2-2.47).

Rationale: The Code Committee proposes this addition to the Faculty Code because it is similar to the end of the academic year 1995-96 that once the Faculty Senate passed the Conflict of Interest Policy, that section of the Policies Manual would be referenced in the Faculty Code.

II. ISSUE OF PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND AWARDS OF TENURE

5.10 Reappointment - Procedures

A. Following review of the candidate's Professional Record, each tenured and tenure-track faculty member in a candidate's department may submit a statement to the appropriate dean indicating his/her recommendation regarding reappointment.

B. Each department shall submit an administrative recommendation to tenured and tenure-track faculty regarding reappointment, using an established whatever committee procedure is desired in arriving at the recommendation but limiting the committee to tenure and tenure-track faculty. The candidate and the department chair shall receive a copy of the departmental recommendation.

C. Each Department chair shall submit to the appropriate dean a letter stating his/her independent recommendations regarding reappointments. In the meeting with the probationer required by Section 5.23F of this Faculty Code, department chairs will give to the probationer a copy of their independent recommendations and share with the probationer a summary of the evaluations of the probationer's performance submitted by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department.

D. Individual faculty members under consideration may submit an updated Professional Record and other materials helpful to an adequate consideration of their circumstances regarding reappointment to the tenured and tenure-track faculty of their departments, in the department chair and school dean. The material presented shall be available for review by the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the probationer's department at least one month in advance of the date for submission of the departmental and chairs' recommendations for reappointment. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to make sure the Professional Record and other materials are complete at the time of submission.

Rationale: The changes proposed above would ensure that a proper academic review of probationers occurs and that they are fully aware, from year to year, of the departmental and chair's evaluations of their performance.

5.25 Acquisition of Tenure - Probationary Periods

A. A faculty member may, when circumstances make it justifiable, be granted tenure by the Board of Trustees, effective at a specified time prior to the expiration of a six (6) year probationary period with the university. As a general rule, faculty members appointed to the academic rank of Assistant Professor or higher who, at the time of appointment, have completed three (3) years of full-time service at the rank of instructor or higher at other institutions of higher learning, or three (3) years of service in other appropriate work, or three (3) years of combined teaching and other appropriate work, shall serve a probationary period of four (4) years, such provision to be made in the faculty member's original letter of appointment. Extensions may be considered for such reasons as major illness or other situations which require a faculty member's extended absence from full-time service. Faculty members occasionally may be granted tenure at the time of original appointment; such appointment shall ordinarily be upon recommendation of the appropriate academic department and administrators.

1. The provost/vice president for academic affairs and the deans of the schools and colleges will publish guidelines for determining how other appropriate work, including part-time teaching, will be calculated toward prior service in the determination of the length of the probationary period. Appropriate work considered as prior service must be related to the appointment at Central and enhance the teaching capabilities of the faculty member.

2. Faculty members occasionally may be granted tenure at the time of original appointment, such appointment shall ordinarily be upon recommendation of the appropriate academic department and administrators.

D. Extensions of the probationary period may be considered for such reasons as major illness or other situations which require a faculty member's extended absence from full-time service.

[E. and F. would remain the same.]

G. When a probationer is considered for tenure in the final probationary year, the dean shall combine the reappointment and tenure evaluation (Section 5.30) so that only the tenure evaluation will occur.

Rationale: The changes proposed above would encourage consistency of the implementation of this section throughout the university. The addition of 5.25G would eliminate a duplication of evaluation that has apparently occurred in the past.

III. ISSUE OF SALARY POLICIES

8.48 Salary Policies for Miscellaneous Appointments

G. In cases of separation from the university payroll before the completion of any academic-period academic quarter, or for personal leave, the state policy of prorating earned income on a daily basis will be followed. Working days are considered to be the annual total of all instructional, registration and final examination days for teaching faculty and department chairs in the academic year (Section 2.05B).

8.55 Pay Periods and Salary Payment Policies

A. The salary for faculty members whose academic contract year comprises the three (3) regular quarters (fall, winter, spring) shall be paid as determined by the State Legislature and/or the Governor of the state of Washington. The salary for faculty members whose academic contract year comprises two (2) academic years and a summer assignment may be paid beginning with the quarter in which the actual assignment begins. The university cannot make payments in advance of work to be completed. Faculty as defined in Section 2.10 of this Faculty Code who are contracted on the basis of an academic year as defined in Section 2.05 of this Faculty Code shall be paid one-third of the academic year salary each quarter.

B. In cases of separation from the university payroll before the completion of any academic period or period, for personal leave, the state policy of prorating earned income on a daily basis will be followed. Working days are considered to be the annual total of all instructional, registration, and final examination days in the academic year (Section 2.05B), unless provided otherwise in this code.

Rationale: These proposed changes to the Faculty Code would bring the code in line with the psychology of most faculty members and eliminate burdensome calculations in the dean's office. They will also introduce consistent treatments across quarters of faculty who, for a variety of reasons, need to have their salaries pro-rated.

IV. ISSUE OF LEAVE

9.40 Retaining Leave - Definition

A. Retaining leave provides assistance to those faculty desiring to retain to benefit the university. The university expects faculty members to request retaining leave for the purpose of improving their service to Central Washington University by beginning or continuing a program of retaining in an academic area differing from their specialties at the university where the need for additional personnel is clearly demonstrated.

Retaining leave is intended to provide faculty members with assistance in acquiring or further developing professional competence in an academic area other than their field(s) of specialization, their usual teaching assignment and their usual research emphasis. Retaining leave may be granted for any of the following purposes serving the needs of the University:

A. Meeting new professional demands and requirements for reassignment to another department at the University;
B. Meeting new professional demands and requirements for reassignment to another program or curriculum component within the faculty member's own department;
C. Meeting new professional demands and requirements for a joint (interdepartmental) appointment;
D. Developing expertise in interdisciplinary studies.

9.41 Retaining Leave - Eligibility and Procedures

[B. of current Sections 9.40 would become A. of new Section 9.42, C. would become B. and so on.]

