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MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 17 May 1978
Presiding Officer: J. Arthur Keith
Recording Secretary: Esther Peterson

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except Richard Doi, Michael Golden, Peter Gries, A. James Hawkins, Betty Hileman, W. Clair Lillard, Mary Mahan, Margaret Sahlstrand and Dale Samuelson.


CHANGES TO AGENDA

Mr. Keith announced the following changes:

1. Under "Communications" add
   B. Letter from Vice President Harrington, dated May 11, 1978
   C. Letter from Burton Williams, dated May 11, 1978
   D. Letter from Vice President Harrington, dated May 11, 1978
   E. Memorandum from Fred Cutlip and Ron Frye, dated May 12, 1978
   F. Letter from President Brooks, dated May 17, 1978

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the Senate meeting of May 3, 1978, were approved as distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

A. Letter from Linda Clifton, dated May 4, 1978, acknowledging receipt of the Senate's proposed Faculty Code amendments of April 10, 1978. She also acknowledged receipt of the Senate's memo of January 31 and the copy of the recommendation mentioned in it. The Board concurred in the Senate's findings concerning interpretations of leaves of absence and differentiation of probationary times for tenure and seniority. She also thanked Mr. Keith, and the Senate, for the kind remarks on the way the presidential search and the Board of Trustees' meetings have been conducted.

B. Letter from Vice President Harrington, dated May 11, thanking Mr. Keith for his letter regarding the Faculty Senate's recommendation on the designation of three departments within the School of Business Administration and Economics. Mr. Harrington is holding the recommendation in abeyance until Dr. Garrity arrives in September and has the opportunity to review the total organizational structure. Mr. Harrington mentioned, as to the amendment that "faculty members, currently teaching in more than one of the areas shall receive joint appointments," he could only say that he shares Mr. Keith's concern as to its "acceptability." Mr. Harrington said he believes this really is a recommendation that has to come from within the School of Business Administration and Economics, not from the Faculty Senate. He therefore will await Dean Ball's recommendation on the matter of titles.

C. Letter from Burton Williams, Dean of the School of Social & Behavioral Sciences, dated May 11, saying he has reviewed the proposal for restructuring campus committees as presented by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and commented he believes the proposal to restructure the Teacher Education Council places all too much power in the hands of too few people with the distinct possibility that academic departments will lose all representation.
D. Letter from Vice President Harrington, acknowledging receipt of the letter regarding the Faculty Senate's recommendation on the separation of the Mass Media Program from the Department of Communication. He will hold the recommendation in abeyance until Dr. Garrity arrives in September and has the opportunity to review the total organizational structure.

E. Memorandum from Fred Cutlip and Ron Frye, for the Teacher Education Council, dated May 12, 1978, regarding the proposal for restructuring campus committees. They mentioned that the Teacher Education Council discussed the proposal at its May 10 meeting, and while there was general agreement to the proposal, some concerns were expressed. The Council asked them to communicate those concerns, which they have listed in the memorandum.

F. Letter from President Brooks, dated May 17, re-submitting the proposal regarding Revision to the Faculty Code--R.I.F., previously submitted to the Senate on April 4, 1978. The new date of submission will be May 17, 1978.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

A. Undergraduate Curriculum proposals, pages 490 and 491.

MOTION NO. 1736: Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Mr. Tolman, to approve the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee's proposed Course Additions, SPAN 383, HOCT 456, and AERO 484, on page 490. Passed by a majority voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1737: Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Mr. Tolman, that the Undergraduate Committee's Program Initiation, Bilingual Studies, listed on page 490-491, be tabled until the next regular Senate meeting.

The rationale for this motion was that the Bilingual major (English-Spanish) as it is presented in the proposal has no English language courses. Presumably, it is the assumption that people would be quite literate in English. It was generally agreed that the program would be strengthened by adding a course in English grammar. The proposal has gone back to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, to be presented later.

Motion No. 1737 voted on and passed by a unanimous voice vote and one abstention.

B. Graduate Curriculum Committee proposals, pages 93 and 94.

MOTION NO. 1738: Mr. King moved, seconded by Ms. Young, to approve the Graduate Curriculum Committee's proposals on pages 93 and 94. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and one abstention.

REPORTS

A. Chairman--Mr. Keith commented on actions by the Board of Trustees relative to the Faculty Code, Section 3.78 B. Reduction in Force Policy. At their meeting May 12, they deferred action on it until next fall.

The Board of Trustees ruled to support the interpretation made by the Senate Code Committee regarding the interpretation of leaves of absence as it related to seniority. The Board has not ruled on the most recent interpretation by the Senate Code Committee regarding faculty member's consent and the moving of location. Mr. Keith has requested they act on that at their June 9 meeting.

The Senate Executive Committee has scheduled a meeting with President-elect Garrity for 4:00 Friday afternoon, May 19. It is the intention of the Executive Committee not to confront him with a number of things they think he ought to do when he arrives, but rather to try to establish a basis of understanding between the role of the president and the role of the Faculty Senate in the decision making processes and encourage him to make ample use of the Senate in terms of seeking recommendations.

The Year Round Scheduling Task Force has completed its initial task and is in the process of submitting a final report to the Senate Executive Committee and to the Vice President and his Advisory Council, and to President Brooks and President-elect Garrity.

A list of the newly elected Senators and the roster of Senators for next year have been distributed at this meeting. The list constitutes the make-up of the Senate, effective June 15. Nominations for the Senate Executive Committee should be made from the names of the Senators on the list and nominations should be filled in on the ballot provided at the top of the list, and sent to the Senate office by May 26. Mr. Keith reminded Senators
they must secure the consent of the nominees before nominating a senator. A ballot will be prepared and distributed at the May 31 meeting. At that time, nominations may be made from the floor, provided the consent of the nominee has been secured.

Nominations are being received for the Grievance Committee and these will be balloted on at that meeting, also.

Mr. Keith recommended that Senators urge faculty members in their departments to complete their pledge cards for CIF Fund and turn them in.

A lengthy report from the Recruitment and Retention Committee has been received, listing some 35 recruitment activities which they have been engaging in this year, and 8 or 9 retention activities.

C. Executive Committee--no report.

D. Standing Committees--

1. Academic Affairs Committee--Mr. Andress, Chairman, presented the year end report and copies were distributed to Senators. He commented there were several items listed which need to be considered by the next year's Academic Affairs Committee. Two of these items are of high priority and he therefore would present motions on them.

MOTION NO. 1739: Mr. Andress moved, seconded by Mr. Carlson, that the Academic Affairs Committee for next year be charged to study Item 5, page 2, of the report regarding changing the name of Department of Education to School of Education.

The Committee recommended that this item be given high priority on the agenda of next fall's committee.

Mr. Keith said Motion No. 1739 will be placed on the May 31 Agenda under Old Business and voted on at that time.

