

5-29-2019

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes -05/29/19

Janet Shields  
senate@cwu.edu

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Shields, Janet, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes -05/29/19" (2019). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 931.  
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/931>

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 [scholarworks@cwu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@cwu.edu).

**REGULAR MEETING**  
**Wednesday, May 29, 2019, 3:10 p.m.**  
**BARGE 412**  
**Minutes**

Meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

**ROLL CALL All senators, or their alternates were present except:** Tafere Belay, Julie Bonner, Lizzie Brown, Mark Oursland, and Keith Salyer

**Guests:** Gail Mackin, Denise Shaw, Ian Loverro, Christopher Boone, Julia Stringfellow, Kevin Archer, Jim Johnson, David ?(not legible), Morgan Bliss, Rebecca Lubas, Michael Goerger, Bernadette Jungblut, Tim Englund, Nicholas Mejia, Kandee Cleary, Mike Harrod, Becky Pearson, Lori Gray, Janet Finke, Scott Robinson, Jeff Stinson, and Paul Ballard

**CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – Senator Stoddard moved to add 10 minutes to the chair report. Senator Rajendran seconded and motion was approved.

**MOTION NO. 18-83(Approved): APPROVAL OF MINUTES** of May 1, 2019

**COMMUNICATIONS** – NWCCU, Provost Council and ADCO communications are available on the Faculty Senate website.

**STUDENT REPORT** - Claire-Anne Grepo reported that she shadowed Provost Frank recently. She attended Provost Council and a staffing award. It was interesting what an administrator goes through during the day and the amount of emails they get. This year SAS has given about \$40,000 to students to attend events, SOURCE, international speakers, events, undergraduate and graduate research. Claire-Anne is currently helping out the new VP. Claire-Anne indicated it has been a pleasure to be part of Faculty Senate and how passionate faculty are about students.

**SENATE CHAIR REPORT** – Chair Claridge reported on the Academic advising task force. The feedback received was mostly positive. There have been some concerns expressed about moving to a new model and fear of moving away of from what works. The goal is to ensure consistency and equity in advising for students. The task force has summarized the feedback and prepared an outline of the next steps and this information will be sent out to campus next week. The group will continue to work over the summer on details of these enhancements. There will be additional discussion during the fall, spending the next academic year to continue the conversation and begin the first phase of implementation in fall 2020. She indicated the group wants to slow down and make sure things are done intentionally.

Chair Claridge talked about the memo from the Provost Council. She reported that she did bring the concerns of the Provost Council to the appropriate committees. The committees chose not to make changes before the second reading to get feedback from Senators as well. Faculty Senate would like to collaborate with administration, but feels the faculty voice should be represented in the Faculty Code. This body is the place for that discussion and wanted to do that for the second reading. Amendments to the Faculty Code does not require approval by the Provost Council, it is an agreement between Senate and the BOT. However, this year we have opted to provide drafts of the Faculty Code to them for their feedback. Provost Council agreed with the language, but indicated this was a managerial right and CBA violation. Amy indicated that the Budget & Planning Committee held two meetings with the college budget committees and met with ADCO twice. This seems to be more about definition of shared governance at Central than it does about the actual language.

Amy thanked the Executive Committee (EC) members who are leaving: Sathy, Cody and Eric. The EC is welcoming two new members: Elvin Delgado and Gregg Lyman.

Amy's final chair report: "I'm a couple and family therapist, and so I study relationships. Dr. John Gottman, a psychologist at the University of Washington, is renowned for his research detailing features of healthy and successful romantic relationships versus those that fail. A key concept in Gottman's theory of romantic relationship health is that conflict is inevitable and not pathological in of itself. What determines whether relationships are healthy or not is how couples engage with each other when they disagree and whether they have a sufficient emotional bank account to weather the withdrawal of negative communication? In order to keep couple emotional bank accounts healthy and stable, we need to maintain a 5:1 ratio of positive interactions to negative in our relationships, because unfortunately negative interactions tend to withdraw more than positive interactions deposit.

"I can't help but think about the faculty-administrator relationship in similar terms. We are all aware that there is a significant faculty morale issue on this campus- and that is exactly what Gottman says happens when we have an empty emotional bank account. I think our relationships has suffered from both a low balance in our emotional bank account over the past few years and a struggle to engage in a productive, collaborative manner when the inevitable conflict arises. In fact, over the past few years, there have been several instances where it felt like the way we engaged in tough conversations caused us to break open our piggy bank account, spend all of our savings, and then attempt to glue it back together and start over. This year I think we mad progress- we deposited more into the bank than we took out. We started out rocky in the fall with the continuation of a multi-year disagreement about a policy on consultation related to reorganization. Despite it being difficult, both the faculty and administration sides opted to trust each other to move forward and try another time to find common ground. We worked closely with the Provost Council over several months to come to a series of compromises, and the language was approved as a university policy at the last Senate meeting. It has also been approved by the Provost Council. Their willingness to support a detailed consultation process and to trust the Senate contributed to large deposits to our emotional bank account. In fact, the Provost Council has been supportive of all university policies that were approved in Senate this year. To achieve that, we have worked to consult with them earlier in the process and discuss areas of concern prior to the Senate vote. I believe our efforts to collaborate have resulted in more efficient policy-making and less contention. We have also worked closely with the Provost and others across campus to implement the new General Education program. This task has not been easy, especially for Becky Pearson, GE Program Director, and it's not yet over. Throughout, both the faculty and administration have had to trust each other, and there were some times this year that I wasn't sure it was going to work out. But, at each bump in the road, we have opted to trust and support each other. The Provost was supportive of slowing down the graduate program assessment process when the graduate council indicated concern about the process. This year the Senate EC has continued to have direct conversations with the BOT each quarter, and these conversations have allowed the trustees to gain insight into the lives of faculty. And that matters- at the last two Board meetings, trustees asked questions in the public meetings directly related to our conversations about faculty morale and the burdens on faculty. The President has been intentional about including the Senate in the early conversations about important campus initiatives, like a new workforce diversity initiative, and the President consistently supports the budget needs of the Senate so we can continue to advocate on behalf of the faculty. Each of these examples has involved collaboration and compromise and strengthened our emotional bank account.

