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MINUTES: Regular Faculty Senate Meeting, 20 May 1981
Presiding Officer: Larry L. Lawrence, Chairman
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 Kenneth Briggs, Clint Duncan, Jay Forsyth, George Grossman, Robert Lapen, James Peterson, Becky Friar, John Savage, and Gretchen Stohr.

Visitors Present: Jerry O’Gorman, Jim Pappas, Bernard Martin and Don Schliesman.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

1) Under "New Business" insert a new item "B. Motion to Rescind" and change the rest of the items alphabetically.

Mr. Lawrence noted he had received notice of a motion to be made at this meeting, which would be to rescind Motion No. 2027, adopting the Withdrawal Policy. The motion to rescind would require a two-thirds vote for passage at this meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION NO. 2041: Ms. Sands moved, seconded by Mr. Brennan, that the minutes of May 6, 1981, be approved as distributed. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

COMMUNICATIONS


This proposal has been returned to the University Curriculum Committee, was revised, and is now back again to be considered at this meeting.

B. Letter from Dale Comstock, dated May 11, 1981, stating that the Graduate Council has developed a proposed modification of the current policy statement on Graduate Faculty to allow a second category of Graduate Faculty, namely, those in Associate Status. He requests the Senate’s action in approving the changes before the end of this quarter so that the revised policy can be in effect for Summer Quarter.

This has been referred to the Academic Affairs Committee.

C. Letter from Bernard Martin, Chairman of the Retirement and Insurance Committee, transmitting the Phased Retirement Policy approved by that Committee. He requests that the Senate review the policy and refer it to the administration and the Board of Trustees for approval and implementation beginning July 1, 1981.

This is on the Agenda for today’s meeting as an action item under New Business.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

A. University Curriculum Committee proposals--

1. Page 591 (and 595)
   a) POLITICAL SCIENCE -- COURSE ADDITIONS

   POSC 455. Introduction to Constitutional Law. (3).
   POSC 456. Constitutional Law II. (3).
   POSC 457. Constitutional Law III. (3).
   POSC 458. Sex Discrimination and the Law. (3)

   b) SPECIAL EDUCATION -- COURSE ADDITIONS.

   SPED 302. Pre-School for the Handicapped. (4)
   SPED 426. The Language Disabled Child. (3). This proposal was returned to the UCC for revision of the description, and is now before the Senate, on Page 595, for approval.
2. Page 592
   a) **EDUCATION -- COURSE CHANGE** -- Guide to Curriculum change #2 -- increasing the total number of credits from 3 to 4.
      

3. Page 593
   a) **ART -- COURSE ADDITION**
      
      ART 451. Advanced Illustration. (3).

   b) **MILITARY SCIENCE -- COURSE ADDITIONS**
      
      ML S 298. Special Topics (1-6).
      ML S 398. Special Topics (1-6).

   c) **BUSINESS EDUCATION -- COURSE CHANGE** -- Guide to Curriculum change #2 -- increasing the total number of credits from 2 to 3.
      
      BSED 401. Principles and Philosophy of Vocational Education. (3).

   d) **TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION, HOME ECONOMICS, FAMILY AND CONSUMER STUDIES DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION -- COURSE ADDITIONS**
      
      DE/T-IE/HOEE 401. Principles and Philosophy of Vocational Education. (3).

   e) **POLITICAL SCIENCE -- COURSE CHANGE**
      
      Guide to Curriculum change #2 - increasing the total number of credits from 1-8 to 1-15.
      
      POSC 490. Field Experience. (1-15)

MOTION NO. 2042: Mr. Dean moved, seconded by Mr. Kaatz, that the above proposed course additions and changes on pages 591, 592, 593 be approved (including SP Ed 426, which has been resolved and has a revised description on page 595). Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

**REPORTS**

A. Executive Committee -- no report.

B. Chairman--

1) Salary recommendations for the faculty are due June 5, which is the date President Garrity will be returning from a trip to China. The President has asked the Senate Chairman to work with the Vice President for Academic Affairs to prepare a proposal that can be presented to the Senate Budget Committee in his absence.

2) Committee Assignments--The Executive Committee will be making recommendations for university committee assignments before June 3. The new Executive Committee members, after they are elected at this meeting, will be welcome to jointly meet with the present Executive Committee regarding making these recommendations.

