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

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

ROLL CALL:
Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except John Alsoszatai-Petheo, Melissa Bowers, Bobby Cummings, Michael Gleason, Gerald Gunn, Richard Mack, Deborah Medlar, James Roberts, Dieter Romboy, Todd Schaefer, Hugh Spall, Keith Lewis, Charles McGehee, Bill Owen, Barbara Radke, Wendy Rittereiser, Carolyn Wells, Blaine Wilson


CHANGES OF AGENDA: Faculty Productivity Report: Sid Nesselroad

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
The minutes of the May 14, 1997, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS: 5/8/97 memo from Faculty Senate Personnel Committee re: Regression Analysis of Salary Inequities of Non-tenure-track faculty with Academic Year Appointments

REPORTS:
1. CHAIR:

MOTION NO. 3115 - 1997/98 Faculty Senate Grievance Committee membership:
Reports to: President
Purpose: Resolve, by informal means, specific grievances, disputes or conflicts of faculty members and recommends action to the President. (Members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and ratified by the Faculty Senate.)
Membership: 6 faculty (3 regular members and 3 alternates)
Regular Members: Patrick O'Shaughnessy, Accounting 3 years
Jim Brown, Teacher Education Program 2 years
Nancy Jurenka, Teacher Education Program 1 year
Alternate Members: Brenda Hubbard, Theatre Arts 3 years
Steve Schepman, Psychology 2 years
Corwin King, Communication 1 year

Motion No. 3115 Passed

MOTION NO. 3116 - 1997/98 Faculty Senate Standing Committee List:
Comment: The Budget Committee which will be doing the salary inequity study shows no diversity as far as representing women or any other under-represented group. A subcommittee consisting of a diverse group just for the Salary Inequity Study was suggested.
Perkins: Just prior to the meeting the creation of an ad hoc committee on the salary inequity study was being discussed. Chair Perkins suggested that the idea be presented to the Executive Committee for approval and appointment.
Hawkins: Persons of diverse backgrounds do not necessarily speak to diverse issues in a positive manner. Knowing the members of the Budget Committee rather well, I trust their ethics. They probably have as strong opinions in support of minority groups as do those coming from those groups. In fact, to choose someone to be on a committee by their gender or race is, in fact, not appropriate.
Comment: It would be preferred to see people on the committee with different perspectives, i.e., people who have lived with salary inequity.
Nelson: If we don't start this study on the right foot, when the end is reached no one will believe the results. People need to accept the makeup of this committee.
Comment: What Dr. Nelson says is true and it should speak to all the committees that the Senate supports - they should reflect the diversity that exists on the Faculty Senate and on the campus.
Perkins: Diversity is taken into consideration by the Executive Committee. Months are spent putting together Senate as well as University committees. Although some committees are defined with a gender breakdown, the Executive Committee takes into consideration equity distribution. An all men committee is usually due to no women volunteering for committees.
Gammon: The number of women on campus is small. By the time women are put on committees, they are overworked.
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Nesselroad: We can vote to approve these committees but move to seek additional membership to achieve diversity. The Senate Committees are not limited to five members.

Hawkins: If we select committees by the members' gender or race, we will saddle those people with the expectation that they would speak with more authority on issues relating to their race and gender. It is more inclusive to deal with the issues that people stand for with a certain passion than to assume that because of what they are, there is a philosophy that follows.

Comment: We should approve an ad hoc committee for the salary inequity study and approve the expanding committees as a different issue.

Perkins: Ad hoc committees are well designed to handle one basic issue. We should reexamine different breakdowns on committees.

Williams: We need committee membership diversity from people who are not full professors, ethnic backgrounds, etc. It behooves us to make the commitment to that even though the many male full professors on the committees are very well suited to represent these views. This is a credibility issue.

Benson: Living here for almost thirty years, I cannot see this premise as being close to true. Most of us at this table are living with immense inequity. Many of our salaries are 40% to 50% below when we are hired. The university faculty as a whole are living in relative deprivation. Are there not staggered terms on the Budget Committee? (No) To assume that faculty input through hearings, etc. cannot influence or be considered by anyone of sexual orientation, gender, race, age, etc. is something we should get beyond.

The people on the Budget Committee can represent the general interests of the faculty. The process of discerning gender inequity should be objective. The data should speak for themselves. However, the regression analysis doesn’t have enough data to be adequate.

McGehee: Bill's points are very well taken, but they are also beside the point. The President’s point goes to the question of law, mainly that it is the appearance of fairness that counts not the actual fact of appearance. If you start out with a committee that is by definition according to federal guidelines out of balance, then the outcome will be out of balance as well. You simply will not be taken seriously. You can’t rely on volunteers, you need to get on the phone and twist some arms if need be.

Monson: It was my understanding that the Budget Committee would be working with the consultants.

Perkins: That motion is an ongoing motion. It is for years to come in the process of dealing with inequity. What we are trying to do is the consultant will bring us into line. I would assume the consultant would get information from various committees. The ad hoc committee will oversee the initial action.

Nelson: The definition/structure should be put together by the faculty. It will fail if it appears that the administration or someone else is putting it together. It should be worked on it this summer, so we can be ready to go in the fall with an RFP to get the consultant on board to do this study. Our criteria should be specific. We will be throwing away $50,000 if we don’t come out of the shoot straight on.

Kidwell: What is this new committee putting together? Last year we had mutual accusations of a fixed agenda. The whole suggestion of an outside consultant was to bring in someone who would conduct a study strictly based on statistical relevance and based on the knowledge of court cases, the law and statistics - based on things which have been taken to court and not individuals' opinions on what should and shouldn't count. If we put together yet another committee we will only produce more opinions rather than what’s been tried legally in the courts.

Nelson: The consultant will respond to an RFP. We can’t just say we want a consultant to conduct a faculty salary study and that’s the end of it. The more you put in, the more it will cost. The more difficult things you put in, the more it’s going to cost. We need to put in our five, six or seven key points so that the consultants will address those points you deem most important. What we feel is most important is not defined yet.

Perkins: The last motion has set a frame of guidelines which need to be developed because the RFP needs to be specific.

Donohoe: Can committee nominations be taken from the floor today?

Perkins: There is nothing to prevent us from adding individuals to the list. These are recommendations that come out of the Executive Committee based on faculty volunteering. As such there could be other recommendations. It is very difficult to do committee work on the Senate floor. The Senate can activate the Executive Committee to re-examine the Budget Committee and its makeup.