Rationale: Whereas the Faculty Code contains explicit criteria for the award of Professional Leave, Retaining Leave has never been well-defined. The proposed changes would differentiate retaining from professional leave.
9.71 Leave for Family Catastrophe

Leave for Family Catastrophe entitles eligible faculty members to the benefits of salary, according to a prescribed formula, and to retention of status as faculty members for prescribed lengths of time. A family catastrophe shall be defined to include a critical or life-threatening illness or accident of a spouse, parent, child or foster child for which the faculty member’s care is essential as determined by the provost or vice president for academic affairs after consultation with the faculty member and the faculty member’s physician.

All faculty members as defined in Section 2.10 of the Faculty Code shall be eligible to receive leave for family catastrophe, subject to the following limitations and exceptions:

A. Faculty members generally shall be eligible for leave for family catastrophe only when they are on the payroll or would have been on the payroll but for the family catastrophe, and faculty members who need care for a family member during a time when they are not on the payroll shall begin to receive benefits from the time when they would have been placed on the payroll.

B. The university shall have the prerogative, at its expense, of requiring verification of the family member’s critical condition by one or more licensed physicians that it chooses at any time. Failure to submit to such verification shall result in the suspension of benefits under this policy within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of the institution’s request for verification.

C. In the event that individuals with full-time non-tenure-track appointments (e.g., “term appointments”) experience a family catastrophe, they are eligible for paid leave under the terms of this section until the end of the quarter in which the catastrophe occurs.

D. Faculty members with less than full-time appointments (e.g., half-time) are not eligible to receive leave for family catastrophe.

E. Faculty members as defined in Section 2.10 of the Faculty Code shall be eligible for leave for family catastrophe according to the following terms:

1. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are eligible for three (3) months of paid leave for family catastrophe during any one (1) academic year.

2. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are eligible for unpaid leave for family catastrophe subject to the following conditions:
   a. Tenured faculty members who have completed four years (48 months) of service at Central are eligible for unpaid leave for family catastrophe for fifteen (15) calendar months with retention of full employment status.
   b. Faculty members on probationary appointments who have completed less than six (6) years of service at Central are eligible for unpaid leave for family catastrophe with retention of full employment status.

   i. Five (5) calendar months for those who hold 9-month contracts.
   ii. Six (6) calendar months for those who hold contracts for longer than 9 months.

F. An eligible husband and wife who are both faculty members at Central are each entitled to leave for family catastrophe according to the terms and conditions of this section. However, their combined leave per incident of catastrophe may not exceed a total of three (3) months of fully paid leave and, for tenured faculty members who have completed forty-eight (48) months of service with Central, fifteen (15) months of unpaid leave with retention of full employment status. Eligible husbands and wives who are non-tenured faculty members and hold 9-month contracts are eligible for a combined total of five (5) months of unpaid leave with retention of full employment status.

G. Faculty members on leave for family catastrophe shall make a concerted effort to inform the department chair and the dean in writing of their ability to return to work at least four (4) weeks in advance of their intention to do so.

Rationale: Leave for family catastrophe is desirable.

9.50 Disability Leave - Eligibility

B. In the event that individuals with full time non-tenure-track appointments (e.g., “term appointments”) suffer a disability, they are eligible for paid leave under the terms of this section until the end of the quarter in which the disability occurs, unless the incurred disability is directly work related and/or occurred in the course of one’s prescribed obligations to the university.

C. Faculty members with appointments for one (1) academic year or less (e.g., visiting faculty members or term appointments) and faculty members with less than full-time appointments (e.g., half-time) are not eligible to receive disability leave benefits except in cases where the incurred disability is directly work-related and/or occurred in the course of one’s prescribed obligations to the university.

C. Faculty who are disabled but capable, according to a licensed physician’s certification, of assuming fifty (50%) of their normal teaching load may, with the permission of the dean and provost/vice president for academic affairs, retain full employment status at one-half the normal short-term disability benefits for the same lengths of time specified in Sections 9.50 and 9.55 A and B of this Faculty Code. Faculty members are not entitled to other fractions of part-time disability leave because of the necessity to protect other benefits and to meet academic needs.

E. Disability faculty members shall make a concerted effort to inform the department chair and the dean in writing of their ability to return to work at least four (4) weeks in advance of their intention to do so.

Rationale: The proposed changes 9.50 B and 9.55 C respectively take into account the needs of term appointees and the fact that for some disabled faculty members, it is therapeutic to take only part-time disability leave, yet there is no provision in the Faculty Code for doing so. After much deliberation, the Code Committee suggests the method above for solving this problem. The proposed 9.70 E would simply make it easier for departments to plan staffing of instructional needs when a faculty member is disabled.

9.72 Family Leave

A. In accordance with the Family and Medical Leave Act, Central Washington University shall grant eligible faculty members family leave for any of the following events: the birth or adoption of a child, or the foster care placement of a child; the care of an employee’s spouse, son, daughter, foster child, or parent if that individual has a serious health condition.

B. All faculty members as defined in Section 2.10 of this Faculty Code shall be eligible to receive family leave, except for faculty members with appointments of one (1) academic year or less (e.g., visiting faculty members and “term appointments”) and faculty members with less than full-time appointments.

C. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are eligible for unpaid family leave subject to the following conditions:

1. Tenured faculty members who have completed four years (48 months) of service at Central are eligible for unpaid family leave of eighteen (18) calendar months with retention of full employment status.

2. Faculty members on probationary appointments who have completed less than six (6) years of service at Central are eligible for unpaid family leave with retention of full employment status:
   a. Eight (8) calendar months for those who hold 9-month contracts.
   b. Nine (9) calendar months for those who hold contracts for longer than 9 months.

D. An eligible husband and wife who are both faculty members at Central are each entitled to leave for family catastrophe according to the terms and conditions of this section. However, their combined leave per incident of catastrophe may not exceed a total of thirty (30) months of fully paid leave and, for tenured faculty members who have completed forty-eight (48) months of service with Central, fifteen (15) months of unpaid leave with retention of full employment status. Eligible husbands and wives who are non-tenured faculty members and hold 9-month contracts are eligible for a combined total of five (5) months of unpaid leave with retention of full employment status.

E. Faculty members on family leave shall make a concerted effort to inform the department chair and the dean in writing of their ability to return to work at least four (4) weeks in advance of their intention to do so.

