

2-19-1975

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 02/19/1975

Esther Peterson

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Peterson, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 02/19/1975" (1975). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 883.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/883>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 19 February 1975
Presiding Officer: Duncan McQuarrie, Chairperson
Recording Secretary: Esther Peterson

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except Louis Bovos, Stan Dudley, Allen Gulezian, Zolton Kramar, Ramon Mercado, Derek Sandison and George Stillman.

Visitors Present: Bob Benton, Roy Ruebel, Al Lewis, Lee Ann Schliz, Ken Harsha, R. S. Mack, Bernard Martin, Lyle E. Ball, and Jerry O'Gorman.

AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairperson suggested the following be added:

1. Under "Communications" add
 - A. Memorandum from Steve Milam
 - B. Letter from Ken Harsha
 - C. Letter from Jimmie Applegate, et al
 - D. Letter from Vice President Harrington
2. Under "Reports"
 - (a) Delete "C" Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate the President
 - (b) Change C.F.R. from "D" to "C"
 - (c) Add "D. Ad Hoc Committee to Study CFR Recommendation."
3. Under "Old Business" add
 - A. Faculty Code

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

- A. Memorandum from Steve Milam, dated February 11, 1975, responding to the request of the Senate Executive Committee to redraft the Faculty Senate's Faculty Code proposals regarding the amendment process, Section 000-099, so as to remove the legal impediments to the Board's adoption of that proposal. He has attached the redraft to his Memorandum and states that it has been reviewed and approved by President Brooks.

- B. Letter from Ken Harsha, dated February 18, 1975, requesting reimbursement on travel expenses incurred by him in conducting CFR business in the amount of \$30.
- C. Letter from Jimmie Applegate, J. Arthur Keith, and Madge Young, Senators from the Department of Education, dated February 12, 1975, requesting the Faculty Senate support a resolution opposing the current policy on sabbatical leave and requesting that funds accruing from sabbatical leave be given to the department to which the faculty member on sabbatical leave is assigned. This letter is being referred to the Senate Personnel Committee for their consideration and recommendation.
- D. Letter from Vice President Harrington, dated February 13, 1975, listing proposed policies the Vice President's Advisory Council is recommending the Faculty Senate to consider relating to withdrawals. He requests approval be in time to include the policies in the final catalog copy by March 31.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

- A. Proposals approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on pages 393 through 399.

MOTION NO. 1241: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Ms. Young, to suspend the three week rule and consider Undergraduate Curriculum proposals on pages 400 and 401 also. Voted on and passed by a 2/3 majority hand vote and with one abstention.

MOTION NO. 1242: Mr. Purcell moved, seconded by Mr. Fisher, that the Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals on pages 393 through 401 be approved. Voted on and passed with a majority voice vote and Mr. Harrington abstaining.

- B. Proposals approved by the Graduate Council on pages 55 through 61 were presented.

MOTION NO. 1243: Mr. Purcell moved, seconded by Mr. Applegate, that the Graduate Council Proposals pages 55 through 61 be approved. Voted on and passed by a majority voice vote and with Mr. Harrington abstaining.

REPORTS

- A. Chairperson's report--Mr. McQuarrie accompanied the College Representatives on February 6 to the Legislative Budget Hearings before the House Ways & Means. Current feelings seems to be that salary raises may be tied to tuition increases and there is a possibility of being funded at 72% of formula instead of the Governor's recommended 75%.

Mr. McQuarrie reported that the President's Council adopted the academic calendar that was presented to the Senate at the last meeting, and that calendar did include a four day final examination period.

A study session has been scheduled with the Board of Trustees and the Executive and Code Committees on February 28, 2:30 to 4:30 in Sub 207. Mr. McQuarrie said he understands that the Faculty Code will be on the Agenda for the February 28 Board meeting as an action item. The Faculty Code has been added on today's Agenda under Old Business in case the Senate wishes to take some action prior to the Board of Trustee's meeting.

The survey on Collective Bargaining that the Senate approved has been completed; 389 ballots were sent out, 230 replies were received as of 5 p.m. February 14. This represents a return rate of 59%; of those 59% returned, 95% agreed with the statement and 5% disagreed. The results have been communicated to a representative of the Faculty Coalition at Western, who is testifying today at the legislative hearing on collective bargaining for higher education. The results will be communicated to the other individuals as directed in the motion.