3) Board of Trustees--The Board approved all of the Code amendments presented thus far, including the lay-off policy.

C. Standing Committees--

1. Academic Affairs Committee--Corwin King discussed the report distributed at this meeting by the Academic Affairs Committee regarding the charge to them to investigate the matter of program review and evaluation, in response to concerns that it consumes a great deal of faculty time and energy which might be more usefully employed elsewhere. Questions have been raised about the need for this activity, and especially about the process for carrying it out. No action was taken at this time.

2. Code Committee--Mr. Pratz announced that there will be a Faculty Code hearing next Wednesday, May 27, at 4:00 p.m., in SUB 204-205, on the item which has already been approved by the Senate regarding 100% salary for professional leave.
3. The Curriculum Committee is still reviewing the open-ended courses issue. The Committee will be meeting with Vice President Harrington next week and hopes to present a report at the June 3 meeting.

4. Personnel Committee--The Committee has been reviewing the Phased Retirement Plan and will be presenting it later in the meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

No Old Business.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of Officers for 1981-82

1. Chairperson nominees:
   - Frank Carlson
   - Rosco Tolman
   There were no other nominations from the floor.
   - Rosco Tolman was elected on the first ballot.

2. Vice Chairman nominees:
   - David Canzler
   - Owen Pratz
   - Catherine Sands
   - David Canzler withdrew his name as nominee.
   - Owen Pratz was elected on the first ballot.

3. Secretary nominees:
   - David Canzler
   - Catherine Sands
   - Catherine Sands was elected on the first ballot.

4. At-Large Executive Committee Officers -- (2) nominees:
   - David Canzler
   - Bob Dean
   - Kathleen Morris
   - John Utzinger was nominated from the floor.
   - David Canzler was elected on the first ballot. Bob Dean was elected on the fourth ballot.

B. Motion to Rescind Motion No. 2027 (on Withdrawal Policy)--

MOTION NO. 2043: Mr. Klemin moved, seconded by Ms. Spithill, to rescind Motion No. 2027 on the Withdrawal Policy.

Considerable discussion ensued.

Motion No. 2043 failed by a hand vote of 6 ayes, 24 nayes and no abstentions.

Mr. Lawrence noted that if a petition for Faculty Review is filed, the policy will go to a vote of the faculty.

C. Phased Retirement--Mr. Kerr discussed the Phased Retirement proposal which was distributed with the Agenda for this meeting.

MOTION NO. 2044: Mr. Kerr moved, seconded by Mr. Kastz, to adopt the Phased Retirement plan for faculty.
Discussion ensued. Bernard Martin and Jerry O'Gorman were present to provide background information and discuss the plan with the Senators at the meeting.

Mr. Lawrence noted he would like the Personnel Committee to follow up on questions raised and suggestions made before the plan is presented to the Board of Trustees.

Motion No. 2044 was voted on and passed by a majority hand vote and no abstentions.

D. Academic Plan--

MOTION NO. 2045: Mr. Pratz moved, seconded by Mr. Tolman, that the Senate adopt the following prepared Resolution:

Resolved, That

In view of the extent and complexity of the proposed Academic Plan, and in view of the serious implications of the many specific proposals therein contained;

and in view of the severe constraints of time and the limited circulation of this document to members of the faculty;

and in view of the consequent absence of discussion by and response from that faculty;

Therefore, the Faculty Senate of CWU hereby makes known to the faculty, the administration, the President, and the Board of Trustees that it cannot at this time endorse the proposed Academic Plan but must defer all consideration and any action until the 1981-82 academic year.

Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

E. Code Amendments--Mr. Pratz presented the following Code changes which have been recommended by the Senate Code Committee for adoption:

Item 1. Delete from Section 1.25 A(1)

Administrative faculty defined in 1.01 A(2).

This Code change would bring the Code into alignment with what is present practice.

MOTION NO. 2046: Mr. Pratz moved, seconded by Mr. Brennan, to adopt the above Code change. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

Item 2. Revise and restructure Section 1.25 A as follows:

A. The Faculty Senate shall be comprised of:

(1) the following voting members:

(a) One senator and an alternate ...(continue as in present Code).

(b) At-large senators ...(continue as in present Code).

(c) Three (3) full-time students ...(continue as in present Code)

(2) the president of the university, ex-officio (non-voting, attendance not required).