Rationale: A family leave policy is desirable in order for the university to comply with the federal and state Family Leave Acts and to establish guidelines as we employ increasing numbers of new and young faculty.
V. ISSUE OF PHASED RETIREMENT

9.92 Phased Retirement for Faculty

B. Faculty members will be paid on a prorated basis of their adjusted salary as their assignments are completed. Phased retirees participating in the Washington State Teachers’ Retirement Systems (WSTRS) I, II, or III are responsible for comply with the requirements of those systems.

H. The university academic administrators will make every effort to arrange teaching schedules to accommodate the reduced loads and personal plans of the phased-retiree and the phased-retiree’s right to teach up to 40% (15 credit hours) per academic year or any portion of the academic year in which the faculty member is officially on phased retirement.

1. Faculty members who elect phased retirement as of June 30 of the academic year will be eligible to teach 40% (15 credit hours) of a full teaching load, as defined in Section 7.20 of this Faculty Code, during the academic year.

2. Faculty members who elect phased retirement as of December 31 or March 31 of the academic year will be eligible to teach 40% (10 and 5 credit hours respectively) of the remaining annual teaching load, as defined in Section 7.20 of this Faculty Code, during the academic year in which they retire. If individuals elect phased retirement as of December 31, 40% (10 credit hours) of the remaining load can be taught in one quarter of the academic year in which they retire.

Rationale: These proposed sections to the Faculty Code will, in the instance of 9.92B make explicit a practice that has existed since the phased retirement policy went into effect. A small portion of faculty member participate in the Washington State Teachers’ Retirement Systems that have different rules concerning the payment of pension than does TIAA-CREF.

In the case of 9.92 H, the Code Committee proposes to bring the Code up to date with faculty members’ increasing practice of electing phased retirement in the middle of the academic year.

VI. HOUSEKEEPING

4.30 B. 1. a. Assistant Professor

The doctorate degree, as recognized by United States accrediting associations, or equivalent (i.e., standards established by recognized United States accrediting associations) and two (2) years of professional academic experience;

Rationale: The proposed change would simply eliminate from the Faculty Code a fossil from the days when the university hired people at the rank of instructor. Currently, assistant professors come to the university directly from graduate school and have not had time to accumulate this experience.

4.60 A. 6 . . . . They may serve on the Faculty Senate only after six consecutive years of continuous employment as a full-time non-tenure-track faculty member.

Rationale: This change is a housekeeping item that more closely reflects the contracts of full-time non-tenure-track faculty.

8.40 A. Promotions in rank, provided that a faculty member promoted during any given biennium shall receive at least the current minimum salary for the new rank and a salary increase of two (2) steps on the salary scale and simultaneously attain at least the current minimum salary step for the new rank even if each increase exceeds two steps; provided further that if the promotion comes at a time of a scale adjustment, the faculty member shall benefit from the scale adjustment.

Rationale: The wording of 8.40A. would simply clarify the terms of salary increases at the time of promotion.

8.65 A. The university benefits when faculty members individually and collectively increase in professional competence. The university, by whatever means possible, should encourage and assist each faculty member in his or her efforts to improve professionally.

E. The contents of each faculty member’s personal file will be available for his or her inspection at any time, with the exception of his or her original letters of recommendation . . .

Rationale: The above changes are housekeeping items that will maintain neutrality of gender language in the Code.

8.66 C. A faculty member considered for professional improvement must provide evidence for each of the above criteria, consistent with the type of professional improvement desired (Section 8.70 B. and 8.75 A.).

Rationale: This proposed change would encourage a proper academic review of faculty members for merit and promotion.
2. PRESIDENT

Enrollment: (Handouts: Eastern's Enrollment (Seattle PI 5/13/97)
Annual FTE Enrollments)

Funding for Washington state universities is dependent on enrollment. Because
of this, Eastern is currently suffering great difficulty. $1.6M was taken from their
1995/96 budget and $4M will be taken from their 1996/97 budget. Eastern's enrollment
is comparable to Central's, even though their current enrollment is less than
Central's.

The total enrollment at Central has been flat for the past four years. Central
has also been "eating up" its over enrollment. Over enrollment will no longer meet
the needs of state funding. Our FTE enrollment for next year will be 7448 plus 90.
It is very critical that we meet our enrollment as there is a proviso on enrollment.

We can keep our enrollment in two ways, 1) recruitment and 2) retention.

This changes the way we view recruitment. Institutions are now actually
"buying" students. Financial Aid advises that all kinds of scholarships are being
offered to people. All of us can become recruiters. Faculty and staff can be very
avid recruiters. "Retention" does not mean we keep them because of their failure. It
means we retain them by the manner in which we treat them -- by demonstrating that
Central is a student-centered university.

Around the state, all the institutions of higher learning are down in
enrollment. This happens when the economy is good, people obtain employment -- when
it is bad, they come to school. The present economy is good.

In October the Budget will be analyzed to see where we are relative to our
enrollment on the 1997-98 budget report. If the numbers are okay, we will
proceed with the present budget. If not, we may make a decision to freeze or do
other things. We do not want to cut dollars away from the budget.

Comment: The big difference between fiscal years 1993 and 1994 is in the exclusion
of extended degree enrollments. Aren't the extended degree enrollments greater than
the difference between our over enrollments? So, by putting them in, we don't have
much over enrollment.

President Nelson: Actually our extended degree centers enrollment is about 13% of our
total enrollment.

Chair Perkins noted that the academic affairs budget fared well in the hearings. The
Lynnwood Center received $229,000 for capital operations. The School of Business and
Economics received $270,000 for completion of audio-visual equipping of classrooms.
Theatre Arts received $142,000 for a light-control tower. In addition to that there
is $1M that could be spread around through reallocations: academic affairs received
$600,000 of that. Also the provost received $175,000 for academic affairs equipment.
ROLL CALL 1996-97
MEETING: 5-14-97

ALSOSZATAI-PETEHO, John
ARLT, Walter
BEAGHAN, Jim
BLAIR, Karen
BOWERS, Melissa
BRODERSEN, Bret
BURKHARDT, John
CLEYAY, 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
NESSERoad, Sidney
OLSON, Steve
PERKINS, Rob
PRIGGE, Debra
ROBERTS, James
ROMBOY, Dieter
ROSELL, Sharon
RUBIN, Charles
SAHLSTRAND, James
SCHAEFER, Todd
SPALL, Hugh
SPENCER, Andrew
THOMAS, Carin
UEBELACKER, Morris
WILLIAMS, Wendy
WYATT, Marla
YEH, Thomas

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

ELDRIDGE, Aaron
BENSON, William
GRAY, Loretta
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Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.
Faculty Senate on the Web!
Http://www.cwu.edu/~f senate
e-mail: fsenate@cwu.edu
Welcome to Faculty Senate Online! The purpose of this page is to facilitate discussion/dialogue about collective bargaining amongst the campus community.