"The reality, however, is that alongside the deposits we made this year were a number of

withdrawals. The withdrawals hurt, especially because we still live in a context where we don't have enough savings of respect and trust built up to protect us. I'm sure you can imagine why the communication from the Provost Council about the Code change today is, to me at least, a significant withdrawal from the emotional bank account. The Provost Council acknowledges that the language is reasonable and good, but they are unwilling to allow faculty to control even the broad principles of consultation. When it feels like we may be making progress on issues related to shared governance, we hit roadblocks where it feels the administration is unwilling to compromise. When push comes to shove, it seems that the interests and needs of the faculty are too often subject to the whim of 'managerial right'.

"This specific Code disagreement is not the only example of a withdrawal this year. And I don't have to tell you all, because you experience withdrawals frequently as you're disempowered from making decisions about your programs, you're unsupported to engage in scholarly activities, and you're asked to do more with less in so many ways. I've experience many instances of conflict this year in my role as Senate chair- and most often the conflict is not in the outcome (the *what*), but in the process (the *how*). When there is conflict, the way in which we approach it matters immensely and greatly impacts the weight of the withdrawal. Just like in relationships, we must be good listeners, who genuinely try to understand the other's side, and when we mess up, we must listen without defensiveness. When we are upset, we must express ourselves without criticism or contempt. To me, these communication skills directly translate to shared governance. Shared governance isn't about agreeing on everything and it's not even about consulting on every issue. It's about treating each other with respect and empathy. To do that, I think we need to truly believe that the other's opinion is worth listening to, and we need to listen before we have our mind already made up. And I acknowledge that it's hard to communication well and fairly when our emotional bank accounts are empty. No relationships can survive when partners jealously cling to established roles, powers, and expectations; similarly this relationship between faculty and administration cannot survive if shared governance is reduced to a battle between 'managerial rights' and 'consultation'." We must instead embrace the broader and nobler principles of collaboration and cooperation on which any reasonable definitions of shared governance must be founded.

"I have a feeling that this is starting to sound like a complete lack of faith in the administration, and that's not what I intend. I genuinely believe that the administrators I have worked with this year care about Central and our students, and they work long, hard hours to make this place better. I get along well with all of them because they're good people and want to do the right thing. We see reality differently- the reality that our faculty are burnt out, overburdened, and still incredibly available for our students; the reality that faculty are the core of our ability to recruit and retain students; the reality that faculty are invested in the long-term success of this institution in a way that many others are not. And the fact that we struggle to communicate well makes our different realities even more problematic. I think we often agree on the vision and ultimate goals, but we have fundamental disagreements about the methods to achieve them. And most of all, I am greatly concerned about the apparent disconnect between faculty and administrators about what shared governance means at Central. I think that is what has been so disappointing about the relationship that has developed between faculty and administrators. I know the administrators. I like them. When forced, we work really well together. I know that we can accomplish much in our collaborations, if we are both willing to deposit freely in the bank account.

"Although I really like my extra height up on this special box, I think I better leave some time for the Senate business today. So to sum it up, I think our emotional piggy bank has a few more quarters in it than it did at the start of the year, thanks to the administration, the work of the Senate, to many hard working staff and students in this room, and you all as faculty. I'm concerned that we have not built up enough savings to protect us from the inevitable negative

interactions and conflict that are coming our way. We need to engage in more intentional relationship building to better understand and support each other.

“That means that there continues to be much more to do to build our emotional bank account and strengthen the trust, respect, and appreciation between the administration and faculty. I am confident Walter will continue the work whole heartedly next year. In fact, he is the perfect person to lead the Senate through a revision of the Faculty Code and discussion of shared governance- he has become a scholar in this important area and will bring fresh perspective to the issues.”

**FACULTY ISSUES** – Amy met with Facilities regarding the lack of ADA signage. They are looking into the issue. Faculty, students and staff with ongoing mobility issues should work with Disability Support Services. There is work being done on a digital map that will indicate ADA entrances and elevators. In regards to the web search issue brought up, Web Design indicated this is a known issue, especially with Google. Google can find old documents even when they are unlinked from the website. They suggested that documents be clearly labeled with dates and help students understand how to determine the date of a document as well as physically remove the documents when they are outdated.

Senator Dormady brought forward that he would like to see the Diversity awards have a monetary award like the Distinguished Faculty awards.

Senator Eklund expressed a concern about the new graduation format. Without the center ramp faculty can no longer congratulate students at the bottom of the ramp. While it is great to have their names on the big screen, it isn't as special for the students.

Senator Lindsey asked if non-tenure-track faculty could know in the spring that they will be hired for the fall. Many departments need individuals with specialized background and departments can't plan for classes if we don't know if we will have these faculty.

Senator Castillo thanked the Senate for approving spring graduation for spring intern teachers. Families and students are excited to celebrate at the spring commencement with their students who will be doing their fall student teaching

**OLD BUSINESS** - None

## **REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS**

### **SENATE COMMITTEES:**

#### **Executive Committee**

**Motion No. 18-84(Approved):** Endorsement of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee procedure manual as outlined in Exhibit A.

**Motion No. 18-89(Approved with 2 abstentions):** Election of 2019-20 Faculty Senate Chair-Elect – Nominee: Elvin Delgado, Geography.

**Academic Affairs Committee** – No report.

**Budget and Planning Committee** – The committee's not so final Year-End Report is with the agenda. Kathy Temple indicated that the Yea-End report is not the final report as there is a survey open. She gave an overview of the process of the Faculty Code change, how the language was developed and the consultation process. There are two changes from original. The first change is Section 2 college policies. The second is to Section 3: remove the statement about faculty of all ranks and replace with “All faculty are eligible to serve on the

committees” and removed statement to “include both chair and non-chair faculty members”. Mary Radeke talked about how the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee (BFCC) is working on strengthening the Code and shared governance. BFCC recommends inclusion of the language that BPC is proposing on budget planning committees. They feel this is consistent with Section 1.c.1. Encourages transparency and consultation process. Key assumptions of shared governance. Addition of Appendix A are the guidelines for inclusions and clarification.

Senator Dormady indicated he doesn't approve of the removal of the broad language of all ranks. He hope colleges adhere to the spirit of this policy.