This action has been requested by President Garrity to clarify his relationship to the Faculty Senate.

MOTION NO. 2047: Mr. Pratz moved, seconded by Ms. Sands, to adopt the above Code changes. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

Item 3: Delete Section 2.10 B

As a general policy, the "academic" doctorate (e.g., Ph.D., Ed. D.) is required for initial appointment in those fields where the doctorate is normally expected, and experience is required in an academic context. The doctorate is required for promotion and tenure, in those disciplines where it is normally expected except in those specific job positions within the discipline where the
doctorate is not normally considered the terminal degree, e.g., coaching. A faculty member lacking the appropriate terminal degree in his discipline may be promoted to the ranks of associate professor and professor only in exceptional cases and where his qualifications are equal to those associated with the doctorate.

This section appears to be redundant with the information following it in Section 2.10 C (to be renumbered 2.10 B) and in Section 2.12.

MOTION NO. 2048: Mr. Pratz moved, seconded by Mr. Tolman, to adopt the above Code changes. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

Item 4: Replace Section 3.59 with the proposed Section 3.59.

This section has been revised in response to the President’s request for a more flexible and graduated series of disciplinary steps than exists in the present Code.

3.59 Disciplinary Actions and Policies

A. In the event a question is raised concerning the action of any faculty member in relation to this Code or other published university regulations and policies, the requisite elements of academic due process and all provisions of this Code shall be observed. In the case of disciplinary action regarding programs or departments with three members or less, and under conditions calling for faculty participation in the disciplinary action, the appropriate dean will convene an ad hoc committee from among the faculty of the same school who will act as required using the ordinary standards they would apply if the matter had occurred in their own departments. When disciplinary action requires approval by faculty members, the consideration of the case shall take place in a closed meeting of the faculty members of the department or program (or the ad hoc committee) with the safeguards and rights of Section 3.6. Minutes of the meeting will be kept and a copy given to the faculty member in question.

B. The administrative sanctions available are:

1. Warning: A warning may be given in response to minor infractions of required Code behavior by faculty members. Warning must be delivered in writing, and must be issued by the chairman of the department or program director in the case of faculty, or by the appropriate school dean in the case of department chairmen or program directors. The warning may designate a probationary period, not to exceed 12 months, during which a repetition of the infraction may lead to a more serious disciplinary step.

2. Reprimand: A reprimand may be given in response to continued minor infractions or a single more serious infraction of the Faculty Code. A reprimand must be delivered in writing, and must bear the signature of the department or program chairman and the appropriate school dean. A reprimand may designate a probationary period, not to exceed 12 months, during which a repetition of the infraction may lead to a more serious disciplinary step. The faculty members in the department or program involved shall be notified of the reprimand and the situation leading to it during the next regular meeting of the department or program meeting following the issuance of the reprimand. Such notification will be indicated in the minutes of the meeting.

3. Censure: Censure may be given in response to faculty behavior that violates the Faculty Code and which seriously threatens the reputation, integrity, or credibility of the university. Censure must be delivered in writing, and must bear the signature of the department chairman or program director, the school dean, and the vice-president for academic affairs. Censure may not be given unless approved by a majority vote of the faculty of the department or program involved. Censure may entail a probationary period, not to exceed 12 months, during which a repetition of the infraction may lead to a more serious disciplinary step.
(4) Censure with temporary reduction in pay: This sanction may be given in response to repeated violations of the Faculty Code or a violation of the Faculty Code that seriously threatens the functioning of the university. The faculty member involved must be informed in writing by certified mail at least 60 days before the reduction in pay is to take effect. Such reduction in pay shall not exceed 1.5% of the gross regular annual contract salary per month, and shall not continue for more than three months. Temporary reduction in pay must be approved by a 2/3 vote of the faculty of the department or program involved. The written notification must be signed by the department chairman or program director, the school dean, the vice-president for academic affairs, and the president of the university. Censure with temporary reduction in pay may entail a probationary period, not to exceed 12 months, during which a repetition of the infraction may lead to a more serious disciplinary step.