- B. Executive Committee--Mr. Lygre reported that the Executive Committee met on February 10 with President Brooks and Steve Milam to discuss the Code and to see if further agreement could be reached. Mr. Milam expressed the opinion that Section 000-099 of the version the Senate sent to the President was illegal in that the impasse procedure was binding on the Board of Trustees. Mr. Milam was then asked to draft a version which would incorporate an impasse procedure which would, in his opinion, be legal. He has done that and it has been distributed at this meeting. The main point is that the impasse committee recommendation would be advisory rather than binding on the Board of Trustees. This is an item that can be discussed further under Old Business.

The Executive Committee met with Mr. Anderson concerning CFR activities relating to the possibility of a strike by state employees. He indicated that the CFR would endorse a statement of support in behalf of the state employees' salary requests and this will be considered further under the report of the CFR. Possible ramifications of whatever action the faculty might take or not take in the event of a strike were discussed. The Executive Committee decided to appoint an ad hoc committee to study possible courses of action in the event of a strike and to report to the senate its recommendations. This will be presented after the CFR report provided the appointment of that committee is approved. The members of that committee are Mr. Anderson, Mr. Habib, Mr. Harsha, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Benton and Mr. Floyd.

MOTION NO. 1244: Mr. Lygre moved that the Senate ratify the appointment of an ad hoc committee to study the CFR recommendation. Voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote and with several abstentions.

- C. CFR Report--Mr. Anderson presented the following:

1. He introduced Mr. Richard Mack, a representative on the CFR Task Force on a salary schedule. He explained that the Task Force does the preliminary work on the salary schedule and presents it to the CFR and the CFR takes it from there. Mr. Anderson explained some

of the background of the salary schedule. He said the CFR is interested in formulating a proposal for a statewide salary schedule. They have met with the Governor to give the faculty viewpoint on the budget for this upcoming biennium and one of the issues raised in the discussion was to point out the difference between faculty status in budget making and those of the members of Civil Service. Civil Service has a built-in growth factor, and faculty has to ask for a raise each biennium. The Governor recognizes this, but it is the Legislature that must be convinced. The Governor asked the CFR if they wanted to come up with a statewide salary schedule with a built-in growth factor. The CFR are in agreement with this idea and they have asked the Task Force to develop a rationale for maturation increments. The position paper includes a rationale for merit increases; a rationale for a scale factor for the entry level and a scale factor which will give the top level of the rank. The CFR have not agreed on a specific schedule yet. Mr. Anderson said he is presenting today a rationale without salary schedule. He has been asked to get the sense of the Senate on the salary schedule for the reason that the Council of Presidents will be meeting on March 4 and would like to have the input of the faculty on the matter.

MOTION NO. 1245: Mr. Anderson moved, seconded by Mr. Thelen, that the CWSC Faculty Senate approve in principle a statewide salary schedule which encompasses three parts:

- (1) That all institutions will have a salary schedule based on a maturation increment;
- (2) That all salary schedules will have a common drive factor of 4%;
- (3) That the schedule will reflect a range factor for the colleges of an exit level of 2.5 times that of the entry level, whereas the universities will have an exit level of 3.0 times the entry level and that this range factor will be subject to regular review.

Discussion on the motion followed. Mr. Applegate asked Mr. Anderson to explain the difference between maturation concept and the concept of merit.

Mr. Anderson said the only differences are that maturation increments are normally given and they are withheld if there is some logical reason. On merit increment, nobody gets a merit increment unless they demonstrate some meritorious service.

Motion No. 1245 was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

2. Mr. Anderson reported on the action of the CFR in regard to the possibility of the Washington Federation of State Employees conducting a strike. He said his understanding of the situation of the state employees is that the legislature has established a commission to maintain their salaries. They feel that the legislature has not funded the salaries according to the principles agreed to. Mr.

Anderson suggested there is a rationale for this. Secondly, he feels another reason to support the WFSE is that the faculty should cooperate with other state groups in their aims. The CFR Task Force suggested that the faculty support the state employees.

- D. Ad Hoc Committee to Study CFR Recommendation--The chair requested Mr. Benton to present a report on behalf of the ad hoc committee. Mr. Benton said the committee considered the CFR recommendation. They also were very interested in the situation that now faces the Washington Federation of State Employees. The faculty are making salary requests from the state legislature and relying on other organizations to support their requests. They also are asking the state legislature to authorize collective bargaining and they would like to receive support from the Washington Federation of State Employees in their request. Therefore, they have considered the possibilities of such an action, and have drafted the motion which has been distributed. He discussed the possible consequences to faculty honoring picket lines in the case of a strike.