Dean Tim Englund – “Thank you for recognizing me. First, I just want to take a second that I really appreciated our relationship with Chair Claridge. There have been a lot of very interesting conversations. Everything she said, there have been a lot of deposits made and a lot of withdrawals made. I guess I want to focus on that, because I think I look at the relationship a little bit differently. I want to make it clear that when I talk about the perspectives of the Provost Council or my own, that I don't think anybody is objecting to the content of the language as it exists right now. Especially about the parts about rights and responsibilities of the faculty. No one in their right mind will ever disagree that faculty shouldn't be retaliated against for speaking their mind on a budgetary matter. I don't know why it is stopping at budgetary matters. It seems to me it should be in a broader context and no one should be retaliated for what they say on this floor period. But that is not what we are talking about. So, that's fine. As far as Appendix A where they lay out the guidelines for which the committee exists. Well it mirrors within probably 99% correlation of how the budget committee in the College of the Sciences (COTS) looks. Again, this is what has been created in our college sort of organically. So there is no problem there from my perspective what so ever. What I object to is the fact that it is in Faculty Code. I have a number of reasons of why I think it doesn't belong in Faculty Code. The Deans have agreed, and we did say, we thought it agreed that it belonged in college language, but we also agreed it could belong in faculty policy. I want to be clear about that. So what are my concerns? First of all, purview. College budget committee report to the college. They report to the Dean, the Dean reports to the Provost, and the Provost reports to the President. Faculty Senate committees obviously don't. So there are organizational barriers that are being crossed here by writing language from one to the other. And as it has been mentioned there are only Faculty Senate committees are in the Code right now. There is language around college level committees in the CBA (*Collective Bargaining Agreement*) and that language in the CBA was consultative. We negotiated that. We sat down at a table behind closed doors and negotiated. No one can say that this language was negotiated between the two bodies. We learned about it on March 5<sup>th</sup>. I didn't know that the Budget and Planning Committee was meeting with the college level budget committees. I had no idea that was happening until I saw the language, I had no idea this was happening. This is a completely different process there. Two, precedence. Again, there are no prior incidences that I am aware of to write language for non-Faculty Senate committees. Once these institutional boundaries are crossed. This is the thing, they cross both ways. Please keep this in mind. I have been here since 1998. My first experience with the relationship between administration and faculty...was, I was here for two weeks and I was asked to vote no confidence or confidence in a President. The relationship between administration and faculty was horrible. Then it got better. Then we voted to unionize and it got horrible again. And now it is great. This was a rough time. I sat right about where Kandee is sitting for 4 or 6 years as a faculty Senator and we went through the discussions of exactly what the purview of each unit was. And we talked about, and it was rough in those days. But it got better now. If you go back to the 80's the Faculty Senate Executive Committee started a lawsuit against the Board of Trustees because we went into financial exigency. Academics goes in a circle. And things are very good right now. Once these organizational boundaries are crossed, they are crossed both ways. You open the doors, you can go one way or go the other. And things will change.

Jim is my fourth President. Katharine is my sixth Provost. There have been six Deans in COTS. I expect there will be several more Presidents if I live long enough. We will see. Hopefully many more Deans in COTS. Maybe sooner than I thought. Anyway, those of us who were around in the bad old days can easily imagine creation of language of how many Deans would you like on the EC (*Executive Committee*)? So, you know, once these boundaries are crossed, they are crossed, and it goes both ways. Third, practicality. College budget committees are exactly as useful, and exactly as...people will have as much input as the Dean gives them. Nothing in the language here guarantees anything will happen. Wouldn't it have been better to work collaborative to establish something that we could all agree on and that we all happy with. It could have happened differently. Lastly, personality. Policy based on current sets of personalities are never a good idea. So a lot of ways this policy 'wonkishness'. I realize this is hard not to understand the nuance differences between policy and Code. I had a hard time keeping it straight when I was a senator and luckily I have Mike Harrod to keep me on the straight and narrow as it is now. I have been here long enough to what comes around goes around. In the current configuration of the university there really isn't any down side to this. I agree, faculty should have a say in budgetary matters. We gave them that already. Things will change. Guaranteed, it will come back around. Once the door is open, it goes both ways and think about what could happen in the future. Again, it's not the language. It is all very reasonable. It is something I can live with, it is the placement. Last, but not least, the university has existed for a long time. There is a reason your predecessors didn't cross this line. We've talked about this, I agree it is a living document, but there is a reason why everyone who has sat in this room for the last 120 years didn't cross this line. Think about that when you vote. Thank you."

**Motion No. 18-89 (Approved):** Senator Douglas moved that Motion No. 18-57 vote be done by paper ballot. Senator Rajendran seconded and motion was approved.

Dean Jeff Stinson – "I would like to add to what Tim was saying. One of the things that I struggle with this is calling out this specific committee as opposed to...Why this committee is any more important than other college committees that we also operated in a shared governance kind of way. In here, in the Code we are taking that step of identifying a specific committee and the specific pieces for that committee, rather than dealing with the overarching issue which is all of them. I don't see the distinction. I think there are other college level committees that are more important or equally important to our ability to function and address the issues that are faced in the college. I think most of us, I can't speak for all of the colleges, and I know Tim has way more money than we do. What are we really talking about when we sit down with our college budget committees, to allocate, I mean it is something like the magnitude of 5% of the budget. Other than those intricate times when maybe we do have the opportunity to support or consider brand new programs or brand new lines. The amount that is discretionary, I would argue, at least in the College of Business there are other committees that have much more influence on college and the success of the college, than the budget committee. Calling this committee out in this way I am struggling to see how that fits in.

**Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee** – Year End Report

**Motion No. 18-57(Approved 33 yes, 7 no, 4 abstentions):** Recommends amending the Faculty Code Section I.B Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and Appendix A as outlined in Exhibit B.

**Curriculum Committee** – Year End Report

**Motion No. 18-85(Approved):** Recommends approval of a new TESOL Type B Certificate as outlined in Exhibit C.

**Motion No 18-86(Approved):** Recommends approval of a new Graduate certificate in Professional Tax Practice as outlined in Exhibit D.

**Motion No. 18-87(Approved):** Recommends approval of a new Liberal Studies Minor as outlined in Exhibit E. (Pending Curriculum Committee approval)

**Motion No. 18-88(Approved):** Recommends approval of a new Teacher Certification, MAT with two specializations: Secondary & K-12 Specialization and Special Education Specialization as outlined in Exhibit F. (Pending Curriculum Committee approval)

**General Education Committee** - Year-End Report Email will be going soon. Proposals for any change, is Friday October 4th.

**Evaluation and Assessment Committee** - Year End Report is attached to agenda. Jim Bisgard provided a written report that is with the agenda packets. There is a summary of comments from the listening sessions around SEOIs. The draft SEOI policy language is also in the information. Senators are encouraged to talk with departments and provide any feedback. This language will be coming forward next year.

**Faculty Legislative Representative** – Bret reported that over the summer the Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) will be active with local legislators. They will be doing a retreat in the fall. They will be working a little more proactively on the supplemental calendar. Some bills they were watching this year will automatically come back the next year. Send Bret any comments or concerns.

