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MINUTES

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
May 2, 1979

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by the chairman, Frank Carlson, in the Senate office. All members of the committee were present except Mr. Tolman.

Mr. Carlson reported receiving a request from President Garrity for a change in the Faculty Code, amending Section 3.93 Q. The proposed change would enable the Board of Trustees to take final action on terminations at special meetings in addition to regular meetings. The Executive Committee decided to forward the letter to the Code Committee, asking them to consider whether the change would apply to cases currently being heard, whether it would be desirable to make such a change while a case is being heard, what implications such a change would have for time of termination notification, and whether there is a real need for such a change.

Mr. Carlson reported that he had prepared a letter to send to Dean Ball regarding Senators from the School of Business and Economics. He proposed that Mr. Lillard remain a Senator and that two more be elected from the School.

The Executive Committee further discussed the topic of "special courses" (Motion 1812). It was moved, seconded, and decided by majority vote to recommend that the Senate Curriculum Committee consider Motion 1812 as its first item of business and bring it back to the Senate before the end of the academic year.

Mr. King informed the Executive Committee of the details of the planned Inauguration Ceremony for President Garrity.

The Committee decided that Mr. King would calculate the number of at-large Senators to be elected, and from what Departments, according to Code provisions. They also decided that a nominating ballot for next year's Executive Committee would be sent to all Senators after the Senate roster for next year is complete.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 9 May 1979
Presiding Officer: Franklin D. Carlson
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 Clifford Cunha, Owen Dugmore, Donald Garrity, Peter Gries, James Hawkins, Erlice Killorn, Robert Mitchell, Woodrow Monte, Darryll Olsen, Margaret Sahlstrand, Catherine Sands, and Robert Yee.

Visitors Present: Don Caughey

CHANGES TO AGENDA

There were no changes or additions to the Agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Without objection, the minutes of April 25, 1979 were corrected as follows: Page 1, under Communications, A., second line, delete the word "news" and insert the word "issues," and on page 2, under Curriculum Proposals, (2) Page 511--., fourth line, insert "312" between the words "PHIL" and "Applied."

MOTION NO. 1822: Mr. Tolin moved, seconded by Mr. Marx, to approve the minutes of April 25, 1979, as corrected. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

A. Letter from Donald Garrity, President, dated April 30, 1979, proposing an amendment to Section 3.93 Q. of the Faculty Code. The amendment provides that the Board of Trustees may take final action on cases of dismissal at either a regular or special meeting. At present, such action may be taken only at a regular meeting.

B. Letter from Donald Garrity, President, dated May 1, 1979, enclosing a draft of his recommendations for a layoff policy at this university. He asks that the proposal be examined and then invites discussion of it with him.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

A. University Curriculum Committee proposals, page 515:

(1) Page 515--

Chemistry Course Addition - CHEM 499. Seminar. (1-5)

Education Special Education Course Addition - SPED 494. Mini-courses in Special Education.

MOTION NO. 1823: Mr. Lillard moved, seconded by Mr. Thurston, that the University Curriculum Committee proposals on page 515, Chemistry Course Addition - CHEM 499, and Education Special Education Course Addition - SPED 494, be adopted. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and one abstention.

REPORTS

A. Chairman--Mr. Carlson, chairman, reported that the President's Advisory Council, which he is a member of, met April 26. He explained the Council will be a group with the responsibility of considering university-wide issues and problems and making recommendations regarding actions to be taken. The Council will not be duplicating work or responsibilities of others, i.e., the Senate, B.O.B., Employee Council, Deans, Residence Hall Council,
schools, departments, etc. The Council's business would be with regard to those things which are not the province of any other group or area, but properly are the business of all of those who make up the university.

He mentioned there are administrative positions which are in the process of being filled. In order for the positions to be advertised here at CWU, the policy will be to have the affirmative action office forward notifications and job descriptions to the information office.

Mr. Carlson discussed the letter and Code proposals from President Garrity regarding the layoff policy for this university. He suggested Senators route a copy of the Code proposals to faculty in their departments.