Hawkins: It there some confusion over the task at hand? What we are doing is electing the membership of the standing committees which do the groundwork of the Senate. The Senate Budget Committee has much to do every year. Perhaps it would help if the charge to the Budget Committee, relating to the salary inequity study, was either developed and sent to the Senate for their approval OR, because it is such a particular issue, the ad hoc committee made up of a membership which is reflective of the charge could be chosen for that particular instance.

Motion No. 3116 Passed.
MOTION NO. 3117 (Ad Hoc Salary Inequity Study Committee) was moved by Cindy Emmans and seconded by Jim Hawkins to form an Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Inequity Study. Motion No. 3117 passed. 1 Oppose, 1 abstain.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO MOTION NO. 3117 was moved by Michelle Kidwell and seconded by Cindy Monson and Jim Hawkins that the Salary Inequity Study Ad Hoc Committee be appointed to reflect the diversity of the faculty and to oversee and develop a request for proposal (RFP).

AMENDMENT MOTION NO. 3117A was moved by Jim Hawkins and seconded by Sid Nesselroad to determine whether or not we need an outside consultant. Amendment Motion 3117A was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT MOTION NO. 3117B was moved by Sid Nesselroad and seconded by Terry DeVietti to charge the Salary Inequity Study Ad Hoc Committee to work over the summer. Amendment Motion No. 3117B Passed: 1 oppose, 4 abstain.

Collective Bargaining Election: Chair Perkins reported that over 70% of the faculty voted.
  Tenure, Tenure-Track: 211 Yes Votes, 77 No Votes
  Adjunct (50%+) Spring: 25 Yes Votes, 7 No Votes
  Administrative Faculty: 10 No Votes
Chair Perkins will be relaying these results to the Board of Trustees at the June 13, 1997, meeting.

Faculty Productivity Report: Sid Nesselroad reported on the Council of Faculty Representatives (CAR) meeting of May 25, 1997. There were four delegates from each of the six state-funded institutions of higher education in attendance, a staff person from the governor’s office, and two staff persons from the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HEB). The agenda addressed the issues relating to the recently legislated performance measures. The nebulous “Faculty Productivity Measure” was discussed. All present agreed that 1) any faculty productivity measure should look at unit productivity first before looking at individual productivity for the reason that education’s product is graduates and educated people and we do that in programs and units more than in individuals. Secondly, it was recommended to design some way to look at productive work that faculty presently does versus non-productive work, i.e., paperwork that faculty is not equipped to do that cuts into productive time.
  Ken Gamon, CCU CAR representative, mentioned that CAR took this on as a way of trying to get ahead of the curve and be out front in deciding what productivity means among faculty and not be locked in at the whim of the legislature.

PRESIDENT
  Accountability Measures for Washington’s Higher Education System (Handout)
  President Nelson pointed out the five specified performance measures and the amount of funds held in reserve for Central ($269,000 FY1998, $403,000 FY1999).
  Proposed Guidelines for Higher Education Accountability Plans (Handout)
  President Nelson related that there has been a meeting between Provost Dauwalder and the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HEB) to begin working on guideline compliance. Central is working on defining faculty productivity and an additional measure unique to the institution.
  President Nelson brought the “HEB’s Method for Setting Accountability Performance Targets for AY 1997-98” to the Senate’s attention.
  Central’s plan will be submitted for HEB. approval by August 15, 1997.

Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education
Chair Blaine Wilson briefly presented the Ad Hoc Distance Education Committee Report of May 14, 1997, as follows:

The Ad Hoc Distance Education Committee was charged by the Faculty Senate chair, Robert Perkins, to recommend positions on each of the following issues related to distance learning and after six months of deliberation, the Distance Learning Ad Hoc Committee composed of Margaret Badgley, James DePaepe (ex officio), Charles McGehee, James Nimnicht, Linda Clark-Santos (ex officio), and Blaine R. Wilson (chair) recommended the following position statement as the basis of policy to govern the development and operation of distance learning at Central Washington University.

1. 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.

2. What should be CCU’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.
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for transfer. The policy in the catalog regarding transfer credit applies equally to all courses submitted for credit transfer.

3. **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.

4. **What should the position of CCU 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.

5. **What should the position of CCU 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.

6. **How will the offering of distance learning courses affect CCU 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.

7. **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 desired learning outcomes are achieved and that distance learning pedagogy is continuously improved.

8. **Who owns courses and related instructional materials 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.

9. **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 $2,000 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 CCU’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 CCU, 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 members is assigned to lead the students at his/her home-site as a 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 $2,000 based on five credit hours at $400* per credit and $1,000 based on five credits at $100 times 2 distance sites.)

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

10. 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 mother 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 CCU, 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.”

Nesselroad: Commented that it might be a little ridged to set amounts (like $2,000, etc.) When an actual number is put in place, such as was done many years ago with part-time salaries, then those numbers tend to stay the same for years. Wouldn’t it be better to use a more flexible system with starting figures and allowances for inflation, etc.

Williams: Can you define “New Course Development?”

Wilson: Whenever the delivery of a course is changed, so it can be taught via distance whether by Internet or two-way interactive, it would be defined as such.

McGehee: The issue was that distance education is a totally new mode. It has to do with what is involved in creating a distance production, not a course in general. You may have taught it all your life, but the conversion to distance education is so dramatic a difference that it requires different expenditures efforts.

Williams: The question is: if the course has been taught and prepared three times by three different people, but a new professor comes on campus and wants to teach it through distance education; do they get the $2,000 even though ....

Clark-Santos: We decided that there should be enough consistency in trying to get as many courses up and running as possible. I thought we finally decided that the first time for a course and then if it was a new delivery mode for the faculty member that there would be an additional site.

Garon: WSU in this state has the most experience. Have you talked with them?

Wilson: The committee consulted probably 20 universities throughout the country.

Ubelacker: I don’t like rewarding people with money for getting on a “train wreck.” These people are paid by the state to teach, whether they do it in a classroom or a distance mode is irrelevant. Paying faculty to teach in a different mode is wrong. This separates and divides departments; it will create strife.

Comment: There are some faculty who will not be able to offer distance courses, specifically in the Music Department studio teachers cannot teach oboe over the Internet. Music faculty will immediately be at a disadvantage. Also, regarding graduation requirements: since there will be no difference between distance courses and courses taken on campus, will this lead to the situation that students will be able to take an entire degree in distance. That smacks of not being “university.” One of the most important things a university offers is what is learned by being on campus and being in a community of scholars and being surrounded by the pursuit of intellectual curiosity. Sitting in a good lecture class, discussing issues with fellow students is very important. This is a policy we should review very carefully here at Central.