**Sexual Misconduct Task Force** – Year End Report was provided by chair Jill Hoxmeier. The report indicates best practices and comparing to what we do at Central. The Task Force engaged in discussions with faculty, staff and students. The report indicates that we know sexual misconduct persist in environments where they are perceived as tolerated. The task force is recommending we move us away as a compliance focus and really emphasizing in the role that faculty play in that role. Faculty not knowing fully their role as a mandatory reporter. Broader discussion in faculty/student issues and faculty/faculty issues. Reporting issue of transparency. They would like to have a resolution process and what appropriate information back to the parties involved. Currently, some of these issues are going without reporting and when they are individuals don't know what happened.

**PRESIDENT** – President Gaudino reported that this has been a difficult, but good year. We have dealt with the tragic deal of students, the ghost shooting event, and snow. President Gaudino thanked Senators and all faculty for being partners in helping to address these issues. It has been a fantastic legislative year. There were no real negative policies from the legislature this year and pleased with the creation of a new revenue stream. They are turning the state need grant from a privilege to a right and everyone who is eligible will get served. Central received funding for the new Health Science building. Hertz is in abatement right now and soon after graduation the building will be taken down. CWU also received \$5 million for design money for Health Education (Nicholson Pavilion). The implementation of the new General Education program is the obvious star of the year. President Gaudino: "On the subject of shared governance, I agree with both Amy and Tim oddly articulated. I have a slightly different, if Amy can throw a citation out of her discipline I will throw one out from mine. Actually is from Kandee Cleary's discipline not mine, it is Berger and Luckmann 'Social Construction of Reality'. Essentially for those who don't read that stuff, it basically says we habituate into a world view and we are socialized into it in various aspects of our lives whether in family relationships, our religious beliefs and so forth. But also our organizational structures. What happens in the academy, at least from my view, is that faculty

start getting socialized at least the moment they enter into a PhD program with a certain view of the way the university is run. Most administrators, probably 99% of administrators, have that same initial socialization and somewhere along the way they turn and they start getting different information and going to professional groups and you start getting a different way of looking at things. The reason I bring that up is I think this capital that Amy is talking about, I wish it weren't a necessary expenditure, but it is. Because it isn't just a matter of agreeing, it is a matter of ourselves having to change the way we have been habituated to. When I say I agree with Tim, one of the first things I said when I arrived at Central and got a little bit of the lay of the land was how efficient our system of shared governance was. We had a healthy relationship with the Union. We did not have a healthy relationship between administration and faculty outside of the collective bargaining agreement. I think we are getting there. It doesn't feel healthy because we are yelling at each other. We are finding various ways of getting the other to see our perspective and that is causing some withdrawals. I see much more positive, than I see negative. It hurts, it's painful, it hurts professionally, and it hurts personally if you are one of the people doing the fighting, but we are getting there. I think five-six years down the road, if we are willing to keep this pressure on each other, protecting management rights but honoring consultation we will eventually get there. Whether it is policy or Code could probably not be less relevant, other than faculty have access to the Trustee's on Code and they have less direct access on policies. So, if as administrators we get more active in enacting policy that effects shared governance in a way, if that is the way we want to go, we can do that. I have been waiting for this committee structure, since two years before I pulled the string and said let's do RMC and we are just now getting to this college level shared governance. It has taken us a long time to adapt to that. So, whether it goes into the Code or into policy, to me, is less important than its existence. I will say the reason I am such a strong advocate for the Code is because we have a collective bargaining agreement. I have worked at universities that have allowed shared governance to creep into the collective bargaining agreement because of their desire to withhold the strengthening of the Code. Faculty are a little bit like running water, they are going to find the way down the hill and they are going to take different paths as one gets blocked, it's not going to get backed up forever, it is going to find another way around. That is somewhat what is happening here. One path they have is through their union to get certain things into the CBA. As an administrator, and to the trustees we want to resist that. If it is in the CBA it becomes grievable and a violation becomes a grievable act and becomes is now subject to outside the university intervention through forced arbitration, PERC starts to decide things for us. I don't want, it's not that I don't trust the UFC, I don't necessarily trust Washington's perspective on some of the things we might want to do. And it would be precedent setting to all the other universities as well. The Code is ours and where I would disagree with Tim is where the faculty don't get to write Code, the faculty and the Board of Trustees get to write the Code. So who is more active, the faculty so it is an uneven playing field, but we have avenues. I watched the last episode of Game of Thrones and I am a hand to the King. I get to advise the Board of Trustees, so I do have the ability. But if you put things in policy, it is totally my signature that approves or disapproves. If you want to play personalities that is a real dangerous place to give the President the power to abolish a policy. Where the Code is a negotiation with the Board of Trustees."

The President thanked Amy for her service this year. President Gaudino presented Walter with his gavel.

**PROVOST** - Provost Frank talked about shadowing Clare Ann. She attended four classes and spent time in ASCWU office. She is passionate about how a campus flows. She had three classes in the L&L building and has strong opinions of L&L. The flow of traffic is very troubling and is one of the busiest places during passing period. The hallways are crowded, learning environment is terrible. This is effecting the students learning environment. A number of the courses in the building are General Education and serves most of students on campus. She

attended a class in Shaw-Smyer and it was a much different learning environment. We are not serving the students without buildings. There are two capital project town halls this week: May 30 at 3:00 p.m. and, May 31 at 9:00 a.m. both in Samuelson 104. Both sessions will have video conference capability. There will be two core theme forums: June 6 9:00-10:00 a.m. in Discovery Hall room 301 and June 7 will have a drop in period from 10:00-12:00 in Science I room 115. WebEx will be available.

**CHAIR-ELECT: Motion No. 18-90(Approved):** Senator Szeliga moved:

**Whereas** Amy Claridge led the Faculty Senate with integrity, honesty, vision, courage, and tireless effort;

**Whereas** Amy Claridge has been an active learner with an uncanny knack for detail while always maintaining a broader vision for Senate and the University during a period of significant change;

Whereas Amy Claridge advanced the cause of shared governance at all levels of the university;

Whereas Amy Claridge represented the interests of faculty in numerous campus conversations through committees, groups, and councils; and

Whereas Amy Claridge spearheaded many focus groups and listening sessions, empowered many voices by recognizing and addressing faculty concerns, and continuously advocated for academics and faculty; therefore,

Be it resolved that the Central Washington University Faculty Senate is grateful and wishes to publically thank Amy Claridge for her service as Chair of the Faculty Senate during the 2018-2019 academic year.