Names are being solicited from those departments who have Senators serving who have their three year terms expiring. These vacancies should be filled before an election is held for the Senate officers to serve on the Executive Committee. The nomination procedure from last year will be used, and anyone nominated must have agreed to serve if they are elected. A letter has been sent out to all faculty asking them to list the campus committees and standing committees they would like to serve on.

Mr. Carlson congratulated Corwin King on his excellent work on the President's Inauguration.

A copy of a letter has been received from Otto Jakubek, who has been on the Teacher Education Council. Mr. Jakubek requests that the letter be brought to the attention of the Senate. This coming fall, CWU will be going through an evaluation by the Northwest Council and NCATE. Mr. Jakubek comments, in the letter, on the inclusion of heavy multicultural emphasis in some of the standards. A copy of the letter is in the Senate office and anyone wishing to see it may do so.

B. Executive Committee

Mr. King presented a brief report on the meeting held on May 2. The Executive Committee discussed the communication received from President Garrity regarding a change in the Faculty Code, amending Section 3.93 Q. which would enable the Board of Trustees to take final action on terminations at special meetings in addition to regular meetings. The Executive Committee decided to forward the letter to the Code Committee to consider whether the change would apply to cases currently being heard, whether it would be desirable to make such a change while a case is being heard, what implications such a change would have for time of termination notification and whether there is a real need for such a change.

The Executive Committee discussed the topic of "special courses" (Motion 1812) and decided to recommend that the Senate Curriculum Committee consider Motion 1812 as its first item of business and bring it back to the Senate before the end of the academic year.

The Committee decided that Mr. King would calculate the number of at-large Senators to be elected, and from what Departments, according to Code provisions. They also decided that a nominating ballot for next year's Executive Committee would be sent to all Senators after the Senate roster for next year is complete.

C. Standing Committees

1. Academic Affairs--Ken Hammond reviewed the report distributed at this meeting on CWU Faculty Participation in Grants and Contracts - May 1979. He commented that the task was a rewarding one and considerable interest was shown and many helpful suggestions were sent in response to the questionnaire which was sent out to the faculty. Some of the ideas in the report are already being considered and/or implemented in the grants and contracts office.

At the next meeting, after the Senate has had time to discuss the report, the Committee will offer motions asking the Senate to support the document and possibly to be forwarded to the President, Vice President, the appropriate deans, and also to direct the 1979-80 Academic Affairs Committee to prepare a report next year on progress made in implementing these and any other pertinent policies.

Mr. Hammond commented that anyone wishing to see the responses to the questionnaire may do so and they are in the Faculty Senate office.

2. Budget Committee--No report.
3. Code Committee--Mr. Harsha reported the Committee has not yet done anything with the President's request for special meetings and will take it under consideration after the other Code proposals have been completed.

4. Curriculum Committee--Joe Schomer reported that the committee members reviewed Motion No. 1812 regarding special topic courses which had been sent back to them at the Senate meeting of April 25, along with Vice President Harrington's letter presented to the faculty at the last Senate meeting. The Committee recommends that as a policy guide they accept the recommendation of Dr. Harrington until it is shown that it isn't going to work. The Committee will present a motion at the next meeting.

5. Personnel Committee--No report.

6. Student Affairs--No report.

OLD BUSINESS

No Old Business.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed changes to the Faculty Code--Ken Harsha reviewed the proposed changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure, which were distributed at the meeting. There was considerable discussion on the proposed changes.

MOTION NO. 1824: Mr. Harsha moved, seconded by Mr. Lapen, to adopt the following proposed
sections:

2.30 Procedure for Determining Promotions (p. 30)

(4) ...The dean or director will notify each eligible faculty member in writing indicating what his priority ranking is and whether or not he is being recommended for promotion. This information shall remain in the personnel files only upon the explicit consent of the faculty member.

2.95 Professional Leave--Salary and Administration (p. 43)

A. Final recommendations regarding candidates for professional leave made by the Professional Leave Committee to the vice president for academic Affairs shall be presented to the president of the university and the Board of Trustees for final approval. Faculty members given professional leave shall receive a-fraction-of-the-regular-salary they would receive 75% of the regular salary they would receive if they remained engaged in their usual duties the-fraction-of-the following-scale:

1-quarter------------------50% of salary
2-quarters------------------66-2/3% of salary
3-quarters------------------75% of salary

B. Salaries of faculty members on professional leave will be adjusted according to when step and/or scale adjustments are made in the salary schedule in during their absence.

