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MINUTES: Regular Faculty Senate Meeting
Central Washington University
April 27, 1983
Presiding Officer: Jack Dugan, Vice-Chairman
Recording Secretary: Vicki Potts

ROLL CALL
Senators Present: All Senators and/or their Alternates were present except for J. Hawkins, and Thurston.
Visitors Present: Barney Erickson, Don Garrity, Dale Comstock, Kent Richards and Libby Nesselroad.

CHANGES TO AGENDA
The presentation on the budget by Dr. Garrity will precede Communications.

DR. GARRITY
President Garrity addressed the Senate on the present state of the budget. Because the legislature had not passed the final budget, his comments were limited to an outline of the House, Senate and Governor's proposals, and the effects that they could have on Central. The House version provides for the lowest funding and attaches the most restrictions to those funds. The Senate version allows more latitude in putting the budget together without all of the limitations and proposes a higher allocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Minutes of the April 6th meeting were approved as distributed with the correction of a typographical error.

COMMUNICATIONS
Kathleen Morris read the April 12th letter from the members of the Anthropology Department and Ethnic Studies Program requesting a postponement of the proposed code amendments with respect to the layoff policy.

REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: Catherine Sands mentioned that the committee had met with Dr. Garrity as requested in the last meeting to discuss the motion (#2174) presented by the Anthropology Department. She requested that a copy of Dr. Garrity's response be circulated to all Senators. See attached.

*MOTION NO. 2178: Catherine Sands moved and Owen Pratz seconded the following motion: Where appropriate any campus department may require that a grade of C- or better be earned in each listed prerequisite to a particular course.

Questions were raised on the necessity for the words 'Where appropriate', 'campus', the need for the statement in the catalog at all, and how it would be policed.

*MOTION NO. 2179: Catherine Sands amended the motion to read: Any department may require that a grade of C- or better be earned in each listed prerequisite to a particular course. Motion passed with one abstention.

BUDGET COMMITTEE: Rosco Tolman circulated for the Senators information, the following statement:
The Senate Budget Committee recommends that the 7% salary increase, effective on June 30, 1983, be distributed as follows:
1) to fund professional growth steps for those eligible and recommended (approximately 2%);
2) to fund merit increases (not to exceed 1%);
3) to adjust the scale by the balance available (at least 4%).
If funds are not available elsewhere in the University's budget, the Budget Committee also recommends that promotions be funded from the 7%.

Dr. Tolman indicated that the above was not listed in priority order. This statement will be presented as a motion at the next meeting. As far as he knows there will be a 7% salary increase in the new budget. He outlined the reasoning behind the committee making the above recommendation.
REPORTS

CODE COMMITTEE: Tom Yeh mentioned that the committee had met and reviewed all of the input from the code hearing and letters and they have prepared a new draft of proposed changes. All senators will receive copies of the revised proposal two weeks prior to presentation before the Senate.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE: Don Black mentioned that there will be three issues presented to the Senate at the next meeting: variable credit, the new music program and the question of the number of credits allowed in a program.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: Libby Nesselroad reviewed three issues under consideration by the personnel committee. First was whether tenure is a condition of promotion. Members unanimously felt that the code does not allow tenure as a condition for promotion, but that practice may not be consistent with the code and suggested that the Senate Executive committee communicate with department chairs, deans, the vice president for academic affairs and the President to specifically inquire about the current practice. If current practice is inconsistent with the code, then that should be addressed either by a change in the code or a change in the current practice.

Next was the possibility of a fall faculty meeting with the Board of Trustees. A forum or a smaller meeting of just Trustees and Senators was suggested in lieu of a full faculty meeting which might turn into a social hour and not meet the hoped for needs.

The last issue discussed was morale which they felt was influenced by many large and small issues. They are presently compiling these issues for the Executive committee.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: The nominations committee has acquired a number of nominees for the 83-84 Senate executive committee and need additional nominations. Suggestions are welcome.

CFR: Barney Erickson reviewed the current status of the collective bargaining bill which is now with the Governor. CFR drafted a letter to the Governor urging his signature of the bill.

Bill Chance, CPE, is now chairing the Temporary Committee on Education and Policies Structure and Management. They will be looking at kindergarten through higher education and making recommendations to the legislature about such things as transition and progression of students kindergarten through graduate school, vocational education, early childhood education, finance, management policies and procedures, teacher certification, et al.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Regular Meeting - April 6th

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. Dr. Garrity - State of the Budget

VI. REPORTS
   A. Chair
   B. General Education Committee - John Vifian
   C. Standing Committees: Executive - Jack Dugan
      Academic Affairs - Catherine Sands
      Budget - Rosco Tolman
      Code - Tom Yeh
      Curriculum - Don Black
      Personnel - Libby Nesselroad

D. Nominations Committee

E. CFR

F. President's Report

VII. OLD BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURNMENT
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PLEASE RETURN TO THE FACULTY SENATE SECRETARY
April 27, 1983

Lillian Canzler, Chair
Catherine Sands, Academic Affairs Committee
Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Campus

Dear Colleagues:

You have suggested it might be helpful to us all as we try to think clearly about what we are doing, what is happening to us, and as we make plans if I would put into writing my response to the three resolves contained in the communication from the Department of Anthropology and Ethnic Studies discussed at the Senate meeting of March 16, 1983. I am happy to do so, but ask that you recognize that I am attempting to keep my comments brief in order to ensure that they will be read.

