4-4-2018

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 04/04/18

Janet Shields
senate@cwu.edu

Called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL All senators, or their alternates were present except: Lori Braunstein, Chet Claar, Michael Johnson, Kim Jones

Guests: Christopher Boone, Aaron Richards, Carolyn Thurston, Lindsey Brown, Greg Lyman, Bill Schafer, Julia Stringfellow, Mike Harrod, Tim Englund, Kathy Whitcomb, Greg Paveza, Andreas Bohman, Becky Pearson, Bernadette Jungblut, Tim Englund, Todd Shiver, Scott Robinson, Lindsey Brown, Jason Berthon-Koch, Gail Mackin, Greg Schwab

CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA - Approved as presented

MOTION NO. 17-40(Approved as presented): APPROVAL OF MINUTES of March 7, 2018

COMMUNICATIONS - Email from English Department - See office for a printed copy.

Information Systems update - Dr. Andreas Bohman **–** Dr. Bohman gave a brief overview of his presentation that he did in November to the Faculty Senate. Recently our institution has experienced instances of degraded availability and performance in some of our core business systems. Once availability starts to degrade, that starts to effect how we do business. Storage is the main issue right now. Other things they are working on is to establish a secure technology ecosystem. Changes to our production environment is key to improving the availability. To the extent possible, IS has automated the process by which employees are granted access to CWU systems. Access is based on having an active assignment in PeopleSoft. All access begins on the first day of employment, or in some instances prior to the first day of employment, such as tenure-track faculty who have access to Outlook, MyCWU, Canvas and Campus Solutions up to 150 days prior to the start date. Access ends when the job ends. NTT faculty access ends 90 days after the job end date. Dr. Bohman recommended that we incorporate faculty access workflow into the business process improvement effort. Dr. Bohman indicated he would be fine with putting faculty access in a policy rather than the current guideline.

Campus Public Safety update – Chief Jason Berthon-Koch – Chief Berthon-Koch talked about the type of training that his officers are involved in as well as trainings they provide on campus. They train for any kind of an event that may interrupt education on campus. If departments would like someone to come talk with them about generalized and specific plans, please contact his office. The Emergency Plan will online so it can be reviewed. Chief Berthon-Koch indicated that they are in the process of developing fire drills for academic buildings. Senator Finke indicated that the online active shooter training is set in an office environment and doesn't really impact the classroom. Chief Berthon-Koch indicated he would be willing to come to classrooms and talk about tools inside the classroom and the ability to get out. Students get information at Wildcat Weekend and there are personal safety talks in the residence halls. They are currently working with the transfer student association to include these students as well.

SENATE CHAIR REPORT: Chair Stoddard gave a budget update. The Budget Executive Committee (BEC) has reviewed and passed on the budget requests that were made by the support departments. Those have been sent to the cabinet. One of the missing pieces has been presentations from the colleges. The Allocations Committee and the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) are working together to put these together. The presentations will be on May 7th from 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. in Shaw-Smyser 115. The budget process is important, and we want to solicit feedback on the process. BPC will be sending out this survey to Senators. There will also be a survey to get feedback for the Registrar regarding student drops or adds. Do faculty want to be notified when this happens? A steering committee has been formed regarding the Hispanic serving institution (HIS) conversation. There will be a report to the BOT at the end of the year and to campus next fall. Gina Garcia is on campus today and tomorrow. Tomorrow there will be a presentation from 2:00 – 3:00 p.m. in Science 2 room 103. Cody indicated that the final BOT meeting

will be May 17-18. He has been working to have more faculty interaction with the BOT. Last fall they met with committee chairs and at their winter meeting they met with center faculty. During the spring the Executive Committee would like to have about 3 groups to have conversations with the BOT. There are currently no times set up but will have information out soon.

FACULTY ISSUES: Cody gave a brief update on some of the faculty issues that have been brought up. Chief Berthon-Koch was here today to address the safety concerns in an active shooter situation. General Education assessment was partially addressed by Associate Provost Jungblut and there is additional information about upcoming GE assessment in the agenda packet today. Scheduling of final examinations can be worked on by academic scheduling, but any potential changes to the final exam schedule would need to be done by the 30th day of instruction. The issue of faculty emails for faculty who leave the institution or NTT faculty who are not on contract for a quarter was partially addressed by Dr. Bohman's presentation. The Executive Committee will be working with Dr. Bohman and Human Resources to continue the conversation.

