

5-1-2013

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/01/13

Janet Shields

Central Washington University, senate@cwu.edu

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Shields, Janet, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/01/13" (2013). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 32.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/32>

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.

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE**

**REGULAR MEETING  
Wednesday, May 01, 2013, 3:10 p.m.  
BARGE 412  
Minutes**

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

**Senators:** All senators or their alternates were present except: Wendy Cook, Jason Dormady, Jonathan Fassett, Theresa Francis, Steve Jackson, Boris Kovalerchuk, Robert Pritchett, Stephen Robison, Cody Stoddard, Matthew Wilson

**Visitors:** Robert Moser

**CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – Agenda was approved with the deletion of the President's report.

**MOTION NO. 12-30(Approved): APPROVAL OF MINUTES** of April 3, 2013

**COMMUNICATIONS:** None

**FACULTY ISSUES:** Senator Bartlett asked about the ongoing moratorium on courses being submitted to the General Education curriculum and if it is still in place. His department has had a course ready to go for a year and had hoped to be able to offer it next year. Chair Madlem reported that the General Education Committee is meeting with ADCO on May 9<sup>th</sup> and Provost Council on May 7<sup>th</sup>. The hope is to bring the proposal back to the Faculty Senate at the May 29<sup>th</sup> meeting. If the proposal is not accepted, the committee will decide if the moratorium will still be in place. Senator Rawlinson brought forward a concern about bicycles on campus. You don't hear them coming and usually moving at a higher rate of speed. Some suggestions of a bike lane, a speed limit for bicycles be enforced, registration for bicycles that includes education for riders. Chair Madlem will speak with Facilities Management and Campus Safety about these possibilities. Senator Harper has a concern about the tracking of mandatory faculty training. Human Resources does not always have copies of certificates for training that has been completed. Faculty receiving a generic e-mail about their attendance at the recent faculty training on harassment, which did not include their name.

**Q2S Student presentation** – Robert Moser presented a brief overview of the semester conversion survey that was done. The purpose of the survey was to gauge the general student response and concerns regarding the potential of a conversion to semesters. The survey was not gathered in a scientific manner, but they believe it is an accurate portrayal of the feelings of the 500+ students that were surveyed. The group spent 3 hours in the SURC. The assumption the students were mostly freshman, but not positive because they didn't ask class standing. Question 1: Have you ever attended a school on the Semester system? The majority indicated they had not, but there was some confusion over high school vs. college. Question 2: Do you favor a transition to a semester system? The result was an overwhelming no. Question 3: What is your biggest concern about converting to a semester system? A. Money (125); B. Not graduating on time (203); C. Bigger class size (170); D. Less class choice per year (343); E. Other (57); F. No concern (19). The group would like to reach more students and would like help in revising the

survey.

Chair Madlem indicated that Faculty Senate will be having discussion next fall on the Quarter to Semester feasibility.

**PROVOST:** Provost announced that Kevin Archer is now interim Graduate Dean. They are putting together a task force charged with recommendation for future of graduate assistants, creating stability, vision and mission and international graduate students. There will be a promotion/tenure/distinguished faculty ceremony and reception on May 29<sup>th</sup>. Faculty will be receiving a personal invitation. David Rawlinson has been appointed to the higher education tech sub-committee of the Washington State Achievement Council.

Provost Levine reported that she met with ADCO to discuss the realignment process. This process came after talking with all the departments on campus. There is a need to look at the broader picture with the \$58 million dollar cuts Central has taken over the past few years. We can't avoid change, as doing nothing is still change. Lori Braunstein is working on fine tuning the data. Since no one accepted the offer to do work sessions, the Provost will be working through the Deans for this process. The deans will help vet the data through Lori. The department chairs will provide a one page response to the data to the Deans. Data will be refined and the new Dean's Council will work through this process.

**OLD BUSINESS** - None

## **REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS**

### **SENATE COMMITTEES:**

#### **Bylaws & Faculty Code Committee**

**Motion No. 12-23(Approved):** Approve changes to Faculty Senate Bylaws Section VIII Faculty Forum, Referendum, Initiative and Review as shown in Exhibit C.

**Motion No. 12-24(Approved):** Approve changes to the Faculty Code Section IV Faculty Senate as shown in Exhibit D.

**Motion 12-33(Approved):** Senator Rawlinson moved to suspend the rules and go to the third reading on Motion 12-24. Motion was seconded and approved. .

**Motion No. 12-25(Approved):** Approve changes to the Faculty Code Section V Inquiry into Disputes and Scholarly Misconduct as shown in Exhibit E.

**Motion 12-34(Approved):** Senator Rawlinson moved to suspend the rules and go to the third reading on Motion 12-25. Motion was seconded and approved.

**Motion No. 12-26(Approved):** Approve changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws Section IV.A.3 e as shown in Exhibit F.

**Motion No. 12-27(Approved):** Approve changes to the Faculty Code Section IV.D.1.e) as shown in Exhibit G.

**Motion 12-35(Approved):** Senator Rawlinson moved to suspend the rules and go to the third

reading on Motion 12-27. Motion was seconded and approved.

**Evaluation and Assessment Committee** – Jeff Snedeker thanked the entire faculty that participated in the SEOI GoCentral poll. The poll had started in November and the results were summarized on April 9<sup>th</sup>. The committee made the following recommendations to the Executive Committee: Faculty access to student's names that have/have not completed their SEOI should be eliminated and this information communicated to the students. SEOIs should be open for only a week and end the last day of class. These recommendations were passed on to the President and Provost and hopefully they will be put into place for spring quarter. SEOI online response rates dropped from fall to winter quarter. Winter quarter the forms were changed from having comment boxes after each question to having two general questions at the end of the SEOI. The rate for comments went up winter quarter. The committee is concerned about the response rate and is continuing to improve the process. The Faculty Assessment of Academic Administrators opened on April 8<sup>th</sup> and will close on May 7<sup>th</sup>. The Senate evaluation by all faculty will start this week. Today the Senators will be filling out an assessment of the Executive Committee.