Comment: The Distance Education “train” is “on the tracks.” WSU is offering a social studies degree right here in Ellensburg. A total degree via distance.

McGehee: It is already state law that the university owns anything faculty do. Whatever faculty publish is owned by the state — that’s the law right now. It has been asked that the state waive that right. It’s in the Policies & Procedures Manual. All states have pre-emptive rights.

Donahoe: The committee was congratulated for its work. The point of distance education is that it is as good or as poor as you want it to be. Many studies on it have found that instructors do need to make site visits at different times. We thought people wouldn’t read when movies and videos came out. People are reading like crazy. Distance education will not change the university structure. People will still want to come to university, but rural and remote locations need distance education. People in Wenatchee are very grateful that they do not have to drive over the mountains to get an education. Those of us who want to use that option should be supported.

Hawkins: The committee, perhaps because of its charge, has focused primarily on the compensation for instructors which is really the issue that was troubled over and that has been abused over the years. I hope part of the Senate’s deliberation and its future charge can be to go after the issue of quality with as much fervor. The process at this
stage must give to the departments and schools all authority possible beyond the hiring of teachers as to the content of the course and the level of achievement. That cannot be negotiated. There was a time when we all knew that the best kind of instruction was between one great teacher and one motivated student. We've gone a long ways from that.

McGehee: What we learned on the committee was that distance learning was not for everyone, and not all disciplines lend themselves well to it (laboratories, etc.). We were told that the better faculty were attracted to it. It is a very intensively prepared medium (it has to be scripted, prepared) and $2,000 is not going to cut it.

Nesselroad: There is one issue here that still needs quite a bit of consideration. That is, "how all of this interfaces with the last issue which is these productivity/performance measures." Depending on a lot of variables, it could either impact all of that favorably or very unfavorably.

MOTION NO. 3118 was moved by Susan Donahoe and seconded by Jim Hawkins to accept the report.
Motion No. 3118 Passed

4. **Retirement and Insurance Committee**: Wendy Rittereiser, Benefits Representative, Human Resource Services related Central's options in adding alternate investment vendors to the CCU Retirement Plan. The Senate may choose to take a position for or against the addition of vendors, or the Senate may choose not to take a position. If the Senate does wish to take a position, it should be forwarded to the Vice President of Business and Financial Affairs through the CCU Retirement and Insurance Committee. The following are three alternate motions:

1. That the Faculty Senate take a position in support of adding alternate investment vendors to the CCU Retirement Plan and encourages the administration to go forward with the addition of these option.
2. That the Faculty Senate take a position in opposition of the addition of alternate investment vendors for the CCU Retirement Plan, due to the increase in administrative costs and the overall satisfaction with TIAA-CREF's performance.
3. That the Faculty Senate take no position on the addition of alternate investment vendors for the CCU Retirement Plan.

MOTION NO. 3119 - Terry DeVietti moved and Sid Nesselroad seconded to select motion #1: a position in support of adding alternate investment vendors to the CCU Retirement Plan and encourages the administration to go forward with the addition of these options.
Motion No. 3119 Passed.

5. **Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation** Robert Fordan presented the report. The committee will continued its work in the fall with a questionnaire which will be submitted to the Executive Committee by the end of October. One question of interest in response to one of the questions raised in the charge was, "Should the average grade appear along side the student's grade on transcripts?" Perhaps the percentile ranking should be seen and that be a part of the grade report not the transcript.

Chair Perkins commented that the committee did a remarkable job considering how late date in the quarter they were given this charge. The committee will be reappointed for fall of 1997 and will return to the Senate with a complete report and questionnaire.

6. **FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

MOTION NO. 3120 - Charles McGehee recommended the adoption of the "Proposal regarding assigning functions of the former Undergraduate Council to the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee" (Ref.: Motion #3022, 5/31/95). He commented that two years ago the Senate approved a proposal by the Academic Affairs Committee to restructure the committee and redefine its function to assume the functions of the previous Undergraduate Office and Undergraduate Council. The committee was charged to collate and edit all academic policy on campus. The committee believes that the structure has been quite successful and has brought the Senate into the creation of academic policy in ways that has never before been the case.

Motion No. 3120 Passed

**BUDGET COMMITTEE** - No Report
**CODE COMMITTEE** - No Report
**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE** - No Report
**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE** - No Report
**PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE** - No Report

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

FIRST 97/98 REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: OCTOBER 8, 1997
CHANGES OF AGENDA: Faculty Productivity Report: Sid Nelsenroad

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the May 14, 1997, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS: 5/8/97 memo from Faculty Senate Personnel Committee re: Regression Analysis of Salary Inequities of Non-tenure-track faculty with Academic Year Assignments

REPORTS:

1. CHAIR:

MOTION NO. 3115 - 1997/98 Faculty Senate Grievance Committee membership:

Reports to: President

Purpose: To insure, by informal means, specific grievances, disputes or conflicts of faculty and recommends action to the President. (Members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and ratified by the Faculty Senate.)

Membership:

Regular Members: 6 faculty (3 regular members and 3 alternates)

- Patrick O'Shaughnessy, Accounting
- Jim Brown, Teacher Education Program
- Nancy Jurecka, Teacher Education Program
- Brenda Hubbard, Theatre Arts
- Steve Schepanski, Psychology
- Corwin King, Communication

Alternate Members:

- 3 years
- 2 years
- 1 year
- 3 years
- 2 years
- 1 year

Motion No. 3115 Passed

MOTION NO. 3116 - 1997/98 Faculty Senate Standing Committee List

Comment: The Budget Committee which will be doing the salary inequity study shows no diversity as far as representing women or any other under-represented group. A subcommittee consisting of a diverse group just for the Salary Inequity Study was suggested.

Perkins: Just prior to the meeting the creation of an ad hoc committee on the salary inequity study was being discussed. Chair Perkins suggested that the idea be presented to the Executive Committee for approval and appointment.

Hawkins: Persons of diverse backgrounds do not necessarily speak to diverse issues in a positive manner.

Nelson: Knowing the members of the Budget Committee rather well, I trust their ethics. They probably have as strong opinions in support of minority groups as do those coming from those groups. In fact, to choose someone to be on a committee by their gender or race is, in fact, not appropriate.