Mr. Harrington commented this change of name request from the School of Education is not the only one coming up. The T & I. E. Department has submitted a request to him to become the School of Industry. He was recently in California and met with President-elect Garrity and they agreed not to move ahead on these requests until he arrives on campus. In terms of replacing Dean Erickson, they will appoint an acting Dean until Dr. Garrity arrives. Zoltan Kramar has accepted being the acting Dean of Arts & Humanities with the stipulation that at whatever time Dr. Garrity wishes, he will step out.

Mr. Harrington commented he would be happy to receive any thoughts, concerns or comments on re-organization, in writing. They plan to move ahead on a Search for a Dean of Library Services.

MOTION NO. 1740: The Academic Affairs Committee moved that the Faculty Senate appoint for next fall an Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Organization to study the existing academic structure and make recommendations for change as deemed appropriate.

The motion will become an Old Business item on the Agenda and voted on at the May 31 meeting.

Chairman Keith commended the Academic Affairs Committee for the excellent job they have done this year.

2. Budget Committee--Mr. Tolman reviewed the Budget Committee's and Senate's recommendation on the disposition of the 4% salary increase for next year. The Budget Committee recommended and the Senate passed that anything up to $25,000 be used for special salary adjustments for individuals who were not in an equitable position and for promotions. Subsequently, Mr. Brooks made his own recommendations to the Board of Trustees which were different from the Senate's. He listed four priorities: (1) Promotions; (2) correction of salaries and equities; (3) adjustment to the scale; and (4) merit increases. Mr. Tolman said the number one item has been take care of, number two will be acted upon next, and they will know, prior to the next Senate meeting, how much money there is available, which they did not know prior to this time. He mentioned he would like this to be handled as an Old Business item at the next Senate meeting. The Budget Committee will make a report at that time and a new recommendation.
Mr. Keith commented the Budget Committee is re-assessing the budget situation in light of new information, what is available, what will be called for in salaries and inequities, what it will cost for promotions, and the Senate will then have to establish what their position is and present it to the Board of Trustees' meeting on June 9, when they will act on this item. He suggested Senators give any input on the matter to Mr. Tolman or other members of the Budget Committee before next Wednesday.

3. Code Committee—Mr. Carlson presented a report regarding a Code amendment that has been prepared by President Brooks in response to two recent situations where faculty members of CWU were faced with resignation because the present Faculty Code does not permit unpaid leaves of absence to be renewed more than once. The Code Committee is of the opinion that it is in the interest of faculty welfare at this time, considering the circumstances and with the University allocations operating fairly close to the numbers of faculty to have this amendment made and they are in agreement with the Executive Committee that the amendment be made with the approval of the Faculty Senate rather than by the Board of Trustees without the Senate's involvement.

MOTION NO. 1741: Mr. Carlson moved, seconded by Mr. Franz, that the Senate rules be waived so that the Senate can act on the Code amendment to Section 2.123 at this meeting. Passed by a two-thirds majority hand vote.

The Code amendment was placed on the Agenda for this meeting as Item "D" under Old Business.

Mr. Carlson continued with his report. He said the Code Committee has been reviewing the RIF Plan that has been distributed to Senators previously. These proposals are dated April 4, 1978, and are now to be re-dated May 17. This postpones the 60 calendar days in which the Senate may act on the proposals and extends the date to late October or early November when the Senate must respond. A recommendation will be presented by the Code Committee at the May 31 meeting concerning the RIF set of Code amendments and a motion to put it on the Old Business Agenda for next fall. Mr. Carlson urged the Senate to review the proposal thoroughly, as there are a great deal of changes. He suggested Senators urge all faculty members in their departments to review the proposals, also.

4. Curriculum Committee—Mr. Wiberg will present a final report at the May 31 meeting.

5. Personnel Committee—no report.

6. Student Affairs Committee—A year end report was distributed at this meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Motion to accept General Studies revisions—

MOTION NO. 1742: The Senate Executive Committee moved the adoption of the proposal for a Revised General Education Program for Central Washington University.

Discussion began on the proposal.

MOTION NO. 1743: Mr. Warren moved to amend, seconded by Mr. Kaufman, that the breadth requirement for the Schools of Social and Behavioral Sciences be separated from the rest of the proposal.

Concern was expressed by Chairman Keith that the amendment was appropriate; however, it could present problems if it passed because it could end up with the rest of the proposal passing and with the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences not represented by the General Studies proposal.

Discussion on the merits of deleting that section began.

Motion No. 1743, to amend, was defeated by a majority nay voice vote.

Mr. Brunner presented a proposal entitled "Position Paper, General Education Core," prepared by the Department of Technical and Industrial Education. Copies of the proposal were distributed to Senators at the beginning of this meeting.
MOTION NO. 1744: Mr. Brunner moved to table Motion No. 1742 on the General Education Proposal until a university-wide ad hoc committee can get input to develop a true General Education Program.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Motion No. 1742 voted on by roll call:

Aye: Phil Tolin, Joel Andress, Walter Emken, Corwin King, Robert Yee, Curt Wiberg, Peter Burkholder, Sandra Fairchild, David Kaufman, Frank Carlson, Lillian Canzler, Madge Young, Rosco Tolman, Warren Street, John Vifian, Robert Mitchell, and Art Keith.


Abstain: Wolfgang Franz, Kathleen Adams, George Fadenrecht, Robert Nuzum and Ed Harrington.

Passed by a majority vote of 17 Aye, 6 Nay, 5 Abstain.

B. Motion to accept Committee Structure proposal--

MOTION NO. 1745: The Executive Committee moved the adoption of the Proposed Statement of Organization and Procedure for Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, Teacher Education Council and University Curriculum Committee, Program Review and Evaluation Committee and the General Education Committee.

Discussion began. Fred Cutlip and Ron Frye, representing the Teacher Education Council, were present to discuss the proposal with the Senate.

MOTION NO. 1746: Mr. Street moved to amend, seconded by Mr. Yee, by deleting the words "Teacher Education" from the requirements for faculty and student for the Teacher Education Council. Passed by a majority voice vote.

Discussion resumed on Motion No. 1745, as amended.

Motion No. 1745 passed by a majority voice vote and one abstention.

C. Curriculum Committee--Motion on Credit/No Credit Option.

MOTION NO. 1747: The Curriculum Committee moved the approval of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee's recommended changes to the Credit/No Credit option, as follows:

Delete the sentence, "Furthermore students may elect to take the earned grade in that course up to a time three weeks prior to the end of the quarter during which the course is being taken," and the addition of a sentence, "Courses may not be repeated on a Credit/No Credit option."

Mr. Wibert, chairman of the Senate Curriculum Committee, discussed the proposed policy. He said the Committee had decided to change the wording on the addition to the proposed policy as it was too ambiguous.

MOTION NO. 1748: The Curriculum Committee moved to amend by changing the wording of the sentence "Courses may not be repeated on a Credit/No Credit option," to "Courses for which a grade has been recorded may not be repeated on a Credit/No Credit option." Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Motion No. 1747, as amended, passed by a unanimous voice vote.