Senator Mitchell reminded faculty of the First Amendment Festival that will be on campus. Senator Mitchell will send the information to Janet to share with Senators.

PRESIDENT: President Gaudino yielded his time to the Bret Smith, Faculty Legislative Representative.

PROVOST: Provost Frank reminded senators that graduate commencement and hooding ceremony will be a separate event this year, on Friday, June 8 at 6:00 p.m. in Tomlinson. The graduate students who are walking in Kent ceremony will have the option to come to this ceremony or walk at the Kent ceremony on Sunday. Honors Convocation will be held in the individual colleges. Most of the colleges are doing college level events, but the College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS) will be doing department level events. This year will have student's names pre-recorded and their name and achievements will show on the screen. Provost Frank indicated that youth activism and democracy will be the theme for the next social justice dialogues.

STUDENT REPORT - No report.

OLD BUSINESS - None

REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS

SENATE COMMITTEES:
Executive Committee
Motion No. 17-41(Approved): Ratify 2018-19 committee vacancies as presented in Exhibit A.

Motion No. 17-42(Approved): Approve the 2018-19 Faculty Senate meeting dates as follows: Fall: October 3, October 31, November 28; Winter: January 9, February 6, March 6; Spring: April 3, May 1, May 29.

Academic Affairs Committee

Motion No. 17-43(Approved, 4 nays 5 abstentions): Recommends amending CWUP 5-90-040(15)(c) Grading Policies and Regulations and CWUP 5-90-040(19) Statute of Limitations on Grade Changes as outlined in Exhibit B.

Budget & Planning Committee – Kathy Temple thanked everyone that came to the Budget summits this year. The budget recommendations have gone through BEC and have now forwarded to cabinet. If you have comments on the process this year, please participate in the survey or please talk with Kathy or the Executive Committee. College budget presentations was talked about that was missing from the conversations. Encouraged everyone to attend the upcoming college budget summits.

Statement from the Budget and Planning Committee on the FY19 budget
We believe that, in order for the university to thrive, departments and programs must provide a quality educational and student experience. To achieve this, the colleges and departments need to have adequate funding to support their missions and enable innovation to create a sustainable future. The current budget discussions have not adequately prioritized the needs of the programs and departments

inside the four colleges. We support a budget that funds much-needed priorities such as those from the Budget Allocations Sub-Committee by reallocating or adjusting resources within the support units.

The committee would like senate endorsement on this.

Motion No. 17-50:(Approved, 2 abstentions): Senator Hickey moved to endorse the statement from budget & planning. Senator Bisgard seconded.

Statement from the Budget and Planning Committee on the FY19 budget
We believe that, in order for the university to thrive, departments and programs must provide a quality educational and student experience. To achieve this, the colleges and departments need to have adequate funding to support their missions and enable innovation to create a sustainable future. The current budget discussions have not adequately prioritized the needs of the programs and departments

Bylaws & Faculty Code Committee
Motion No. 17-37(Second reading of three): Recommends amending Faculty Code Section V Complaint Policy and Procedures as outlined in Exhibit C.

Motion No. 17-44(First reading of three): Recommends amending Section I Faculty Rights and Responsibilities as outlined in Exhibit D.

Motion No. 17-45(First reading of three): Recommends adding a new Appendix A Creation, Reorganization, and Renaming of Academic Units to the Faculty Code as outlined in Exhibit E. Bob - there was a major reorganization before this came into play.

Curriculum Committee

Motion No. 17-46(Approved, 1 abstention): Recommends approval of a new BA degree in FILM as outlined in Exhibit F.

Motion No. 17-47(Approved, 1 abstention): Recommends approval of a new minor in Film Production as outlined in Exhibit G.

Motion No. 17-48(Approved, 1 nay, 5 abstentions): Recommends approval of a new Robotics and Automation Minor as outlined in Exhibit H.

