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REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Central Washington University

February 27, 1991

Presiding Officer: Charlie McGehee
Recording Secretary: Sue Tirotta

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

ROLL CALL
Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Smith.
Visitors: Gregory Trujillo, Bob Wieking, Joan Mosebar, Kent Richards, Carolyn Wells, Steve Hinthorne, Bobby Cummings, Keith Champagne, Steve Horowitz, Phil Backlund, James Green, Paul Schmidt, Jerry Jones, Michael Launius, Andrew Bates, Peggy Cooke, Samantha Swain, Earl Clauer, William Barker, George Town, Thom Franklin, Clay Denman, Anne Denman, Walter Arlt, Jim Thomsen, Marla Pugh, Jon Elliott, Matt Braden, Dan Sutich, Russell Johansen, Barbara Radke, Jean Putnam, Courtney Jones, Curt Wiberg, Dale Otto, Dan Ramsdell, Chester Keller, Joel Andress, Nancy Hultquist, Steven Kimball, Catherine Sands and Jim Pappas.

CHANGES TO AGENDA
- Chair McGehee pointed out items #12 and #13 on the sheet titled 'Procedures for Senate meeting of February 27, 1991:' "12) If there is no objection, the order of the agenda will be changed to put the Resolution on Confidence first under New Business, and 13) If there is no objection, the agenda will be changed to cut off debate on the Resolution on Confidence at 4:30 p.m., to allow for balloting, unless debate has ended earlier. There are few items on the agenda, and there should be ample time for discussion." There were no objections to these changes.
- Chair McGehee added the names of Bobby Cummings and Patsy Callaghan to the list of those Senators who have signed the 2/15/91 memo noted as the last item under "Communications."

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes of the January 16, 1991 and January 30, 1991 Faculty Senate meetings as distributed were accepted without objection.

COMMUNICATIONS
- 2/1/91 letter from Don Schliesman, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, regarding class attendance policy; referred to Senate Academic Affairs Committee.
- 2/4/91 memo from Gerald Stacy, Dean of Graduate Studies, regarding policy change for approval of Professional Development courses; referred to Senate Curriculum Committee.
- 2/8/91 letter from Dolores Osborn (BEAM), Chair of the University Curriculum Committee, regarding interpretation of section 5 - Curriculum Planning & Procedures Guide; referred to Senate Curriculum Committee.
- 2/12/91 letter from Eric Roth, Music, regarding Senate Motion No. 2793 ("anti-war motion"); see New Business (below).
COMMUNICATIONS, continued

-2/20/91 letter from Robert Envick (IET); 2/19/91 letter from F. Ross Byrd (BEAM); 2/20/91 letter from John Gregor (PEHLS); 2/20/91 letter from Rosco Tolman (Foreign Languages); 2/19/91 letter from Owen Pratz (Psychology); 2/20/91 letter from Dale Otto (Education/ECE-TESL); 2/15/91 memo signed by Phil Backlund (Communication), Russ Schultz (Music); Rosco Tolman (Foreign Languages), John Vifian (English), Jim Hinthorne (Geology), Richard Leinaweaver (Drama), Gary Frederick (Athletics), Terry Martin (English), Bobby Cummings (English) and Patsy Callaghan (English) re. confidence vote on Provost; see New Business (below).

REPORTS

1. CHAIR
- Chair McGehee explained that several departments have not completed their election of Faculty Senators for 1991-92, so a full roster is not yet available from which to select next year’s Senate Executive Committee.

*MOTION NO. 2798 Connie Roberts moved and Patrick McLaughlin seconded a motion to suspend Faculty Senate Bylaws section III.A. (*Principal officers of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the Senate at the last regular meeting of the Winter Quarter of each academic year.*) until the April 3, 1991 Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed.

Chair McGehee added that any Senator may make a nomination to next year’s Executive Committee by 1) obtaining the nominee’s approval to be placed on a ballot and 2) notifying the Faculty Senate of the nomination by March 27, 1991.

* * * * *

*MOTION NO. 2799 Patrick McLaughlin moved and Connie Roberts seconded a motion to approve the following 1991-92 Faculty Senate meeting dates, all of which will be held at 3:10 p.m. in SUB 204-205 with the exception of the April 29, 1992 meeting, which has been scheduled for 3:10 p.m. in SUB 206-207:

1991-92 FACULTY SENATE MEETING DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 9</td>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>April 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30</td>
<td>February 5</td>
<td>April 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20</td>
<td>February 26</td>
<td>May 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion passed.

2. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
None
3. BUDGET COMMITTEE

Barry Donahue reported that the Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) passed a resolution on January 11, 1991 based on the following argument: "With a view to fostering equity within the state employment system and enhancing competitiveness with our peer institutions, the Council of Faculty Representatives supports a resolution calling for annual step or incremental (cost-of-living) salary increases for faculty, professional staff, librarians, and teaching assistants, which would be in addition to the merit salary increases (raises) currently provided by the legislature. The CFR recommends that each institution's faculty legislative body review the resolution addressing faculty salaries which is being discussed at the University of Washington, and consider adopting a similar resolution. The issue of faculty salaries has received significant attention at all CFR meetings this year. Faculty (as well as the few other higher education employee categories) do not receive any cost-of-living increment. This 'missing piece' means that 'raises' received do not result in the same actual salary increases received by most other state employees (cost-of-living increment + raises). It is crucial that this inequity be addressed."

(excerpted from 1/19/91 memo from Sue Durrant, Chair, CFR to all Washington Faculty Senates)

*MOTION NO. 2800 Barry Donahue moved the approval of the following resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE REGARDING ANNUAL SALARY INCREMENTS FOR FACULTY, LIBRARIANS AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS

WHEREAS, K-12 teachers and almost all other state employees have a funded state-wide salary allocation schedule; and

WHEREAS, University faculty, librarians and teaching assistants do not have a funded salary allocation schedule; and

WHEREAS, the lack of such a schedule and attendant annual increments contributes to a lack of competitiveness with peer institutions:

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Central Washington University Faculty Senate that the Washington State Legislature be encouraged to recognize the necessity for a funded salary allocation schedule for University faculty, which include librarians, and teaching assistants, with a view to fostering equity within the state employment system and enhancing competitiveness with our peer institutions.

*MOTION AMENDMENT NO. 2800A Eric Roth moved and Steve Olson seconded a motion to amend MOTION NO. 2800 with the following words: "...a funded salary allocation schedule for University faculty and part-time faculty, which include librarians, and teaching assistants,..."

Motion Amendment No. 2800A passed.

A Senator expressed concern regarding how such a salary increase would be funded. CFR members Erlice Killorn and Ken Gamon explained that the resolution assumes that the salary increase would be awarded
3. BUDGET COMMITTEE, continued

in addition to merit and promotion, that the resolution as stated does not exclude part-time faculty, and that CFR has no plans to bring this resolution in the form of a bill to the legislature during the current session.