D. Proposed Code amendment, Section 2.123 Leaves of Absence Without Pay.

MOTION NO. 1749: Mr. Carlson moved, seconded by Ms. Killorn, to approve the proposed Code Amendments to Section 2.123 Leaves of Absence Without Pay as specified on the attachment to the May 17 Agenda, particularly Sections A., B., and E. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., May 17, 1978
Psychology Building, Room 471

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 3, 1978

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
   A. Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals, Pages 490, 491
   B. Graduate Curriculum Proposals, Page 93

VI. REPORTS
   A. Chairman
   B. Executive Committee
   C. Standing Committees
      1. Academic Affairs Committee
      2. Budget Committee
      3. Code Committee
         Motion re: Faculty Code Amendment, Section 2.123
         Leaves of Absence Without Pay
      4. Curriculum Committee
      5. Personnel Committee
      6. Student Affairs Committee

VII. OLD BUSINESS
   A. Motion to accept General Studies revisions
   B. Motion to accept Committee Structure proposal
   C. Curriculum Committee--Motion on Credit/No Credit Option

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The attached Code amendment was prepared by President Brooks in response to two recent situations where faculty members of CWU were/are faced with resignation because the present Faculty Code does not permit unpaid leaves of absence to be renewed more than once. Please study the attached proposed amendment.

The Faculty Senate Code Committee has been asked to prepare a recommendation for presentation at the May 17 Senate meeting. The Senate Executive Committee will request a waiver of Senate rules in order to vote on the motion at the May 17 meeting. The Board of Trustees has this item on its May 12 agenda, but President Brooks has agreed to ask that it be deferred until the May 20 special meeting of the Board of Trustees.
### 1977-78 FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF May 2, 1978

#### ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATOR</th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Kathleen</td>
<td>Clayton Denman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andress, Joel</td>
<td>Cal Willberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, James</td>
<td>David Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkholder, Peter</td>
<td>Ed Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunner, Gerald</td>
<td>Chester Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Frank</td>
<td>Galer Beed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson, Rosella</td>
<td>Glenn Madsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doi, Richard</td>
<td>Lillian Canzler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugmore, Owen</td>
<td>Clarence Beecher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emken, Walter</td>
<td>Robert Nuzum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadenrecht, George</td>
<td>Richard Hasbrouck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairchild, Sandra</td>
<td>William Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz, Wolfgang</td>
<td>Jay Forsyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden, Michael</td>
<td>Barbara Brummett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gries, Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, A. James</td>
<td>Richard Leinaweaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hileman, Betty</td>
<td>Deloris Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman, David</td>
<td>George Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Art</td>
<td>John Gregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killorn, Erlice</td>
<td>Stephen Worsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillard, W. Clair</td>
<td>Roger Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Corwin</td>
<td>Dolores Osborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klemin, V. Wayne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahan, Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Willa Dene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Russell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahlstrand, Margaret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuelson, Dale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street, Warren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolin, Phil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolman, Rosco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vifian, John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, Gordon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiberg, Curt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yee, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Madge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATOR</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Tolin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beberly Heckart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Enwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hultin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Andress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgang Franz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Adams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corwin King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Brusius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Yee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fadenrecht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Dugmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Wiberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Wayne Klemin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Bachrach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin Pinehove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Ross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heddy Heibir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Henderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Benson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kaufman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Doi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Golden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Carlson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlice Killorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reballa Duxham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madge Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Roberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clair Allard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Hileman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willa Dene Powell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Douce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosco Tolman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Sahlstrand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vifian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roselle Rickson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Keith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Samuelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Keith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISITORS

Ron Frye
Bevly Heckart
Eug Schlusman
Ed Blyen
Fred Cutlip
D.W. Clements

Chairman

LE/—/—

FRED C/ATLIP

Teacher Education

Prom. Lang.

7 Chr Ed Council

Biol. Sci.

English/Academic Skills

Up for AA

Registrar

Grad Sch & Res

Physical Education
Dr. Art Keith  
Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
Central Washington University  
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Dear Dr. Keith:

    We have received your proposal of April 10, 1978, proposing Faculty Code amendments.

    We have also received your memo of January 31, 1978, and the copy of the recommendation mentioned therein but forwarded to us later. We concur in the Senate's findings concerning interpretations of leaves of absence and differentiation of probationary times for tenure and seniority.

    Finally, thank you, and the Senate, for your kind remarks on the way the presidential search and the Board of Trustees' meetings have been conducted. Your views are always of interest to the Board.

Sincerely,

Linda J. Clifton  
Chairperson  
Board of Trustees

cc: Trustees  
Dr. Brooks
Dr. J. Arthur Keith  
Chairman, Faculty Senate  
CWU, Campus  

Dear Dr. Keith:

Thank you for your letter regarding the Faculty Senate's recommendation on the designation of three departments within the School of Business Administration and Economics.

I had previously advised Dr. Garrity of this proposal. Accordingly, I am going to hold the recommendation in abeyance until Dr. Garrity arrives in September and has the opportunity to review our total organizational structure.

As to the amendment that "faculty members, currently teaching in more than one of the areas shall receive joint appointments," I can only say that I share your concern as to its "acceptability." I believe this really is a recommendation that has to come from within the School of Business Administration and Economics, not from the Faculty Senate. I will, therefore, await Dean Ball's recommendation on the matter of titles.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

jm

cc: Dr. Brooks  
    Dr. Garrity  
    Dr. Ball
Professor J. Arthur Keith  
Chairman, Faculty Senate  
Campus  
CWU  

Dear Professor Keith:  

I have reviewed the proposal for restructuring campus committees as presented by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee which I received on May 3 and wish to comment as follows:  

Even though I believe CWU suffers from a severe case of "committeeitis" I am, in general, opposed to the plan for restructuring the several committees in question as proposed by the Executive Committee. In essence I fear that the attempt to reduce the size of these committees for the sake of efficiency, or whatever, may in fact be too drastic a reduction in numbers. I am particularly opposed to what is being recommended by the Executive Committee in reference to the Teacher Education Council. Why does the Executive Committee propose that membership to this committee be confined to 6 teacher education faculty and 1 teacher education student? Who is and who is not to be considered teacher education faculty? And what criteria are to be used to make this determination? It is and has been my position that virtually all of our faculty members are engaged in teacher education. The Executive Committee proposal, as I read it, could and very likely would restrict the definition of teacher education faculty to the Department of Education, Special Education, Early Childhood Education and the like. If this were to happen it would remove all academic departments and programs from sharing in decision making regarding teacher education and for this reason I am adamantly opposed to this proposal. Then too, how would you define a "teacher education student?" Could it be any student, in any discipline, so long as they were working towards being certified?  

In summary I believe the proposal to restructure the Teacher Education Council places all too much power in the hands of too few people with the distinct possibility that academic departments will lose all representation. As Lord Acton once quipped, "All power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Sincerely,

Burton J. Williams  
Professor of History and Dean  

cc: Chairman and Program Directors, Social and Behavioral Sciences  
Deans Schliesman, Comstock, and Erickson  
Dr. Harrington  
Professor Ron Frye
May 11, 1978

Dr. J. Arthur Keith
Chairman, Faculty Senate
CWU, Campus

Dear Dr. Keith:

Thank you for your letter regarding the Faculty Senate's recommendation on the separation of the Mass Media Program from the Department of Communication.