Please remember that this is just a trial run for the interactive web area. The procedure is as follows.

First Things First
You need to configure your "Mail and News Preferences" to recognize the CWU news server. To do this, from Netscape's options menu, choose Mail and News Preferences. Another dialog box will appear...choose the Servers tab. Towards the bottom of the screen, you will find a sub-section box that talks about servers. This is where you need to change the server to: news.cwu.edu

See illustration –

Also, be sure your "identity" is correctly entered so Netscape knows how to identify you!

Once those settings are set, you are ready to continue.

Step 1 – Open Netscape Navigator (if not already open) and load the Central Washington University Homepage.

Step 2 – From the CWU Homepage, choose "Faculty Senate". That will take you to the Faculty Senate Homepage (www.cwu.edu/~f senate).

Step 3 – From this page, you can choose to continue into the Collective Bargaining Discussion Area or you can choose to report a problem and you'd like help.

Step 4 – Assuming you've entered the discussion area, you can now interact with the list. Upon arrival at the list, you will see, basically black and blue text. Those of you who've used Netscape before know that blue text that's underlined means that is a link, whereas black text is plain text. You will find the question and then some brief background (where available) or an answer to the question. You will ALWAYS be able to "jump" to a USENET newsgroup. The question is always the link. So, click on the first question "What is Collective Bargaining?"

Step 5 – Don't Panic – Netscape News is opening. At this point, you will see a list of the groups you've subscribed to. The first thing that you each individually need to do is subscribe to each group. Click on Options and choose "Show All Newsgroups". This action will list every newsgroup that CWU has on their server...might take a little while.

Step 6 – Netscape will then list every group. The group we are looking for is:

cwu.f senate....

ie: cwu.f senate.coll_bargain.ql

This is the discussion group for the Collective Bargaining section – question 1.

You'll now need to choose every cwu.f senate group that's listed. Do this by clicking in the square next to each item. **see other handout**

Step 7 – Now, click on Options and choose "Show Subscribed Newsgroups". This should list all newsgroups that you are subscribed to.

Step 8 – Then, click on the one on the left (referring back to your "other handout") that you'd like to interact with. However, you will have to switch back and fourth to see the original question and the follow-up to that question.

From your Netscape News screen, click the very first button on the left. This will "post new article". That will bring up another box. You should see a few things there...most important is a bar that says NEWSGROUPS. If there is not, click VIEW and then NEWSGROUPS.

Step 9 – From there, in the Newsgroup input bar, type in the title of the newsgroup that you'd like to post to. For example, if I'd like to respond to Collective Bargaining, Question 1 (as I did), you'll type in the following information:

NEWSGROUPS: cwu.f senate.coll_bargain.ql

Step 10 – It is always a good idea to type in a subject. "Regarding question 1" or something of that nature. Also, if you'd like to receive a copy of the message you're posting, place your e-mail address in the CC section of the screen. Now, toward the bottom, you will see a large white space that you are free to type in.

GO FOR IT!

Step 11 – Upon completion of your message, click SEND. Looks like an envelope that's speeding. First icon on the left.

You've done it!
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Eastern's enrollment clips — so could budget

Cheney school works to attract students

By RUTH SCHUBERT
SPokane P.I

CHENY — The Cheney exit off Interstate 90, 10 miles southwest of Spokane, runs between fields swathed in spring green and tilled brown, past the Cheney Rodeo bleachers and a billboard that says, "Jesus Is The Answer."

Off to the right, Eastern Washington University sprawls out, an island of red brick and concrete. It is the educational home to 7,337 students.

That's 437 fewer than last year, another 225 fewer than the year before. Since 1994, Eastern's enrollment has dropped by more than 3 percent, making it the only Washington public university with declining enrollment.

The decline at Eastern comes at a time when the state is bracing for a surge in high school graduates from the so-called "baby boom echo" and when the Legislature is demanding greater efficiency from Washington's institutions of higher learning. Eastern, legislators say, must do its part.

Fed up with Eastern's inability to attract more students to Cheney, the Legislature wrote a fiscal time bomb into the university's budget this year. In each of the next two years, nearly $3.2 million will be held back, meted out only if Eastern can attract more students.

"There is a clear recognition that if they expect to receive general funds, they will have to recruit the students that Eastern needs," said Rep. Don Carlson, R-Vancouver, chairman of the House Higher Education Committee.

On top of the looming holdback in state money, the enrollment drop means Eastern lost $1.6 million in tuition dollars last year. In total, the school needs to cut about $4 million from next year's budget, said Mike Stewart, Eastern's vice president for business and finance. The

See EASTERN, Page A7

Eastern:
Problem with image dogs school

Prop Page 1

Ours will likely include eliminating programs and firing some non-tenured faculty who make up about one quarter of the university's 477 faculty.

Administrators hope to have a budget-cutting financial plan by the end of next week, Stewart said.

"To boost enrollment, Eastern needs to attract and retain students like Jessica Johnson, a 20-year-old sophomore from Bothell.

Johnson was drawn by Eastern's photography program. And she liked the idea of going to a state school far from home. She enrolled in 1995.

After one year in the dorms, Johnson moved out to nicer, less expensive housing in Cheney. Now, two years later, she's transferring to Southern Illinois University. Eastern's photography program had been scaled back to two basic courses, the social life on campus was less than sizzling, and when she went home friends would ask, "Eastern? Why did you go there?"

"I guess I just wanted a bigger school," she says now.

Johnson's experience underscores Eastern's problems filling empty classrooms and dorms: It has an image problem west of the Cascades. A high proportion of older students make the school feel like a glorified community college to some undergraduates. There are too few incentives to stay in the dormitories and thus fewer social activities on campus. And its growing presence in Spokane has forced some undergraduates to commute from Cheney to get the courses they need.