General Education Implementation Task Force

Motion No. 17-49(Approved): Endorse the General Education implementation timeline as outlined in Exhibit I.

General Education Committee - No report.

Faculty Legislative Representative – Bret reported that the regular session ended on time this year. There was a lot of activity in the last week. The capital budget that was left as an impasse at the end of the last sessions was resolved and funded. Central had a big win with the funding for the Health Science building. Minor works and preservation are now funded. There was funding at community colleges to develop open education resources. There was funding to grant approximately 5000 more students with financial aid state need grants. There were incentives put in place for the GET program to move from the old plan to the new plan. Central will host a retreat with the Council of Faculty Representatives on June 2nd in the Grupe Faculty Center. Bret indicated he would love to have legislatures on campus during SOURCE next year. There has been conversation regarding the rising costs for library subscriptions. Other states have some statewide licensing agreements. There is a possibility of a bill being crafted next year on this topic. Some of the other issues dealt with this year were the student journalism freedom of speech and the uncoupling of S&A fees from tuition.

CHAIR-ELECT: Chair-elect Claridge reported that the Bylaw and Faculty Code Committee will have some changes to the Distinguished Faculty award on the next agenda. They will be asking that Senate rules be suspended and allow these changes to be voted on with two readings instead of three. She reminded senators to plan on longer meetings in May. There is a number of items that will be coming forward. The Open Executive Committee meeting will be next Wednesday at 3:10 p.m. in the Grupe Faculty Center. The next Faculty Friday will be on April 13th.

NEW BUSINESS – Chair Stoddard pointed out there is information on the NSSE and FSSE surveys and the reaffirmation of assessment in the packet.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Exhibit A

Committee	Name	Department	Term
Academic Affairs			
1 CAH vacancy	Joshua Welsh	English	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
1 CEPS vacancy	Jaclyn Krause	ITAM	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
1 CB vacancy	Wendy Cook	Management	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
1 COTS vacancy	Megan Matheson	Psychology	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
Budget & Planning			
1 CB vacancy	Vacant		6/14/18 – 6/15/21
1 CEPS vacancy	Lad Holden	ETSC	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
1 COTS vacancy	Kathy Temple	Mathematics	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
1 LIB vacancy	Aimée Quinn	Library Services	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
Bylaws & Faculty Code			
3 Faculty Senator vacancies	Jason Dormady	History	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
	Mary Radeke	Psychology	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
	Stephen Robison	Art	6/14/18 – 6/15/20
Curriculum Committee			
1 CAH vacancy	Michael Goerger	Philosophy & Religious Studies	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
1 CEPS vacancy	Vacant		6/14/18 – 6/15/21
2 CB vacancies	Keke (Coco) Wu	Management	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
	Sayantani Mukherjee	Management	6/14/18 – 6/15/21

1 LIB vacancy	Vacant		6/14/18 – 6/15/21
Evaluation & Assessment Committee			
1 COTS vacancy	James Bisgard	Mathematics	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
General Education Committee			
1 CB vacancy	Tim Hargrave	Management	6/14/18 – 6/15/21
1 COTS vacancy	Vacant		6/14/18 – 6/15/21
Sexual Violence, Sexual Harassment & Gender Discrimination Task Force			
1 CAH vacancy	Emily Rollie	Theatre Arts	
1 CEPS vacancy	Jill Hoxmeier	Health Sciences	
1 CB vacancy	Wendy Cook	Management	
1 COTS vacancy	Cassandra Fallscheer	Physics	
1 LIB vacancy	Mary Wise	Library	

Exhibit B

CWUP 5-90-040 (15) Grading Policies and Regulations

(A) "Grade points" are assigned to each grade as follows:

Letter Grade	GPA Credit	Transcript Explanation	Definition of letter grade/ Policy Statement
A	4.0	Excellent	Meets all objectives of the course and fulfills all requirements; performs at a level that reflects excellence
A-	3.7		
B+	3.3	Good	Meets all objectives of the course and fulfills all requirements; performs at a high level
B	3.0		
B-	2.7		
C+	2.3	Satisfactory	Meets all objectives of the course and fulfills all requirements; performs at a satisfactory level
C	2.0		
C-	1.7		
D+	1.3	Marginal Pass	Makes progress toward meeting the course objectives; fulfills course requirements at a substandard level
D	1.0		
D-	0.7		
F	0.0	Failure	Fails to meet the course objectives; does not fulfill course requirements

(B) No "grade points" are assigned for the following symbols:

CR   Credit (see CWUP 5-90-040(17))
NC   No Credit (see CWUP 5-90-040(17))
S   Satisfactory (see CWUP 5-90-040(18))
U   Unsatisfactory (see CWUP 5-90-040(18))
AU   Audit (see CWUP 5-90-040(9))
W   Complete withdrawal from the university. (see CWUP 5-90-040(13))
+W   Uncontested withdrawal from a course. (see CWUP 5-90-040(11))
HW   Hardship withdrawal from a course. (see CWUP5-90-040(12))
I   Incomplete (see CWUP 5-90-040(25))
IP   In Progress (see CWUP 5-90-040(26))
NR   No grade reported. (see CWUP 5-90-040(28))
NS   No show. (see CWUP 5-90-040(27))

(C) All grades are frozen upon award of degree.

(D) (C) Financial Aid may be affected by certain grades and/or grading symbols. It is incumbent upon students to be aware of the impact of all grades on their Financial Aid. Financial Aid information policies are available from the Financial Aid Office.

(E) (D) Grading policy is the responsibility of individual instructors as long as students are notified of that policy at the outset of a course and the policy is applied consistently within a course.

(F) (E) Departments may establish grading standards and policies which guide the grading by individual instructors. Any such policy must be course-specific and not instructor-specific, must be applied uniformly for all sections of the course, and must be in existence prior to the first day of instruction of the quarter in which the course is offered.

CWUP 5-90-040(19) Statute of Limitations on Grade Changes
Grade changes may be filed until the end of the quarter following the one in which they were recorded. Spring quarter grades may be changed until the end of the fall quarter.

All types of grade changes require the instructor's signature and a justification. Grade changes, beyond one week after grades are due, require both instructor and chair/program director signatures. Any request for a grade change after one quarter also requires the dean's signature. If the instructor is not available, the chair or program director shall be the instructor's designee. A request for a grade change after one year or after graduation must be submitted to the academic

dean for approval/denial. No grade change will be allowed after two years from the date the original grade was issued.

Rationale: Clarifying what signatures/approvals are needed for grade changes as well as setting limits on when a grade change can be submitted.

Exhibit C

Section V. COMPLAINT POLICY AND PROCEDURES
A. Obligations
The university recognizes the right of faculty to express differences of opinion and to seek fair and timely resolutions of complaints. It is the policy of the university that such complaints shall first be attempted to be settled informally and that all persons have the obligation to participate in good faith in the informal complaint process before resorting to formal procedures. The university encourages open communication and resolution of such matters through the informal processes described herein. The university will not tolerate reprisals, retribution, harassment or discrimination against any person because of participation in this process. This section establishes an internal process to provide university faculty a prompt and efficient review and resolution of complaints.
All university administrators shall be attentive to and counsel with faculty concerning disputes arising in areas over which the administrators have supervisory or other responsibilities, and shall to the best of their ability contribute to timely resolution of any dispute brought to them.

B. Definitions
1. Complainant(s): An individual or group representative making the complaint.
2. Respondent(s): An individual or entity against whom the complaint is being made. A   respondent could be an academic department, a member of the faculty, staff, an administrative unit, or a member of the administration.
3. Complaint: An allegation made by a complainant(s) that the respondent(s) has violated the faculty code or policies under the Faculty Senate purview.