Motion No. 2800 passed as amended by Motion Amendment No. 2800A.

4. CODE COMMITTEE
None

5. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
None

6. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
None

OLD BUSINESS
None

NEW BUSINESS

CONFIDENCE VOTE ON THE PROVOST

Chair McGehee reported that a petition signed by thirty-four faculty members has been received by the Senate Executive Committee. Under Section 3.40 of the Faculty Code, this qualifies as an Initiative. This petition calls for consideration of the following resolution:

*MOTION NO. 2801

BE IT RESOLVED:
That the Faculty Senate within two weeks from the date of this Senate agenda, will sponsor and conduct among the entire faculty as defined in sections 2.10, 2.15, 7.20, 7.25 and other relevant sections of the Faculty Code as interpreted by the Faculty Senate Code Committee, a formal vote to ascertain the "confidence" or "no-confidence" the faculty have in Robert V. Edington in his capacity as Provost of Central Washington University. AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:
That the results of this vote of confidence will be made available to the Faculty, the President and the Board of Trustees.

Chair McGehee recognized Robert Edington, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who addressed the Faculty Senate concerning the resolution. Provost Edington stated that C.W.U. has very bright future, and he expressed his dismay at activities here
which are divisive and destructive and which may leave this a weakened institution with some diminished credibility among our supporters, our students, and with the legislature;" he was confident "that this opportunity to clear the air will allow us to put this all behind us and emerge a better and stronger university." The Provost outlined his perception of the events which have led to conflict and lack of communication and specifically endorsed the resolution calling for a confidence vote.

Chair McGehee reported that a prior written request had been received from Senator Owen Pratz, Psychology, for a roll call vote on Motion No. 2801, whereupon Senator Pratz withdrew his request for a roll call vote.

Chair McGehee ruled that in view of the apparent resolution of contention over MOTION NO. 2801, it would be passed by general consensus if there were no further objection from the Senate.

Senator Eric Roth, Music, objected to the chair's ruling and stated his opinion that a confidence vote of the faculty concerning an administrator does not fall within the Faculty Senate's purview and negates the hierarchical structure of the university.

Senator David Carns, IET, read aloud a letter from the faculty of the Department of Industrial and Engineering Technology expressing its opinion that a confidence vote not be held on the Provost.

Senator Dieter Romboy cited a recent confidence vote on the President of the University of Utah and pointed out that a number of university faculties have made decisions on confidence in administrators without excessive damage to the public or legislative perception of the university. Senator Ken Hammond pointed out that the vote either for or against Motion No. 2801 does not indicate the Faculty Senate's confidence in the Provost but would allow faculty members to express their opinions. It was pointed out that the substantial number of departments represented by signature on the petition signifies that the request for a confidence vote is not frivolous in nature but a matter of substantial concern.

Several Senators expressed concern that many faculty members have no objective data on which to base a decision of confidence. Other Senators pointed out that a large amount of discussion has taken place and that information is readily available to those who want it. Chair McGehee informed the Senate that a ballot would pose the following categories for response: 1) I have confidence in Robert V. Edington in his capacity as Provost of C.W.U.; 2) I have no confidence in Robert V. Edington in his capacity as Provost of C.W.U.; 3) I do not know enough about Robert V. Edington in his capacity as Provost of C.W.U. to respond; and 4) I abstain from this poll. Chair McGehee went on to state that the outcome of a vote would be reported in terms of raw data only, with no attempt made at interpretation of that data. Senator Dieter Romboy stated that direct or limited contact with the Provost...
REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 27, 1991

NEW BUSINESS, continued

CONFIDENCE VOTE ON THE PROVOST, continued

and others involved is not necessary in order to make a judgment on confidence; opinions themselves are more important than what they are based on, and we are often asked in the democratic process to make uninformed decisions. Senator Barry Donahue reminded the body that since the Provost expressed his endorsement of a full faculty vote, this implies that he wants an assessment of his support among the faculty in order to function effectively. The proposal that discord be resolved strictly through appeal to a hierarchical structure was criticized by Senator Warren Street as not always workable in a university setting.

The previous question was moved, and debate on Motion No. 2801 was closed by a 2/3 vote (26 yes, 9 no, 1 abstention).

A vote was immediately taken on Motion No. 2801. Motion passed by simple majority.

FACULTY SENATE'S RIGHT TO SPEAK FOR THE FACULTY

In a February 12, 1991 letter from Eric Roth, Music, he stated the following: "The Faculty of the Department of Music has instructed me to inform the Faculty Senate of their strong displeasure, collectively and individually, in regard to Senate Motion No. 2793 [anti-war motion]. The following points were made: 1) The Faculty Senate does not have the right to speak for the entire University Faculty on such a matter, and publicity should make this point clear. 2) The Faculty Senate should not concern itself with any issue at any time that is not directly related to academic affairs, especially issues that are political in nature. Accordingly, I have been instructed to introduce the following motions:"

*MOTION NO. 2802  Eric Roth moved and Tami Schrank seconded a motion that the chair of the Faculty Senate write a letter to the local media stating that opinions of the Senate are not necessarily held by all members of the faculty. Said letter should make specific reference to Motion 2793.

Senators pointed out that those with opposing viewpoints have equal access to the media and that there is nothing that prohibits the Senate from voting on issues of a political nature. The emotional circumstances under which Motion No. 2793 was considered and passed (i.e., with five minutes left before adjournment and the announcement that bombing of Baghdad had begun) were reviewed.
FACULTY SENATE'S RIGHT TO SPEAK FOR THE FACULTY, continued

Chair McGehee emphasized that Senators are the uninstructed representatives of their constituents and that the Faculty Senate made no claim to represent the university as a whole. He added that the Music Department has also requested that "the Senate henceforth will limit its representation of the faculty to matters that directly address academe." The Executive Committee reviewed this proposal and found the wording unclear and potentially in conflict with the Faculty Code. Therefore, this request has been remanded to the Code Committee for their review and recommendation.