(5) Suspension with reduction in pay: This sanction may be given in response to behavior which is a serious violation of the Faculty Code and which clearly interferes with the functioning of the university or threatens the safety and well-being of university personnel or students. Such suspension shall not exceed a period of 12 months, and the reduction in pay shall not exceed 5% of gross regular annual contract salary per month. The period of suspension may or may not be counted toward seniority. This condition must be specified in the written notification which must be delivered by certified mail at least 60 days prior to the initial date of suspension from duties. Suspension with reduction in pay and the seniority status involved must be approved by 2/3 vote of the faculty of the department or program involved. Written notice must be signed by the department chairman or program director, the school dean, the vice-president for academic affairs, and the president of the university.

(6) Suspension without pay: Suspension without pay and without accrual of seniority may be applied when the behavior of the faculty member is in violation of the Faculty Code and is intolerable to the continued functioning of the university. Such suspension shall not exceed a period of 12 months. The faculty member involved shall receive written notice of such suspension by certified mail 90 days before the beginning of the suspension period. Such suspension must be approved by 2/3 vote of the faculty of the department or program involved. The letter of notice shall be signed by the department chairman or program director, the school dean, the vice-president for academic affairs, and the president of the university.

(7) Termination or dismissal: This sanction is dealt with in Section 3.72 of the Code.

*******************
(Re-label the following items in this section C. D, and E respectively)

*******************

F. Compulsory reassignment: If the behavior of a faculty member represents an immediate and clear threat to the safety or well-being of university students or personnel, the president of the university may, at his discretion, temporarily reassign a faculty member to other duties without prejudice and deny access to the campus while continuing salary at full pay. This step shall be used only during the interim period between the onset of the problem and some other action in order to comply with the requirements of due process, while at the same time protecting the campus community. This action shall not extend for more than 90 days.
MOTION NO. 2049: Mr. Pratz moved, seconded by Mr. Canzler, to adopt the above Code changes. Passed by a majority voice vote and no abstentions.

E. Senate Reorganization--Mr. King reviewed the report of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee which was distributed at the last meeting. This will be an action item at the June 3rd meeting under Old Business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

The next Senate meeting will be June 3, 1981, at 3:10 p.m., in SUB 204-205.
AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, May 20, 1981
SUB 204-205

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of 6 May 1981

IV. COMMUNICATIONS
   A. Letter from Dolores Osborne, dated 11 May, 1981,
      re: request for return to UCC of curriculum proposal Sp. Ed. 426, for further deliberation by committee
   B. Letter from Dean Comstock, dated 11 May, 1981,
      re: transmitting a proposed revision of the policy statement on Graduate Faculty.
   C. Letter from Bernard Martin, dated 11 May, 1981,
      re: final revision of Phased Retirement proposal.

V. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
   A. University Curriculum Committee proposals, pages 591, 592, 593

VI. REPORTS
   A. Executive Committee
   B. Chairman
   C. Standing Committees
   D. CFR
   E. President

VII. OLD BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Election of Officers (nominating ballot attached)
   B. Phased Retirement (attached)
   C. Academic Plan
   D. Code Amendments (please bring your copies)
   E. Senate Re-organization (copies distributed at May 6 meeting)

IX. ADJOURNMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATOR</th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appleton, Laura</td>
<td>David Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan, James</td>
<td>Lawrence Lowther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs, Kenneth</td>
<td>Karen Jenison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzler, David</td>
<td>Thomas Blanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Frank</td>
<td>Daryl Basler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Robert</td>
<td>Barney Erickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan, Clint</td>
<td>John Meany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Betty</td>
<td>Milo Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth, Jay</td>
<td>Patrick O'Shaughnessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrity, Don</td>
<td>Edward Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gries, Peter</td>
<td>Sidney Nesselroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossman, George</td>
<td>Helen Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, James</td>
<td>Betty Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henniger, Michael</td>
<td>Mary Ellen Matson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Edwin</td>
<td>Gerald Brunner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinthorne, James</td>
<td>Don Ringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Robert</td>
<td>Makiko Doi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaatz, Martin</td>
<td>Ken Hammond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr, Tom</td>
<td>Robert Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Corwin</td>
<td>Roger Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klemin, V. Wayne</td>
<td>Connie Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapen, Robert</td>
<td>John Shrader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, Larry</td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Kathleen</td>
<td>Wells McInelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylander, James</td>
<td>Deloris Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, James</td>
<td>Max Zwanziger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratz, Owen</td>
<td>Clayton Denman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prieur, Becky</td>
<td>Bette JEAN Sundling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sands, Catherine</td>
<td>Calvin Greatsinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage, John</td>
<td>Duncan McQuarrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schactler, Carolyn</td>
<td>Kenneth Cory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrader, Dorothy</td>
<td>Nancy Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spithill, Alma</td>
<td>Peter Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillman, George</td>
<td>Clair Lillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stohr, Gretchen</td>
<td>Richard Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolman, Rosco</td>
<td>Dale Samuelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utzinger, John</td>
<td>Esbeck, Edward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks, Gregory</td>
<td>Ann McLean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler, Raymond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsley, Stephen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlcek, Charles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors Please Sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody J. Khuman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Pappas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Schindler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return to the Faculty Senate Secretary
Dr. Larry L. Lawrence  
Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
C.W.U.  
Campus