3.28 Summer Salaries (p. 54)

A. Unless otherwise provided in this code, the salaries for regular university faculty teaching full time in the summer session in addition to their regular academic contract year shall be at least 2/9th's of the salary for the previous academic contract year (1/3rd by summer of 1982). Faculty members on twelve month contracts shall have their salaries adjusted accordingly. A prorated amount shall be paid for teaching a partial load full session or a full load for a portion of the session.
2.130 Professor Emeritus Appointments

B. add:

(10) may serve on any committees dealing substantially with retirement or emeriti faculty.

Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

Discussion resumed on Sections 2.85 and 3.03.

MOTION NO. 1825: Mr. Marx moved, seconded by Mr. Tolin, that the Code Committee be directed to prepare an amendment to Section 2.85 B., lines two, three and four, which would strike the words "and that the granting of leave can be substantially accommodated within existing staff..."

Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

The Code Committee will report this amendment and recommendation back to the Senate for approval and transmission to the President.

ADJOURNMENT

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

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., May 9, 1979
Psychology Building, Room 471

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of April 25, 1979

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
   A. University Curriculum Committee proposals, page 515

VI. REPORTS
   A. Chairman
   B. Executive Committee
   C. Standing Committees
      1. Academic Affairs
      2. Budget
      3. Code
      4. Curriculum
      5. Personnel
      6. Student Affairs

VII. OLD BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Proposed changes to the Faculty Code

IX. ADJOURNMENT
## FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF

**May 9, 1979**

### JLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appleton, Laura</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Dugan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan, James</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkholder, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chester Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzler, Lillian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edith Greatsinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daryl Basler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunha, Clifford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Eickhoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugmore, Owen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Nuzum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emken, Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Hasbrouck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadenrecht, George Franz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maikiko Doi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrity, Donald</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Thurston, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillie, Tim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Brummett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gries, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossman, George</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Guatney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsha, Ken</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milo Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, A. James</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dee Eberhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, Kenneth</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Gregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killorn, Erlice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Shrader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapen, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Worsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillard, W. Clair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, Celia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ann McLean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, Mike</td>
<td></td>
<td>Willa Dene Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marx, Victor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deloris Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte, Woodrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylander, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsen, Darryll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahlstrand, Margaret</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Cory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuelson, Dale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sands, Catherine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayton Denman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schomer, Joe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calvin Greatsinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadle, Owen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Galer Beed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spithill, Alma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Pratz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolin, Phil</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max Zwanziger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolman, Rosco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vifian, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yee, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Kerr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**1978-1979**
Dr. Franklin Carlson
Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Re: Proposed Code Revision - Section 3.93 Q.

Dear Dr. Carlson:

I would like to propose for the consideration of the Faculty Senate an amendment to Section 3.93 Q. of the Faculty Code. That section presently provides, in cases of dismissal of a faculty member for cause and termination of employment due to reduction in force, that the Board of Trustees shall consider the record of the formal hearing and shall announce its decision and final action "at a regular Board meeting."

Since the Board of Trustees has adopted a new meeting policy which calls for regular meetings to be held quarterly, with additional special meetings as the need arises, I believe it would be advisable to amend the Code to enable the Board to take final action at either a regular or a special meeting. Therefore, I am proposing that Section 3.93 Q. be amended so that the relevant phrase in the last line would read "at a regular or special Board meeting."

I would appreciate it if the Senate could take this matter up in a timely manner to enable the Board of Trustees to take action on an amendment before the end of the current academic year.

Sincerely,

Donald L. Garrity
President

bd
Dr. Frank Carlson
Chairman, Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Campus

Dear Frank:

You'll find attached a draft of our recommendations regarding a layoff policy for this university. You will notice that we have proposed changing the language from "R.I.P." to "Layoff" and further that the proposal is considerably simplified from that which presently exists. Further, it is our feeling that this proposal represents a fair and workable way to approach the problem of layoffs.