Walter reported that there will be an open EC meeting next Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. in the Grupe Faculty Center. There is still an opening on the Executive Committee for the Member-At-Large if anyone is interested in putting their name in for consideration.  
Still have At-Large EC member open.

**NEW BUSINESS** - None

Meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

# Exhibit A

## Faculty Senate Executive Committee Policies and Procedures Manual

### PURPOSE

The Senate Executive Committee (EC) Policies and Procedures manual is intended to assist the EC members in the performance of their responsibilities to the Senate. The policies and procedures detailed in this document are not intended to supersede any CWU policies and procedures including the Faculty Code (Code) and Senate Bylaws. In case of a conflict, the Code and Bylaws Committee will control any conflicts.

### ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT

These policies and procedures for the conduct of the EC's operations shall be established on adoption by two-thirds majority vote of the EC members and approval by the Faculty Senate. Amendments to the Policy and Procedures may be passed with a two-thirds vote of EC members and approval by the Faculty Senate.

### RESPONSIBILITIES

#### 1. Powers and Duties

In accordance with Section II.B of the Bylaws, the EC has the following powers and duties:

- a. to perform the leadership role for the Senate;
- b. to receive, evaluate and direct the disposition of all items directed to the Senate for consideration;
- c. to compile and publish the agenda in advance of each regular meeting of the Senate;
- d. to meet at least twice monthly to review Senate business during the regular academic year;
- e. to initiate matters for Senate consideration;
- f. to represent the Senate in discussions with the various committees, administrators, and other university groups or individuals;
- g. to represent the Senate in discussions with external organizations and groups (e.g., NWCCU, other Faculty Senates, Legislature);
- h. to create Senate standing and ad hoc committees as described in the Code;
- i. to nominate, subject to ratification by the Senate membership, all members of Senate standing committees, members of Senate ad hoc committees, a parliamentarian, and such other positions as may be necessary;
- j. to nominate a faculty legislative representative to the president; once approved, the nominee shall then be confirmed by the full Senate;
- k. to forward nominations for faculty positions on university standing committees and councils to the president and provost;
- l. to create the committee and provide the guidelines for selection of university Distinguished Faculty;
- m. to act on behalf of the Senate and exercise any of its powers. When necessary, such actions may be subject to ratification by the Senate at its next regular meeting;
- n. to receive and review proposed changes to the Code and Bylaws according to the respective amendment processes;
- o. to exercise other powers delegated to it by the Senate or assigned to it by the Code;
- p. to fill vacancies on the Executive Committee;  
other powers that are germane to the operation and function of the Faculty Senate that are not explicitly assigned to Senate subcommittees or other faculty organizations.

#### 2. Committee Liaisons

At the start of the academic year, the Chair appoints each EC member as a liaison to at least one of the Senate standing / ad-hoc committees or task forces. The EC member liaises between the EC and committee/task force to communicate and coordinate their activities. Liaisons should serve as a resource and

support to the committee and advocate on behalf of the committee at the EC. The EC members will attend the meetings of their liaison committees. Following any meetings of their liaison committees, the EC member will submit a verbal or written report to the EC as determined by the Chair. Pertinent documents resulting from committee activities should also be distributed to the Chair and discussed at an EC meeting when appropriate.

### **3. Faculty Selection Process for Committees, Task Forces, and Councils**

The EC receives frequent requests from university constituents to nominate/recommend faculty members for various committees, task forces, or councils not directly under the authority of the Faculty Senate. When selecting faculty members for these committees, the EC shall send out a call for nomination to all faculty members. The EC will nominate faculty members based on a review of the nomination materials and discussions. Under extenuating circumstances, the EC may recommend members without sending a call for nomination. In instances of a committee member's persistent lack of attendance or consistent disrespect for the orderly operation of a committee, the EC may be called upon to facilitate the review of such allegations, or execute removal of the committee member.

### **4. Faculty Legislative Representative Selection Process**

The EC is responsible for nominating a faculty legislative representative to the president. The Senate office will send out a request for nomination to all faculty; self-nomination is allowed. The prospective nominees shall submit a detailed statement to the EC describing their goals and the vision for the position. After review of the materials, the EC will invite each of the candidates for an in-person interview. The EC will select the nominee based on their analysis of the statement and interview, and send their nomination to the president; once approved, the full Senate shall then confirm the nominee.

### **5. Grupe Faculty Center**

The EC is responsible for the management of the Mary Grupe Faculty Center. The Center can only be used by faculty or for faculty-related events. The EC will review all requests to use Grupe according to the established guidelines (See Appendix A).

### **6. Faculty Issues**

Faculty bring up various issues or concerns through Senate meetings, open EC meetings, emails, and other forms of communication with the Senate. It is critical the EC take every matter seriously and find ways to address each issue. The Chair typically takes the lead on reviewing the issues, delegating them to EC members depending on their expertise (if needed), and reporting back to the faculty with any findings, updates, or resolutions.

### **7. Position Statements or Resolutions**

Shared governance is critical to the success of our institution and faculty. The ability to improve the success of any institutional decision that impacts academics increases with faculty consultation through the process prescribed in the Code. Ideally, decisions will reflect a consensus between the administrative leadership and the appropriate bodies of the faculty. However, in some cases, administrators do not consult with faculty, blatantly dismiss faculty voice, or willfully violate CWU policies or procedures including the Code. The EC should always consider resolving the matter one-on-one with the involved parties. If those efforts fail, the EC will take the leadership role to voice faculty's objection, and officially register our concerns through the Chair's Senate report, a Senate resolution, or an EC position statement. The Chair, in consultation with the EC, will review each such situation on a case-by-case basis to determine the appropriate response. If the EC deems it necessary to voice our concern publicly, the Chair shall draft a statement with input from the EC and deliver it at a Senate meeting. Position statements will be posted on the Senate website.

## **Other Tasks**

Beyond the Executive and other committee meetings, the EC may assign additional duties to members, or reassign existing responsibilities. EC members are expected to perform these other duties as assigned by the EC and/or the Chair, assuming the scope of the duties falls within the assigned workload for the EC member.

## **MEMBERSHIP**

The faculty shall elect members of the EC, with such powers and duties as set forth in the Code and Senate Bylaws.

### **1. Committee Size**

The EC shall consist of the following eight voting members: the chair of the Senate, the chair-elect, a past Senate Chair, and five additional elected members. If the penultimate Senate chair is unable to serve as past Senate Chair, the next most recent past Senate chair available shall serve. The past Senate chair (immediate or appointed) will serve as a voting member of Senate and EC, even if not a current member of the Senate (Bylaws Section II).