Historically, Eastern has been viewed as the most blue-collar of Washington's public universities — and the easiest to get into. As recently as 1994, Eastern's minimum admissions index — a number computed from college entrance exam scores and high school grade-point averages — was only 13, compared with 28 at Washington State University. Nearly 40 percent of the new students that year were transfers from community colleges, and nearly three-fourths came from the eastern side of the state.
enrollment in physical therapy courses has more than doubled.

But like many of the changes Eastern has made in recent years, the move into Spokane has come with criticism. Some undergraduates have been forced to shuttle between Cheney and Spokane to get even basic accounting courses.

"The problem is they have too many campuses," said Colleen Sather as she sat with a notebook and calculator perched on her lap. "A junior at Eastern who lives in Cheney Sather is a chemistry major with a minor in business. That keeps her running between Spokane and Cheney.

To ease that problem, undergraduate courses will now be offered on both campuses and the Spokane courses will be limited to afternoons and evenings. The faculty will have to

commute—not the students.

It's forcing us to teach here, there and everywhere," said Hugh Hunter, a professor of finance.

The school has also tried to make its requirements more stringent. In 1994, the admissions index was raised from 13 to 25. In theory, the higher admission scores would make Eastern more elite by making it more competitive. However, some faculty fear that with a higher minimum standard the school could end up turning away more students than it will attract.

To strengthen the undergraduate academic program, President Mark Drummond in 1993 proposed a set of interdisciplinary courses required of all juniors and seniors. The 18-credit requirement was regarded by many students and faculty as an unnecessary burden.

"They were meant to be interdisciplinary, but they've become adisciplinary, really," said Steve Harrison, a senior and editor of the student newspaper. "There are virtually no limits on the class. The teachers can take it in any direction they want.

With the legislature-imposed deadline looming, Eastern no longer has the luxury of mulling over long-term revisions to the core curriculum.

Eastern is scrambling to boost enrollments now with immediate enticements, in the hopes of closing at least a portion of the anticipated budget gap.

This year, $400,000 was allocated to Eastern's recruitment efforts, including a new recruiting office on the west side. Recruiters will be blanketeting festivals and fairs, said Brian Levin-Stankiewich, Eastern's vice provost for students affairs and enrollment management.

They'll also be sending mailings to high school seniors and encouraging faculty to visit high school and community college campuses.

To make Eastern more affordable, the school is trying to bring down the cost of room and board—a move that could also help refill dorm rooms, 30 percent of which are empty. This year, the university offered a $400-$800 "housing incentive grant" to students who sign a yearly contract by May 1.

As of last week, the university's housing office had 832 reservations for next year, up from 627 the year before. The school has 903 dorm rooms, many of which have been converted to single occupancy.

Eastern also launched a scholarship fund-raising drive, which will
## Annual FTE Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>FY 93</th>
<th>FY 94</th>
<th>FY 95</th>
<th>FY 96</th>
<th>FY 97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Funded</td>
<td>6451</td>
<td>6666</td>
<td>6810</td>
<td>6903</td>
<td>7256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>6588 *</td>
<td>7339 **</td>
<td>7337</td>
<td>7339</td>
<td>7448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overenrollment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 93</th>
<th>FY 94</th>
<th>FY 95</th>
<th>FY 96</th>
<th>FY 97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Extended Degree Enrollment was Self Support

**Extended Degree Enrollment now State Support
May 12, 1997

Rob Perkins
Faculty Senate

Subject: Possible change in the CWU Retirement Plan for faculty and administrators

As we discussed, the University of Washington will be changing their retirement plan this September from a single vendor plan, with TIAA-CREF, to a multiple vendor plan. Other universities in the state are moving toward a similar change with a later implementation date, tentatively January 1, 1998. Given budget constraints, there is concern over the increased cost of implementing and maintaining a multiple vendor plan.

If CWU does choose to implement alternate carriers, it would be most cost effective to implement at the same time as other universities in the state, sharing some of the costs. There will be some increase in cost to CWU when UW implements this plan, regardless of whether alternate vendors are added to CWU's plan. The reason for this is that TIAA-CREF will no longer be a sole vendor for the state universities, and each institution will be responsible for some plan administration that TIAA-CREF is currently doing as a sole vendor.

The CWU Retirement and Insurance Committee discussed the possible change at its May 5th meeting and decided to forward it to the Faculty Senate and Association of Administrators. If the Senate chooses to take a position, it should be forwarded through the Retirement and Insurance Committee to Vice President Nasser, who will take the item to the Board of Trustees, for their consideration.

The vendors in the final stage of the evaluation process at the University of Washington are Calvert, Fidelity, SAFECO, Vanguard, and American Century Securities (formerly Twentieth Century Funds and Benham funds). The process of selecting vendors through a Request for Proposal (RFP) will be completed this summer. CWU would have the option of adding the selected carrier(s) as an option to TIAA-CREF, or remaining exclusively with TIAA-CREF.

I will be available through conference call for the Senate's May 14th meeting, where I understand the issue will be briefly introduced. The Chair of the Retirement and Insurance Committee, Bill Owen, and I will attend the Senate's June meeting, when the issue will be on the agenda for a possible vote. Please ask the Senate to forward any questions regarding the possible change to me as soon as possible, so that I can prepare a response for the June meeting.

Sincerely,

Wendy Rittereiser

c: Bill Owen, R&I Committee Chair
O.K. Youmans, HR Director
Rich Corona, Assoc. VP
Abdul Nasser, VP

400 E. 8th Avenue • Filanburg, WA 98228-7425 • 509-963-1202 • FAX 509-963-1733 • Job Line 509-963-1562

LTCQ/AA/TITLE IX INSTITUTION • TDD 509-963-3323
Faculty Senate Budget Committee Salary Proposal

Motion # 1:

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee moves that the rules regarding the used of appropriated salary funds adopted in May 1994 be waived and that the 3% salary increase allocated by the legislature be used as a 3% scale adjustment on the current salary scale. Furthermore, that the 1% authorized salary increase using internal university money be used to implement the first phase of the .5% increments adopted by the Faculty Senate in May 1994. Everyone eligible for Level 1 and everyone eligible for level 2 will get one or two .5% increments. If this does not use up all the 1%, the remainder will be used in a further scale adjustment.

Motion # 2:

The Faculty Senate adopt the proposal presented by the Faculty Senate Budget Committee regarding the Salary Inequity Study.
What position should the institution take regarding the promotion and development of distance learning opportunities?