MOTION NO. 1246: Mr. Anderson moved, seconded by Mr. Lygre, that the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED, The Faculty Senate of CWSC supports the effort of the Washington Federation of State Employees in its current attempts to gain salary increases for its members.

Mr. Benton explained that the ad hoc committee felt that the least the Faculty Senate might do in this situation is to voice its support of the salary negotiation efforts and it might also want to follow by suggesting to faculty members what kinds of things the Washington Federation of State Employees would ask other state employees to do and the possible consequences.

There was considerable discussion on the effect in Olympia on Legislators if this motion passes.

Mr. Marsha said it isn't known what the position will be from day to day. He pointed out that the ad hoc committee tried to leave the wording as open as possible.

Motion No. 1246 was voted on and passed with a majority voice vote and with two abstentions.

MOTION NO. 1247: Mr. Anderson moved, seconded by Mr. Purcell, that the Faculty Senate inform the faculty of the WFSE request and the possible consequences.

MOTION NO. 1248: Mr. Jakubek moved to amend, seconded by Mr. Canzler, that the Faculty Senate also inform the faculty of its action on Motion No. 1246.

The chair suggested this could be a friendly amendment. Mr. Anderson said he would not accept it as a friendly amendment and would rather it was a separate motion since he understands the Executive Committee continues the activities of the Senate and will inform the parties as necessary.

The amendment was discussed briefly.

Motion No. 1248 was voted on and failed by a majority nay voice vote.

Motion No. 1247 was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote and two abstentions.

E. Standing Committees:

1. Budget Committee--The Committee has compiled the results of the questionnaire sent out. They will make a report regarding the results of the questionnaire at the next regularly scheduled meeting.
2. Personnel Committee--No report at this meeting.
3. Curriculum Committee--Mr. Synnes reported that the Committee has completed work on the draft of the proposed Curriculum Policy Handbook and as soon as it is typed and re-produced a copy will be sent to each Senator. It should be on the Agenda as a report for the next meeting with action to be taken on it at a subsequent meeting.
4. Student Affairs Committee--No report at this meeting.
5. Code Committee--David Canzler presented a report which was distributed at the meeting. This recommendation will be presented in the form of a motion at the next Senate meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

- A. Faculty Code--the chairperson asked if anyone wished to speak with respect to the Faculty Code and the pending action by the Board of Trustees on the proposed Code.

Mr. Lygre said he had briefly compared Mr. Milam's version with some of the previous versions. He indicated several differences that he had identified. He said he feels this version is not shared governance and is not satisfied with it.

Mr. Benton suggested the Senators should attend the Board of Trustees meeting on February 28. He will recommend to the AAUP members that they attend also.

The chairperson explained that the Executive Committee has requested a study session to meet with the Trustees. The Executive Committee and Code Committee will attend this meeting and he indicated that the meeting would be open. The meeting is to be held in SUB 207 from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. on February 28. Mr. McQuarrie urged the Senators to attend the Trustee meeting and to encourage their colleagues to attend.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

A G E N D A
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, February 19, 1975
Room 471, Psychology Building

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. CHANGES OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA
- III. COMMUNICATIONS
- IV. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
 - A. Undergraduate Proposals, pages 393 through 399
 - B. Graduate Proposals, pages 55 through 61
- V. REPORTS
 - A. Chairperson
 - B. Executive Committee
 - C. Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate the President
 - D. C.F.R.
 - E. Standing Committees
 - 1. Budget
 - 2. Personnel
 - 3. Curriculum
 - 4. Student Affairs
 - 5. Code
- VI. OLD BUSINESS
- VII. NEW BUSINESS
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF

Feb 19

ROLL CALL

SENATOR

ALTERNATE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Anderson, David		William Cutlip
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Applegate, Jim		Frank Carlson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Backrach, Jay		Peter Burkholder
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bennett, Robert		Robert Bentley
	Bovos, Louis		James Hollister
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brooks, James		Edward Harrington
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Canzler, David		Richard Johnson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Douce', Pearl		Joan Howe
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brunner, Gerald <i>Stan Dudley</i>		Stanley Dudley <i>Stanley Dudley</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fisher, Lee		Robert Cooper
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Garrett, Roger		Starla Drum
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Goodey, Darwin		James Klahn
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gregor, John		Bill Hillar
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gulezian, Alan		Don Coehel <i>off going</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hanson, Russell		Charles McGehee
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hileman, Betty		Helen McCabe
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jakubek, Otto		Joel Address
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jensen, J. Richard		Bonaly Bricker
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Keith, Art		George Grossman
	Kramar, Zolton		Gordon Warren <i>off going</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lester, Nancy		Dieter Romboy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lygre, David		Helmi Habib
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Klug, Linda		Clayton Denman
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McQuarrie, Duncan		Owen Pratz
	Mercado, Ramon		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Miller, Robert		Wallace Webster
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Piccha, Patti		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Purcell, John		Kent Martin
	Sandison, Derek		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Smith, Milo		A. James Hawkins
	Stillman, George		Christos Papadopoulos
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Synnes, Earl		Mike Madison
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Thelen, Thomas		Glen Clark
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Vifian, John		Keith Rinehart
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Winters, Roger		Robert Yee
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yeh, Thomas		William Craig
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Young, Madge		Robert Carlton