In order to facilitate easy understanding of my comments, let me first present the resolve as it was presented to the Senate and then my comments.

1. "Education in the liberal arts and sciences be clearly/explicitly reaffirmed as the primary role/mission of Central Washington University."

I have a major problem with this statement as it is written. Although I believe I understand the intention of those who wrote it and the underlying conception which, in their minds, the use of the word "primary" in this statement, I believe, may be misleading. I do not see that in our present statement of mission and roles that we arrange any of the several instructional or educational dimensions of our mission in any kind of hierarchical order. Certainly Central Washington University did not begin as a liberal arts and sciences institution and it is not exclusively so today. I find our present statement of mission and roles to be appropriate for us at this time. I agree that the programs and curricula of this university are predicated on the centrality of education in the liberal arts and sciences in all of the programs of the University. I see this to be true not only in our conception of general education but in our sense of the completeness and wholeness of each of the programs of the University whether they be labeled as pre-professional, professional, or otherwise.

I am not aware of any effort on the part of any administrative group, faculty committee or other body of the University which
would change our statement of mission and roles. If there are those among us who believe that our mission and roles statement should be modified, I believe that such proposals should be brought before us for consideration and debate and I believe that such considerations could have nothing but a healthy effect on the University.

2. "The principle of tenure as a protection from extemporaneous/expedient administrative shifts in educational philosophy, be reaffirmed."

Although I have never thought of tenure as being fundamentally constructed "as a protection from extemporaneous/expedient administrative shifts in educational philosophy", I can understand how tenure may be seen as related to such protections. I would hold that the policies and practices of this University whether they directly or indirectly involve questions of tenure, should provide protection against unwarranted, expedient and extemporaneous shifts in educational philosophy and practice. I believe that faculty and staff of the University whether their positions involve tenure or not deserve to be protected from decisions which are made willy-nilly and in an indefensible way. The very essence of a university means that it is a planned activity. The creation of a statement of mission and roles, the establishment of programs, the design of curricula, the selection of faculty and staff, and all of the other activities which go into the creation and change of the University are acts of planning. The modification and change of the fabric of a university is likewise a planning enterprise.

I trust that all of us support the proposition that in all of these fundamental areas of our collective being as a university we must insist that the policies and practices involve rational, deliberative and defensible consideration. Our policies regarding tenure should provide some measure of protection. However, I believe that the other policies of the University which do not speak directly to tenure provide important and additional protection.

I personally see as the most important instrument of protection "from extemporaneous/expedient shifts in educational philosophy" or from shifts in educational philosophy originating from other sources other than administrative persons or groups the insistence upon a system of collegial consideration, review, debate and recommendation. I am fully convinced that the real strength of our University and thus the real protection which we individually and collectively enjoy is our ability to consider as staff, faculty, administrator and trustee questions of educational philosophy, program, objective and policy.
3. "The state of fiscal exigency be rescinded immediately and before further consideration is given to revision of lay-off policy and/or new programs."

I must disagree with this statement as I understand it. My disagreement rests first of all on a legal technicality and thereafter on my strong belief that this technicality should in no way prevent us from considering any policy or programmatic considerations which are in the best interest of the University.

The technicality involves rescinding the statement of financial exigency. All of us are aware that the legislature in three successive actions reduced the General Fund portion of the University's budget. We as a university in turn have taken actions which have resulted in the reduction of university expenditures caused by the action of the legislature. All of us are aware of the fact that the last of these three budget adjustments was completed at the end of this past summer. We are all aware that we have been operating during the course of this academic year on the final revised budget. No further actions have been taken by the legislature or the Governor to make further reductions in our budget and consequently we have in common sense terms handled the problem.

However, arising out of the budget adjustments which were made and specific actions taken in connection thereto, the University is involved in administrative hearings which are reviewing some of those actions. In these administrative hearings, the University carries the burden of proof regarding one matter. That matter for which the University carries the burden of proof is that of demonstrating that a bona fide state of financial exigency did in fact exist. Legal counsel for the University has advised me that until the matter is finally and completely presented for the hearing officer's consideration, it is his wish that I take no action of this kind which could cause a potential complication and confounding of the facts which are being judged. I have considered this legal advice and find that it is responsibly given and I have made the decision that I will follow it. I anticipate that this situation may continue to exist for a few more weeks.

I believe that we as University faculty can easily distinguish between the technical situation involving this legal consideration and the common sense fact that we have no further budget cuts and have made all of the adjustments which were required by the legislative action which produced the condition of financial exigency. Review and consideration of policy and programmatic proposals should not be hampered by such technicalities. Without speaking to or about any particular policy or programmatic proposal, I firmly believe that we have the responsibility to continue to conduct the necessary and important work of the University.
I hope that these remarks reflect the substance of the conversation that I had with the Academic Affairs Committee and Chair of the Faculty Senate. Further, I hope that these remarks are helpful and supportive of our collective effort and concern for Central Washington University today and in the future.

I will be happy to assist you in any way in handling these or other questions. Please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

Donald L. Garrity
President
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