C. Scope
1. Jurisdiction: The purpose of the complaint policy and procedure is to provide a means by which (a) complainant(s) may pursue a complaint against a respondent(s) for alleged violations of the code and policies that fall under the Faculty Senate purview. A complainant may file a complaint that asserts a violation of the following code, policies, and/or standards:
- a. Faculty Code
- b. Faculty Senate Bylaws
- c. Curriculum Policy and Procedures (CWUP 5-50 and CWUR 2-50)
- d. Academic Policies, Standards, and Organizational Structures (CWUP 5-90 and CWUR 2-90)
- e. Evaluation and Assessment
- f. General Education (CWUP 5-100)
- g. Budget and Planning
- h. Professionalism
- i. Professional Ethics (Faculty Code Appendix A)
- j. Scholarly Misconduct
    1. Complaints alleging fabrication, falsification, ~~and~~ or plagiarism in research/scholarship are subject to CWUP 2-40-250. Both the Senate and CWUP processes will be conducted in parallel.

2. Exclusions: Should the Senate receive a complaint involving the following exclusions, the complaint will be returned to the complainant(s).
- a. Civil rights complaints properly addressed under the process provided in CWUP 2-35.
- b. Matters subject to the grievance process contained in the CBA, including allegations of violations of the terms of the CBA.
- c. Matters subject to the complaint process contained in the CBA including substantive academic judgments in matters of workload, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review.

D. Complaint Process
1. Prior to submitting a formal complaint to the Senate, complainant(s) are strongly encouraged to make a good faith effort to discuss the complaint with the dean or member of the university administration having direct responsibility for the area of concern. It is acknowledged that the nature of some complaints precludes such a step. If no mutually acceptable resolution of the complaint can be reached, complainant(s) may file a formal written complaint with the Senate for review.
2. A complainant(s) filing a complaint should first consult Section V Complaint Policy and Procedures, and meet with the Faculty Senate Chair. The Chairperson will advise the complaint(s) about the Senate's jurisdiction and the complaint process.
3. To initiate a formal complaint, complainant(s) must complete, sign, and submit the Complaint Form located on the Faculty Senate website, which includes the following mandatory elements.
- a. Concise statement identifying the complaint(s) with contact information.
- b. Concise statement identifying the respondent(s) with contact information.
- c. Basis for seeking a review by the Faculty Senate.

      d. Each and every specific section of the code, policies, and/or standards that was allegedly violated.

      e. Supporting documentation pertinent or referred to in the complaint to substantiate the alleged code, policies, and/or standards violations.

      f. Summary of the complaint with a description of the issue giving rise to the complaint.

      g. Concise statement on how the alleged conduct of the respondent(s) violated the code, policies, and/or standards.

      h. Concise statement of the negative effect that the alleged violation has had on complainant(s).

      i. Reasonable outcomes that would resolve this situation.

      j. Summary of efforts to resolve this complaint.

4. The complainant(s) shall submit the completed Complaint Form and supporting documents in both electronic and hard copy forms to the Senate Office addressed to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (EC).

5. Complaints are not confidential. Elements of this complaint may be released as needed at the discretion of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

6. The complaint will be delivered to all members of the EC at the next scheduled EC meeting. The EC has the primary responsibility to ensure and to arrange an appropriate review by applicable committees. The EC will conduct an initial review of the complaint within 10 business days during the academic year to determine:

      a. Whether the complaint falls within the Senate's purview. If not, the EC will return the   complaint to the complainant(s) with recommendations as to the appropriate avenue for   resolution to the complaint.

      b. Whether the complaint package is complete. If incomplete, the EC may request the complainant(s) to revise and resubmit the complaint.

7. Depending on the basis for complaint, the EC will charge the appropriate Senate standing committee(s) or at its discretion may decide to form an ad hoc committee to review the complaint. The assigned committee shall write an opinion specifically addressing the alleged policy and code violations. The committee(s) will be given specific parameters to work with and shall be required to consider all application of the code and policies.

8. The EC will determine the membership of the ad hoc committee, and will not include members who may have a real or perceived conflict of interest. The ad hoc committee shall consist of at least three tenured faculty members. The EC may invite other representatives, depending on the basis nature of the complaint.