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

Bob Benton

Ray Beabel

Al Lewis

Lee Ann Schilz

Ken Laska

R. S. Macell

Bernard Martin

Lyle E. Ball

Jimmy J. Lorman

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE
An Equal Opportunity Employer

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

RECEIVED

February 18

FEB 18 1975

FACULTY SENATE

Duncan McQuarrie
Chairman, Faculty Senate

Dear Duncan:

The following is an expense incurred by
me in conducting CFR business:

Mileage, CFR meeting in Olympia
February 8, 1975 -- \$30.00

You may wonder why I am the only CFR
member who has turned in expenses of late.
I have taken my car to the last three
CFR meetings. We have been charging the
Faculty Fund for mileage only.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,


Ken Harsha

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

1975

RECEIVED

FEB 15 1975

February 12, 1975

FACULTY - LATE

Dr. Duncan McQuarrie
Chairman, Faculty Senate

Dear Dr. McQuarrie:

The faculty of the Department of Education opposes the current procedure whereby at least 75 per cent of the load of faculty members granted sabbatical leave is absorbed by the department to which the faculty member is assigned. If, indeed, Central Washington State College faculty and administration support the value of the sabbatical leave, it appears inconsistent to expect colleagues to carry increased loads without additional compensation.

Faculty welfare is one of the areas where the Faculty Senate exerts influence. It is entirely appropriate for the Senate to object to the current procedures requiring individual departments to absorb the load of faculty members granted sabbatical leave.

We, therefore, request that the Faculty Senate support the following resolution:

Whereas faculty welfare is one of the primary interests of the Faculty Senate and,

Whereas the sabbatical leave is an important element of the professional growth and the professional contribution of the individual faculty member and,

Whereas current policy requires a department to absorb at least 75 per cent of the load of the faculty member granted sabbatical leave,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate opposes the current policy and requests the funds accruing from sabbatical leave be given to the department to which the faculty member on sabbatical leave is assigned.

Sincerely yours,

Jimmie R. Applegate, Senator, Department of Education

L. Arthur Keith, Senator, Department of Education

Widge A. Young, Senator, Department of Education



OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

SLADE GORTON ATTORNEY GENERAL

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

BARGE HALL

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON 99022

February 11, 1975

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Duncan McQuarrie
Chairperson, Faculty Senate

FROM: Steve Milam, Assistant Attorney General

RE: Code Proposal for Amendment Process

This is in response to your request and the request of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee made during the course of the meeting from 3:00-4:30 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office in Edison Hall at Central Washington State College on February 10, 1975.

During the course of that meeting you asked if I would redraft the Faculty Senate's Faculty Code proposals regarding the amendment process, Section 000-099, in such a way that would remove the legal impediments to the Board's adoption of that proposal, while at the same time keeping to as great extent possible the spirit and intent of the Faculty Senate's original proposal.

The attached redraft of the proposed Faculty Senate code amendment process does not constitute a recommendation on my part that it be adopted as a matter of policy by the Board. It does, however, represent a policy proposal for the amendment process which, in my opinion, the Board may legally adopt and implement.

The draft has been reviewed and approved by President Brooks.