Dear Dr. Lawrence:

Please return curriculum proposal SPED 426, The Language Disabled Child, to the University Curriculum Committee for reconsideration. This request was initiated by Professor Elizabeth Nesselroad, Education Department.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Dolores J. Osborn  
Chairman  
University Curriculum Committee
May 11, 1981

Dr. Larry Lawrence, Chair
The Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Dr. Lawrence:

The Graduate Council, after considerable discussion and consideration of our current policy statement on Graduate Faculty (see page VII.B.II.Y.41, CWU Policies and Procedures Manual), has developed a proposed modification of that policy statement to allow a second category of Graduate Faculty, namely, those in Associate Status. A revision of the entire statement with the proposed modifications inserted and underlined is attached.

The proposed new category grows out of the need to provide an opportunity for junior faculty to gain experience in working with graduate students before advancing to regular status.

On behalf of the Graduate Council, I recommend these changes to the Faculty Senate and request the Senate's action in approving the changes. It is important that action be taken before the end of this quarter so that the revised policy can be in effect for Summer Quarter.

If there are questions on this matter, please contact Dr. John Silva, Chair of the Graduate Council, or me.

Sincerely,

Dale R. Comstock
Dean
DRC:1w
Enc.

cc: Dr. John Silva
    Dr. Harrington
GRADUATE FACULTY

The Graduate Faculty is composed of faculty members of professorial rank who meet the qualifications outlined below. Faculty are placed in consideration for membership in the Graduate Faculty by nomination of the department chair, seconded by both the school/college dean and the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, and approval by the Graduate Council. Graduate faculty members will be appointed for a five-year period, with regular review of their status every fifth year. Graduate faculty may be appointed in an associate status for no more than two five-year terms.

There are two categories of memberships in the Graduate Faculty:

Regular Status. The following two qualifications are required:

(1) Holds the highest degree normally expected and at least one year of professional experience at the college level in his field of expertise, or has at least five (5) years professional experience and evidence of activities which specially qualify the candidate to direct creative work in the college environment.

and (2) Engages in research, study, or appropriate creative work as evidenced by past publications or scholarly activities.

Associate Status. Meets the qualifications specified in (1) under Regular Status, and the department indicates potential for the faculty member to develop as a regular graduate faculty member.

A graduate student supervisory committee must consist of at least three members of the Graduate Faculty, two of which must be in Regular Status.

Further, Graduate Faculty in Associate Status cannot serve as the chair of a committee nor direct the thesis research, but may teach graduate courses upon approval of the department chair.

Adjunct faculty are not eligible to become members of the Graduate Faculty, but they may teach 500 level courses if they meet criterion (1) and have the approval of the department chair, school dean and the graduate dean.
TO: Dr. Garrity
Dr. Harrington
Dr. Lawrence

FROM: Dr. Martin, Chairman
Retirement & Insurance Committee

cc: Members, R & I Committee Dr. Kerr

At the Retirement & Insurance Committee’s meeting on May 7, 1981 the response of the Vice-President Harrington to me regarding the March 18th draft of the "Phased Retirement for Faculty" was reported. The Committee moved, seconded, and passed that the proposal, as amended in section 6 (removal of second sentence), be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for prompt review and recommendation and, simultaneously, to the administration and the Board of Trustees for approval and implementation beginning July 1, 1981.

By this memo, I am requesting that Dr. Lawrence and the appropriate committee of the Senate present this matter to the Senate for rapid confirmation, and that this matter be presented to the Board of Trustees by Dr. Garrity for whatever action needs to be taken to make this policy effective.