Vote was taken on Motion No. 2802. Motion defeated.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

* * * * * NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 3, 1991 * * * * *
FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:00 p.m., Wednesday, February 27, 1991
Bouillon 204-205

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - January 16 and January 30, 1991

IV. COMMUNICATIONS
- 2/1/91 letter from Don Schliesman, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, re. class attendance policy; referred to Senate Academic Affairs Committee
- 2/4/91 memo from Gerald Stacy, Dean of Graduate Studies, re. policy change for approval of Professional Development courses; referred to Senate Curriculum Committee
- 2/8/91 letter from Dolores Osborn (BEAM), Chair of the University Curriculum Committee, re. interpretation of section 5 - Curriculum Planning & Procedures Guide; referred to Senate Curriculum Committee
- 2/12/91 letter from Eric Roth, Music, regarding Senate Motion No. 2793 ("anti-war motion"); see New Business
- 2/20/91 letter from Robert Envick (IET); 2/19/91 letter from F. Ross Byrd (BEAM); 2/20/91 letter from John Gregor (PEHLS); 2/20/91 letter from Rosco Tolman (Foreign Languages); 2/19/91 letter from Owen Pratz (Psychology); 2/20/91 letter from Dale Otto (Education/ECE-TESL); 2/15/91 memo signed by Phil Backlund (Communication), Russ Schultz (Music); Rosco Tolman (Foreign Languages), John Vifian (English), Jim Hinthorne (Geology), Richard Leinaweaver (Drama), Gary Frederick (Athletics) and Terry Martin (English) re. confidence vote on Provost; see New Business (letters attached)

V. REPORTS
1. Chair
   - MOTION: Suspend Faculty Senate Bylaws section III.A. ("Principal officers of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the Senate at the last regular meeting of the Winter Quarter of each academic year")
   - MOTION: 1991-92 Faculty Senate Meeting Dates (attached)
2. Academic Affairs Committee
3. Budget Committee
   - Salary Resolution (see attached motion)
4. Code Committee
5. Curriculum Committee
6. Personnel Committee

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS
- MOTION: "Anti-war motion" (NO. 2793) (attached)
- RESOLUTION: Confidence vote on Provost Edington (attached)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

*** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 3, 1991 ***
MOTION:

PROPOSED 1991-92 FACULTY SENATE MEETING DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 9</td>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>April 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30</td>
<td>February 5</td>
<td>April 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20</td>
<td>February 26</td>
<td>May 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 11</td>
<td>June 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * * * * * * *

MOTION:

RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE REGARDING ANNUAL SALARY INCREMENTS FOR FACULTY, LIBRARIANS AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Whereas, K-12 teachers and almost all other state employees have a funded state-wide salary allocation schedule; and

Whereas, University faculty, librarians and teaching assistants do not have a funded salary allocation schedule; and

Whereas, the lack of such a schedule and attendant annual increments contributes to a lack of competitiveness with peer institutions;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Central Washington University Faculty Senate that the Washington State Legislature be encouraged to recognize the necessity for a funded salary allocation schedule for University faculty, which include librarians, and teaching assistants, with a view to fostering equity within the state employment system and enhancing competitiveness with our peer institutions.
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NEW BUSINESS

2/12/91 letter from Eric Roth, Music: "The Faculty of the Department of Music has instructed me to inform the Faculty Senate of their strong displeasure, collectively and individually, in regard to Senate Motion No. 2793 [anti-war motion]. The following points were made: 1) The Faculty Senate does not have the right to speak for the entire University Faculty on such a matter, and publicity should make this point clear. 2) The Faculty Senate should not concern itself with any issue at any time that is not directly related to academic affairs, especially issues that are political in nature. Accordingly, I have been instructed to introduce the following motions:"

MOTION #1: Moved, that the chair of the Faculty Senate write a letter to the local media stating that opinions of the Senate are not necessarily held by all members of the faculty. Said letter should make specific reference to Motion 2793.

MOTION #2: Moved, that the Senate henceforth, will limit its representation of the faculty to matters that directly address academe.

[MOTION #2 NOT TO BE VOTED ON AT THIS TIME; SEE COMMENT BELOW]

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee reviewed proposed Motions #1 and #2 at its February 20, 1991 meeting and concluded that the wording of Motion #2 is unclear and potentially conflicts with the Faculty Code. Therefore, Motion #2 has been remanded to the Code Committee for their review and recommendation.

The following items are attached for the Senate's information:

- 1/18/91 letter sent to KXLE Radio, KQBE Radio, The Observer, The Daily Record and President George Bush regarding Senate MOTION NO. 2793.

- 2/6/91 reply to 1/18/91 letter to George Bush -- from Shirley Green, White House/Special Assistant to the President for Presidential Messages and Correspondence.
January 18, 1991
(Sent to: KXLE Radio, KOBE Radio, The Observer, The Daily Record)

To Whom It May Concern:

At its meeting of January 16, 1991, the Faculty Senate of Central Washington University passed the following resolution, which I am forwarding to you:

Whereas, modern weapons of war are so destructive that they should be used only as a last, desperate measure when the vital interests of the nation are at stake; and

Whereas, the current Middle East Crisis does not pose a credible threat to the security of the United States; and

Whereas, the government of the United States has not exhausted the peaceful alternatives to war; and

Whereas, silence on this issue is tantamount to acquiescence in the warlike policies of the President;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Central Washington University calls on the government of the United States not to use offensive military action to try to resolve the current crisis in the Persian Gulf; and that the chairman of the Faculty Senate of Central Washington University is authorized and directed to communicate the sense of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the press.

Sincerely,

Charles McGehee, Chair
Faculty Senate

Charles McGehee
Chair
Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Bouillon 240
Ellensburg, WA 98926
We, the undersigned, request the following resolution be placed on the agenda for consideration by the Faculty Senate at its meeting of February 27, 1991.

Whereas: Provost Edington exhibits a compulsion to take action on academic matters and to implement changes in the University in the absence of timely and adequate consultation with the people affected; and

Whereas: Actions of Provost Edington have resulted in some loss of his credibility and erosion of the mutual trust necessary to a collegial environment; and

Whereas: Both the form and substance of actions taken by Provost Edington have generated anxiety and concern in the minds of many CWU faculty members; and

Whereas: The anxiety and concern generated by the decisions of Provost Edington has resulted in the continual and considerable expenditure of faculty time and energy in attempts to cope with, counter and reverse those decisions; and

Whereas: The continual, internal conflict stimulated by actions of Provost Edington is divisive, inimical to academic excellence and generally unhealthy for the university community; and

Whereas: The Faculty Senate is the only duly constituted representative body of faculty; Now, therefore

Be it resolved: That the Faculty Senate within two weeks from the date of this Senate agenda, will sponsor and conduct among the entire faculty eligible to vote for faculty senators, a formal vote to ascertain the'"confidence" or "no confidence" the faculty have in Robert V. Edington in his capacity as Provost of Central Washington University. And

Be it further resolved: That the results of this vote of confidence will be made available to the Faculty, the President and the Board of Trustees.

Signed: See pages attached.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Charlie McGehee, Faculty Senate Chair
FROM: Robert Envick, IET Department Chair
RE: Vote of Confidence/No Confidence (Provost)
DATE: February 20, 1991

Yesterday afternoon Ken Hammond stopped by my office to ask for my signature, as IET Department Chairman, in support of a confidence/no confidence proposal to be placed on the agenda and voted on by the Faculty Senate. I did not sign as I had not read some of the materials, pro and con, concerning the issue.