The university will develop sufficient technological capability, including appropriate support staff, to enable the creation and delivery of educational services at distance sites. Ongoing assessment will be required to insure that desire learning outcomes are achieved and that distance learning pedagogy is continuously improved.

Who owns courses developed for distance learning delivery?

The University will waive rights to copyrights on materials developed for distance learning in favor of the instructor.

The University will not require reimbursement for production costs unless and until actual profits are generated.

At the instructor's discretion, all video and audio tapes will be destroyed within two weeks of production.

How will faculty be compensated when assigned to teach a distance learning course?

How much should faculty be paid to develop distance learning instruction?

Faculty members who agree to or are assigned to teach via distance education will receive a one time only development grant of $2000 for each delivery mode new to the faculty member which each implements. Current delivery modes include two-way interactive, telecourses, and Internet delivery. Specific course development costs not associated with learning a new delivery mode (e.g., specific software packages, additional preparation time) may be requested, but would be negotiated individually between the faculty member and his or her department.

How will faculty be compensated when assigned to teach two-way interactive instruction at two or more sites?

Assumptions:

1. The compensation for distance education should be sufficient to entice some of CWU's best teaching faculty to deliver distance education courses in the multi-site environment.

2. Both minimum and maximum target enrollments must be established for all courses:

   Minimum size constraints would consider both total enrollments at all sites and enrollments at each site. Minimum total enrollments would adhere to the established University policy. The minimum enrollments for individual sites should consider two factors: a) program commitments made by CWU, and b) for non-program courses, a reasonable cost-benefit ratio.

Maximum size would be established by the faculty, chairs, and deans on a course-by-course basis using quality considerations. The following question would be addressed: "Beyond what class size would it be impractical or even impossible to achieve the student outcomes for the course."

3. Faculty members will identify the means through which they will meet face to face with students at distance sites, and where possible, will originate a broadcast at least once during the quarter from at least one distance site. Further, faculty members should schedule sufficient office hours in order to be available at convenient times to students at all sites.

Full-time faculty pay plan

The faculty member is assigned to lead the students at his/her home-site as part of the regularly assigned instructional load and is eligible to receive additional compensation for the concurrent sections at the distance sites. Assuming that combined enrollments at all sites meet or exceed the University minimums for a course, the additional compensation is comprised of two components: an amount based on the rate per credit hour normally paid to part-time faculty to deliver the course in person, plus $500 for each distance site beyond one.

(Thus, for a five credit class taught both on-campus and at three alternative sites, the faculty member would receive five load credits, $2,000 based on five credit hours at $400 per credit, and $1,000 based on $500 per each of the second and third distance sites.)

Pay plan for part-time and full-time faculty volunteering to teach a distance education class on an overload basis.

Part-time faculty and full-time faculty volunteering to teach a distance education class on an overload basis shall be paid: the rate per credit customarily paid to part-time faculty for the "home" site, plus $100 per credit hour for each distance site.

(Thus, the faculty member teaching a five credit class in Lynnwood (the home site) plus sites at SeaTac and Yakima would receive $2000 based on five credit hours at $400 per credit, and $1000 based on five credits at $100 times 2 distance sites.)

*Faculty in some schools and colleges are reimbursed at $500 per credit.

What should the faculty load and remuneration considerations be for Internet and telecourse based instruction?

Internet and telecourse based classes should be considered as part of a faculty load the same as any other University supported credit course and if a continuing education delivered class, the pay scale should be on the same basis as any other continuing education credit class.

Minimum total enrollments would adhere to the established University policy. The minimum enrollments should consider two factors: a) program commitments made by CWU, and b) for non-program courses, a reasonable cost-benefit ratio.

Maximum size would be established by the faculty, chairs, and deans on a course-by-course basis using quality considerations. The following question would be addressed: "Beyond what class size would it be impractical or even impossible to achieve the student outcomes for the course."
The ad hoc Distance Learning Task Force was charged by the faculty senate chair, Robert Perkins, to recommend positions on each of the following issues related to distance learning.

1. Who makes the hiring or assigning of faculty decision related to distance learning?
2. What should CWU's credit transfer policy related to distance learning courses taught at other institutions?
3. What impact, if any, will distance learning systems have on the tenure and promotion decision?
4. What should the position of CWU be regarding working with the public and private K-12 schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges and universities in sharing distance learning resources and opportunities?
5. What should the position of CWU be regarding financial aid support for courses and programs taken in a distance learning setting?
6. How will the offering of distance learning courses affect CWU graduation requirements?
7. What position should the institution take regarding the promotion and development of distance learning opportunities?
8. Who owns courses and related instructional materials developed for distance learning delivery?
9. How will faculty be compensated when assigned to teach a distance learning course?
10. What should the faculty load and remuneration considerations be for Internet and telecourse based instruction?

After six months of deliberation the Distance Learning Ad hoc committee composed of Margaret Badgley, James DePue (ex officio), Charles McGehee, James Nimmicht, Linda Clark-Santos (ex officio), Libby Street, and Blaine R. Wilson (chair) recommend the following position statements as the basis of policy to govern the development and operation of distance learning at Central Washington University.

Who makes the hiring or assigning of faculty decision related to distance learning?

Whether instruction is delivered on campus, off-campus, or through distance education strategies, faculty selection decisions are made at the department level and hiring recommendations are forwarded to the appropriate dean.
MEMO

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee
Charles McGehee, Chair
DATE: April 25, 1997
RE: Proposal regarding assigning functions of the former Undergraduate Council to the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee

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

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

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

The Committee discussed the matter within itself as well as a variety of academic administrators. As the result of these deliberations the Academic Affairs Committee, recommended extensive redefinition of the duty and structure of the Committee. This reorganization was approved by the Faculty Senate on May 31, 1995, with the stipulation that the reorganization be evaluated after one year. Subsequently, the reorganization was extended for an additional year.