9. The committees charged with the complaint review shall receive a copy of the complaint and start their review at the next regularly scheduled meeting. The committee shall have the right to call and question complainant(s) and respondent(s). The respondent(s) will be given an opportunity to present their written response to the complaint along with evidence. The Committee(s) shall make every effort to complete its review, make a determination, and report its findings and recommendations, in writing, to the EC for its consideration and action, within 20 business days. This period may be extended at the discretion of the EC. As a result of their review, the committee(s) shall determine one of the following findings:

      a. No violation

      b. Clear violation

      c. Possible violation

10. The committee's report based on the assigned charges should be specific, and shall include the substantiating basis for each finding and the evidence supporting their recommendation.

11. The EC will review the committee's opinions along with its findings and recommendations. The EC will prepare a summary statement. If evidence was found there were violations of code and policies, the EC will determine the consequences, which could be in the form of:

      a. A Motion of Censure

      b. A Motion of Resolution

      c. A Motion to officially entre the action in the Senate records

12. The EC shall forward the final summary and actions to the member of the university administration having direct responsibility for the area of complaint, along with the Provost, President, and other parties as relevant.

Rationale: A new line was added directing faculty to CWUP 2-40-250: Scholarly Misconduct Policy. This change was made to better align the Faculty Code with the Scholarly Misconduct Policy

Exhibit D

Section I.   FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

D. Faculty Consultation.
1. When consultation with faculty is sought, the initiator (e.g. an administrator or representative of a decision-making unit) will submit a request to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The initiator's request should include:
    a. a succinct written summary of the matter
    b. preliminary identification of faculty bodies that might be impacted or for whom this might be relevant.
    c. an assessment of potential positive AND negative impacts on colleges, departments, faculty, or other entities as relevant.
    d. in cases of creation, reorganization, and renaming of academic units, additional proposal outlined in Appendix A.

    Depending on scope, the request may be submitted in the form of electronic or paper communication.

2. The Executive Committee will:
    a. Verify the list of faculty bodies that might be impacted.
    b. Propose a procedure for faculty consultation and input, usually consisting of the following mechanisms:
        i. "Committee Review": Send the proposal to a Senate Committee or Task Force for review. Senate Committees are responsible for representing faculty and may also, as part of their deliberations, need to solicit broader faculty input, as outlined below.
        ii. Solicit representative faculty input using one or more of the following procedures:
            a) "Faculty Input": Solicit input via the system of senator representatives. This may include an oral presentation of the issue in Senate that includes a written communication via the Senate to faculty senators. This communication will include open-ended questions that solicit a range of concerns or ideas that might pertain to the issue. The communication should provide an end date for feedback (no less than 2 weeks). The Executive Committee will help compile the ideas in preparation for the next step(s).
            b) "Faculty Survey": Administer a survey to the faculty via the Senate office. If the initiators do not have expertise in survey design, they must consult with those with such expertise to ensure a valid survey (e.g., is not leading or pre-determined).
            c) "Faculty Vote": Give faculty the opportunity to participate in a confidential vote (online or in paper) over a specified time period (no less than 2 weeks). The faculty vote can precede or follow solicitation of broader faculty input.

3.   Gather data to gain an understanding of the issues pertaining to the topic or initiative in one or both of the following ways:
    a. "Focus group": Invite a representative sample of potentially impacted parties to a focus group. If the initiators do not have expertise in focus group design or facilitation, they must secure help from those with such expertise.
    b. "Faculty forum": Invite all faculty to a forum to convey information and solicit feedback.

4. In most cases, no one mechanism, alone, can be considered an adequate opportunity for input. Also, the following in isolation do not constitute valid "consultation with faculty": consultation only with the Senate Executive Committee, Senate Chair, or other individual members of a Senate Committee; or representation by one or several faculty on a committee. Moreover, consultation with faculty through Faculty Senate does not preclude consultation with other units, with which consultation may be required or advised (e.g. UFC or ADCO).

5. After consultation the initiator:
    a. Will submit documentation of the process to the Executive Committee and how the input was incorporated in the decision-making.

Rationale: A new line was added to Section 1.D.1 of the Faculty Code. The new language directs faculty to a new Appendix A, which is being added to the code to provide instruction and guidance for creation, reorganization, and renaming of academic units.