I had previously advised Dr. Garrity of this proposal. Accordingly, I am going to hold the recommendation in abeyance until Dr. Garrity arrives in September and has the opportunity to review our total organizational structure.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington
Vice President for Academic Affairs

cc: Dr. Brooks
    Dr. Garrity
    Dr. Williams
TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Fred Cutlip and Ron Frye, for the Teacher Education Council
DATE: May 12, 1978
RE: Proposal for Restructuring Campus Committees

At its meeting of May 10, 1978 the Teacher Education Council discussed the Senate Executive Committee's proposal. While there was general agreement that campus committees and procedures should be streamlined wherever possible, some concerns were expressed relative to the present proposal. The Council asked us to communicate these concerns to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee:

1. The interests on this campus having to do with teacher education are so complex and diverse that six individuals, no matter how carefully chosen, would be unlikely to be aware of the many interlocking constraints and ramifications governing, and following from, any action by the Teacher Education Council. During the present year, well prepared proposals brought to the Council have been reworked in the context of regular meetings or sent back to committee (or in at least one instance to the originating department) because of justifiable questions raised by Council members.

2. The Teacher Education Council is one of the few campus committees to which individuals strongly request assignment. This is an indication of the importance of its role as monitor of all teacher education programs and advisor to the Dean of Professional Studies.

3. The present membership of the Teacher Education Council does not see the proposal as really streamlining curriculum flow, and indeed sees the possibility for more steps being required due to interactions at various stages of the proposed path. The proposal does not clearly state how curriculum approval will proceed through the system.

4. Although small membership on the Teacher Education Council, the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council would appear to make for greater efficiency, these bodies as presently constituted provide valuable forums in which large issues affecting academic life on this campus may be discussed. Actions taken by smaller bodies would be subject to greater debate and criticism after the fact because of viewpoints and issues possibly neglected by the smaller group. Further, the larger number of persons party to the decision process serves better to communicate to the general faculty not only the decisions but also the motives governing those decisions. The effect is greater openness and less opportunity for misunderstanding.
5. The proposed membership for the reconstituted Teacher Education Council appears to be too restrictive. For example, not more than one member from the Department of Education and not more than two from the School of Professional Studies seems to slight the department and the school, respectively, with the greatest interest in and responsibility for teacher education programs.

Streamlining and the reduction of person-hours spent in committee meetings should be accomplished where possible, but not at the expense of considering all facets of many-sided issues, arriving at decisions that have survived the refining fire of debate, and communicating both process and outcome to the campus-wide constituencies of these committee representatives. The Teacher Education Council suggests that the curriculum change flow be shown in greater detail, and that the membership of at least the Teacher Education Council be reconsidered in the light of the above observations. Further, it is suggested by the council that if the proposed changes are to, in fact, speed up curriculum flow that a special task force made up of faculty and administration be formed to study the problem of curriculum flow through the various bodies on our campus.
Dr. Arthur Keith  
Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
Campus  

Re: Revision to the Faculty Code--R.I.F.

Dear Dr. Keith:

I wish to resubmit the proposal I submitted to you on April 4, 1978. The new date of submission will be today's date, May 17, 1978.

Sincerely,

James E. Brooks  
President  

Cc: Board of Trustees  
Dr. Harrington  
Mr. Clarke
1. Course Additions

T-IE 537, Utilization of Community Industrial Resources, 3 credits.
Identification of industrial community. Structure and function of advisory
committees. Assessment of industrial familiarization opportunities.
Philosophical bases of Industrial Arts and Vocational Education.

T-IE 538, Readings in Industrial Education, 3 credits. A study of the
economic, social, political and philosophical factors that have motivated
and influenced the development of industrial education. Leaders, agencies
and movements shall also be investigated. Prerequisite, student must be
a graduate.

HOEC 699, Project Study, 4-6 credits.

2. Program Change

HOME ECONOMICS
FAMILY AND CONSUMER STUDIES

Program Admission Requirements

In addition to the general regulations for admission to graduate study,
students desiring admission to the Home Economics and Family Studies program
are expected to have an adequate preparation in a discipline appropriate to
their desired field of concentration, and to meet the course prerequisites
in the master's program. Applications will be reviewed by the department's
graduate committee which will make recommendation to the Dean of the
Graduate School. Admission is determined by the department after review
of the complete application file of the student (see p. 21 of the Graduate
Catalog).

MASTER OF SCIENCE
HOME ECONOMICS AND FAMILY STUDIES

Program Coordinator: Fern O'Neil, Michaelsen 100

Purpose. The purpose of this program is to provide students an opportunity
to concentrate at the master's degree level in one or more of the subject
matter areas in Home Economics--Family and Consumer Studies. Its goal is
to prepare persons for further graduate study, for public school or college
teaching, as specialists in community health, welfare or other service
agencies, or as professionals in, or consultants to, business, industry,
and government.

Program. In consultation with a faculty advisor, and with approval by
the department graduate committee, students may develop a program of courses
of a comprehensive nature, or may concentrate on one or more of the subject
matter emphases listed below. Certain appropriate courses from other
departments may be included, provided there is a minimum of 18 credits.
Business before the Senate Academic Affairs Committee during 1977-78 is summarized in table form below. The items listed are placed under two headings: I. Items considered and action recommended; and II. Items considered without recommendation for action.

### I. Items considered and recommendations made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Senate action on recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summer session class schedules, except 1978, 4- or 5-day week.</td>
<td>Keep 5-day schedule, 4-day permissible for some departments.</td>
<td>Defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lengthen inter-class period to 15 minutes.</td>
<td>Recommend against this proposal.</td>
<td>Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Report on off-campus grades, Fall, 1977.</td>
<td>Information only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Admission and re-admission policies, SOP.</td>
<td>Return to Undergraduate Council for comment and clarification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Schools to be renamed Colleges.</td>
<td>Recommend against proposal.</td>
<td>Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Separate Mass Media Prog. from Dept. of Communication.</td>
<td>Recommend in favor.</td>
<td>Passed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Items considered but recommendations not made:

1. Relative grading system (V. Gerald Reed).

2. Scheduling of required courses (Catherine Sands).

3. Modified class schedule, classes up to 90 minutes in length (Ham Howard).

4. Final Exam Week--should exams begin on Monday or Tuesday.

5. Change name of Dept. of Education to School of Education.
   The Committee recommends that this item be given a high priority on the agenda for next fall's Committee.

6. General reorganization of the academic structure of the University.
   The Committee recommends that this item be given highest priority on the agenda for next fall's Committee.
Proposed Statement of Organization and Procedure
for
Graduate Council
Undergraduate Council
Teacher Education Council
and
University Curriculum Committee
Program Review and Evaluation Committee
General Education Committee

Introduction:

Three councils—Graduate, Undergraduate, Teacher Education—would be responsible for developing policies and procedures to strengthen and improve educational programs, serving as advisory group to Dean, review and recommendation on program additions, and developing long-range plans.