### **2. Composition/Representation**

EC members will be elected from the eligible senators in the following manner:

- a. Each college shall elect two faculty each, with the exception of the College of Business and Library, which shall share one representative.
- b. The Senate shall elect an at-large member of the EC at a Senate meeting, preferably during spring quarter (Bylaws Section II).

### **3. Election**

- a. The Senate office shall oversee the election process and provide a list of senators eligible for nomination and election.
- b. Elections shall be conducted by secret ballot via online survey during spring quarter.

### **4. Appointment**

In the event of an unscheduled vacancy, whether due to resignation, sabbatical, medical leave, or other causes, the EC has the appointing power. The EC will appoint an eligible Senator for the remaining term or partial term.

### **5. Terms**

- a. Terms shall be three years, beginning June 16<sup>th</sup> following election by the Senate.
- b. Members can serve on the EC for up to two consecutive full terms. A partial term of two years or more shall be treated as a full term, while a partial term of less than two years shall not be counted.

### **6. Attendance**

EC members are expected to demonstrate their commitment to the Senate by regular attendance at EC, Senate, and liaison committee meetings, except when prevented by unforeseeable events. Members should give sufficient notice to the Chair about absences from any meetings which they are obliged to attend.

### **7. Confidentiality**

The EC discusses many sensitive topics and members are privy to University information that may not be known to non-EC members; hence, confidentiality is essential. Confidentiality also encourages open and candid discussion at meetings. EC members must keep all information about matters dealt with by the EC confidential. All information in the form of agendas, documents, electronic communications, or any other format which comes into a member's possession and relates to the work of the EC should be considered confidential unless otherwise stated. The obligation to maintain confidentiality continues to apply even after a faculty member has left the EC.

## **8. Role**

In the spirit of representation, EC members serve as liaison representatives between their colleges and the EC. At the same time, the EC members are faculty leaders who are advocates of all faculty irrespective of their college affiliation. EC members should strive to keep a balance between these two roles. Debate on issues brought before the EC should at all times be professional and courteous.

## **9. Removal from EC**

If an EC member does not adhere to behavioral expectations (including attendance and confidentiality), any EC member may initiate a vote to remove the member. EC members can be removed from the committee by an absolute two-thirds majority via a confidential vote of all EC members.

## **SCHEDULE**

### **1. Regular Meeting**

The EC will commence its regular operations on or after September 16, and end its business on or before June 15 of each academic year. The EC may decide to work on special projects during the summer. In that case, the Chair will request workload compensation for EC members from the President's office. During the academic year, the EC will meet every Wednesday from 3-5pm excluding weeks when meetings of the full senate are held. The Chair may request additional meetings or extended meeting times with the consent of the EC.

### **2. Special Meetings and Additional Senate Business**

The Chair, with the consent of the EC, may call special meetings to address issues that need immediate attention or that require more time and discussion than can be handled during regular meetings. When possible, the Chair will facilitate additional discussions via e-mail between meetings rather than schedule special meetings. EC members should attempt to respond to emails from the chair in a timely manner.

### **3. Quorum**

A simple majority of the current membership of the EC shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at its meetings. For EC decisions to be valid and binding a quorum is required. However, the Chair may decide to hold or continue (due to early departures) a meeting without a quorum to discuss general items during which the EC will not take any official action.

### **4. Agenda**

The Chair will prepare the agenda and circulate it to the EC within a reasonable amount of time before the scheduled meetings. The EC members, especially members who are liaisons to committees or task forces, are expected to submit discussion or action agenda items for consideration by the EC for proposed action or resolutions. The Chair has the final approval of items included on the EC agenda. To be prepared for discussion, members should review the agenda and other material carefully prior to meetings.

### **5. Minutes**

The EC does not keep minutes of its meetings given the executive nature of its discussions, and to assure confidentiality about sensitive matters.

## **6. Closed Meetings (Executive Session)**

The EC meetings are ordinarily closed to visitors. However, the Chair with the consent of the EC can invite visitors to the EC meetings when needed to fulfill its business.

## **7. Open Meetings**

Each month, the EC meeting immediately following a full Senate meeting will be open to faculty, staff, students, and the public. The primary purpose of these meetings is for university stakeholders to meet with the EC to share their concerns or to participate and understand the EC operations. However, during an open meeting, the EC may decide to go into executive session (rendering the meeting closed) when the situation warrants it. The Chair shall determine the conditions for such closure.

## **8. Visitors**

In the spirit of shared governance, and as schedule permits, the EC will extend the opportunity to schedule at least one meeting a quarter with each of the following office holders: President, Provost, ADCO Chair, and UFC President.

## **9. Voting**

The EC makes hundreds of decisions every academic year, and most of them are made using consensus process led by the Chair. The Chair or any EC member may make a verbal motion on a particular decision, and a simple majority vote will be sufficient to take official action, unless otherwise outlined in the Procedures and Practice Manual.

# **OFFICERS**

## **1. Chair-Elect**

At the last Senate meeting of the academic year, the Senate shall elect a new chair-elect. The current chair shall solicit nominations from the eligible members of the EC and will oversee the election process.

Election to the position of chair-elect requires a three-year commitment to the EC: the first year as chair-elect, the following year as chair, and the third year as immediate past chair. Service to the EC takes priority over any existing terms of office, and the chair-elect remains a voting member of Senate for the three year commitment.

The chair-elect shall serve in the place of the chair in the latter's absence. In the event of a vacancy in the chairship after the beginning of the chair's term of office, the chair-elect shall become the chair and serve as such for the remainder of the chair's term of office, and a new chair-elect shall be elected.

The chair-elect performs such duties and provides such advice that may be requested, such as: attend meetings as a resource at the request of the chair, support the ongoing Senate work and support the chair as needed.

The specific roles served by the Chair-elect as defined in the Code or Bylaws include:

- Member of the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee
- Liaison to all non-senate committees, task forces, and councils.

## **2. Chair**

As chief executive officer of the Senate, the chair shall coordinate and expedite the business and budgets of the Senate and its committees. The chair shall be the presiding officer at all meetings of the Senate, at all faculty forums, and at general faculty meetings upon request of the president of the university. The chair shall serve as official representative and spokesperson of the faculty and the Senate in communication with the faculty, the BOT, the administration, the student body, and other groups regarding matters that are not mandatory subjects of bargaining. In this capacity, the chair or the chair's designee shall have the right to ex officio voting membership on any university committees and councils on which the Executive Committee deems that faculty ought to be represented.