As always, I and other members of the R & I Committee, principally, the faculty membership, are available for consultation.
CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY offers phased retirement to eligible faculty.

1. At, or after, age 62 and until age 70, a faculty member may elect to reduce his service to the University by entering a phased retirement program. The faculty member may continue teaching up to 40% of an academic-year teaching load in his respective discipline(s). For this policy, 40% is considered to be 15-quarter-credit-hours per academic year.

2. The faculty member will be paid on a pro-rated basis of his adjusted salary as he completes his assignment.

3. During his phased retirement, the retiree’s salary will be adjusted in accordance with any general salary increases that are subsequently provided to the faculty at large.

4. The decision to teach part-time (as noted in 1 above), once made, shall continue for each retiree to age 70, or until such time as the retiree declines to continue. A decision by the retiree to discontinue the program at any point shall be final.

5. The phased-retiree shall exercise his option to teach the following academic year by March 1 of each year. Failure to notify the school/college dean by this date will indicate to the University that the retiree releases all rights to the phased retirement program and shall be considered fully retired from Central Washington University. Failure to exercise the option by reason of illness shall not prejudice the retiree’s right to his option up to age 70, provided that his incapacity is verified in writing by a medical doctor and that the University may require a medical examination by a medical doctor of its choosing. In case of disagreement, the retiree will abide by the ruling of the medical doctor selected by the University.

6. During phased retirement, the retiree shall retain all the tenure and seniority privileges he had at the time of retirement. He shall not be excused from any performance standards applied to the faculty at large, except as provided herein.

7. The phased-retiree shall be required to meet all the obligations of classroom teaching, including holding office hours, but he shall not be required to perform other duties, such as research, public service, service on departmental and university committees and acceptance of special assignments.

8. The University academic administrators shall arrange teaching loads to accommodate the reduced schedules and personal plans of the phased-retiree and the phased-retiree’s right to teach up to 40% (15 quarter credits) per academic year in his discipline(s).

9. The specific teaching assignments for the ensuing quarters shall
be mutually agreed to by the phased-retiree, the department chairman (or program director) and the appropriate school/college dean at least six (6) months prior to the first day of instruction of each fall quarter, provided that, in case no agreement can be reached, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs shall rule on the matter.

10. Office space and general secretarial and other services shall be provided to the phased-retiree as are provided to full-time faculty.

11. According to the policies of the State Employees Insurance Board, phased-retirees may be eligible to continue, on a self-pay basis, certain group insurance coverages and/or to enroll in the retiree medical and life insurance plans.

12. Other fringe benefits shall continue for the phased-retiree according to the policies of Central Washington University.

13. Should a faculty member select a phased-retirement option prior to age 65, retirement benefits shall be actuarially reduced from age 65 benefits.

(CWU RETIREMENT/INSURANCE COMMITTEE - REVISED 5/11/81)
NOMINATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

(Additional nominations will be accepted from the floor, provided that prior consent of the nominee has been secured.)

CHAIRMAN
Frank Carlson
Rosco Tolman 1st ballot

VICE-CHAIRMAN
David Candler withdrawn
Owen Pratz 1st ballot
Catherine Sands

SECRETARY

AT-LARGE OFFICERS (Two Positions)
David Candler 1st ballot
Bob Dean 4th ballot
Kathleen Morris
Catherine Sands

NOTE: Please add to your 1981-82 Senate roster the following names of recently elected Senators:
Education: Frank Carlson
Library (at-large): Charles Vleck -- alternate, William Craig
Music (at-large): Henry Eickhoff -- alternate, Ray Wheeler
Psychology (at-large): Roger Fouts -- alternate, Larry Sparks
**1981-82**

**NOMINATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Chairman

Vice-Chairman

Secretary

Two At-Large Officers

Please secure the consent of nominees before submitting nominations and return nominations to the Faculty Senate office by May 13, 1981.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Years to Serve</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jay Forsyth</td>
<td>Patrick O'Shaughnessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Catherine Sands</td>
<td>Marco Bicchieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>George Stillman</td>
<td>Kenneth Cory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Robert Lapen</td>
<td>John Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stephen Worsley</td>
<td>Ed Golden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education &amp; Admin. Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V. Wayne Klemm</td>
<td>Connie Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clint Duncan</td>
<td>John Meany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Mass Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corwin King</td>
<td>Roger Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Morris</td>
<td>Wells McInelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jim Hawkins</td>
<td>Betty Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gregory Weeks</td>
<td>Clair Lillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home:Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology &amp; Industrial Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn. Center for Early Childhood Ed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSAL ON SENATE SIZE AND REPRESENTATION