I have now read the materials and have two statements to make:

1. I cannot sign Ken's request, as IET Department Chairman, as I have not polled my faculty. Without doing that, I do not believe that I can, nor should I, speak for them.

2. I do (as a faculty member) support the proposed vote of confidence/no confidence.

This matter needs to be addressed and resolved in relatively short order regardless of the outcome.
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Central
Washington
University

February 19, 1991

Dr. Charles McGehee, Chair
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Charles:

Given the extent of the concerns that have been raised regarding
the Provost, I agree that a vote of the full faculty should be
conducted. At the very least, it would help "clear the air" so
all of us can get on with the job of educating students. I further
agree that such a vote should be conducted as soon as feasible to
help reduce the rumor mill and level of frustration among staff--
as well as the administration.

Sincerely,

F. Ross Byrd
Chair

The Executive Committee Faculty Senate

February 20, 1991

The Executive Committee comprised of the Chair and five Program
Directors in the department of Physical Education, Health Education
and Leisure Services met and discussed the proposed request being
sent to the faculty senate regarding a vote of confidence on the
Provost.

The Committee voted in favor of submitting the request to the
Senate and in asking them to conduct a faculty confidence vote.

John G. Zu"
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Vifian
    Russ Schultz
    Phil Backlund

    Campus

FROM: Rosco Tolman

RE: Provost Edington

DATE: Feb. 20, 1991

It is becoming increasingly evident that the only way the situation regarding the Provost is ever going to be resolved is through a vote of the faculty. I suggest that the time has come for us to abandon our efforts to prevent such a vote. While I still believe that the process is, by its nature, destructive, it is hard to imagine any situation more destructive than the one which currently exists.

It is for this reason that I have decided to support the move under way to allow the entire faculty to express itself through a vote. It seems to be the only way to bring the current difficulties to a resolution. If the Provost has the support of a majority of the faculty, his detractors have promised to abandon their efforts and make every attempt to work constructively with him. If he does not have such support he needs to resign, so we can all direct our energies toward more productive goals.

c: Charles McGehee
Dear colleagues:

I wish to give you my thoughts concerning the proposed confidence vote for Dr. Edington. I have no doubt that there are several issues and problems concerning Dr. Edington's style of administration. As a member of the Education Department, I have experienced two major results of this - one being the administration's handling of the denial of accreditation by NCATE, the other being the recent decisions (and 're-decisions') concerning replacing Dean Applegate with a group of three people to head the School of Professional Studies.

However, the most important question concerning the effect of going ahead with a confidence vote has to do with how the public, particularly the state legislature, will perceive this. Dr. Edington may survive a vote of confidence; or, he may not. In any case, it will be presented to the public as further evidence of internal disarray and division - at the time budget and major programmatic decisions are being made in Olympia. I strongly feel that going ahead with a confidence vote now will have a much more hurtful effect on our university than any internal administrative problems could have.

I also think that Dr. Edington is willing to work with any faculty groups, units or individuals, and to accommodate himself to changes in style which are necessary to open channels of communication and to develop a more participatory administrative style. I have talked frankly about these things with him, and this is my perception.

Finally, I would like to know what contingency plans or proposal(s) those who favor having a confidence vote have for dealing with the results of such a vote. If Dr. Edington is either forced out or resigns, or if he remains but with impaired effectiveness, then what? Is there an interim or a permanent arrangement envisioned to replace him? And are these ideas and plans adequate for dealing with the resulting public relations problems? I think there is an obligation which accompanies a confidence vote to describe at least in general terms the plans which speak to the possible outcomes and contingencies for each.

I feel that we will replace a problem which is now manageable but which is very large, administratively unknown, and cancerous regarding our public image if we go ahead at this time with a confidence vote. It would be much better to move in a positive direction and work with Dr. Edington to clearly see if accommodation is possible between his and our styles, thoughts, priorities and plans.

Sincerely,

Dale Otto
Professor, ECE and TESL/Bilingual Studies

cc: Professors Osman Alawiy, Parker Fawson, Randall Wallace
MEMORANDUM

To: Chairs
From: Concerned Chairs
Subject: The proposed request to the Faculty Senate to hold a vote of confidence on the Provost

Date: February 22, 1991

Some Chairs feel that there are many important reasons to reconsider the process leading to a faculty vote of confidence in Provost Edington. Such a vote is a most serious undertaking since it carries with it possible extensive negative consequences for the entire University Community. There are serious concerns about the direction and means by which the Provost has exercised his authority. There is a strong feeling among the faculty that for the current Administration to continue, progress toward better communication and sensitivity with the faculty must improve. If the University is to progress, the Provost must recognize that developing a plan for the University’s future direction is a cooperative effort. Neither he nor the faculty can succeed without the other’s support.

The risk of losing legislative support for the University is a very serious possibility. The legislature must distribute a very limited budget among many competing agencies, including all of the other colleges and universities. Regardless of the result of such a vote, it will make a clear statement of faculty and administration and disorder. This is bound to weaken our position in the legislature during a major appropriation year. We need support from the legislature for the increased enrollment needed to have at least moderate growth during the next biennium.

The Provost has proposed a number of positive changes for the University; his problems in carrying them out should not detract from his attempts and his achievements. The Provost is trying to improve the budgeting process to pay for known expenses up front. The MAT program is a serious attempt to make CWU a leader in teacher education. His attempts at increasing the number of minority faculty should be applauded, even if his methods were not always approved. Because of the changes we are not at a point where it is desirable to put the University on hold for two years while we search for a new Provost and he or she learns the job. It is by no means certain that we can find an acceptable replacement.

The chaos resulting from a forced resignation of the Provost and the weakening of the Administration will not result in any good for the University Community. We cannot arrive at shared governance by weakening the whole institution. As a faculty we must work with the Administration to achieve the goals we all want. Only in the most extreme cases is the attempt to force the Administration to fire one of its chief members justified. Such extreme action should not be undertaken until all other venues have been exhausted. The disorder that might ensue is usually not productive, and often is extremely negative.

It is clear that many of the actions of the Provost are not without fault, but nowhere is there any kind of major impeachable offence indicated in the many charges against him. Some faculty have had poor relationships with the Provost; others have had acceptable or even good relationships with him. Only the negative relations are reported or asked for. The specific charges against him should be addressed by engaging in meaningful dialogue, not the removal of personnel. The concerns that have been expressed should be the basis for further discussion. The last meeting of the chairs with the Provost indicates that he is willing to discuss issues facing the University. We should use this willingness to develop a more collegial relationship between the Administration and the Faculty.