The specific roles served by the Chair as defined in the Code or Bylaws OR by practice may include:

- Prepare, coordinate, and lead the following meetings/events
  - Full Senate meetings
  - Executive Committee Meetings
  - Faculty Forums
- Supervise Faculty Senate administrative assistant
  - Complete performance evaluations
  - Approve payable time and absence requests
- Serve as a member or Ex officio member of the:
  - Senate Budget and Planning Committee (BPC)
  - President's Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC)
  - Provost Council (PC)
  - University Policy Advisory Committee (UPAC)
  - Commencement Committee
  - Academic Department Chairs Association (ADCO)
  - Summer Session Advisory Committee
  - Naming Committee
- Attend the following one-on-one or general meetings:
  - President
  - Provost
  - Board of Trustees
  - All faculty forums

### **3. Past-Chair**

The past-chair performs such duties and provides such advice that may be requested, such as: attend meetings as a resource at the request of the chair, support the ongoing Senate work and support the chair as needed.

The specific roles served by the Past-Chair as defined in the Code or Bylaws include:

- Member of the Budget and Planning Committee

- Liaison between the FLR and the EC
- Presidential Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC)
- Member of ADAPT committee

## **Appendix A**

### **Grupe Faculty Center (GFC) Use Policy Central Washington University**

The Grupe Faculty Center (GFC) is primarily for the use of CWU faculty. The GFC is an academic, collaborative space where faculty can go to have a quiet space, grade papers, connect with colleagues, and host faculty-related social events. The Faculty Senate welcomes CWU faculty to utilize the GFC conference rooms for meetings, luncheons, conferences, receptions and events directly related to faculty activities.

#### **1. GFC Facilities**

- The GFC includes chairs, couch, love seat, white board table, conference table, WiFi, computer kiosk, audio/video equipment for video conferencing, charging station for electronics, TV/AV equipment, and dividers for privacy if desired, and kitchen.

#### **2. GFC Use General Policies**

- Eligible faculty may gain entrance by having their CWU Connection card encoded by the LockShop.
- Current CWU policies and procedures must be followed. <http://www.cwu.edu/resources-reports/>

#### **3. GFC User Responsibilities**

- Set-up, tear-down and clean-up is the responsibility of the individual who requested use of the facility.
- If kitchen is used, it must be cleaned. No dishes are to be left on the counter or sink.

#### **4. Eligibility for Use**

- Meetings or events that are faculty led or that would benefit the faculty as a whole may submit a use request during the available schedulable hours listed below.

#### **5. Restrictions on Use**

- No alcohol may be served or consumed prior to 5:00 p.m. and an alcohol banquet permit must be acquired.

#### **6. Scheduling:**

- Availability of the GFC is between the hours of 6:00 am – 10:00 pm and at the sole discretion of the Faculty Senate.
- Faculty must request to use the GFC using the form on the Faculty Senate website.

#### **7. Application for Use:**

- To request use of the GFC, please request a use form. Once the request has been received by the Faculty Senate Office, a determination will be made if the request fits the eligibility criteria for facility use. Once the determination has been made, normally within 5 business days, an email

confirming or denying the event will be sent. If additional information is needed to make the determination, you will be contacted within the 5 business days.

#### **8. Approval Process:**

- The faculty senate reserves the right to refuse to permit the use of the GFC.
- Faculty Senate Office approves the requests to use the facility. Appeal of a denial of use of the facility may be submitted in writing to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee who will make a final determination.

# Exhibit B

## Faculty Code & Bylaws Review



**Code Section:** Section 1. And Appendix A.

**New**  **Revision**

**Title:** Faculty Rights and Responsibilities; College Budget Committees

**Summary:** This revision to the Faculty Code articulates the faculty right to participate in budget decisions at all levels of the University. The Appendix provides guidelines for college budget committees to improve consistency across colleges in terms of composition and responsibilities of the committees.

**Rationale:**

### **What does this language do?**

It provides broad principles for faculty rights and responsibilities and the consultation of faculty at the college/library level in the context of budget decisions. The goal was to provide broad principles, not to micromanage the committees. Colleges and the library can and should establish their own guidelines that make sense for their area, consistent with these broad principles, and this proposed language allows for that flexibility.

### **Why is it proposed for faculty code?**

Faculty code is where we articulate faculty rights and responsibilities and what shared governance means in our context at CWU. As we move into RCM, where colleges are the responsibility and decision-making centers of the university, it is important that we agree on broad principles about how consultation happens at the college level. This is a policy about *consultation*, and consultation (as a faculty right and responsibility) properly belongs in faculty code.

### **What are the goals of this language?**

This language was drafted to ensure that college and library budget committees follow a few key principles, namely:

- These bodies should be broadly representative.
- There should be continuity in who is on the committees.
- The committees should operate in a transparent way.

### **Why do we need this language?**

As we move into RCM, we need to define the consultation process so that, regardless of who holds key positions, we have a robust and transparent process. We want to ensure that the college and library budget committees function well not only now but into the future. The committees need to be grounded in process, not in personalities.

## I. FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

B. All faculty members have the right to:

1. participate in faculty and university governance by means of a system of elected faculty representatives on committees and councils at the departmental, college, university, and Senate levels;
  - a. Among the rights valued by the Senate is the right of any faculty member to speak on issues pertaining to his or her responsibilities. The Faculty Senate provides a protected environment in which faculty may engage in speech and actions (including voting) without fear of reprisal or admonition by their supervisors or administration. Faculty members who feel their rights under this Code have been violated may file a formal complaint as outlined in Faculty Code Section V.
2. participate in budget decisions at department, college, and university levels, through the Senate Budget and Planning Committee, representatives on university budget committees and sub-committees, and representatives on college or unit budget committees (see Appendix A).
  - a. The AAUP (1966) statement on shared governance makes clear that the Board of Trustees, administration, and faculty should “have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections.” All participants in the budget process have the right to sufficient information to be able to carry out their responsibilities.
  - b. All faculty involved in the budget process have the right to speak on issues pertaining to the faculty member’s responsibilities as a participant in that process. The protections in 1.B.1(a) apply to faculty members involved in the budget process at all levels.
3. be treated fairly and equitably and have protection against illegal and unconstitutional discrimination by the institution;
4. academic freedom as set forth in the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and Association of American Colleges, now the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), with 1970 *Interpretive Comments* (AAUP), and the CBA;
5. access their official files, in accordance with the CBA.