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Academic Affairs Committee

DATE: May 6, 1981

The committee was charged to consider the size of the Senate and its method of representation, in response to a concern that the Senate has grown too large for a deliberative body. There are thirty-eight Senators presently, and more than ten percent of the faculty are Senators. Further, in the interest of having every voice heard, unequal representation has been accepted; a department of one has a Senator, as does a department of fifteen. It was felt that a smaller number of Senators, with each representing a more equal number of faculty, might function more efficiently and effectively.

The committee elected to survey the faculty for its opinion on the matter. A brief questionnaire was distributed, listing four possible options:

A. Reduce the Senate size to twenty-five and have all Senators elected at-large, with at least three to come from each school.

B. Reduce the Senate size to twenty-five, with proportional representation from each School, with each school faculty electing its own Senators.

C. Reduce the Senate size to twenty-five, with large departments represented by their own Senators and smaller departments combined for purposes of electing Senators.

D. Retain the present size and system of representation.

Respondents were asked to rank these options from one to four, one being first choice. The results of the survey, with 138 persons reporting, are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Row and column numbers do not always total 138 as several respondents ranked fewer than four options.
Senate Size and Representation

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The return rate on the survey was "modest" (less than 50%), which may suggest that the majority of the faculty is indifferent to the size of the Senate and its method of representation. On the other hand, nearly 75% of those who did return the survey favored a reduction in Senate size. The least popular option seemed to be "A", the most popular seemed to be "B". A few respondents suggested that the size should be smaller than 25, perhaps as low as fifteen or twenty.

The committee believes that a reduction in Senate size might be desirable. The figure of twenty-five is somewhat arbitrary, though a figure much lower than this could create problems in staffing Senate Standing Committees and the Executive Committee. Regardless, a smaller number of Senators might be able to work together more closely to accomplish Senate business. If Senators were chosen from Schools rather than departments, it might encourage those who are most concerned about the Senate to serve. More important, it might encourage interdepartmental cooperation, and make the Senate a more genuine faculty body as opposed to a forum for special interests.

The committee recommends, therefore, that the Senate adopt option "B" in the survey: Reduce the Senate size to twenty-five, with proportional representation from each school, with each school faculty electing its own Senators. It recommends further that, if adopted, the Senate Executive Committee be empowered to determine the appropriate number of Senate positions per school, arrange for elections, and propose the necessary changes (under Senate Membership) in the Faculty Code and Senate By-laws.
POLITICAL SCIENCE

COURSE ADDITIONS

POSC 455. Introduction to Constitutional Law. (3). F. Role of the Supreme Court in shaping the governmental structure of the United States. Not open to students with credit in POSC 451.

POSC 456. Constitutional Law II. (3). F. Separation of powers, federalism and substantive due process. Not open to students with credit in POSC 451 or POSC 452.


SPECIAL EDUCATION

COURSE ADDITIONS

SPED 302. Pre-School for the Handicapped. (4). An overview of educational services for handicapped children, ages 0-6. Topics include: enabling legislation, risk factors, educational development, early detection, alternative delivery systems, intervention approaches, physical facilities and environments.

SPED 426. The Language Disabled Child. (3). An exploration of the language disabled child 0-6 from the perspective of normal language development, assessment strategies, and remedial techniques. This course is recommended for teachers of the mildly and severely handicapped child.
ART
COURSE ADDITION

ART 451. Advanced Illustration. (3) FW. Prerequisite, ART 351.
A continuation of ART 351 stressing development of personal expression in illustration. Six hours of studio per week.
May be repeated for credit by undergraduates only.

MILITARY SCIENCE - COURSE ADDITIONS

ML S 298. Special Topics. (1-6).
ML S 398. Special Topics. (1-6).

BUSINESS EDUCATION

COURSE CHANGE - Guide to Curriculum change #2 - increasing the total number of credits from 2 to 3...

AS IT APPEARS

BSED 401. Principles, Philosophy, and Administration of Vocational Education. (2). F. Prerequisite, admission to teacher education program. Not for graduate or fifth year credit. Grades will be S or U.