Exhibit E

Appendix A: Creation, Reorganization, or Renaming of Academic Units

Section I. INITIATION OF FACULTY CONSULTATION
A. Scope
    1. This policy applies to all academic units including colleges, schools, and departments, and includes proposals for the creation of new colleges or schools, reorganization of existing colleges or departments including the shifting of departments or programs from one college/school/department to another; the partial or complete merger of two or more departments; creation of new departments; dissolution of departments; and changes of college, school and department names.

B. Initiation Process
    1. Prior to initiating the process of faculty consultation with senate (see 1.D.1), the following groups should be consulted:
        a. all faculty (as defined in Section I.A.1.a.) within affected academic units
        b. all affected dean(s)

Section II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES
A. Creation, reorganization or renaming involving academic units must support the mission and strategic plan of the university and of the academic units impacted. The faculty, staff, and administration of Central Washington University are dedicated to shared governance and recognize the necessity of faculty knowledge and participation in academic decision making. All reviews and deliberations should be conducted in a collegial and constructive way. Any proposal should seriously consider disciplinary and interdisciplinary relationships and shall also investigate impacts on stakeholders in non-academic units.

B. Academic administrators and faculty must actively solicit and consider the concerns of affected faculty, staff, and students in the preliminary planning stages of proposals, and must give these groups notice, information, and time to enable them to evaluate those proposals and make their concerns known. The impacts on budget, personnel, other departments and offices, non-academic units, accreditation, and the curriculum must be in writing and available at all levels of review.

C. Senate consultation must occur prior to any action forwarding implementation of the change (e.g., initiation of curriculum changes, recruitment of students, hiring of staff, etc.).

D. In extreme cases (e.g., financial exigency as defined in the CBA or other financial crisis), the President may request a reorganization. In this eventuality, the President should consult with the affected groups to the greatest extent possible following the process outlined in this policy.

Section III. PROPOSAL
When seeking faculty consultation, the initiator must submit a proposal to the Executive Committee including the following items:
    A. rationale for the proposed creation, reorganization or renaming
    B. goals and objectives of the proposed creation, reorganization or renaming
    C. centrality of the unit(s) to the mission of the university, college, and department
    D. alignment of the unit(s) to the strategic plan of the university, college, and department
    E. a detailed financial cost/benefit analysis of the creation, reorganization or renaming, including:
        1. impact on resources
        2. cost of positions required;
        3. cost of remodeling space;
        4. cost of purchasing furniture and other equipment;
        5. cost associated with moving;
        6. cost of new promotional and recruitment materials;
        7. website design costs and other related costs
        8. cost of faculty and staff time in working out the creation, reorganization or renaming
    F. impact on the curriculum and programs across the university
    G. criteria used to select the unit(s) for reorganization
    H. before and after organizational chart for all units affected
    I. implementation plan and timeline
    J. potential impacts on tenure/promotion/review processes
    K. impacts on students, faculty, and staff

L. impact on quality of degree programs, student retention, and graduation rates
M. impact of affected unit(s) on other units and programs
N. impact on external constituents
O. impact on accreditation

Rationale: A new Appendix A is being added to the Faculty Code to provide instruction and guidance for creation, reorganization, and renaming of academic units.

Exhibit F

BA Film

https://cwu.curriculog.com/proposal:3920/form

Exhibit G

Film Production Minor

https://cwu.curriculog.com/proposal:3930/form

Exhibit H

Robotics & Automation Minor

https://cwu.curriculog.com/proposal:4166/form

Exhibit I

Gen Ed Implementation Planning Timeline

Task	Start Date	End Date	Notes
PR Coordination	3/9/18	5/30/18	
• List of definitions	3/9/18	4/13/18	
• PR Campaign for program launch	4/20/18	5/30/18	
• Program talking points	3/9/18	5/30/18	
Gen Ed Policies and Procedures	3/9/18	5/25/18	
• Program Administration	3/9/18	4/13/18	Clarifying program administration.
• Program Management	3/9/18	4/13/18	Clarifying program management.
• Definitions	3/9/18	4/13/18	Defining "knowledge area", "pathway", etc.
• Rules for implementation	3/9/18	5/25/18	Rules for program revision, curriculum development, framework modification
• Program Assessment	3/9/18	5/25/18	Recruitment, retention, first year experience impact, writing quality, pathway navigation, pathway effectiveness, timeliness to graduation.
• Gen Ed Committee member workload	3/9/18	5/25/18	Workload proposal for committee service.