EDM

lb
Attachment

cc: Board of Trustees
President Brooks

0.04. Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure--Defined¹

- A. The Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure of Central Washington State College is a set of policies approved by the Board of Trustees pursuant to the Board's authority in RCW 28B.60.120, subsection (11), wherein the legislature provided authorization to ". . . promulgate such rules and regulations, and perform all other acts not forbidden by law, as the board of trustees may in its discretion deem necessary or appropriate to the administration of the college."
- B. This code is binding on the faculty as defined in Section 1.01, the college administration, and the Board of Trustees. Provisions may be changed in accordance with procedures provided in Section 0.10.
- C. All college policies and procedures are subject to federal laws, the laws of the State of Washington and the authority vested in the Board of Trustees. Nothing in this code shall be construed as an abrogation or an extension in any way of any responsibility or power vested in the Board of Trustees by the laws of the State of Washington, nor shall any provision of this code limit the authority of the board by unilateral action to amend this set of policies, to establish other policies concerning the college that may be equally binding, or to delegate administrative authority to the President of the College, his principal administrators and the college faculty. Any authority delegated is subject always to the ultimate authority of the Board of Trustees, as established and empowered by the laws of the State.

All provisions of this code may be subject to and superseded by Washington State Legislative Enactments.

0.05. Repeal of Certain Board Ordinances and Rules

- A. The Board of Trustees of Central Washington State College by the adoption of this code repeals any and all ordinances and policies adopted by the board and any and all rules adopted by the board which are contrary to or inconsistent with the provisions of this code. The enumeration in this code of certain rights and duties shall not prohibit the college administration from adopting and retaining operational rules which are not in conflict or inconsistent with the rules contained in this code. Any pending action or proceeding shall not be affected by this code except that subsequent proceedings therein shall conform with the provisions of this code so far as applicable.

¹The words "he, him, his, man" and the like shall be understood in their general, rather than masculine sense.

0.10 Procedure to Amend the Faculty Code--Regular Procedures

- A. Proposals for amendments to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedures may be initiated by the Board of Trustees, any board member or members, the Faculty Senate and the President. Amendment proposals may be processed to their resolution in groups or singly.

A procedure for amendment to the code through such proposals shall be as follows:

- (1) Amendment proposals submitted to the Board of Trustees by the President or any board member(s) shall be submitted in addition and at the same time to the Faculty Senate. All Senate review of the proposals shall be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of the academic year after receipt of such proposals and at or before the end of such sixty (60) day period the Senate shall submit a report to the Board of Trustees and the President stating the position of the Faculty Senate regarding the President's or board members' amendment proposal. Proposals rejected by any of these parties may be submitted for resolution of differences under procedures described in Section 0.10, Subsection A, (5).
- (2) Amendment proposals shall be submitted to the Board of Trustees by the Faculty Senate through the office of the President. The President and Board reviews of the proposals shall be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of the academic year after receipt of such proposals and at or before the end of such sixty (60) day period the Board and the President shall submit reports to the Faculty Senate stating their respective positions on the Senate's amendment proposals. Proposals rejected by the President or the Board of Trustees may be submitted for resolution of differences under procedures described in Section 0.10, Subsection A, (5).
- (3) Senate and faculty action on amendment proposals originating with the faculty shall proceed as follows:
 - (a) A faculty member may originate an amendment proposal by submitting it to the Senate, accompanied by the supporting signatures of at least 10 percent of all faculty members as defined in Section 1.01 of this code.
 - (b) After submission of the amendment proposal to the Senate, the Senate Code Committee shall consider the rationale for the proposal and may recommend such changes in the form and substance of the proposal as it deems necessary.

- (c) The amendment proposal, accompanied by recommended changes by the Code Committee, and at the same time notice of public hearing on such proposal before the Code Committee shall be submitted to each faculty member in writing at least ten (10) calendar days of the academic year before said public hearing is to be held.
 - (d) After the public hearings the Code Committee shall report to the Faculty Senate. The senate shall then consider the amendment proposal and vote on it. If the proposed amendment passes the Senate by a two-thirds majority, it shall then be submitted to the President, and be duly acted upon as in Section 0.10, Subsection A, (2).
- (4) The faculty may override the action of the Senate through the procedures for faculty review provided in this code.
- (5) Except as otherwise provided in Section 0.01 C., the Board of Trustees may take action on any proposal previously submitted by the Faculty Senate, the President and board member(s) not less than thirty (30) calendar days of the academic year after submitting the final amendment proposal to the Faculty Senate and the President, provided that:
- (a) The Board may immediately adopt the proposal if the President and the Faculty Senate have approved the proposal; or
 - (b) All proposals and recommendations made, and positions taken formally by the Faculty Senate and the President will be given serious consideration and study by the Board of Trustees and the Trustees shall present reasons, in writing, to the Faculty Senate and President, if the Board rejects the proposals, recommendations, or positions; and
 - (c) If the Board rejects the proposal(s) and if objections are filed by the Faculty Senate or the President with the Board chairman within fifteen (15) calendar days of that rejection, at least two (2) meetings attempting to resolve differences shall be held between the President, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and a member or members of the Board of Trustees within thirty (30) calendar days of the academic year, if possible. These meetings shall be open to all interested parties and shall provide for all parties to be heard publicly, according to procedures promulgated by the group designated to meet to resolve differences. If such differences are

resolved in such meeting(s), the Board of Trustees at its next regular meeting shall consider for adoption the proposed amendment so agreed to. If, at the conclusion of these meetings, any party, Board of Trustees, Faculty Senate Executive Committee or President, declines to accept all or part of the proposed amendment, that party may declare that an impasse exists, in which case the following procedures shall be utilized:

- (i) Within fifteen (15) calendar days of the academic year, following a declaration of impasse, an Impasse Committee shall be designated, shall deliberate the issue(s) involved, and shall render a majority recommendation, which shall be considered advisory to all parties. The Impasse Committee shall be comprised of the following persons:
 - (aa) One person designated by the Board of Trustees;
 - (bb) One person designated by the President;
 - (cc) Two persons designated by the Faculty Senate;
 - (dd) One committee chairperson designated by unanimous agreement of the above committee members.
 - (ii) The Impasse Committee shall provide written notification of its recommendations to all affected parties. At its next regular meeting, the Board of Trustees may take any and all action necessary to implement the Impasse Committee's recommendation(s).
- (6) As a general rule, board, president, faculty senate and faculty action on the code shall be completed within the regular academic year, as defined in Section 1.03 of this Faculty Code. This is to allow the President's Office to issue an updated code on September 1 of each year, and to cause all action on code revision to take place during the academic year.
 - (7) In order to assure that the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure is kept under study, and updated, the Faculty Senate Code Committee and the President of the College shall review the code each year and submit their proposed revisions to the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate before January 1. Such proposals may be made jointly or independently.

- (8) Interpretations of this code will be approved by the Board of Trustees who will direct the President to change the text as necessary to reflect the interpretations. The procedures outlined in Section 0.10 shall be followed, provided that if necessary the Board of Trustees may make interpretations of the code which shall be effective until the procedures outlined in 0.10 have been completed.

0.15 Delegation of Board Authority

- A. Unless the Board of Trustees specifically delegates its authority by formal action or resolution to specific individuals or groups, only the Board of Trustees may authorize appointments, leaves, promotions and other employment conditions and privileges contained in this code.

2/18/75

Report of ad hoc committee to implement CFR recommendation on State Employee's salary negotiations:

We urge the Faculty Senate to adopt the following resolution and inform the faculty:

(Motion A)

BE IT RESOLVED, The Faculty Senate of CWSC supports the effort of the Washington Federation of State Employees in its current attempts to gain salary increases for its members.

In the case of a strike, the WFSE asks all state employees to honor (not to cross) the picket lines. Only WFSE members are asked to join the picket lines. Possible consequences to faculty honoring picket lines may be reduction of monthly pay by 1/20 per day out.

(Motion B)

The ad hoc committee recommends that the Faculty Senate inform the faculty of the WFSE request and the possible consequences.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

RECEIVED
JAN 14 1975
FACULTY
ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON
98926

February 13, 1975

Dr. Duncan M. McQuarrie
Chairman, Faculty Senate
CWSC, Campus

Dear Dr. McQuarrie:

The Vice President's Advisory Council recommends that the Faculty Senate consider the following proposed policies relating to withdrawals from class and course additions:

Recommendations

1. Publish in the college catalogs and schedule of classes.
"No course additions after the published change date in the calendar."
2. After published change date, no drops, only withdrawals through the instructor in the usual way. Withdrawals cannot occur before end of change period.
3. Last day for withdrawal should be moved back to end of 7th week (as published on calendar).
4. No fees to be established for add-drop or withdrawal.

Definitions

Drop - course enrollment does not appear on the transcript; change occurs during change period.

Withdrawal- course enrollment appears on the transcript and a W or E grade appears.

While these recommendations are terse I believe they are self-explanatory. If questions arise on this matter the Council's sub-committee that proposed these changes, Drs. Comstock, Housley, and Martin and Mr. Bovos, would be happy to meet with the appropriate Senate Committee.

Duncan M. McQuarrie
February 13, 1975
- 2 -

If changes are to be made in our existing policies they should be approved in time to be included in our final catalog copy; i.e. March 31st.

If I can assist you in this matter I will be pleased to do so.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington
Vice President for Academic Affairs

jm

cc: V-P Advisory Council