We would ask that you review this proposal and when you are ready discuss your reactions and suggestions with us in hopes that we might find a position that all of us can support. I would ask that you note that in this proposal graduate students are included along with part-time employees. I would appreciate your reaction to this part of the proposal. Secondly, you will note that the concept of layoff is by seniority within a department or program area. I would ask that particular attention be given to this concept and a determination made as to whether or not we believe that this is the way in which we believe layoffs should be approached.

I welcome your review and reaction to this proposal and will be happy to meet with you whenever you believe that you are in a position to have such a meeting.

Sincerely,

Donald L. Garrity
President

Attachment

cc: Dr. Harrington
Mr. Clarke
Proposed Faculty Code Amendments

3.78 Layoff Policy

A. It is necessary for Central Washington University to maintain a layoff 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 layoff 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 or enrollment reductions, actions of the Governor, the State Legislature or the federal government, or changes in educational policy necessitating a faculty layoff, the vice president for academic affairs shall be responsible for developing a layoff plan employing the following procedures:

1. The vice president for academic affairs will identify instructional courses, programs and academic units which might be consolidated, reduced in numbers of faculty or eliminated pursuant to a layoff plan.

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

3. The dates for submission of all recommendations required
in connection with development of a layoff plan shall be
established by the vice president for academic affairs. The
development of a layoff plan shall not be delayed by the
failure of anyone entitled to submit recommendations on the
plan to do so within the time periods so established.

4. Following the last date established for the submission
of recommendations, the vice president for academic affairs
shall formulate and submit a proposed layoff plan in writing
to the president and shall provide copies of the proposed plan to
the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the deans, department
chairmen and extra-departmental unit heads.

5. The layoff plan shall (1) identify all courses,
programs, departments or academic units to be consolidated,
eliminated or reduced in numbers of faculty, (2) state the
reasons for the decision to take such 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.

6. The president shall review the proposed layoff plan
and decide whether to implement the plan as submitted by the
vice president for academic affairs or to make changes in the plan. Any changes contemplated by the president will be referred back to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the deans, department chairmen and extra-departmental unit heads for comment. When the layoff plan is satisfactory to the president, the president or his designee may initiate the layoff procedure by sending by certified mail, or causing to be personally delivered, a Layoff Notice to each faculty member who is to be laid off.

7. Any Layoff Notice sent to a faculty member (i) shall be signed by the president or a person specifically designated by the president to act in his behalf, (ii) shall include a copy of the layoff plan, (iii) shall inform the faculty member of his or her layoff date, and (iv) shall inform the faculty member of the right to appeal.

C. Any faculty member who receives a Layoff Notice may request a formal hearing pursuant to Section 3.93 of this Code.

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

1. Whether the decision to lay off was for a constitutionally impermissible reason (such as exercise of First Amendment freedom of expression, or race or religion).

2. Whether the decision to layoff was arbitrary and unreasonable.
3. Whether there were material deviations from the procedures established by the Board of Trustees for implementation of a layoff plan.

E. Hearings on the appeals of faculty members who are to be laid off may be consolidated into a single hearing.

F. Order of layoff

(1) Where it is necessary to lay off members of the faculty within a department, program, or other academic unit, the following order of termination will be utilized:
   (a) part-time academic employees, including 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 degrees 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.
Proposed Faculty Code Amendments
Page 5

(b) Service at Central Washington University shall be measured from the date of appointment to full-time service by the Board of Trustees, which period shall include leaves of absence without pay where seniority rights were granted by the Board of Trustees, professional leaves, retraining 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 laid off.

G. Whenever a position is vacated by a layoff under this policy, resulting in the layoff 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 faculty member who was laid off has been offered reappointment and has failed to accept the offer of reappointment within thirty (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 laid off pursuant to this policy.

2. Laid off faculty members shall be listed by class or teaching service area corresponding to the class or teaching service area from which they were laid off.

3. The university may not fill a vacancy in a class or teaching service area for which there are names on its reemployment list without first making an offer of reemployment to faculty members who were laid off from such class or teaching service area.

4. It is the responsibility of laid off faculty members to keep the office of the vice president for academic affairs informed of where he or she may be reached readily.