During these two years the Committee has completely compiled and reorganized all academic policies on campus as well as having created a number of new policies and modified existing ones. The Committee is exceptionally pleased with the new structure and function of the Committee and therefore recommends the following:

1. The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee will assume role of the former Undergraduate Council thereby becoming the center of initiation, review and change of Academic Policy at CWU.
2. Notwithstanding Sections IV.B.1 and 2 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the Committee will consist of eight faculty members, two from each of the four schools, and two students representing the ASCWU. In addition, the Provost or designee, a representative of the academic deans, and the Chair of Chairs should serve ex officio (without vote). The Committee would therefore be comprised of thirteen regular members. A quorum will be based on regular voting members only.

In the event that none of the faculty members of the Committee is from the west-side off-campus programs, a non-voting representative of the off-campus program will be invited to the meetings as liaison and will share in all correspondence.

Other persons with specialized knowledge, such as, the Registrar, Director of Admissions, et al., may be designated formally as consultants (without vote), and they and others may be called from time to time to advise the Committee as it seems fit.

Members will be appointed from among the faculty by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Department Chairs of the Schools in question should be requested to submit nominations from among their respective faculties. The Committee will select a Chair from among its voting members.

3. Terms of faculty will be for two years and staggered to insure continuity. Voting members will be limited to two consecutive terms, and may be reappointed after two years have lapsed. The ASCWU may appoint student representatives on a yearly basis but are encouraged to select students who can serve for two consecutive years.

4. The structure of the Committee will not be restricted to members of the Senate, however, at least two of the faculty members should be members of the Senate throughout their terms.

5. The agenda will be set by the membership of Committee (ex officio members included) and/or the Senate Executive Committee. In addition, requests may be made to place items on the agenda by individual faculty, department chairs, academic administrators, or students. Appropriateness of items brought forward from outside the Senate or Senate Executive Committee will be determined by the Committee.

A regular meeting time will be established by the Committee, and members will be expected to organize their schedules such that this time will be available. Meetings will be open, and the agenda for meetings at which policy issues will be discussed and/or acted on will be circulated no less than one week prior the meeting.

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

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

Academic policy should be interpreted broadly rather than narrowly. It may encompass not only issues of entrance and graduation requirements but also Withdrawals, Incompletes and other matters of general academic policy. It may include, but not be limited to, assessment, placement, and remediation policy; credit transfer and inter-institution articulation policy; teaching loads and scheduling policy; and physical facilities planning, management, and allocation to the extent they affect the academic program.

2
The university will develop sufficient technological capability, including appropriate support staff, to enable the creation and delivery of educational services at distance sites and will simultaneously develop an assessment plan that evaluates the effectiveness of distance education. If evidence confirms that students at distance sites develop skills and knowledge comparable to on-site students, the university should then move forward aggressively to encourage distance learning opportunities that meet the needs of its constituents.

Who owns courses developed for distance learning delivery?

The University will waive rights to copyrights on materials developed for distance learning in favor of the instructor.

The University will not require reimbursement for production costs unless and until actual profits are generated.

At the instructor's discretion, all video and audio tapes will be destroyed within two weeks of production.

How will faculty be compensated when assigned to teach a distance learning course?

How much should faculty be paid to develop distance learning instruction?

Faculty members who agree to or are assigned to teach via distance education will receive a one-time only development grant of $2000 for each delivery mode new to the faculty member which each implements. Current delivery modes include two-way interactive, telecourses, and internet delivery. Specific course development costs not associated with learning a new delivery mode (e.g., specific software packages, additional preparation time) may be requested, but would be negotiated individually between the faculty member and his or her department.

How will faculty be compensated when assigned to teach two way interactive instruction at two or more sites?

Assumptions:

1. The compensation for distance education should be sufficient to entice some of CWU's best teaching faculty to deliver distance education courses in the multi-site environment.

2. Both minimum and maximum target enrollments must be established for all courses:

   Minimum size constraints would consider both total enrollments at all sites and enrollments at each site. Minimum total enrollments would adhere to the established University policy. The minimum enrollments for individual sites should consider two factors: a) program commitments made by CWU, and b) for non-program courses, a reasonable cost-benefit ratio.

   Maximum size would be established by the faculty, chairs, and deans on a course-by-course basis using quality considerations. The following question would be addressed: "Beyond what class size would it be impractical or even impossible to achieve the student outcomes for the course."

3. Faculty members will identify the means through which they will meet face to face with students at distance sites, and where possible, will originate a broadcast at least once during the quarter from at least one distance site. Further, faculty members should schedule sufficient office hours in order to be available at convenient times to students at all sites.

Full-time faculty pay plan

The faculty member is assigned to lead the students at his/her home-site as part of the regularly assigned instructional load and is eligible to receive additional compensation for the concurrent sections at the distance sites. Assuming that combined enrollments at all sites meet or exceed the University minimums for a course, the additional compensation is comprised of two components: an amount based on the rate per credit hour normally paid to part-time faculty to deliver the course in person, plus $300 for each distance site beyond one.

(Thus, for a five credit class taught both on-campus and at three alternative sites, the faculty member would receive five load credits, $2,000 based on five credit hours at $400* per credit, and $1,000 based on $500 per each of the second and third distance sites.)

Pay plan for part-time and full-time faculty volunteering to teach a distance education class on an overload basis.

Part-time faculty and full-time faculty volunteering to teach a distance education class on an overload basis shall be paid: the rate per credit customarily paid to part-time faculty for the "home" site, plus $100 per credit hour for each distance site.

(Thus, the faculty member teaching a five credit class in Lynnwood (the home site) plus sites at SeaTac and Yakima would receive $2000 based on five credit hours at $400* per credit, and $1000 based on five credits at $100 times 2 distance sites.)

*Faculty in some schools and colleges are reimbursed at $500 per credit.

What should the faculty load and remuneration considerations be for Internet and telecourse based instruction?

Internet and telecourse based classes should be considered as part of a faculty load the same as any other University supported credit course and if a continuing education delivered class, the pay scale should be on the same basis as any other continuing education credit class. The maximum size for an Internet course section should be 15 students and for a telecourse section should be 30 students.
Academic policy is to be distinguished from curricular policy which applies only to specific programs and courses of instruction within the larger university setting. Academic policy is not ordinarily concerned with specific courses and program offerings unless they affect the institutional program as a whole.

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

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

the formal steps by which policies are implemented and enforced.

Procedures are to be distinguished from policy in that policy pre-exists and authorizes procedures as means for implementing the policy in question.