## APPENDIX A: College Budget Committees

### Section 1. DEFINITION

For the purposes of this section, "college budget committees" will also include the library budget committee, and "college" refers to an academic college and the library.

### Section 2. COLLEGE POLICIES

The principles below are broad guidelines relative to faculty rights and responsibilities on college budget committees. Colleges shall establish their own specific policies and guidelines for their budget committees which at a minimum, should adhere to the principles and practices below. College budget committee policies shall be approved by a vote of a simple majority of all the faculty in the college.

### Section 3. COMPOSITION

A. College deans shall ensure that college budget committees:

1. are broadly representative of the departments in the college. ~~Faculty members at all ranks are eligible to serve on the committees.~~ All faculty are eligible to serve on the committees.

All members of the committee must be members of the college. Faculty (including chairs) shall represent at least 2/3 of the voting members of the committee. ~~include both chairs and non-chair faculty members.~~

2. have clearly delineated terms that allow for continuity on the committee.

### Section 4. COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

- A. The committees are consultative groups for the Deans, and are the minimum required consultation on college and unit budget questions. Larger questions may require broader consultation, as outlined in I.D., Faculty Consultation.
- B. The committees shall review and make recommendations about the entirety of the college budget.
- C. Committees shall report back to the faculty in their college on a regular basis.

### Section 5. COMMITTEE MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

- A. Faculty members of the committee represent the greater good of the college and will make budgetary recommendations based on a broad range of faculty interests and ideas.
- B. On issues of broader import, committee members have an obligation to consult with the larger college prior to making a recommendation to the Dean.

## Exhibit C

### TESOL Certificate Program - Fall - 2019

#### Required Courses

- ENG 320 English Grammar (5)
- ENG 420 English Linguistics (5)
- ENG 431 Principles and Practices of TESOL (5)
- ENG 437 Pedagogical Grammar and Discourse
- ESL 492 TESOL Certificate Practicum
  - For On-campus Field Experience (5 credits)
- OR
- ENG 490 Cooperative Education
  - For Off-Campus Field Experience (5 credits)

**Total Credits 25**

## Exhibit D

### Professional Tax Practice Graduate Certificate

#### Grad Tax Core Courses

- ACCT 521 Advanced Tax 1: Business Entities (5)
- ACCT 522 Advanced Tax 2: Individuals (5)
- ACCT 523 Advanced Tax 3: Practice and Procedure (5)
- ACCT 524 Advanced Tax 4: Current Issues in Taxation (5)

#### Grad Tax Applied Courses

- ACCT 521A Tax Research Lab – Entities (1)
- ACCT 522A Tax Research Lab – Individuals (1)
- ACCT 523A Tax Research Lab - Practice and Procedure (1)
- ACCT 524A Tax Research Lab - Current Issues (1)

**Total Credits: 24**

## Exhibit E

### Liberal Studies Minor

#### Program Core Courses (Credits 9-10)

Complete the following core courses:

CAH 289 Introduction to the Major (1)

CAH 389 Academic and Career Exploration (3)

CAH 489 Senior Portfolio Project (1)

#### Research Methods in Liberal Studies (Credits 4-5)

Choose one of the following approved courses:

COM 300 Media Research

COM 351 Visual Anthropology

ENG 303 Principles of English Studies

HIST 302 Historical Methods

HIST 395 Research in Local History

WL 427 Cross Cultural Competence in a Globalized World

UNIV 295 Introduction to Undergraduate Research

AND

UNIV 205 Introduction to Interdisciplinary Research

#### Liberal Studies Electives (credits 20-21)

As approved by the program director. An elective course of study will be submitted as a part of CAH 289.

### Total Credits 33 – 36

#### Liberal Arts PLUS

Students seeking the minor are encouraged to include the Liberal Arts PLUS Certificates or Opportunities along with the minor.

# Exhibit F

## Teacher Certification, MAT – Secondary & K-12 Specialization

### Core Requirements

These Core classes will be taken by all Teacher Certification MAT Candidates.

EDBL 514 Introduction to Linguistic Diversity in Education

EDBL 514 Introduction to Linguistic Diversity in Education (3)

EDU 503 Adolescent Dev. and Learning (4)

EDU 504 Since Time Immemorial (4)

EDU 532 Multicultural Education for Social Justice (4)

EDU 551 Assessment (3)

EDU 561 Methods and Models of Instruction (3)

EDU 563 Technologies for Teaching and Learning (4)

EDU 582 Seminar I (4)

EDU 583 Seminar II (4)

EDU 584 Seminar III (5)

EDU 585 History and Philosophy of Education (3)

**Total Core Credits: 41**

### Secondary & K-12 Specialization

EDSE 502 Equitable Differentiated Instruction (4)

EDU 531 Culturally Responsive Management of the Learning Environment (3)

EDU 572 Clinical Practice I (1)

EDU 573 Clinical Practice II (1)

EDU 574 Clinical Practice III (1)

EDU 575 Legal Issues in Education (3)

EDU 700 Thesis, Project and/or Examination (3)

(Must be taken for 3 credits)

**Total Specialization Credits: 16**

**Total Credits: 57**

## Teacher Certification, MAT – Special Education Specialization

### Core Requirements

These Core classes will be taken by all Teacher Certification MAT Candidates.

EDBL 514 Introduction to Linguistic Diversity in Education (3)

EDU 503 Adolescent Dev. and Learning (4)

EDU 504 Since Time Immemorial (4)

EDU 532 Multicultural Education for Social Justice (4)

EDU 551 Assessment (3)

EDU 561 Methods and Models of Instruction (3)

EDU 563 Technologies for Teaching and Learning (4)

EDU 582 Seminar I (4)

EDU 583 Seminar II (4)

EDU 584 Seminar III (5)

EDU 585 History and Philosophy of Education (3)

**Total Core Credits: 41**

### Special Education Specialization

EDSE 512 Educational Rights of Individuals with Disabilities (3)

EDSE 520 Behavioral Management and Interventions for Students with Exceptionalities (3)

EDSE 522 Collaboration, Consultation and the Inclusive Environment (3)

EDSE 524 Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment for Students with Exceptionalities (4)

EDSE 531 Program Management for Students with Exceptionalities (3)

EDU 572 Clinical Practice I (1)

EDU 573 Clinical Practice II (1)

EDU 574 Clinical Practice III (1)

EDU 700 Thesis, Project and/or Examination (3)

(Must be taken for 3 credits)

**Total Specialization Credits: 22**

**Total Credits: 63**