5. Any person on a reemployment list who cannot be reached or who fails to respond within the thirty (30) day period for acceptance of an offer of reemployment shall be deemed to have declined the offer.
6. Any faculty member reemployed shall be placed:
   (a) at least at the same rank he or she held when laid off, and
   (b) at least at the same salary step, or if a salary scale is not in effect, at a salary level comparable to that he or she held when laid off.
3.83 Formal Hearings: Dismissal of Faculty Member for Cause and Termination of Employment Due to Layoff

A. 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 hereinafter described.

B. Failure to apply for a formal hearing within ten (10) days after receipt of the written notice of intention to recommend dismissal for cause 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 in cases of dismissal for cause. Failure to apply for a formal hearing within ten (10) days after receipt of a Layoff Notice shall also be treated as a waiver by the faculty member of the right to a formal hearing in cases of termination of employment due to layoff.

C. 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 shall provide such faculty member with notice of the hearing in accordance with the provisions of RCW 28B.19.

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

E. 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,
but 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.

F. The principal hearing officer shall determine whether the hearing shall be open to the educational community or whether particular persons should be permitted in attendance or excluded from attendance.

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 cause for dismissal 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 faculty layoffs the burden of proof that the decision to lay off was for a constitutionally impermissible reason, was arbitrary and unreasonable, or that there have been material deviations from the procedures established by this code for implementation of a layoff (which are the only issues to be considered by the hearing officer or officers) 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 concerning 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 cost 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 RCW 28B.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 bound thereby, and no other evidence with respect thereto will be received on behalf of such party.

P. 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;
Proposed Faculty Code Amendments
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(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.

Q. Within ten (10) days of service of the 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 announce its decision and final action to be taken and the reasons therefor at a regular or special board meeting.

R. 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;
(3) Include a concise statement of the nature and background of the proceeding;
(4) Be accompanied by appropriate numbered findings of fact and conclusions of law;
(5) Wherever practical, the conclusions 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.
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
FACULTY CODE OF PERSONNEL POLICY AND PROCEDURE

2.30 Procedure for Determining Promotions (p. 30)

(4) ...The dean or director will notify each eligible faculty member in writing indicating what his priority ranking is and whether or not he is being recommended for promotion. This information shall remain in the personnel files only upon the consent of the faculty member.

2.85 Application for Professional Leave (pp. 42-43)

A. A formal letter of application from a candidate for professional leave shall be filed with the department-chairman or-principal-administrator-for-those-not-assigned-in-a department; the-vice-president-for-academic-affairs-and-the appropriate-dean; on-or-before-November-1 office of the vice president for academic affairs on or before October 20 of the fall quarter preceding the academic year in which the candidate desires such leave. Copies of this application should be sent to the department chairman and appropriate dean at the same time. The chairman and dean should send their comments and endorsement to the office of the vice president for academic affairs on or before November 1 of the same quarter. Besides providing assurance of compliance to the special conditions outlined in this code regarding professional leave, the application letter shall include the following: ...

B. If the department chairman or principal administrator can verify that the faculty member can be released and that the granting of leave can be substantially accommodated within existing staff, he shall do so in writing to the Professional Leave Committee as he transfers the faculty member's request to-the-committee appropriate dean who will see that the endorsement or comments reach the office of the vice president for academic affairs by November 1 of the same quarter.

Individual faculty members in the department may agree to overloads, however, to make the leave possible. No application shall be considered by the committee that is not first endorsed by the department chairman, principal administrator and dean.

2.95 Professional Leave--Salary and Administration (p. 43)

A. Final recommendations regarding candidates for professional leave made by the Professional Leave Committee to the vice president for academic affairs shall be presented to the president of the university and the Board of Trustees for final approval. Faculty members given professional leave shall receive a-fraction-of-the-regular-salary-they-would
receive 75% of the regular salary they would receive if they remained engaged in their usual duties the fraction to-be-based-on-the-following-scale:

1-quarter--------50% of salary
2-quarters--------66-2/3% of salary
3-quarters--------75% of salary

B. Salaries of faculty members on professional leave will be adjusted according to when step and/or scale adjustments are made in the salary schedule during their absence.