PROPOSED

BSED 401. Principles and Philosophy of Vocational Education. (3) F. Prerequisite, admission to teacher education program. Not for graduate or fifth year credit.

TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

HOME ECONOMICS, FAMILY AND CONSUMER STUDIES

DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

COURSE ADDITIONS

DE/T-IE/HOE 401. Principles and Philosophy of Vocational Education. (3) F. Prerequisite, admission to teacher education program. Not for graduate or fifth year credit.

POLITICAL SCIENCE

COURSE CHANGE - Guide to Curriculum change #2 - increasing the total number of credits from 1-8 to 1-15.

AS IT APPEARS

POSC 490. Field Experience. (1-8)
POSC 490. Field Experience. (1-15)
PROPOSAL ON PROGRAM REVIEW AND EVALUATION

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Academic Affairs Committee

DATE: May 20, 1981

The committee was asked to investigate the matter of program review and evaluation, in response to concerns that it consumes a great deal of faculty time and energy which might be more usefully employed elsewhere. Questions have been raised about the need for this activity, and especially about the process for carrying it out. Following are the committee's findings.

Background Information

In the Spring of 1977, a procedure for reviewing and evaluating undergraduate academic programs was approved by the Senate. A Program Review and Evaluation Committee (PREC), a standing committee of the Undergraduate Council, was created to administer it. The ultimate aim of the review was to make recommendations, through the Undergraduate Council, to the Senate on the continuation, discontinuation, or probation of academic programs. The review was initiated in response to the intentions of the Council on Postsecondary Education to begin reviewing undergraduate programs. It was felt that it would be to the university's advantage to develop its own review system rather than have one imposed on it by an external agency.

Subsequently, (Fall, 1978) the review was modified to include graduate as well as undergraduate programs, the jurisdiction of the PREC was changed from the Undergraduate Council to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the policy of making recommendations to the Senate on the status of programs was dropped. Under the current system, (Winter, 1980) the PREC's final report is submitted to the appropriate academic dean, with copies to the Vice President and reviewed department.

The basic procedure for the review, however, has remained the same: Departments compile various kinds of documentary material on their programs, and written evaluation reports are completed by both internal faculty review committees and external consultants. These are forwarded to the PREC, together with a survey of recent departmental graduates by Testing and Evaluation. All academic areas are subject to review every five years, according to a schedule developed by the PREC.

Current Situation

The first reviews began in the Spring of 1979 with four departments: accounting, biological sciences, English, and history. To date, only two of those reviews (biological sciences and history) have been completed. A second round of reviews of four more departments was scheduled to begin in the Spring of
1980. To date, those reviews have barely been started. A third round of reviews, to begin in the Fall of 1980, has been indefinitely postponed. Clearly, the reviews are way behind schedule, and it is taking much longer to complete them than anticipated.

There have also been doubts expressed about the value of the reviews that are finished. Apparently, there is some confusion about the purpose of the reviews, i.e., who is to see them and what is to be done with them. Members of one reviewed department claim that they were not even aware that they were being reviewed and were never consulted. Further, members of the internal faculty review committee for one department have questioned the wisdom of having non-experts in an academic area attempt to evaluate the area. Finally, uncertainty exists about the administration's role in, and commitment to, the reviews. Presently, the Vice President for Academic Affairs meets with the PREC just once a year, and the role of the deans seems similarly limited.

The committee has discussed these issues with the PREC, and with the Deans of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies. All feel that the reviews are useful, though they admit that the review process could be improved. The PREC has recently revised the guidelines for the review in response to this.

Discussion and Recommendation

The committee believes that the policy of the review is generally good. Periodic reviews of academic programs are of value to the entire university community as well as the individual departments, and they have traditionally been part of a university faculty's responsibility. The committee also believes, however, that the current review procedures are vague, cumbersome, and possibly ineffective. The revisions suggested by the PREC may remedy these problems, as they considerably streamline the procedures and shorten the time necessary for conducting them. Still, it is unlikely that the current schedule for reviews can be met under any circumstances.

The committee recommends, therefore, that all reviews now in process be suspended until a revised set of procedures is approved by the administration and accepted by the Senate, and a new, more realistic schedule for reviews is established. If the procedures proposed by the PREC are adopted, and dates are changed in the current schedule, this could be accomplished with a minimal delay in continuing the reviews.