Comment: It would be preferred to see people on the committees with different perspectives, i.e., people who have lived with salary inequity.

Nelson: If we don't start this study on the right foot, when the end is reached no one will believe the results. People need to accept the makeup of this committee.

Comment: What Dr. Nelson says is true and it should speak to all the committees that the Senate supports - they should reflect the diversity that exists on the Faculty Senate and on the campus.

Perkins: Diversity is taken into consideration by the Executive Committee. Months are spent putting together Senate as well as University committees. Although some committees are defined with a gender breakdown, the Executive Committee takes into consideration equity distribution. An all men committee is usually due to no women volunteering for committees.

Gannon: The number of women on campus is small. By the time women are put on committees, they are overworked.

Nelsenroad: We can vote to approve these committees but move to seek additional membership to achieve diversity. The Senate Committees are not limited to five members.

Hawkins: If we select committees by the members' gender or race, we will saddle those people with the expectation that they would speak with more authority on issues relating to their race and gender. It is more inclusive to deal with the issues that people stand for with a certain passion than to assume that because of what they are, there is a philosophy that follows.

Comment: We should approve an ad hoc committee for the salary inequity study and approve the expanding committees as a different issue.

Perkins: Ad hoc committees are well designed to handle one basic issue. We should reexamine different breakdowns on committees.

Williams: We need committee membership diversity from people who are not full professors, ethnic backgrounds, etc. It behooves us to make the committee to that end even though the many male full professors on the committees are very well suited to represent these views. This is a credibility issue.

Benson: Living here for almost thirty years, I cannot see this promise as being close to true. Most of us at this table are living with income inequality. Many of our salaries are 40% to 50% below when we are hired. The university faculty as a whole are living in relative deprivation. Are there not staggered terms on the Budget Committee? To assume that faculty input through hearings, etc. cannot influence or be considered by anyone of sexual orientation, gender, race, age, etc. is something we should get beyond. The people on the Budget Committee can represent the general interests of the faculty. The process of discerning gender inequity should be objective. The data should speak for themselves. However, the regression analysis doesn't have enough data to be adequate.

Bill's points are very well taken, but they are also beside the point. The President's point goes to the question of law, mainly that it is the appearance of fairness that counts not the actual fact of appearance. If you start out with a committee that is by definition according to federal guidelines out of balance, then the outcome will be out of balance as well. You simply will not be taken seriously. You can't rely on volunteers, you need to get on the phone and twist some arms if need be.

It was my understanding that the Budget Committee would work with the consultants. That motion is an ongoing motion. It is for years to come in the process of dealing with inequity. What we are trying to do is the consultant will bring us into line. I would assume the consultant would get information from various committees. The ad hoc committee will oversee the initial action.

Nelson: The definition/structure should be put together by the faculty. It will fail if it appears that the administration or someone else is putting it together. It should be worked on it this year. We can be ready to go in the fall with an RFP to get the consultant on board to do this study. Our criteria should be specific. We will be throwing away $50,000 if we don't come out of the shoot straight on.

What is this new committee putting together? Last year we had mutual accusations of a fixed agenda. The whole suggestion of an outside consultant was to bring in some body who would conduct a study strictly based on statistical relevance and based on the knowledge of court cases, the law and statistics - based on things which have been taken to court and not individuals' opinions on what should and shouldn't count. If we put together yet another committee we will only produce more opinions rather than what's been tried legally in the courts.

The consultant will respond to an RFP. We can't just say we want a consultant to conduct a faculty salary study and that's the end of it. The more you pay in, the more it will cost. The more difficult things you put in, the more it's going to cost. We need to put in five, six or seven key points so that the consultants will address those points you deem most important. What we feel is most important is not defined yet.

Perkins: The last motion has set a frame of guidelines which need to be developed because the RFP needs to be specific.

Donohoo: Can committee nominations be taken from the floor today?

Perkins: There is nothing to prevent us from adding individuals to the list. These are recommendations that come out of the Executive Committee based on faculty volunteering. As such there could be other recommendations. It is very difficult to do committee work on the Senate floor. The Senate can activate the Executive Committee to re-examine the Budget Committee and its makeup.

Hawkins: If there is some confusion over the task at hand? What we are doing is electing the membership of the standing committees which do the groundwork of the Senate. The Senate Budget Committee has much to do every year. Perhaps it would help if the charge to the Budget Committee, relating to the salary inequity study, was either developed and sent to the Senate for their approval OR because it is such a particular issue, the ad hoc committee made up of a membership which is reflective of the charge could be chosen for that particular instance.

Motion No. 3116 Passed.
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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 $2,000 based on five credit hours at $400* per credit and $1,000 based on five credits at $100 times two distance sites.)

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

10. 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

McGehee: 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 con- sider two factors: a) program commitments made by CCU, and b) for non-program courses, a reasonable cost-benefit ratio.

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

Nesselroad: Commented that it might be a little ridged to set amounts (like $2,000, etc.). When an actual number is put in place, such as was done many years ago with part-time salaries, then those numbers tend to stay the same for years. Would it be better to use a more flexible system with starting figures and allowances for inflation, etc.

Williams: Can you define "New Course Development?"

Wilson: Whenever the delivery of a course is changed, so it can be taught via distance whether by Internet or two-way interactive, it would be defined as such.

McGehee: The issue was that distance education is a totally new mode. It has to do with what is involved in creating a distance production, not a course in general. You may have taught it all your life, but the conversion to distance education is so dramatic a difference that it requires different expenditures efforts.

Williams: The question is: if the course has been taught and prepared three times by three different people, but a new pro- fessor comes on campus and wants to teach it through distance education; do they get the $2,000 even though . . .

Clark-Santos: We decided that there should be enough consistency in trying to get as many courses up and running as possible. I thought we finally decided that the first time for a course and then if it was a new delivery mode for the faculty member that would be an additional site.

Garon: What I think was the most experience. Have you talked with them?

Wilson: The committee consulted probably 20 universities throughout the country.

Ubelacker: I don't like rewarding people with money for getting on a "train wreck." These people are paid by the state to teach, whether they do it in a class room or a distance mode is irrelevant. Paying faculty to teach in a different mode is wrong. This separates and divides departments; it will create strife.