3.03 Selection Appointment of Department Chairmen (pp. 50-51)

A. Each department elects its chairman at a meeting presided over by the appropriate dean. The election is by majority vote-of-those-faculty-members-voting-at-such-a-meeting-(see Section 1.05; eligibility-to-vote). All department members shall be given appropriate and reasonable notice of the meeting date. Every reasonable effort should be made to include by proxy vote or absentee ballot department members who are in off-campus positions or on leave. The election is by a majority vote of those faculty voting at such a meeting along with a tabulation of proxy and absentee ballots, if any exist (See Section 1.05; eligibility to vote). The selection of a chairman is subject to the approval of the dean, the vice president for academic affairs, the president and ultimately the Board of Trustees. Service is for four (4) years. Chairmen may be re-elected. If a new chairman is to be selected, candidates may be solicited both from within and without the university. The administration may remove a chairman at any time following consultation with the chairman and the department. Such dismissal may be for disability, incompetence, negligence, or equivalent causes, if in the judgment of the administration the best interest of the department or the university require such change. A simple majority of the faculty within a department may petition in writing to the appropriate dean for a review of the chairman's effectiveness at any time. When-a-department-chairman-is-to-be-on-leave-from-the-campus-for-less-than-one-(1)-academic-year,-the-dean,-in consultation-with-the-chairman,-shall-name-an-acting-chairman to-serve-in-the-chairman's-absence.-When-the-chairman-is-to be-on-leave-for-one-(1)-academic-year,-or-more,-the-chairman must-resign-and-a-new-chairman-be-elected. When a chairman is to be absent from the campus for a prolonged period, the department may elect an acting chairman within its ranks. An acting chairman may serve for a period of up to two (2) years.

B. In critical cases where the department is evenly split in its vote or where the department formally decides that it
cannot reach consensus on a candidate, the dean may appoint an acting chairman or a chairman for a period not to exceed two (2) years, subject to the approval of the vice president for academic affairs, the president and the Board of Trustees.

3.28 Summer Salaries (p. 54)

A. Unless otherwise provided in this code, the salaries for regular university faculty teaching full time in the summer session in addition to their regular academic contract year shall be $\frac{2}{9}$ th's $\frac{3}{9}$ th's of the salary for the previous academic contract year. Faculty members on twelve month contracts shall have their salaries adjusted accordingly. A prorated amount shall be paid for teaching a partial load full session or a full load for a portion of the session.

2.130 Professor Emeritus Appointments

B. add:

(10) may serve on the Retirement and Insurance Committee or any committees dealing substantially with retirement or emeriti faculty.
APRIL 6, 1979
CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY
THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
AND FORWARD TO THE SENATE

CHEMISTRY
COURSE ADDITION

CHEM 499. Seminar. (1-5).

EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION
COURSE ADDITION

SPED 494. Mini-courses in Special Education. (1). Prerequisite,
SPED 301 or permission of instructor. Current issues in
Special Education. Grades will be either S or U.
REPORT ON CWU FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN GRANTS AND CONTRACTS - May 1979

The response of both faculty and administration to Senate Academic Affairs Committee requests for information and assistance has been both willing and substantial. The rather considerable interest shown, the expressions of support received, and the numerous helpful suggestions forwarded to us all provide a positive outlook for the future of scholarly activity in the broadest sense at CWU.

The Academic Affairs Committee offers this report as a starting point and assumes new ideas will be added. The comments and suggestions fall into three, broad, rather loose but useful categories: 1) Improved integration and status of scholarly activity in general and grants and contracts in particular into the university system - a framework; 2) Techniques to encourage participation - incentives; and 3) Means to facilitate idea generation, proposal writing and submission to appropriate organizations, project execution and reporting - assistance.

A single item may be crucial to one individual. But we conclude significant success requires elements of all three categories.

A Framework

The forthcoming academic plan will be important to indicate the status of scholarly activity vis-a-vis the other academic functions of teaching and public service. A policy statement is necessary because there is a lingering suspicion, and for some the conviction, that Central is and ought to be solely a teaching institution. In that light individuals who do research are considered to be slighting or even damaging, rather than aiding and abetting, the teaching function. We conclude however that a statement that scholarly activity is important both for its own sake
and for teaching will not be adequate to encourage much greater participation in grants and contracts at CWU. Other substantive changes are required which will improve the total climate for scholarly behavior, whether funded or unfunded. Research, class projects and activities which provide students with the opportunity to learn and do research are included.