Many of us would agree, for example, that a major problem has often been a failure of communication. Some of his proposals have sounded like platitudes, and have provoked negative responses from many of us. We must continue to strengthen the lines of communication using the existing structures. Chairs should continue to be an active group and participate in University decisions. We need to elect a "Chair of Chairs" who will meet regularly with the Deans and the Provost. The Chairs should meet regularly as a group, and have representation on the Academic Council.

In spite of our many real and serious concerns, let us work together to make this University succeed. Above all, let us avoid an extremely untimely conflict with the Administration.

If you agree with this position, or if for other reasons you do not wish to conduct a vote of confidence on the Provost at this time, please add your name to the list below and forward it to the Faculty Senate Chair.

This response has been prepared by: PHILIP BACKLUND RUSS A. SHULTZ ROSCO N. TOLLMAN JOHN L. VIFIAN JIM MINTHORNE RICHARD LEINWEAVER CARY C. FREDERICK TERRY MARTIN
ATTENTION, ATTENTION, ATTENTION !!!

THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 27, 1991 WILL BE HELD IN SUB 204-205 (RATHER THAN IN BOUILLON 204-205, AS STATED ON THE MEETING AGENDA).

ATTENTION, ATTENTION, ATTENTION !!!

THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 27, 1991 WILL BE HELD IN SUB 204-205 (RATHER THAN IN BOUILLON 204-205, AS STATED ON THE MEETING AGENDA).
ROLL CALL 1990-91

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF February 27, 1991

Osman ALAWIYE
E.E. BILYEU
Peter BURKHOLDER
David CARNS
John CLARK
Ken CORY
David DARDA
Barry DONAHUE
Clint DUNCAN
Steven FARKAS
Jennifer FISHER
Ken GAMON
Donald GARRITY
Ed GOLDEN
Ken HAMMOND
Jim HAWKINS
Erlice KILLORN
Karina KUHLMIEIER
Larry LOWTHER
Charles McGEHEE
Patrick McLAUGHLIN
Jack McPHERSON
Deborah MEDLAR
Vince NETHERY
Steve OLSON
Patrick OWENS
Gary PARSON
John PICKETT
Jim PONZETTI
Owen PRATZ
Connie ROBERTS
Eric ROTH
Tami SCHRANK
Stephen SMITH
Warren STREET
Alan TAYLOR
Randall WALLACE
Rex WIRTH
Roger YU

Andrea BOWMAN
Dieter ROMBOY
Raeburne HEIMBECK
Walter KAMINSKI
Teresa MARTIN
Gary GALBRAITH
John CARR
George TOWN
Walt EMKEN
Don RINGEN

Stephen HINTHORNE
Robert EDINGTON
Morris UEBELACKER
Betty EVANS
Patricia MAGUIRE
Dan RAMSDELL
Charles HAWKINS

Dick WASSON
Stephen JEFFERIES
John HERUM
Thomas YEH
George KESLING
Andrew SPENCER
Ethan BERGMAN
Jim GREEN
Ken HARSHA
Geoffrey BOERS

Richard MACK
Max ZWANZIGER
Roger GARRETT

Robert JACOBS

1/24/91 (RL:31)
**VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Angell</td>
<td>Jim Thomsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Wibbing</td>
<td>Marla J. Pugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Marlow</td>
<td>Jon Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Nichols</td>
<td>Matt Braden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Wellen</td>
<td>Dan Sutich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Hutton</td>
<td>Russell Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Klumpp</td>
<td>Barbara Roelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith M. Chezgn</td>
<td>Jan Haines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Horning</td>
<td>lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Redlund</td>
<td>Kurt Weller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Wilson</td>
<td>Dale Otis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Schmidt, Daily Record</td>
<td>Mike Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry L. Jones</td>
<td>Tom H. Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lawman</td>
<td>Nancy B. Nucko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark West</td>
<td>Steve R. Kippling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Bates</td>
<td>Catherine J. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leona Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Furman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Haynes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Berkman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. R. Penn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Franklin - Herald Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE F. PERRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please sign your name and return this sheet to the Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.
TO: Faculty Senators and Seated Alternates
FROM: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
DATE: February 27, 1991
RE: NEW BUSINESS

A petition signed by thirty-four faculty members has been received by the Executive Committee. Under Section 3.40 of the Faculty Code, this qualifies as an Initiative. This petition calls for consideration of the following resolution:

Be it resolved: That the Faculty Senate within two weeks from the date of this Senate agenda, will sponsor and conduct among the entire faculty eligible to vote for faculty senators as defined in sections 2.10, 2.15, 7.20, 7.25 and other relevant sections of the Faculty Code as interpreted by the Faculty Senate Code Committee, a formal vote to ascertain the "confidence" or "no-confidence" the faculty have in Robert V. Edington in his capacity as Provost of Central Washington University. And

Be it further resolved: That the results of this vote of confidence will be made available to the Faculty, the President and the Board of Trustees.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee finds the wording "...eligible to vote for faculty senators" to be vague and in contravention of the Faculty Code. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee, therefore, replaces these words with those underlined in order to reflect the Code definition of "faculty."

This wording is that which is placed before the Faculty Senate for its consideration. It needs no motion or second since it gains its standing through compliance with the Faculty Code.
In anticipation of the Senate meeting of February 27, 1991, and especially the anticipated debate on the resolution concerning a referendum on the Provost, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee wishes to make known certain rules, procedures and other considerations which will be in effect for this meeting. PLEASE DISCUSS THESE WITH YOUR DEPARTMENT PRIOR TO THE MEETING.

1. While the meeting will be public, it will not be a public forum. The Chair will recognize only senators and seated alternates for the debate. The Provost will also be recognized by the Chair. Non-senators or non-seated alternates will be permitted to participate if a senator or seated alternate yields the floor to him or her. Otherwise, others will be recognized by the Chair only if they have specific information useful for the debate or if no senators or seated alternates wish to speak. Such additional debate may be limited at the discretion of the Chair.

2. All debate will be addressed to the Chair and not to specific persons. Speakers will refrain from personal attacks and pejorative language.

3. The issue as currently worded is only whether to refer the question to the faculty as a whole. The Chair will limit debate to matters germane to this point.

4. Voting will follow the requirements of the Senate Bylaws, Section V.B:

A simple majority of the elected members of the Faculty Senate shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Except as otherwise provided in the Faculty Code, all actions of the Faculty Senate shall be by majority vote of all members of the Senate present and voting at the time of voting. All votes on formal motions shall be recorded and approved by a vote of the Senate. Voting will generally be by voice or show of hands, but any Senator has the right to demand a roll call vote on any motion, either before or immediately after the vote is taken.

5. A written request by a senator for a roll call vote has been received. Therefore, voting on the main motion will be by roll call. The roll-call vote will be immediately preceded by a written, secret straw vote which will be tallied and immediately reported to the Senate. There will be no debate between the straw vote and the roll-call vote.
6. The Chair will not relinquish the gavel to participate in the debate, though the Chair may provide procedural and substantive information he deems useful to the debate as the occasion arises.