Comment: These are some faculty who will not be able to offer distance courses, specifically the Music Department studio teachers cannot teach online over the Internet. Music faculty will immediately be at a disadvantage. Also, regarding graduation requirements: since there will be no difference between distance courses and courses taken on campus, it will only lead to the situation that students will be able to take an entire degree in distance. That smacks of not being "university." One of the most important things a university offers is what is learned by being on campus and being in a community of scholars and being surrounded by the pursuit of intellectual curiosity. Sitting in a good lecture class, discussing issues with fellow students is very important. This is a policy we should review very carefully here at Central.

Comment: The Distance Education "train" is "on the tracks." WSU is offering a social studies degree right here in Ellensburg. A total degree via distance.

McGehee: It is already state law that the university owns anything faculty do. Whatever faculty publish is owned by the state — that's the law now right. It has been asked that the state waive that right. It's in the Policies & Procedures Manual. All states have pre-emptive rights.

Donahoo: The committee was congratulated for its work. The point of distance education is that it is as good as or as poor as you want it to be. Many studies on it have found that instructors do need to make site visits at different times. We thought people wouldn't read when movies and videos came. People are reading like crazy. Distance education will not change the university structure. Distance educa-

Donahoo: tion will not change the distance education. People in Wenatchee are very grateful that they do not have to drive over the mountains to get an education. Those of us who want to use that option should be supported.

Hawkins: The committee, perhaps because of its charge, has focused primarily on the compensation for instructors which is really the issue that was troubled over and that has been abused over the years. I hope part of the Senate's deliberation and its future charge can be to go after the issue of quality with as much fervor. The process at this stage must give to the departments and schools all authority possible beyond the hiring of teachers as to the content of the course and the level of achievement. That cannot be negotiated. There was a time when we all knew that the best kind of instruction was between one great teacher and one motivated student. We've gone a long ways from that.

What we learned on the committee was that distance learning was not for everyone, and not all disciplines lend themselves well to it (laboratories, etc.). We were told that the better faculty were attracted to it. It is a very intensively prepared medium (it has to be scripted, prepared) and $2,000 is not going to cut it.

There is one issue here that still needs quite a bit of consideration. That is, "how all of these interfaces with the last issue which is these productivity/performance measures." Depending on a lot of variables, it could either impact all of that favorably or very unfavorably.

MOTION NO. 3118 was moved by Susan Donahoo and seconded by Jim Hawkins to accept the report.

Motion No. 3118 Passed.

4. Retirement and Insurance Committee: Wendy Ritterman, Benefits Representative, Human Resource Services related Central's options in adding alternate investment vendors to the CCU Retirement Plan. The Senate may choose to take a position for or against the addition of vendors, or the Senate may choose not to take a position. If the Senate does wish to take a position, it should be forwarded to the Vice President of Business and Financial Affairs through the CCU Retirement and Insurance Committee. The following are three alternate motions:

MOTION NO. 3119 was moved by Susan Donahoo and seconded by Jim Hawkins to accept the report.

MOTION NO. 3119 Passed.

5. Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation Robert Fordan presented the report. The committee will continue its work in the fall with a questionnaire which will be submitted to the Executive Committee by the end of October. One question of interest in response to one of the questions raised in the charge was, "Should the average grade appear on transcripts?"

MOTION NO. 3119 was moved by Susan Donahoo and seconded by Jim Hawkins to accept the report.

MOTION NO. 3119 Passed.

FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:

6. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MOTION NO. 3120 - Charles McGehee recommended the adoption of the "Proposal regarding assigning functions of the former Undergraduate Council to the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee" (Ref: Motion #3022, 5/31/95). He commented that two years ago the Senate approved a proposal by the Academic Affairs Committee to restructure the committee and redefine its function to assume the functions of the previous Undergraduate Office and Undergraduate Council. The committee was charged to collate and edit all academic policy on campus. The committee believes that the structure has been quite successful and has brought the Senate into the creation of academic policy in ways that has never before been the case. Motion No. 3120 Passed

BUDGET COMMITTEE - No Report

CODE COMMITTEE - No Report

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - No Report

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - No Report

PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - No Report

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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3. Faculty productivity report: Sid Nesselroad reported on the Council of Faculty Representatives (CAR) meeting of May 25, 1997. There were four delegates from each of the six state-funded institutions of higher education in attendance, a staff person from the governor's office, and two staff persons from the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HEB.). The agenda addressed the issues relating to the recently legislated performance measures. The nebulous "Faculty Productivity Measure." was discussed. All present agreed that 1) any faculty productivity measure should look at unit productivity first before looking at individual productivity for the reason that education's product is graduates and educated people and we do that in programs and units more than in individuals. Secondly, it was recommended to design some way to look at productive work that faculty presently does versus non-productive work, i.e., paperwork. Nesselroad stated that faculty is not equipped to do that cuts into productive time. Ken Gann, CCU CAR representative, mentioned that CAR took this on as a way of trying to get ahead of the curve and be out front in deciding what productivity means among faculty and not be locked in at the whim of the legislature.

2. President

Accountability Measures for Washington's Higher Education System (Handout)

President Nelson pointed out the five specified performance measures and the amount of funds held in reserve for Central ($250,000 FY1998, $403,000 FY1999). Proposed Guidelines for Higher Education Accountability Plan (Handout)

President Nelson related that there has been a meeting between Provost Duwalder and the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HEB.) to begin working on guideline compliance. Central is working on defining faculty productivity and an additional measure unique to the institution.


3. Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education

Chair Blaine Wilson briefly presented the Ad Hoc Distance Education Committee Report of May 14, 1997, as follows:

The Ad Hoc Distance Education Committee was charged by the Faculty Senate chair, Robert Perkins, to recommend positions on each of the following issues related to distance learning and after six months of deliberation, the Distance Learning Ad Hoc Committee composed of Margaret Badgie, James DePase (ex officio), Charles McGhee, James Nemeich, Linda Clark Santos (ex officio), and Elaine R. Wilson (chair) recommended the following position statement as the basis of policy to govern the development and operation of distance learning at Central Washington University.

1. 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 departmental level and hiring recommendations are forwarded to the appropriate dean.

2. What should be CCU'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.

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

The time demands associated with distance education are such that individual documents 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.

5. What should the position of CCU 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 K-12 schools and Educational Districts in matters of mutual interest as regards distance learning.

6. How should the position of CCU 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.

6. How will the offering of distance learning courses affect CCU 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.

7. 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 desired learning outcomes are achieved and that distance learning pedagogy is continuously improved.