The mere provision of university supported time will not in and of itself increase scholarly productivity but time is important. The following actions could help.

1) Greater flexibility in scheduling teaching. Strict interpretation of the mandated 12 contact hours each quarter does not provide blocks of time either for writing or carrying out research projects. Decreased loads during selected quarters may be accomplished by: other department members assuming added teaching burdens; by an increased teaching load for two quarters and decreased load for one; or by assignment of faculty to a research function. Another possibility is to offer substantially fewer classes and have classes of larger size. This suggests the importance of careful integration of all of the academic policies and programs - general studies, grants and contracts, scholarly productivity, committee work, and public service.

2) Support for travel to scholarly meetings where participants can get stimulation and ideas to make contacts.

3) Faculty assignment to groups who use their time to generate ideas, write proposals and carry out projects. We have an enormous number of committees on the campus and there is no suggestion here that we add to the number. Surely, some committees could be eliminated or combined.

4) Class scheduling to allow an individual to have whole days free from
other obligations to devote to projects should be possible. As a minimum, all Chairman and Deans should be encouraged to schedule scholarly work, participation in multi-disciplinary projects, and work with student researchers into the regular workload.

5) Another aspect of the time problem is the fact that notification of award for grants and contracts is likely to come late in the spring or in the summer. At this late date there often are no available graduate students to both assist with and learn from the project. Usually, it is too late to find them for the next year. To avoid this unfortunate circumstance, graduate assistantships need to be emphasized and awarded on a timely basis. The university must decide to pledge support in advance for graduate students who may then be shifted to externally supported projects. Obviously on many occasions the university will provide the support for these students. Such assistantships need not be restricted to departments that have formal graduate programs since it is possible to do an individualized masters program. They might more profitably be allocated to individuals who have a history of obtaining grant funds or who have appropriate projects pending.

6) We have for some time been stuck with an emphasis on student credit hours. SCHs have proven to be the single most important factor for funding, staffing, staff replacement, summer school allocations, and other items important to both productivity and morale. If scholarly activity (including grants and contracts) is to be encouraged the system must be altered so that it carries weight in such decisions.

Incentives

To emphasize the support for scholarly activity there should be a system of reward for those faculty members and departments that obtain and participate in
grant and contract work.

1) Make scholarly activity more important in the system for promotion, tenure, and merit. Obviously in order to accomplish this there has to be some assurance that there will be merit, promotion and tenure granted.

2) Share some of the institutional overhead and salary savings with the schools and departments whose members make the effort to obtain and carry out projects with grant and contract funds. It is desirable that the system shares fractions of both institutional overhead and salary savings since institutional overhead is frequently cut drastically in order to meet budgetary requirements of the funding agency, or if course credit is involved, it may have to be dedicated to pay student fees. If only overhead is shared then decisions on whether or not to participate in particular types of programs will be skewed away from those where overhead is minimal. Loss of faculty and civil service staff time dedicated to the project along with supplies and materials not replaced all create a disincentive to participate.

3) On an individual basis, faculty who participate in grants and contracts should be partially or wholly replaced if this is desired by their departments. Otherwise, individuals who produce large numbers of student credit hours through teaching popular classes will be discouraged from participating since it may harm the department in the statistical measures which are consistently used to evaluate worthwhileness and viability of a department. This can produce a very insecure and unstable situation. As an alternative the funds may be used as seed money to explore additional grant and contract work.

4) Formally recognize successful scholarly activity whether funded or unfunded. Letters of recognition for personnel files would be welcome.
**Assistance**

A significant number of faculty are interested in becoming participants but do not know how to get started or see the difficulties as far greater than the rewards.

1. **Provide assistance in the writing of grants.** This seems to require that appropriate resources be made available to the Grants Office. These might be internally provided in the form of a writing team to help individuals put ideas into grant language or at some point perhaps we could even employ professional grant writers outside the faculty. On-campus review teams using the criteria supplied in guidelines could review proposals prior to submission. Many faculty have experience in reviewing proposals.