7. The Chair will not vote except to break a tie.

8. The Faculty Code Section 3.15.A.2. stipulates that the President is an ex officio member of the Senate without vote. Student representatives are full voting members of the Senate.

9. In the event the motion passes as written, the definition of Faculty as defined in Sections 2.10, 2.15, 7.20, 7.25 and other relevant sections of the Faculty Code as interpreted by the Faculty Senate Code Committee where necessary, will prevail for purposes of voting, the wording of the motion notwithstanding.

10. Senators' attention is called to the following Section I.D. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws:

   Individual Faculty Senators are the uninstructed representatives of their constituents. Senators have the responsibility to act in a fiduciary capacity in relation to their constituents and to seek their opinions. However, having exercised such responsibility, individual Faculty Senators shall be free to make their own decisions, to speak and vote on matters according to their own reasoned judgments.

11. Further attention is called to Section II.C.2. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws:

   When it is necessary for a departmental or at-large Senator to be absent from a Senate meeting, such Senator shall notify his/her alternate of his/her intended absence. Senate Alternates, when acting in the capacity of Senator, shall have all the powers and responsibilities of Senators.

12. If there is no objection, the order of the agenda will be changed to put the Resolution on Confidence first under New Business.

13. If there is no objection, the agenda will be changed to cut off debate on the Resolution on Confidence at 4:30 p.m., to allow for balloting, unless debate has ended earlier. There are few other items on the agenda, and there should be ample time for discussion.

14. If there is objection to either of the preceding changes to the Agenda, they must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. This vote is not debatable.

cc: Department Chairs
    Program Directors
    The Provost
    Deans
Remarks to Faculty Senate February 28, 1991

Thank you for the opportunity to address a few remarks to you, the members of the Senate, on the matter currently before you.

First, I want to state here that I truly love this university and believe that it has the potential for a very bright future. It is proper that we should be engaged in meaningful discussions about the future of Central. Among the institutions of society, the university setting is indeed the appropriate place for discussion, reasonable debate, analysis, and negotiation. The Senate has an important role to play in such discussions.

Now, however, it is unfortunate that we are engaged in activities here which are divisive and destructive and which may leave this a weakened institution with some diminished credibility among our supporters, our students, and with the legislature. I am confident, however, if handled properly, that this opportunity to clear the air will allow us to put this all behind us and emerge a better and stronger university. For me personally, therefore, I hope the Senate calls for a review by the full faculty. I specifically endorse the resolution calling for such a review.

The matter which appears to have led to the controversy currently before you began for me, I believe, about a year and a half ago when I heard of a meeting of a group of department chairs and directors (principally from the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences) who evidently had some grievances with me. The Dean of the College evidently was not invited to participate in their discussions. When I learned of this meeting, I expressed to several chairs my willingness to discuss any matters of concern with them. This offer was rejected and the core group then requested a meeting with the President. Evidently at the request of the President, some of the CLAS chairs and I met. This meeting turned out to be the most confrontational experience imaginable. No reasoned discussion of issues took place. Subsequent to that meeting I offered on several occasions, both through individual chairs and through the Dean, to meet for a true exchange of ideas about the issues and about any additional concerns, hopes, and expectations which anyone might have. I offered to meet with all of the CLAS chairs, with some of the chairs, or with any individual. Indeed, I did have fruitful meetings with some individual chairs and other individual members of the faculty, and the Dean and I have engaged in very useful discussions about the problems within CLAS. But no meetings were requested by the group of chairs who have led this movement, and I have received no letters, memoranda, or any other communication from them. During all of this time, I have met with many groups in this university about matters of concern and of substance, including meetings with departments and with department chairs around other issues.

Since coming here, one of my major goals has been to strengthen university academic structure and process. There is a formal structure for communicating. Each faculty member has been hired by, and is a member of, a department; each department has a department chair; each department chair is responsible to a dean. I meet with the Deans on a regular basis to provide open discussion on matters of importance to the functioning of this university. The President oversees all of our activity and reports to the Board of Trustees. This formal organizational structure has not led to any open discussion of these matters either. So there have been many opportunities, both within the formal organizational structure and through informal channels, to bring any matters of concern forward for discussion and resolution. Unfortunately, this has not happened.

But now these matters have been brought to you. I believe that the Senate has a serious responsibility here. I hope that your actions will serve to resolve this matter so that this university can progress for the good of all its members. I wish you well for the sake of us all.
MEMORANDUM

TO:       Colleagues
FROM:     Robert V. Edington, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
DATE:     February 28, 1991
SUBJECT:  Remarks to Faculty Senate February 27, 1991

Several people have asked me for a written copy of the remarks I made to the Faculty Senate on February 27. I have decided to share that brief statement with the whole faculty rather than just a few. I would be pleased to receive any comments which you wish to make.

After the Senate meeting at which these remarks were made, several people suggested to me that it would be helpful if I met with groups of faculty in the schools and college to speak openly about the issues. Responding to that, I have set up the following meetings. I hope that you can attend the meeting designated for your academic area:

Wednesday, March 6
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m. (Group) School of Business and Economics Faculty
4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. (Group) School of Professional Studies Faculty

Thursday, March 7
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m. (Group) Humanities/Fine Arts Faculty
4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. (Group) Social Science Faculty

Friday, March 8
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m. (Group) Science/Mathematics Faculty
4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. (Group) Social Science Faculty

I am scheduled to be on the west side March 5 and will meet with faculty at Lynnwood at 1:00 and South Seattle (including Stellacoom faculty) at 4:00. I have already scheduled a meeting with the library faculty for March 6 about another matter, but I would like to discuss these issues with them following that meeting.

If these meetings are inconvenient for you, I would be happy if you would call my office and set an individual appointment.
From: Charles McGehee  
Chair, Faculty Senate  
Bouillion 240  
Central Washington University  
(509) 963-3231 SCAW 453-3231

PLEASE ROUTE TO:

XX ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE:

Peter Burkholder, Philosophy (CHAIR
Ken Hammond, Geography
Gary Heesacker, Accounting
Jean Putnam, HPER
Andrea Bowman, Education
Jennifer Fisher, ASCWU/BOD

☐ For your information
☐ For your action
☐ Need not return
☐ For your files
☐ Let’s discuss
☐ Please answer
☐ Please return

MESSAGE: Please review and make a recommendation
to the Faculty Senate.
Charles McGehee, Chair
Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Campus

Dear Dr. McGehee:

During its meeting on January 29, 1991 the Undergraduate Council approved a motion proposing modification of the class attendance policy. The first paragraph of the present policy is typed below with the proposed new wording in parentheses.