8. Who owns courses and related instructional materials 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.

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

Faculty members who agree to or are assigned to teach via distance education will receive a one-time-only development grant of $2,000 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 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/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 CCU's best teaching faculty to deliver distance education courses in the multi-site environment.

2. Minimum size constraints 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 CCU, and b) for non-program coursework, 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.

Final-time faculty pay plan:

The faculty members is assigned to teach the students at his/her home-site as a 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.)
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Thus, we would know that in TH 332, out of 12 students, 57% were at or below John. In HIST 201 out of 68, only 10% were at or below John.

The committee sees this as one of the first steps in addressing the problem of grade inflation. Perhaps at a later date the idea of placing this information on transcripts should be reviewed, and we have placed a question related to this matter on our questionnaire.

4. How should repeated course grades be calculated in their GPA?

The committee believe the most recent grade, computed into Grade Point Average, represents the most updated level of knowledge of the student in the subject matter.

Departmental Questions:
1. Should each department establish its own grading philosophy?
   No, for two reasons: (1) This issue verges on a violation of academic privilege; and (2) a policy is already spelled out for departments in the CWU catalogue.
   However, the committee also believes that each faculty member should have a grading philosophy that is defensible, and that department chairs might take some role in making sure that individual faculty grades are justified.

2. Should each department examine their own course offering to determine the manner of grading for each class?
   Yes, with consideration given to the types of courses offered by the department. For example, if the basis for grading in the course is primarily attendance, an S/U grade should seriously be considered.

II. Fall Quarter, 1997 work

Department Questionnaire:
Due to receiving our charge so late in the quarter, our committee has agreed to draft a questionnaire which will be submitted to all CWU departments. Our questionnaire document will be submitted to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee no later than October 31, 1997.

To: Robert Perkins, Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee
From: Robert Fordan, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation
Date: 5/21/97
Re: Grade Inflation Committee Report/Spring '97

Our charge was to submit a report by May 21, 1997 on the subject of grade inflation, reviewing various departmental and university-wide measures that could be taken to address the problem. However, due to the fact that our charge arrived at the beginning of May, and our report was due today, there was not enough time to complete the tasks the Faculty Senate discussed and recommended at its December 4, 1996 meeting—to question departments to find ways to address grade inflation. Thus, our Spring Quarter, 1997 report consists of: I. addressing the questions posed in our Spring Quarter, 1997 charge; and II. listing what we will do to complete our work Fall Quarter, 1997.

The following then, is our report:

I. We will address the issues raised in the charge:

University-wide Questions:
1. How should independent study courses be graded?
   The committee recommends no change in the guidelines, as they appear to suggest rigor and accountability. There’s no reason why IS courses should be viewed any differently from regular classes.

2. What should the withdrawal policy be at CWU?
   The committee does not believe the withdrawal policy’s effect on grade inflation can be determined without data which establishes student withdrawal has a significant impact on the grade spectrum campus wide. We have included the issue on our questionnaire for further study.

3. Should the average class grade appear along side the student’s grade on the transcript?
   The committee would like to see students receive a grade and their standing in class, in the grade report which is sent home to students. The student’s grade would be followed by a percentile ranking in the class, and the number of students enrolled in the course.
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To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
From: Karen Adamson
Personnel Committee
Date: May 8, 1997
C: Dr. Ivory Nelson, Dr. David Dauwalder, Interested Others

Below is the regression analysis regarding salary inequities of nontenure track faculty with academic year appointments at Central Washington University. As with Curriculum and Supervision/Teacher Education, gender is statistically significant. The law states that for women there must be equal pay for equal work.

**Summary - Nontenure Track Faculty**

Variables considered:
- Gender - (male or female)
- Terminal degree - (yes or no)
- Area of teaching - (SB&E, CEPS, CAH, COTS)

Results:

The regression equation is:

\[
\text{salary} = 32,150 - 2,225 \text{ sex} + 1,304 \text{ degree} + 8,576 \text{ sbe} - 174 \text{ cep} - 2,049 \text{ cah}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coef</th>
<th>Stdev</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>32150</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>-2224.6</td>
<td>998.6</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sbe</td>
<td>8576</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cep</td>
<td>-174</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cah</td>
<td>-2049</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[s = 3047 \quad \text{R-sq} = 70.4\% \quad \text{R-sq(adj)} = 66.8\%\]

Interpretation:

Statistically when examining all nontenure track faculty with academic year appointments, women are paid $2,225 less than men. Regression analysis determines that salary for both men and women on the average is composed of $32,150 plus $1,304 for a terminal degree minus $2,225 if you are female plus or minus the following adjustment for the college you are teaching in:

- School of Business and Economics: $8,576
- College of Education & Professional Studies: ($174)
- College of Arts and Humanities: ($2,049)
- College of the Sciences: no adjustment
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The 1997-99 biennial budget [ESHB 2259, Sections 601-610], enacted by the Washington Legislature and approved by Governor Locke, sets accountability measures for Washington's higher education system. Measures are outlined and defined in the budget's proviso language. Responsibility for measuring, and assuring achievement of, performance is assigned to the Higher Education Coordinating Board [HECB] for the four-year universities and college, and to the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges for the public two-year institutions.

For the four-year institutions, five performance measures are specified:
1. Undergraduate Graduation Efficiency Index
2. Undergraduate Student Retention
3. 5-year Graduation Rates
4. Faculty Productivity Measure (to be defined)
5. Additional measure for each of the six four-year institutions

The budget also sets statewide performance goals for the first three measures, with goals for the latter two to be determined by HECB in consultation with the institutions. Each institution's performance on these measures will be compared to a baseline from the 1995-96 academic year. A "performance gap" will be established for each institution for each measure. HECB will set performance targets for each institution for each year of the 1997-99 biennium. At the Legislature's direction, "performance targets shall be set at levels that reflect meaningful and substantial progress towards the state-wide performance goals."

As incentives for performance, funds are held in reserve until HECB approves plans for 1997-98, assesses "meaningful and substantial progress" for that year, and approves plans for 1998-99. These resources are only a small fraction of each institution's appropriation, yet they are large enough to ensure that the desire for higher education's accountability will be addressed.

The Legislature has directed HECB to develop criteria for the allotment of these performance and accountability funds. These criteria will be developed in consultation with the four-year institutions. Sufficient flexibility will be built in to reflect the individual missions, unique characteristics, and strengths of each of the universities.