Three committees—University Curriculum, Program Review and Evaluation, General Education—would be responsible for curriculum additions and deletions, review and evaluation of programs, and basic and breadth requirements, respectively on a University-wide basis. The first two would be advisory to and report to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs; the General Education Committee would be advisory to and report to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

Membership:

All faculty appointments to the three councils and committees would be made by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Vice-President's Advisory Council. Faculty members serve three year terms with approximately 1/3 of the terms expiring each year. No more than two faculty from any school or more than one from any department shall serve at the same time on any council or committee. Faculty members shall not serve more than two consecutive terms.

Members of the councils and committees shall exercise their best judgment for the University community and do not represent organizational units. Council and committees would have the following membership characteristics:

Graduate Council — 5 Graduate Faculty, 2 Graduate Students
Undergraduate Council — 6 Faculty, 2 Students
Teacher Education Council — 5 Teacher Education Faculty, 1 Teacher Education Student
University Curriculum Committee — 10 Faculty, 3 Students
Program Review and Evaluation Committee — 6 Faculty, 1 Student
General Education Committee — 6 Faculty, 1 Student
CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS APPROVED
BY THE GRADUATE COUNCIL AND
FORWARDED TO THE SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

4/26/78

1. Course Additions

T-IE 537, Utilization of Community Industrial Resources, 3 credits. Identification of industrial community. Structure and function of advisory committees. Assessment of industrial familiarization opportunities. Philosophical bases of Industrial Arts and Vocational Education.

T-IE 538, Readings in Industrial Education, 3 credits. A study of the economic, social, political and philosophical factors that have motivated and influenced the development of industrial education. Leaders, agencies and movements shall also be investigated. Prerequisite, student must be a graduate.

HOEC 699, Project Study, 4-6 credits.

2. Program Change

HOME ECONOMICS
FAMILY AND CONSUMER STUDIES

Program Admission Requirements

In addition to the general regulations for admission to graduate study, students desiring admission to the Home Economics and Family Studies program are expected to have an adequate preparation in a discipline appropriate to their desired field of concentration, and to meet the course prerequisites in the master's program. Applications will be reviewed by the department's graduate committee which will make recommendation to the Dean of the Graduate School. Admission is determined by the department after review of the complete application file of the student (see p. 21 of the Graduate Catalog).

MASTER OF SCIENCE
HOME ECONOMICS AND FAMILY STUDIES

Program Coordinator: Fern O'Neil, Michaelsen 100

Purpose. The purpose of this program is to provide students an opportunity to concentrate at the master's degree level in one or more of the subject matter areas in Home Economics—Family and Consumer Studies. Its goal is to prepare persons for further graduate study, for public school or college teaching, as specialists in community health, welfare or other service agencies, or as professionals in, or consultants to, business, industry, and government.

Program. In consultation with a faculty advisor, and with approval by the department graduate committee, students may develop a program of courses of a comprehensive nature, or may concentrate on one or more of the subject matter emphases listed below. Certain appropriate courses from other departments may be included, provided there is a minimum of 18 credits.
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee
DATE: 4-17-78
RE: Credit/No Credit-option

The Undergraduate Council has proposed the following policy change in the credit/no credit option for consideration by the Senate:

Credit/No Credit

"Students are urged to use the credit/no credit option as a way to explore academic areas of interest. All students except first quarter freshmen and students on academic probation may select one class per quarter under this option. A maximum of fifteen credits earned in credit/no credit courses may be allowed toward the 180 required for the bachelor's degree.

The courses must be selected from Breadth requirements and free electives; they must not be courses in Basic Requirements, majors or minors or professional education sequence.

Students designate the course as credit/no credit during registration or during "Change of Schedule" period. Furthermore, students may elect to take the earned grade in that course up to a time three weeks prior to the end of the quarter during which the course is being taken.

Credits earned under the credit/no credit option are not included in computing grade point averages. The grade recorded on the student's transcript will be "CR" if the course grade is C- or above; if below C-, the entry will be "NC". Courses may not be repeated on a CR/NC option.

The credit/no credit option is distinctive from courses graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis."

The proposed policy deletes the sentence, "Furthermore, students may elect to take the earned grade in that course up to a time three weeks prior to the end of the quarter during which the course is being taken."
The purpose of the Credit/No credit option is to allow students to explore academic areas of interest without jeopardizing their grade point average. A maximum of 15 credits can be earned on this basis. Students have been exploiting the option by signing-up for Breadth requirements on a Credit/No credit basis and then changing to a grade before the end of the quarter if their scores are high. In effect, this allows many more than 15 credits of Credit/No credit courses.

The proposed change is an attempt to prevent this scatter gun approach and to have the option used the way it was originally intended.

The inclusion of "Courses may not be repeated on a Credit/No credit option" depends on the disposal of the Senate Curriculum Committee motion on repetition of courses. If "all grades are used in computation of grade point average", then the sentence is not needed.

The reasoning behind not allowing courses to be repeated on a Credit/No Credit basis is that a student will use it to remove a bad grade. They sign-up Credit/No Credit for a course in which they received an "E". The E is used in their grade-point average. Without even attending the repeated class they receive a NC, the new grade for the course. The course would no longer be used in determining grade point average!

Motion: The Senate Curriculum Committee moves the approval of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee recommended changes to the Credit/No Credit option.
2.123 **Leaves of Absence Without Pay**

A. Leaves of absence without pay may be granted for up to twelve (12) months by the Board of Trustees. Such leaves, which may be renewed in unusual circumstances, shall not generally be granted to faculty members unless they have been on active, full-time service with the university for at least three (3) academic years.

B. An individual desiring leave without pay shall submit a request in writing to his department chairman, specifying the purpose and location of the leave and the proposed dates of absence. Faculty members are encouraged to make such requests should be made at least six (6) months before the start of the proposed absence to allow the university time to adjust schedules and/or hire a replacement. The chairman may forward this the request, with his own recommendation, to the vice president for academic affairs who may recommend it to the president of the university and the Board of Trustees. A primary concern for the instructional program will govern decisions concerning such requests.

C. The terms of the leave of absence shall be set forth in writing. Staff benefits (medical and life insurance, etc.), if continued during the leave of absences, will be paid by the individual faculty members. The leave will not affect unfavorably on the tenure of a faculty member, except that the time spent on such leave will not count as probationary service unless otherwise agreed to in writing.

D. Providing employment has not been terminated during the period of leave, according to the provisions of this code, an individual completing such leave shall return to the same employment status that he occupied at the commencement of his leave, unless he agrees to another assignment.

E. A request for renewal of a leave of absence for one (1) year may be granted by the Board of Trustees if it is approved by the vice president for academic affairs and the president after review and approval by the department chairman and the dean. If possible, a request for a renewal of leave should be made at least six (6) months in advance of the proposed absence.

F. Granting of a leave of absence to an employee for any purpose does not constitute or imply, on the part of the university, any greater obligation to resume or continue his employment than had the employee not been granted leave.