(Class attendance may be required at the discretion of the instructor to meet the educational objectives of the course.) If a student fails to attend a class in which enrolled by the end of the third instructional day of the quarter, the course instructor may drop the student from the class roll and fill the space with another student. The instructor must notify the Registrar so the dropped student can be informed and the added student registered. Students are responsible for informing course instructors when it is impossible to attend the first class meeting.

I support the proposed change for several reasons. First, the current policy is not clear. The second sentence implies that attendance is mandatory in some courses, but does not give the student much help in finding out which ones. The proposed change clearly tells the student that the instructor must tell them if attendance is required. The second reason I like the suggested change is because it responds better to the wishes of the faculty, at least as I have understood them in the past. Whenever the subject of mandatory class attendance has been discussed in the Undergraduate Council or on the floor of the Senate, the faculty seems to be clearly divided -- some favoring it and
some opposing. The proposed policy would allow those who want to require attendance to do so, and those who do not would not have to. The change being suggested appears to be a good change. I recommend it be approved by the Senate.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Schliesman
Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies

DMS:rd

G:11
From: Charles McGehee  
Chair, Faculty Senate  
Bouillon 240  
Central Washington University  
(509) 963-3231 SCAN 453-3231

PLEASE ROUTE TO:

XX SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:

- Jerry Hogan, Library
- Robert Jacobs, Political Science
- James Ponzetti, Home Economics
- Warren Street, Psychology (CHAIR)
- Morris Uebelacker, Geography
- Jennifer, Fisher, ASCWU/BOD

XX For your action

MESSAGE: Please review and make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles McGehee, Chair  
Faculty Senate

FROM: Gerald Stacy, Dean  
Graduate Studies and Research

DATE: February 4, 1991

RE: Changes to Professional Development Proposal

Would you please have the Faculty Senate take a look at the attached memo and forms relating to a change in procedure for implementing a Professional Development 500 course. If the Senate approves of this change, the Curriculum Procedures will need to be updated.

Please call me if you have any questions on this.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans, Department Chairs, Program Directors

FROM: Gerald J. Stacy, Dean of Graduate Studies & Research

DATE: January 28, 1991

RE: Proposal forms for Special Topics, Seminars, Workshops, and Professional Development

The Graduate Council recently approved changes to the Professional Development (500) course proposal. A new form has been created specifically for proposing a Professional Development 500 course. A copy of this form is attached. Please keep it on hand as your original for copying more forms.

Professional Development courses will no longer be shown on the same listing as Special Topics, Seminars, and Workshops, nor will they require a two-week review period before approval. Please note, though, that 500 course proposals must be submitted to Extended University Programs at least four weeks prior to the first class session or they will not be considered.

The proposal process has not changed for Special Topics, Seminars, or Workshops, although the form has. A copy (to use as your original) is also attached.

If you have any questions on these new procedures, please call my office at 3101.

ck

Attachments
Central Washington University
Proposal for
Professional Development 500

Directions for submission of Proposal Form

A. Course Proposal forms must be submitted to Extended University Programs at least four weeks prior to the first class session or they will not be considered.

B. Check the appropriate box with regard to the number of times this course will be offered.

- □ only once
- □ occasionally
- □ frequently

C. Adjunct must be approved before the course can be scheduled.

D. Complete both sides of the form (please type).

E. All 500 courses should be graded S or U, justification for letter grades is required.

| Originated or submitted by: ____________________________ |
| Department __________________ Date Initiated ____________ |

1. Title ___________________________________________ Credits ________
   List abbreviated title for transcript. Limited to 18 spaces, including punctuation.

2. Course description (brief-25 words or less):

3. If this course duplicates or approximates some other course now offered, specify an interdepartmental agreement.

4. Describe the need for this course, including anticipated course clientele. Be specific.

5. Describe arrangements which have been made to staff the course for the initial offering.
   Instructor ____________________________ Rank ____________________________
   Dates and time __________________________________________________________
   Anticipated enrollment ____________________________________________________

6. Describe special facilities, materials and/or equipment needs.


8. Approval
   Signature Date
   Department Chair ____________________________
   School/College Dean ____________________________
   Graduate Studies Dean ____________________________

GSR:1/91 (Submit in Quadruplicate)
Central Washington University
Proposal for
Professional Development 500

Directions for submission of Proposal Form

A. Course Proposal forms must be submitted to Extended University Programs at least four weeks prior to the first class session or they will not be considered.

B. Check the appropriate box with regard to the number of times this course will be offered.
   - [ ] only once
   - [ ] occasionally
   - [ ] frequently

C. Adjunct must be approved before the course can be scheduled.

D. Complete both sides of the form (please type).

E. All 500 courses should be graded S or U, justification for letter grades is required.

Originated or submitted by: ___________________________________________

Department __________________________ Date Initiated __________________

1. Title ____________________________________ Credits _____
   List abbreviated title for transcript. Limited to 18 spaces, including punctuation.
   __________________________________________

2. Course description (brief-25 words or less):

3. If this course duplicates or approximates some other course now offered, specify an interdepartmental agreement.

4. Describe the need for this course, including anticipated course clientele. Be specific.

5. Describe arrangements which have been made to staff the course for the initial offering.
   Instructor __________________________ Rank __________________________
   Dates and time __________________________________
   Anticipated enrollment __________________________

6. Describe special facilities, materials and/or equipment needs.


8. Approval
   Department Chair __________________________ Signature __________________________ Date __________
   School/College Dean __________________________ __________________________
   Graduate Studies Dean __________________________ __________________________

GSR:1/91 (Submit in Quadruplicate)
From: Charles McGehee
Chair, Faculty Senate
Bouillon 240
Central Washington University
(509) 963-3231 SCAN 453-3231

PLEASE ROUTE TO:

FACULTY SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:

Jerry Hogan, Library
Robert Jacobs, Political Science
James Ponzetti, Home Economics
Warren Street, Psychology (CHAIR)
Morris Uebelacker, Geography
Jennifer Fisher, ASCWU/BOD

For your information
For your action
Need not return
For your files
Let's discuss
Please answer (Dolores Osborn, UCC; c: Don Schliesman
Senate Executive Committee)
Please return

MESSAGE:

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
February 8, 1991

Dr. Charles L. McGehee
Chair, Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Campus

Dear Dr. McGehee

The University Curriculum Committee needs clarification of information adopted by the Faculty Senate on October 31, 1990, and included in the Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide on page 10, section 5.

At its January 31 meeting, varying interpretations were expressed regarding the statement that "Course requirements for admission to the major will be counted in the credit total for the major." Does this mean that no CWU courses are to be listed in the program description but instead must be listed with the required courses and the credits for these courses added to the total for the program?