For further information, contact Tom Sykes at HECB, at (360)753-7890, FAX (360)753-7808, or toms@hecb.wa.com
Authority for these guidelines is contained in the Operating Budget for the 1997-99 Biennium [Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2259, Section 601 (3)(a),(b) and Section 610,(1) through (3)], enacted by the Washington Legislature and signed by Governor Locke:

"Each institution receiving appropriations under sections 604 through 609 of this act shall submit plans for achieving measurable and specific improvements in academic years 1997-98 and 1998-99 to the Higher Education Coordinating Board. The plans, to be prepared at the direction of the Board, shall be submitted by August 15, 1997 (for academic year 1997-98)..."

These guidelines set the framework for the Accountability Plans due on August 15, 1997, from each of Washington’s six four-year public universities and college. These guidelines reflect the explicit direction as well as intent of the Legislature and the Governor, while giving flexibility to each institution. Upon receiving and reviewing these Accountability Plans, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) will set performance targets for each institution for each of five accountability measures at its meeting of September 23-24, 1997.

**Part I: Broader Context for Accountability Plans**

This context should serve as a “backdrop” for the Accountability Plans. Each institution’s accomplishments in the following areas should be only briefly summarized in their Plan.

1. **Master Plan:** The Legislature intends its actions on accountability in the 1997-99 Budget to connect with continuing efforts in higher education planning. Institutional approaches, and related strategies, also should generally connect to the themes of the 1996 State of Washington Master Plan for Higher Education, including:
   - increasing the use of technology,
   - exploring new partnerships,
   - improving the coordination of curriculum,
   - enhancing academic efficiency, and
   - improving administrative efficiency.

2. **Assessment:** The assessment initiatives that the Legislature has funded, in the amount of $11.4 million for the four-year institutions of higher education since 1989, also can be part of the context and background for each institution’s Accountability Plan. These efforts have assisted institutions and their faculty to increase and better focus student learning in degree programs; improve student quantitative analysis, writing, and critical thinking skills; and evaluate both alumni and employer satisfaction with the “products” of Washington’s higher education system.

3. **Academic Program Review:** RCW 28B.80.340 directs the HECB to “…review, evaluate, and make recommendations for the modification, consolidation, initiation, or elimination of programs at the four-year institutions…” The 1995 HECB directions for program review ask for systematic analyses of both quantitative and qualitative aspects of instructional programs, such as enrollments, labor market demand for graduates of specific programs, academic program quality, and
production of degrees. The Board's 1996 analyses of low-output and duplicative academic programs called for institutional responses, due in July 1997, which will include additional dimensions such as centrality of particular programs to the overall instructional mission of the institution and benefits over costs. Each institution's 1997-98 Accountability Plan can set a broader context for this ongoing qualitative review.

4. Diversity Efforts: The Washington Legislature, in its 1997-99 biennial budget, continues to appropriate funds to each four-year institution for recruitment and retention of minority faculty and students. Each institution has set diversity goals for student enrollment, retention and graduation, as well as faculty and staff recruitment, hiring and retention. HECB assesses achievement of these goals annually. Accomplishments and progress in this area also can give context for the development of institutional Accountability Plans for 1997-98.

**Part II: Specific Guidelines for the 1997-98 Accountability Plans**

1. **Links to Strategies:** Each institution's Accountability Plan shall include the approaches and strategies that it proposes to link to the measures specified in ESHB 2259, Section 601 (3a).

2. **Statewide Performance Goals:** The 1997-99 Budget sets statewide performance goals for three of the accountability measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability Measure</th>
<th>Performance Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Undergraduate Graduation Efficiency Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Students Beginning as Freshmen—</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Transfer Students—</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Undergraduate Student Retention:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities (UW,WSU)—</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Four-Year Institutions—</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 5-year Graduation Rate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities (UW,WSU)—</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Four-Year Institutions—</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Performance Gap:** For these three measures, as directed in ESHB 2259, Section 601 (3b), the performance gap for each measure, for each institution, will be the difference between the value of the statewide performance goal for that measure and the value of that measure in the baseline year (1995-96).

4. **Fourth and Fifth Measures:** The other two measures—a measure of faculty productivity and an additional measure, specifically linked to the mission of each institution of higher education—will be determined by the Higher Education Coordinating Board in consultation with the institutions. This process of measure definition, goal selection, and performance target specification for these two measures will be informed by the Legislature’s intent to achieve “measurable and specific improvements” [ESHB 2259, Section 601 (3a)] from the 1995-96 baseline period to the measurement year of 1997-98.

5. **Fourth and Fifth Measures—Single or Composite:** Proposals for these latter two measures can suggest either single or composite measures. Whether they are single or composite, these latter two measures should follow the logic of the three measures specified in the 1997-99 Biennial
Budget, and build in "meaningful and substantial" normative goals, performance gaps, and performance targets for 1997-98.

Composite measures should be made up of no more than four components—or sub-measures. Each sub-measure must be able to be expressed in quantitative terms and must be able to be connected to a baseline time period. Each sub-measure should also have a normative goal that is ambitious and beyond what can be achieved in a single academic year. In addition, a lay-person should be able to understand the presence or absence of "meaningful and substantial progress" [ESHB 2259, Section 601(3b)] from the baseline period to the 1997-98 academic year.

6. Performance Targets: The Legislature has directed the Board to set performance targets that reflect "meaningful and substantial progress" for each of the five accountability measures. The Board’s method, for the first three measures, is to close 100 percent of the performance gap for each measure over an eight-year period, beginning with a 7 percent closure in year one (1997-98), 8 percent in year two (1998-99), and moving to a 16 percent closure in year eight (2004-05). See the Attachment (page 4) for a description of this method, and its application to examples from the first three measures for the six four-year institutions.

Alternatively, the six four-year institutions can propose a common methodology for setting performance targets for the 1997-98 academic year for each of the five measures that will demonstrate "measurable and specific improvements", as well as give clear indication of "meaningful and substantial progress". Under a common methodology, the individual performance targets, for each measure for each institution, could, of course, be different.

7. Percent of Funds Linked to Each Measure: Each institution, in its 1997-98 plan, should indicate the percentage of its funds held in reserve to be linked to each measure. Each measure must be linked to at least 10 percent, but not more than 30 percent, of an institution’s 1998-99 allocation that is held in reserve. The Board intends to recommend the release of reserve funds, for each measure, in proportion to how much of the performance target was achieved. So, for example, if an institution met 100 percent of its performance target on the 5-year graduation rate measure, the Board would recommend release of 100 percent of the funds linked to that measure. With 80 percent achievement, the recommendation would be release of 80 percent of the reserve funds linked to that measure, and so forth.