G. Leaves of absence without pay may be granted at the faculty member's request if the faculty member is nominated for a state or national office, or if he is elected to same.
Our uneasiness about the content and meaning of liberal education should not bring us to the conclusion to return to the requirements that have collapsed under pressures of the skepticism of many students, alumni, parents, employers, and faculty.

Identifying a new coherent common core of knowledge could gain the support of these dissenters. A consensus of shared beliefs about the fundamental goals of undergraduate education as a viable base for University general education requirements could bring the necessary coherence to negate the dissenters' arguments:

1) tested departmental interests, not a holistic educational concept
2) reimposition of warmed-over distribution requirements
3) lack of articulation between the required core and the majors

To accomplish this, faculty members in different disciplines need to more seriously and continuously make a real effort to cross departmental barriers and consider the crucial academic issues at the intersections.

We should avoid producing another eclectic conglomeration of requirements taught with minimal conviction. We offer many excellent courses. The challenge is to put them together so the present dissenters can conceive articulation and coherence in the prescribed University general education requirements. This requires establishing communication linkages with the dissenters as a part of the general education revision process.

A serious systematic search for consensus of the interested groups of
..."objectives and criteria which would enable us to discriminate more convincingly among competing academic claims and more clearly communicate the Universities' missions and role.

The proposed general education requirements, recently distributed, do not reflect the above developmental process believed to be critical to a viable core curriculum.
Leaves of Absence Without Pay.

Leaves of absence without pay may be granted for up to twelve (12) months by the Board of Trustees. Such leaves, which may be renewed in unusual circumstances, shall not generally be granted to faculty members unless they have been on active, full-time service with the university for at least three (3) academic years.

An individual desiring leave without pay shall submit a request in writing to his department chairman, specifying the purpose and location of the leave and the proposed dates of absence. Faculty members are encouraged to make such requests should be made at least six (6) months before the start of the proposed absence to allow the university time to adjust schedules and/or hire a replacement. The chairman may forward this request, with his own recommendation, to the vice president for academic affairs who may recommend it to the president of the university and the Board of Trustees. A primary concern for the instructional program will govern decisions concerning such requests.

The terms of the leave of absence shall be set forth in writing. Staff benefits (medical and life insurance, etc.), if continued during the leave of absence, will be paid by the individual faculty members. The leave will not affect unfavorably on the tenure of a faculty member, except that the time spent on such leave will not count as probationary service unless otherwise agreed to in writing.

Providing employment has not been terminated during the period of leave, according to the provisions of this code, an individual completing such leave shall return to the same employment status that he occupied at the commencement of his leave, unless he agrees to another assignment.

A request for renewal of a leave of absence for one (1)-year may be granted by the Board of Trustees if it is approved by the vice president for academic affairs and the president after review and approval by the department chairman and the dean. If possible, a request for a renewal of leave should be made at least six (6) months in advance of the proposed absence.

Granting of a leave of absence to an employee for any purpose does not constitute or imply, on the part of the university, any greater obligation to resume or continue his employment than had the employee not been granted leave.

Leaves of absence without pay may be granted at the faculty member's request if the faculty member is nominated for a state or national office, or if he is elected to same.
To: Board of Trustees  
Art Keith, Chairman, Faculty Senate  

From: President Brooks  

Re: Proposed Revision to the Faculty Code: Reduction in Force Policy  

Following the provisions of the Faculty Code, I am submitting to you a proposed revision of the reduction in force policy. I request that the proposal be processed within the time limitations specified by the code.

On several occasions in the past I have mentioned the need for a policy. The existing policy contains many time consuming procedural steps which could require more than twenty months to complete. Obviously, this makes the policy unworkable, or almost so.

I requested Fritz Clark to draft a proposed new reduction in force policy which would simplify as much as possible the procedural steps necessary to implement a reduction in force and at the same time to preserve for affected faculty members the due process rights to which they are entitled. With respect to the due process right to review required by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, Fritz placed heavy reliance on the federal district court's opinion in the case of Glenn Douglas Johnson, et al. v. The Board of Regents of Wisconsin System, et al., 377 F. Supp. 227 (W.D. Wisc. 1974) which he believes to be the leading case concerning the rights of faculty in state institutions of higher education whose employment is terminated due to reduction in force.

Some highlights of the proposed new reduction in force plan are the following: increased reliance on the academic vice president to formulate a reduction in force plan in consultation with the deans, department chairmen and extra-departmental program heads; timing for submission of recommendations to the vice president for academic affairs is entirely within the control of the vice president; Faculty Senate to be given an opportunity for comments but not to delay development of a reduction in force plan for the purpose of holding hearings or debating the issues; final review and approval by the president with the right of affected faculty members to submit a written appeal to the president; elimination of the informal hearing before the Faculty Grievance Committee followed by a formal administrative hearing and substitution of a single formal administrative hearing at which the issues would be limited to only those constitutionally required to be heard as stated in the Johnson case; shifting of the burden of proof on all issues from the university administration to the faculty members appealing as also deemed proper by
the court in the Johnson case; and shortening the length of time for appealing the findings and recommended decision of the hearing officer to the Board of Trustees from thirty to ten days.

Because the proposed new reduction in force policy which would supplant Section 3.78 of the Faculty Code affects Code Sections 3.92 and 3.93 pertaining to hearing procedures, Fritz also made some proposed revisions to those sections which are typed in legislative format and included with the proposed new Section 3.78.

cc: Fritz Clarke
    Ed Harrington
    Faculty Senate Code Committee members

Enclosure
3.78 Reduction in Force Policy

A. It is necessary for Central Washington University to maintain a reduction in force policy in order (1) to meet budgetary or enrollment reductions; (2) to respond to actions of the Governor, the State Legislature (including, but not limited to, reductions in the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty positions funded by the legislature) and the federal government; and (3) to reorganize, consolidate, or eliminate academic programs and departments necessitated by changes in the university's educational policy. Under the provisions of this reduction in force policy, all faculty members, regardless of their rank or designation and whether or not they are tenured, are subject to possible layoffs from their faculty positions.

B. In the face of budgetary enrollment reductions, actions of the Governor, the State Legislature or the federal government, or changes in educational policy necessitating a reduction in force, the vice president for academic affairs shall be responsible for developing a reduction in force plan employing the following procedures:

1. In consultation with the deans, department chairmen and administrative heads of extra-departmental academic units, the vice president for academic affairs will identify instructional courses, programs and academic units which might be reduced or eliminated.

2. Each department and extra-departmental academic unit requested to do so by the vice president for academic affairs will make recommendations concerning reduction or elimination of programs, courses and faculty in their department or academic area and shall submit their recommendations to the appropriate dean who shall in turn submit such recommendations together with the dean's own recommendations to the vice president for
academic affairs.

3. The calendar for submission of all recommendations required in connection with development of the reduction in force plan shall be established by the vice president for academic affairs. If department chairmen, extra-departmental academic unit heads or deans fail to submit recommendations for reduction in force in accordance with the calendar established by the vice president for academic affairs, the vice president will formulate the reduction in force plan without such recommendations.