What is meant by the statement "entry skill requirements" should be introduced in the program description preceding the listing of required courses? If specific CWU courses cannot be listed, what are appropriate ways of describing these entry skill requirements? Again, committee members disagreed on the interpretation of this statement. Some felt that generic names might be given to these requirements, such as pre-calculus mathematics or mechanical drawing.

Was any consideration given as to whether these entry skill requirements be only courses one could have completed at the secondary school level or whether they might include knowledge or course work completed at the post-secondary level? The committee members did not agree on the types of entry skills which might be listed here so some further explanation is desired. (The University Curriculum Committee did approve a program change for the Manufacturing Engineering Technology Major only yesterday which those members present felt met the Guideline requirement. The statement read: "Students must have the appropriate background in pre-calculus mathematics and basic engineering drawing. It may be necessary, by advisement, to take courses in these areas." Was the Guideline properly interpreted in this instance?)
Since "extensive listings of career opportunities and messages
designed to encourage students to choose a major are
inappropriate," in the program description, how can any listings
be unacceptable when another statement directs that "professional
applications" be included in the program description? Who will
determine that a listing is "extensive"?

Another concern raised was whether or not program descriptions
should be so rigidly prescribed by the Guide. Adding lengthy
descriptions to each program in the catalog will certainly add to
the length of that document. And, does the Faculty Senate really
wish to have such program descriptions considered by all groups
involved in the curriculum approval process, including the
Senate, each time the description is revised? Generally, the
Committee felt that departments should be encouraged to develop
student handbooks for their majors which could contain this
information.

Please reconsider the action taken on this addition to the
Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide. Should you wish to
discuss these concerns with me, I can be reached at 3014.

Sincerely

Dolores J. Osborn, Chair
University Curriculum Committee

Cc Dr. Donald M. Schliesman
University Curriculum Committee Members
REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
October 31, 1990  
Page 5

6. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, continued

Arts and Sciences, reported that similar problems are arising with the proliferation of 500 level Professional Development courses, which have no "sunset clause" and may be re-approved indefinitely. It was suggested that the mechanism to deal with open content courses be strengthened.

Motion passed (unanimous).

* * * * * * * *

*MOTION NO. 2780 Warren Street moved and Ken Hammond seconded a motion to add a new section 5 to page 10 of the Curriculum Planning and Procedures guide and iterate the section numbers of existing section 5-17 that follow. The new section 5 should read:

5. Program descriptions

Major and minor programs should be introduced by a brief description of the subject content of the major, entry skill requirements, formal requirements for admission to the program, specialization options, advisement procedures, and professional applications. Extensive listings of career opportunities and messages designed to encourage students to choose a major are inappropriate.

Formal requirements for admission to the major must be approved by the Undergraduate Council. Course requirements for admission to the major will be counted in the credit total for the major.

A Senator pointed out that the Dean of Undergraduate Studies' Office already edits program descriptions before including them in the university catalog. Warren Street pointed out that this change in the Curriculum Planning and Procedures guide will provide valuable advice to departments in creating program descriptions.

Motion passed (1 no, 0 abstentions).

* * * * * * * *

*MOTION NO. 2781 Warren Street moved and James Ponzetti seconded a motion to endorse the general principles of the Masters of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) proposal (as described on page 4 of "A Restructured Teacher Education Program for Central Washington University, October 1990," with the following understandings:

a. There is no endorsement of any specific curriculum elements or groupings of curriculum elements, including the curriculum examples described in the MAT proposal itself;

b. Endorsement is subject to assurance that the specific curriculum will conform to high academic standards;

c. Separate bachelor's and master's segments make up the program and independent admissions procedures precede each segment;

d. That principle #2 on page 4 be changed from "That the new program should not provide initial certification with the Baccalaureate degree" to read "That the new program should ordinarily provide initial certification with the Master's degree."

Warren Street emphasized that no specific curricula, but only general principles, are being endorsed by the Senate Curriculum Committee in this motion. Senators expressed concern about the haste with which the proposed restructuring is being presented and asked what Central hopes to obtain by quickly approving the principles set forth
Date 3/6/91

From: Charles McGehee
Chair, Faculty Senate
Bouillion 240
Central Washington University
(509) 963-3231 SCAN 453-3231

PLEASE ROUTE TO:

XX FACULTY SENATE CODE COMMITTEE:

Cathy Bertelson, BEAM
Russell Hansen, Sociology
Deborah Medlar, Accounting (CHAIR)
Randall Wallace, Education
Max Zwaniger, Psychology

☐ For your information
XX For your action
☐ Need not return
☐ For your files
☐ Let's discuss
☐ Please answer
☐ Please return

MESSAGE: Please review Motion No. 2 (*) on the attached letter from Eric Roth, Music. The wording of the motion is unclear and potentially conflicts with the Faculty Code. You should make a recommendation to the Senate (via the Executive Committee) on this item.

THANKS!
Date 3/6/91

From: Charles McGehee
Chair, Faculty Senate
Bouillon 240
Central Washington University
(509) 963-3231 SCAN 453-3231

PLEASE ROUTE TO:

XX FACULTY SENATE CODE COMMITTEE:

Cathy Bertelson, BEAM
Russell Hansen, Sociology
Deborah Medlar, Accounting (CHAIR)
Randall Wallace, Education
Max Zwanziger, Psychology

☐ For your information
☐ For your action
☐ Need not return
☐ For your files
☐ Let’s discuss
☐ Please answer
☐ Please return

MESSAGE: Please review Motion No. 2 (*) on the attached letter from Eric Roth, Music. The wording of the motion is unclear and potentially conflicts with the Faculty Code. You should make a recommendation to the Senate (via the Executive Committee) on this item.

THANKS!
Dear Charlie,

In the printed agenda for the 3/27 Senate meeting, would you please include the entire letter (enclosed) rather than the motions by themselves. This also is in accordance with the wishes of the Music Faculty.

Thanks for your indulgence on this matter. I'm fully in sympathy with your position of being between "a rock and a hard place."

Sue

#2
February 12, 1991

Professor Charles McGehee
Chair, Faculty Senate

Dear Dr. McGehee:

The Faculty of the Department of Music has instructed me to inform the Faculty Senate of their strong displeasure, collectively and individually, in regard to Senate Motion No. 2793.

The following points were made:

1. The Faculty Senate does not have the right to speak for the entire University Faculty on such a matter, and publicity should make this point clear.

2. The Faculty Senate should not concern itself with any issue at any time that is not directly related to academic affairs, especially issues that are political in nature.

Accordingly, I have been instructed to introduce the following motions:

1. Moved, that:

The chair of the Faculty Senate write a letter to the local media stating that opinions of the senate are not necessarily held by all members of the faculty. Said letter should make specific reference to Motion 2793.

2. Moved, that:

The Senate henceforth, will limit its representation of the faculty to matters that directly address academe.

Sincerely,

Eric Roth