Advising

• Identify Key Stakeholders	3/9/18	4/13/18	Making sure we have the right people to help (e.g., advisors, running start, registrar's office)
• Develop Common Student Scenarios	4/16/18	9/15/18	Planning for determining how various common students enter CWU (e.g., 1st year students, those with DTA but not finished)
• Considering catalog year switching rules	4/16/18	5/30/18	Determine rules for potential for students to catalog years of Gen Ed so it benefits students—coordinate with GEC & registrar's office
• Retention strategies	3/9/18	5/30/18	Trying to think about the best way to help students as they are coming in and how to keep them and help them to be successful.

Transfer/Mapping

• Map current Gen Ed onto New Gen Ed	3/2/18	3/31/18	Build from work already completed by Janet Shields and Todd Weber.
• Articulate equivalent courses from WA45, IP/AB and Common Course Number courses to new Gen Ed	3/2/18	5/31/18	
• 2a. Work with the Registrar to develop a spreadsheet with current articulations for CWU courses in both the current and new Ged Ed programs.	3/2/18	3/16/18	Work with Registrar and Departments to establish equivalencies for AP/IB courses in new Gen Ed
• 2b. Distribute list to Department Chairs for Re-affirmation or changes in articulation to existing CWU courses for new Gen Ed.	3/23/18	4/30/18	Departments may use TES to look up course descriptions from other institutions.

• 2c. Distribute Common Course Number list to Departments. Ask Departments to articulate new CWU courses for new Gen Ed against the Common Course Number List.	3/23/18	4/30/18	Departments may use TES to look up course descriptions from other institutions.
• 2d. For new CWU courses with no articulations with Common Course Number list, departments may articulate against known courses, or indicate they will wait until transfer courses begin being accepted.	3/23/18	4/30/18	Departments may use TES to look up course descriptions from other institutions.
• 2e. Compile articulations and work with Registrar to make sure complete.	5/1/18	5/30/18	
• Course catalog rules for continuing and transfer students to select old vs. new Gen Ed.	3/2/18	5/30/18	It appears this is also on the task list for sub-group #3. Either we can work together or delegate to one group or the other.
RCM/Funding	3/2/18	5/30/18	
• Support funding estimates	3/2/18	8/1/18	IT, Registrar office, etc. -- estimates of new costs.
• ADCO feedback/engagement	3/2/18	5/30/18	Work at ADCO meetings.
• Deans feedback/engagement	3/2/18	5/30/18	Work to estimate college changes in SCHs and classes
• Associate Deans feedback/engagement	4/15/18	8/1/18	Work to obtain class plans at department level
• Report on distribution of SCHs and Classes Across Colleges	3/2/18	10/1/18	Models of SCHs and classes under various assumptions. Ongoing reports as needed.

• Distribution Provost Gen Ed funding over three years and how these funds are accessed.	3/2/18	11/15/18	RCM model and subvention/investment over three years; funding "teach out" of old program;
General Timeline			
• Timeline endorsement by Faculty Senate	2/7/18	4/4/18	
• Preliminary implementation plan report by GEITF	3/9/18	5/30/18	
• Implementation Plan endorsement by Faculty Senate	2/7/18	Fall 18	
• Program changes due (tentative)		1/10/19	Deadlines have not been set yet
• Academic Scheduling sends Fall schedule to departments (tentative)		2/1/19	Deadlines have not been set yet
• New course & course changes due (tentative)		2/8/19	Deadlines have not been set yet
• Departments return Fall schedule to Academic Scheduling (tentative		2/25/19	Deadlines have not been set yet
• Academic Scheduling sends finalized fall schedule to departments		3/22/19	Deadlines have not been set yet
• Schedule goes live		4/6/19	Deadlines have not been set yet
• Fall 2019 classes begin		9/25/19	