4. Following the date established for the submission of recommendations from the department chairmen, extra-departmental academic heads and deans, the vice president for academic affairs shall submit a final reduction in force plan in writing to the president and shall provide a copy to the chairman of the Faculty Senate. The final reduction in force plan shall (1) identify all courses, programs, departments or academic units to be consolidated, reduced or eliminated; (2) state the reasons for the decision to take each proposed reduction in force action; (3) describe the manner in which the decision was arrived at; and (4) disclose the information and data relied upon in making the decision.

5. At the time the reduction in force plan is submitted to the president, the vice president for academic affairs shall also send by certified mail, or cause to be personally delivered, a notice of termination of employment to each faculty member to be laid off. The notice of termination shall state the faculty member's termination
C. Any faculty member who receives a notice of termination of employment due to reduction in force may appeal in writing to the president within ten (10) calendar days from the date written notification of termination was received. The Faculty Senate may also submit a written statement of position to the president within the same time period. A written response will be provided by the president to the faculty member with a copy to the chairman of the Faculty Senate, stating his decision on the appeal and giving his reasons for the decision.

D. If the decision of the president is unacceptable to the faculty member whose appointment is being terminated, the faculty member may then request a formal administrative hearing pursuant to Section 3.93 of this Code.

E. The hearing officers or officers conducting the formal hearing shall limit their consideration exclusively to the following issues:

1. Whether the decision to terminate the faculty member's employment was for a constitutionally impermissible reason (such as exercise of First Amendment freedom of expression, or race or religion).

2. Whether the decision to lay off faculty members was arbitrary and unreasonable.

3. Whether there have been material deviations from the procedures established by this Section 3.78 for implementation of a reduction in force plan.
7. Hearings on the appeals of faculty members whose employment is being terminated due to reduction in force may be consolidated into a single hearing for the convenience of the institution.

G. Order of Termination.

(1) Where it is necessary to terminate members of the faculty within a department, program, or section, the following order of termination will be utilized:

(a) part-time academic employees, excepting graduate assistants;
(b) probationary employees with least seniority;
(c) full-time tenured academic employees with least seniority;
(d) tenured faculty members with least seniority;
(e) between tenured faculty members with equal seniority, the faculty member who has obtained the highest academic degree shall have the greatest retention priority.

(2) Seniority for all full-time faculty members (whether tenured or non-tenured) shall be computed in the following manner:

(a) All periods of service at Central Washington University shall be counted. Part-time service shall be prorated and added to full-time service for the purpose of computing seniority under this section.

(b) Service at Central Washington University shall be measured from the first day of classes as a faculty member, which period shall include leaves of absence without pay, professional leaves, sabbatical, leaves and disability leaves but shall not include leaves granted to enable a faculty member to pursue advanced degrees.
(c) In instances where employees have the same beginning date of full-time service, seniority shall be determined in the following order:

(i) Date of appointment to full-time service by the Board of Trustees;

(ii) Date of the signature of a letter of intent to accept employment;

(iii) Date of application for employment.

(iv) If a tie exists after the above order of termination has been followed, the vice president for academic affairs, after consulting with the appropriate dean and department chairman, will recommend to the president which faculty member should be terminated.

H. Whenever a position is vacated by reduction in force under this policy, resulting in the termination of a full-time, ranked faculty member on a regular appointment, that position shall not be filled by a replacement within a period of two (2) years unless the terminated faculty member has been offered reappointment and has failed to accept the offer of reappointment within 30 days after receipt of notification. In addition, the following procedures for reemployment shall be observed:

1. The vice president for academic affairs shall establish and maintain for a period of two (2) years reemployment lists of all permanent employees terminated for lack of funds, declining enrollments and changes in programs.
2. Terminated employees shall be listed by class of teaching service and corresponding to the class of teaching service area from which they were terminated.

3. The university may not fill a vacancy in a class of teaching service area for which there are names on its reemployment list without first making an offer of reemployment to these individuals.

4. A list will be established and maintained which identifies those employees who were offered and rejected to accept a transfer in lieu of being terminated. These employees will be given first consideration in filling any positions which are equal or comparable to the positions from which they were transferred.

5. It is the responsibility of the person terminated to keep the office of the vice president for academic affairs informed of where he may be reached readily.

6. Any person on a reemployment list who cannot be reached within thirty (30) calendar days or who fails to respond within the specified time limit shall be deemed to have declined the offer.

7. Any faculty member employed shall be placed:

(a) at least at the same rank he held when he was terminated, and

(b) at least at the same salary step or at a salary scale in effect, at a salary level comparable to that in effect when he was terminated.
Informal Hearings: Dismissal of Faculty Member for Cause and Termination of Employment due to Reduction-in-Force.

A. An aggrieved faculty member shall apply for an informal hearing by filing a written request for a hearing with the president or his designee within ten (10) working days after receiving the written notice of intention to recommend dismissal for cause, or notice of termination due to reduction-in-force, and the hearing shall be granted. Upon receipt of the faculty member's request for an informal hearing, the president or his designee shall provide a copy of the notice of intention to recommend dismissal or notice of termination due to reduction-in-force and the faculty member's request for an informal hearing to the chairman of the Faculty Senate. A hearing will be scheduled as soon thereafter as possible.

B. The chairman of the Faculty Senate shall, after receiving a copy of the notice of intention to recommend dismissal or notice of termination due to reduction-in-force and the faculty member's request for an informal hearing, establish a date for an informal hearing by the Faculty Grievance Committee. A notice establishing the date, time, and place of the hearing shall be provided to the faculty member not more than ten (10) days from the date of the chairman's receipt of the request for an informal hearing.

C. The informal hearing shall be held not less than ten (10) working days from the mailing of the notice of hearing to the faculty member, unless all of the parties with the consent of the chairman, agree to shorten the time to less than ten (10) days.

D. The faculty member may waive the opportunity for an informal hearing and initially request a formal hearing pursuant to the provisions of Section 3.93 of this code.

E. The Faculty Grievance Committee may rule that it is impossible to conduct an informal hearing. In such cases, the committee may decline to conduct an informal hearing and refer it to the president or his designee for a formal hearing.
It is expected that most issues will be settled in an equitable and mutually satisfactory manner through the informal procedures set forth in this code, without resorting to the formal hearing procedures herein described.

Failure to apply for a formal hearing within ten (10) days after receipt of the written notice of intention to recommend dismissal for cause or notice of termination due to reduction in force, if the informal hearing procedure has been waived by the faculty member, or within ten (10) days after receipt of the final decision if an informal hearing has been held, shall be treated as a waiver by the faculty member of the right to a formal hearing.

Failure to apply for a formal hearing within ten (10) days after receipt of the president's decision in cases of termination due to reduction in force also shall be treated as a waiver by the faculty member of the right to a formal hearing.