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

The Faculty Senate, through the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, is responsible for approving all courses and program requirements for the undergraduate and graduate curricula upon recommendation by the departments and Graduate Council respectively. The Academic Affairs Committee will not ordinarily be involved in such curricular or programmatic review and approval, though it will coordinate its own recommendations with departments, the Graduate Council, the General Education Committee, and the academic deans to insure smoothly functioning policy and procedures.

The new assignment of the Committee will require administrative support; however the resources of the Faculty Senate are not adequate for the task. Administrative support will be provided by the Provost's office. Additional support, where appropriate, will be provided by the offices of Academic Services with the approval of the Provost.

The Committee will report to the Faculty Senate, and the Faculty Senate will act on the Committee's recommendations. All policy actions of the Committee will be subject to Faculty Senate approval.

In addition to the foregoing principles, the Academic Affairs Committee recommends the Faculty Senate Bylaws be amended as follows. While this proposed amendment is longer than the section it replaces, the changes proposed are far-ranging and a significant departure from past practices. There should be no doubt about the nature and structure of the Committee.

IV.B.3.d. The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee shall be concerned with study and improvement of academic standards and academic organizational structures. It shall make policy recommendations concerning admissions; registration; grading; withdrawals; the academic support systems such as the library and audio-visual division; it shall cooperate with other individuals, groups or committees in long-range planning; including the creation of new schools; departments; programs and similar things as may be requested by or approved by the Senate Executive Committee.

13. The Committee further recommends that the Faculty Senate Code Committee be instructed to change the Faculty Code description of the Academic Affairs Committee to reflect this new duty and structure.

End of report.
BUDGET COMMITTEE

MOTION: RECOMMENDATIONS ON SALARY INEQUITY

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.

General Procedure for Group Bias:

At least once every five years, the Provost, in conjunction with the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee and the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, shall conduct a study of faculty salaries to determine if a group-based bias (race, age, disability, disabled veteran, Vietnam-era veteran, and sex) appears to be present. The first such study will take place during the 1997/98 academic year and will be completed no later than March 1, 1998. This study will be done by an outside consulting firm experienced in determining salary inequities. This consulting firm will be selected by the Provost, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee. If biases are present, a plan to ameliorate this problem will be developed within three months from the date of the acceptance of the study. Such a plan will allow no more than three years for correction of the bias. The Provost, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee will advise and oversee the work of the consultant. Funds to adjust salaries for group bias will come from sources other than general faculty salary increases approved by the legislature.

General Procedure for Salary Compression:

1. Each year the Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee will conduct a peer institution salary study. This will be a comparison of individual salaries with average faculty salaries from the same discipline at CWU peer institutions. The first year this study will be done with the consulting firm identified above.

2. Once a compression-related disadvantage has been identified, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee and the Provost will determine a means by which the compression-related disadvantage can be remedied over a period of time. This will include a procedure to determine the compression of individual faculty, source of funds, and a time line for remediating the inequity.

Note: The President is committed to providing money to hire the consulting firm.

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. "Group bias" will be defined as those categories listed in the Human Resource Data Base at CWU and includes race, age, disability, disabled veteran, Vietnam-era veteran and sex.

CWU's equal opportunity statement includes the following categories: race, color, creed, religion, age, national origin, disabled veteran or Vietnam-era veteran status, disability (marital status, sex and sexual orientation). (See Policy Manual Parts 2-2.2.1.4 and 5)

3. All tenured and tenure-track faculty (including those on leave) will be included in the study, with the following exceptions:

a. Present and former CWU deans, provosts, and presidents.

b. Faculty who will retire (full or phased) prior to the following academic year.

4. The consulting team together with the Provost, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee, the chairs of the academic department and the academic deans will develop a fair and consistent policy for evaluating prior service (pre-CWU service).

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 the CWU peer institutions.

6. Each year the Provost's office will obtain average salary by rank and by department from the CWU peer institutions for use in the peer institution study.

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

MOTION: RECOMMENDATION FOR DISTRIBUTION OF MONEY FOR SALARY INCREASE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1997

According to the best information we have received to date, the following seems to be the available money:

(a) 3% available from the legislature July 1, 1997;
(b) 1% from internal funds (student tuition?) available July 1, 1997. (This is non-base money and if used will need to be regenerated every year);
(c) 2% from internal funds (student tuition?) available July 1, 1998. (This is also non-base funds and would need to be regenerated each successive year making a total of 3% to be regenerated after the second year. Although we are not sure this is the real case. See Note below). This would include those who are one-year continuing appointments.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

The motion passed in May 1994 be waived and that the 3% legislated be used for a general scale adjustment. This can be done in one of two ways (and perhaps others also): (a) a 3% shift across the board or (b) a lump sum adjustment. The difference being that in (a) everyone gets a 3% increase from what they are currently getting. This would mean that each step get a different amount with those further up the scale getting more than those at the lowest end. In (b) everyone would get the same amount regardless of where they are on the scale.

PROS AND CONS FOR EACH. (Some, perhaps not all)

(a): Pros: 1. Keeps the scale uniform for future work.

2. Keeps the scale spread out.

3. Rewards longevity.

Cons: 1. Gives those at the low end of the scale less when they probably need more.


Cons: 1. Disrupts the salary scale so there are no longer "nice" increments.

2. Does not recognize longevity.

RECOMMENDATION #2

The 1% from internal funds be used to begin to implement the "merit" proposal passed by the Senate in May 1994.

This proposal would be to identify all faculty eligible at level land level 2 and fund these people at .5% (the first level in the multi-step proposal). If there is enough money, then fund the second phase of the multi-step proposal, otherwise use the leftover money to further adjust the salary scale. This would be a very small amount, but a start.

Note that if everyone is eligible for both level 1 and level 2 this would use up all the 1% money.

RECOMMENDATION #3

The 2% money available for July 1, 1998 be used for another scale adjustment.

NOTE: The 1% money for July 1, 1997 and the 2% money for July 1, 1998 both need to be taken from existing funds. This was not appropriated by the legislature. This means that the money would need to come at the expense of something else. Do we really want to do this?

The recommendation to use this money in the above manner is for thought and discussion. We feel we need to look at the impact this would have on the instructional program vs the monetary gains of the faculty.

There is some discussion about the 2%. Is it an additional 2% or is it the 1% this year and another 1% next year making a total of 2%?

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