2. **Develop a central bank of potentially fundable ideas.** It could be used, continually revised and made available to administrators, department chairmen or faculty who wish to get started. Staff seminars or colloquia might focus on ideas for projects. People who organize such activities should receive recognition. Perhaps it ought to be equivalent to major committee work.

3. **Deadlines are a problem.** The most rapid possible movement of grant proposals through the institutional approval process is desirable. If deadlines are missed, individuals will be quickly disenchanted with the process.

4. **Provide a brief newsletter which could include ideas, suggestions, and specific information on projects that would seem appropriate for our resources and pertinent for specific departments and suggest specific sources of funding and deadlines.** Try to minimize the reasons why we can't support scholarly activity.

5. **Improve library holdings for research purposes.** In many fields the holdings are inadequate.
6. Develop a clear policy on the availability of institutional seed money or matching money for worthy proposals.

7. Establish a policy and a tradition which encourages cross-disciplinary team work.

8. We probably need an on-going course for students involved in grants and contract writing.

9. Minimize the hassle which may arise from federal auditors going over the multiple reports - grant effort report, faculty activity analysis, budget reports, final reports, etc.

10. Involve appropriate administrators as participants in the grants and contract projects.
May 7, 1979

Professor W. Fred Cutlip
Chairman
Teacher Education Council
C/o Department of Mathematics
CAMPUS

Dear Fred:

Please urge all members of the Council to read carefully the two documents entitled:

1) NCATE Evidence Questions (a draft);

2) (Draft) Questions That Could Provide Evidence of Complying With NCATE Multicultural Education Standard 2.1.1.

I have two concerns to raise with the Council about the contents of these documents. These are, first, that it appears that NCATE wishes to gain substantial control of teacher education and graduate study in education across the country; and second, that this control is to be gained and exercised through an ostensible concern with "multicultural education," which appears to be an undefined but open-ended concept.

If the draft documents identified above are adopted by NCATE then teacher education institutions across the country will be required to provide very detailed information on "multicultural education." This information could be used to deny or threaten to deny accreditation to those institutions in order to control:

1) teacher education programs in general;

2) student recruitment, selection, retention, and graduation for, in and from teacher education programs;

3) faculty participation in teacher education programs;

4) faculty development programs;

5) curriculum development in general studies, major and minor studies, teacher education studies and humanistic and behavioral studies;

6) institutional relationships with schools;

7) library and other instructional support activities (including purchasing);
8) campus facilities;
9) evaluation of graduates of teacher education program;
10) institutional long-range planning;
11) institutional funding.

The above apply to undergraduate programs alone. Graduate study programs, resources, and faculty also will be subject to "multicultural education" control by NCATE. Whether or not the nation's total undergraduate and graduate educational establishment should be geared to the socio-political doctrine of the six people comprising NCATE's "Committee of Standards" is a question which should be answered by the institutions which subject themselves to NCATE accreditation - not by NCATE alone.

The second concern, one of definition, is raised in conjunction with the following quotation from the draft of NCATE evidence questions. This statement is the only one in either of the noted documents which, however faintly, resembles a definition.

Multicultural education could include but not to be limited to experiences which: 1) promote analytical and evaluative abilities to confront issues such as participatory democracy, racism and sexism, and the parity of power; 2) develop skills for values classification including the study of the manifest and latent transmission of values; 3) examine the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing teaching strategies; and 4) examine linguistic variations and diverse learning styles as a basis for development of appropriate teaching strategies. (NCATE Evidence Questions, "Standard" 2.3.

Please read the first ten words of this purported definition: "Multicultural education could include but not to be limited to ..." (emphasis mine). This says:

1) It could be this -- but it could be something else;

2) It could not be limited to this.

This "definition" seems designed to be anything a given accreditation team wants it to be for any given institution. As such this "definition" and the documents using it, clearly constitute a means for NCATE to control the direction of education at all levels for its own purposes.

This must not happen.

Yours sincerely,

Otto F. Jakubek
Associate Professor
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cc: President Garrity, Vice-President Harrington; Deans Schliesman, Comstock, Applegate, Williams, Martin, Kramar, Guy; Dr. Carlton; Dr. Carlson (Faculty Senate)