8. Timetable for Fiscal Year 1998: The Board’s notification to the Office of Financial Management for release of fiscal year 1998 funds held in reserve for each institution will depend upon each institution submitting, by August 15, 1997, a proposed plan for achieving measurable and specific improvements during 1997-98 and the Board’s approval of that plan.

9. Timetable for Fiscal Year 1999: The Board’s notification to the Office of Financial Management for release of fiscal year 1999 funds held in reserve for each institution will depend upon timely receipt of each institution’s performance data, and an evaluation of each institution’s performance toward attaining its targets in academic year 1997-98, as well as approval of an Accountability Plan for academic year 1998-99. The recommendation for release of funds will be linked to the proportion of the performance target(s) attained for each measure by each institution.

10. Further Steps in This Process: These Guidelines are outlined at this time so the Board can provide sufficient lead time for the four-year institutions to develop their Accountability Plans for submission on August 15, 1997. Further details, to assist the institutions in compiling their Plans, will elaborate on the broad outlines contained in these Guidelines.
HECB'S METHOD FOR SETTING ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE TARGETS FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 1997-98:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gap Closure Target:</td>
<td>7% 8% 12% 14% 14% 14% 15% 16% Total 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Would This Mean for The Measures Set in the 1997-99 Budget?

Look at the Graduation Efficiency Index (Freshman), Retention Rate, and 5-Year Graduation Rate as Examples:

**Measure 1a: Graduation Efficiency Index (GEI) [For Students Beginning as Freshmen]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW (arts)</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>90.82</td>
<td>91.18</td>
<td>91.72</td>
<td>92.35</td>
<td>92.98</td>
<td>93.61</td>
<td>94.28</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>87.76</td>
<td>88.37</td>
<td>89.31</td>
<td>90.40</td>
<td>91.49</td>
<td>92.58</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWU</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>90.16</td>
<td>90.58</td>
<td>91.20</td>
<td>91.93</td>
<td>92.66</td>
<td>93.39</td>
<td>94.17</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWU</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85.70</td>
<td>86.50</td>
<td>87.70</td>
<td>89.10</td>
<td>90.50</td>
<td>91.90</td>
<td>93.40</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWU</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>91.56</td>
<td>91.86</td>
<td>92.30</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>93.34</td>
<td>93.85</td>
<td>94.41</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure 2: Undergraduate Student Retention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.33%</td>
<td>86.16%</td>
<td>87.41%</td>
<td>88.86%</td>
<td>90.32%</td>
<td>91.78%</td>
<td>93.34%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>75.49%</td>
<td>76.74%</td>
<td>78.61%</td>
<td>80.80%</td>
<td>82.98%</td>
<td>85.16%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWU</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>54.93%</td>
<td>57.53%</td>
<td>59.61%</td>
<td>61.80%</td>
<td>64.07%</td>
<td>66.34%</td>
<td>68.61%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWU</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>74.19%</td>
<td>75.55%</td>
<td>77.59%</td>
<td>79.97%</td>
<td>82.35%</td>
<td>84.73%</td>
<td>87.28%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure 3: 5-year Graduation Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>62.21%</td>
<td>62.45%</td>
<td>62.81%</td>
<td>63.23%</td>
<td>63.65%</td>
<td>64.07%</td>
<td>64.52%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>55.89%</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
<td>57.85%</td>
<td>59.22%</td>
<td>60.59%</td>
<td>61.96%</td>
<td>63.43%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWU</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>33.98%</td>
<td>35.79%</td>
<td>38.50%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>47.99%</td>
<td>51.38%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWU</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>41.05%</td>
<td>42.25%</td>
<td>44.05%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>48.25%</td>
<td>50.35%</td>
<td>52.60%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESC</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>50.35%</td>
<td>50.75%</td>
<td>51.35%</td>
<td>52.05%</td>
<td>52.75%</td>
<td>53.45%</td>
<td>54.20%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>62.21%</td>
<td>62.45%</td>
<td>62.81%</td>
<td>63.23%</td>
<td>63.65%</td>
<td>64.07%</td>
<td>64.52%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>55.89%</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
<td>57.85%</td>
<td>59.22%</td>
<td>60.59%</td>
<td>61.96%</td>
<td>63.43%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWU</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>33.98%</td>
<td>35.79%</td>
<td>38.50%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>47.99%</td>
<td>51.38%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWU</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>41.05%</td>
<td>42.25%</td>
<td>44.05%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>48.25%</td>
<td>50.35%</td>
<td>52.60%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESC</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>48.49%</td>
<td>49.05%</td>
<td>49.95%</td>
<td>50.87%</td>
<td>51.85%</td>
<td>52.83%</td>
<td>53.88%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was asked to draft a motion for the Senate's consideration on the issue of adding alternate investment vendors to the CWU Retirement Plan. The Senate may choose to take a position for or against the addition of vendors, or the Senate may choose not to take a position. If the Senate does wish to take a position, it should be forwarded to the Vice President of Business and Financial Affairs through the CWU Retirement and Insurance Committee. The following are alternate motions:

It is moved that the Faculty Senate take a position in support of adding alternate investment vendors to the CWU Retirement Plan and encourages the administration to go forward with the addition of these options.

It is moved that the Faculty Senate take a position in opposition of the addition of alternate investment vendors for the CWU Retirement Plan, due to the increase in administrative costs and the overall satisfaction with TIAA-CREF's performance.

It is moved that the Faculty Senate take no position on the addition of alternate investment vendors for the CWU Retirement Plan.

Wendy Rittereiser
Department of Human Resources
Central Washington University
E-Mail WENDYR@CWU.EDU
Phone (509) 963-2279
Fax (509) 963-1733
Ad Hoc Distance Learning Task Force Report
May 14, 1997
Submitted by:
Blaine R. Wilson, Chair

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 Nimnicht, 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 departmental 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.
What action 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 in favor of the instructor.

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 $2,000 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 $2,000 based on five credit hours at $400* per credit, and $1,000 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 course.

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?"
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, 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 its scope with 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 proposed 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 creating a number of new policies and modifying 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 sees 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 Committee 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.