Upon receipt of a written request for a formal hearing, the chairman, vice-chairman, or other member of the Board of Trustees, on the basis of longevity and in the preceding order, shall appoint one or more hearing officers, not to exceed three for any hearing, to preside over, conduct and make proposals for decisions, including findings of fact and conclusions of law, in all cases. The board shall afford the faculty member an opportunity for a formal hearing after not less than ten (10) days notice and provide such faculty member with notice of the hearing in accordance with the provisions of RCW 28B.19.

Should more than one hearing officer be appointed to hear the case, a principal hearing officer shall be designated to preside at the hearing.

Service of a notice of hearing shall be made by the principal hearing officer to the faculty member's last known address of record on file with the vice president for academic affairs of the university by certified or registered mail, telegraph or personal service at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing. The notice shall include:

1. a statement of the time, place and nature of the proceeding;
2. a statement of the legal authority and jurisdiction under which the hearing is to be held;
3. a reference to the particular rules of the university involved; and
4. in cases of dismissal for cause, a short and plain statement of the charges.

In cases of dismissal for cause, the faculty member may respond to the charges in writing at any time before the hearing. If the faculty member waives a hearing, or in writing, clearly and specifically denies the charges against him or asserts the charges do not allege adequate cause for dismissal, such writing and the president's recommendation for dismissal, shall be given to the members of the Board of Trustees for their consideration in acting on the president's recommendation.
G. The faculty member will be permitted to have an advisor or legal counsel of his own choice present at the hearing at his own expense.

H. In cases of dismissal for cause, the burden of proof that adequate case for dismissal as grounds for termination due to reduction in force exists rests with the university, and shall be satisfied only by clear and convincing evidence in the record considered as a whole. In cases of termination due to reduction in force, the burden of proof that the decision to terminate the faculty member's employment was for a constitutionally impermissible reason, was arbitrary and unreasonable, or that there have been material deviations from the procedures established by Section 5.70 of this code for implementation of a reduction in force (which are the only issues to be considered by the hearing officer) rests with the faculty member appealing the termination decision.

I. The principal hearing officer may grant recesses of the proceedings to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made.

J. If the parties agree that a formal record or transcript of the proceedings shall be furnished, the cost shall be borne equally by the parties, otherwise the costs shall be borne by the party requesting the transcript.

K. In cases of dismissal for cause, all documents, communications, and records dealing with the processing of an appeal or grievance shall be filed separately from the individual's personnel file in a sealed envelope which shall not be opened except for use as legal evidence, and then only upon prior written notice to the person. A summary of the final resolution of the case and reference to the entire grievance or appeal file shall be placed in the individual's personnel file.

L. The faculty member will be afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence, and the administration of the university will, insofar as it is possible for it to do so, secure the cooperation of such witnesses and make available necessary documents and other evidence within its control, subject to restrictions on the basis of confidentiality or privilege.

M. The parties will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Where the witness cannot or will not appear, but the principal hearing officer determines that the interests of justice require admission of his statement or testimony, the principal hearing officer may provide for written interrogatories or depositions and may issue subpoenas as provided in REV 289 19.120. Such interrogatories and the responses thereto, and depositions so authorized, shall be admissible in the record of the proceedings, provided, that no person shall be compelled to divulge information which he could not be compelled to divulge by answers to interrogatories or by deposition in a court of law.

N. The principal hearing officer may admit any evidence which is of probative value in determining the issues involved. Every possible effort will be made to obtain the most reliable evidence available.

O. The existence or non-existence of a material fact, as made or agreed in a stipulation or in an admission of record, will be conclusively presumed against any party thereby, and no other evidence with respect thereto will be received on behalf of such party, provided—
A proposal for decision and findings of fact and conclusions of law shall be forthwith served upon the parties and transmitted to the Board of Trustees together with a record of the proceeding. The hearing record shall include:

1. All documents, motions, and intermediate rulings;
2. Evidence received or considered;
3. A statement of matters officially noticed;
4. Questions and offers of proof, objections and rulings thereon;
5. Proposed findings and exceptions, and
6. Any decision, opinion, or report by the officer or committee chairman presiding at the hearing.

Findings of fact and conclusions of law shall be based only on the hearing record.

Within thirty (30) days after service of the proposal for decision and findings of fact and conclusions of law, any party adversely affected may file exceptions, and thereafter all parties may present written argument to the Board of Trustees, which shall consider the whole record or such portions as may be cited by the parties, and after such review the Board shall render its decision and final action to be taken and the reasons therefor at a regular Board meeting.

Every decision and order, whether proposed, initial, or final, shall:

1. Be correctly captioned as to name of agency and name of proceeding;
2. Designate all parties and counsel to the proceeding;
(1) Submit a brief statement of the nature and background of the proceeding.

(2) Be accompanied by appropriate numbered findings of fact and conclusions of law.

(3) Wherever practical, the conclusions of law shall include the reason or reasons for particular action or remedy afforded.

(4) Wherever practical, the conclusion and/or order shall be referenced to specific provisions of the law and/or regulations appropriate thereto, together with reasons and precedents relied upon to support the same.
NOMINATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Please secure the consent of nominee before nomination.

CHAIRMAN

VICE CHAIRMAN

SECRETARY

AT-LARGE OFFICER

AT-LARGE OFFICER

Please return your nominations to the Faculty Senate Office by May 26, 1978.

1978-79 ROSTER OF MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Yrs. to Serve</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dale Samuelson</td>
<td>Richard Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anne Denman</td>
<td>Clayton Danman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Margaret Sahlstrand</td>
<td>Ken Cory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Robert Lapen</td>
<td>John Shradar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>W. Clair Lillard</td>
<td>Stephen Worley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Ed &amp; Adm. Mgt.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*Wolfgang Franz</td>
<td>Eric Thurston, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V. Wayne Klemin</td>
<td>Dolores Osborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Walter Enken</td>
<td>Richard Hasbrouck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling &amp; Testing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corwin King</td>
<td>Roger Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Owen Dugmore</td>
<td>Robert Nuzum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A. James Hawkins</td>
<td>Richard Leinsweaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Frank Carlson</td>
<td>Daryl Basler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joe Schomer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*Madge Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>John Vifian</td>
<td>George Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mike Lopez</td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rosco Tolman</td>
<td>Charles Beecher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology &amp; Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Joel Andres</td>
<td>Carlos Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Robert Mitchell</td>
<td>Otto Jakubek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homem Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>James Brennan</td>
<td>(none selected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Woodrow Monte</td>
<td>Kent Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Fedearrecht</td>
<td>Willa Dene Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Victor Marx</td>
<td>William Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(none selected)</td>
<td>Janice Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peter Gries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*Clifford Cunha</td>
<td>Barbara Brummett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peter Burkholder</td>
<td>Henry Eickhoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Erlice Killorn</td>
<td>Chester Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*James Nylander</td>
<td>John Gregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Robert Yee</td>
<td>Deloris Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Tolin</td>
<td>Tom Kerr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*Alma Spithill</td>
<td>Max Zwanziger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. &amp; Ind. Ed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>William Benson</td>
<td>David Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn. Center for ECE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerald Brunner</td>
<td>Celer Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lillian Canzler</td>
<td>(not selected yet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donald Garrity</td>
<td>Edward Harrington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At-Large Positions