**Motion No. 12-31(Approved):** Endorse a pilot of SEOI for student teaching/field experience as shown in Exhibit H, to be reevaluated in spring 2014.

**Motion No. 12-32(Approved):** Endorse the preliminary structure of evaluation of instruction for further study in 2013-14 as shown in Exhibit I.

**General Education Committee** - Will be hopefully coming back with a proposal. ADCO and Provost Council.

**Faculty Legislative Representative** - See written report.

**CHAIR:** President cabinet RCM Lor Braunstein, Mike Jackson and Melody put together. No decision just pros and cons. Senate approached by HR willingness in a COACHE put out by Harvard surveying faculty perceptions and morale. Endorsed by EC. Liason Eric and Chair Ian Loverro, data Ed Day. Faculty center looking around campus and hope to have by end of year. Paperwork to create a faculty center on campus incorporated into a new building in the future.

**CHAIR-ELECT:** Chair-Elect Cheney welcomed the newest member of the Executive Committee, Kathy Whitcomb, English representing the College of Arts and Humanities.

**STUDENT REPORT:** Jackie Sperlich is the new VP for Academic Affairs. She was newly appointed end of last quarter when Jennifer Arledge left on medical leave. SAS is working on recruitment and retention of their senators. BOD elections are being held tonight. Civil Engagement First Amendment Fest next week.

**NEW BUSINESS** - EC assessment

Meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

# Exhibit C

## Bylaws. VIII. Faculty ~~Forum, Referendum, Initiative, and Review~~ Additional Powers and Duties of the Senate

### A. Interpretation (Faculty Code Section IV-F)

A request for formal interpretation of the Faculty Code must be submitted by a petitioner or petitioners to the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee. That committee shall review the request and make a written recommendation to the Senate within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the request. The Senate shall take action on the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee's recommendation within sixty (60) days of its receipt, and may forward it to the Board of Trustees if necessary.

### B. Faculty Senate Forum (Faculty Code Section IV-G)

The ~~faculty~~ Faculty Senate forum is an ~~unofficial~~ open meeting ~~of the faculty~~ to which all members of the faculty shall be invited. ~~and which shall be presided over by the Chair of the Faculty Senate or by a faculty member designated by the Chair. A faculty forum may be called for any purpose.~~ The Senate Chair and/or the Senate Executive Committee shall decide whether, when, and for what purpose such a faculty forum may be called; but the usual purpose would be for the Senate to convey information to the faculty and to solicit their feedback. The forum shall be presided over by the Chair or by a faculty member designated by the Chair.

### C. Referendum (Faculty Code Section IV-H)

The Faculty Senate may decide to refer any questions or issues before it to the faculty-at-large for vote, which shall be conducted ~~with reasonable promptness~~ according to such procedures as may be prescribed by the Senate Executive Committee. The vote shall be conducted within ninety (90) days of the Senate meeting in which the decision to hold a referendum was made.

### D. Faculty Senate Hearing (Faculty Code IV-I)

1. Any ten (10) eligible faculty members may, by written petition filed with the Chair of the Faculty Senate, secure an opportunity, as a body or by selected representatives, to address the Senate in order to convey information, request Senate action, or propose policy changes on any matter over which the Senate has the power to act. The petitioners do not, however, have the power to advance motions or to compel the Senate to act on any matter that they raise. Eligible faculty includes tenured and tenure-track faculty, and full-time non-tenure-track faculty or those who are senior lecturers.
2. Anonymity cannot be guaranteed.
3. The Chair shall ensure that the petitioners or their designated representatives are given a hearing by the Senate within two regularly scheduled Senate meetings from the date of the petition's receipt.
4. At the hearing, if the petitioners propose a specific Senate action or a specific policy change, then the Senate shall vote on whether to consider the proposal further. If the Senate votes not to consider it further, there shall be no further discussion and the matter shall be closed. If the Senate votes to consider the proposal further, the Chair shall submit the proposal to the Senate so that it will be considered by the Senate within two regularly scheduled Senate meetings of the petitioners' hearing.

5. The Executive Committee shall ensure that the petitioners' proposal and any relevant issues are presented fully, from all sides, to the Senate. If other groups on campus have views that differ from those of the petitioners, the Senate should endeavor to hear those views prior to taking any formal action. Ultimately, formal action on the petitioners' proposal requires that a senator make a motion to that effect. If no senator is prepared to do so, the matter shall be closed.

E. Review by Faculty (Faculty Code IV-J)

1. All actions (~~motions passed~~) by the Senate (~~motions passed by the Senate~~) of the Faculty Senate shall be subject to review by the university faculty. A review shall be conducted if and only if only after a written petition for review has been signed by at least ten (10) percent of the eligible faculty and submitted to the Senate Chair. The petition ~~for review~~ must be filed no later than fourteen (14) days after the approval of the minutes of the meeting during which the action to be reviewed was taken. Eligible faculty includes tenured and tenure-track faculty, and full-time non-tenure-track faculty or those who are senior lecturers.
2. In the event of a dispute over whether the petition has been signed by at least ten percent of the eligible faculty, the relevant comparison shall be the number of faculty employees as recorded by the university's Human Resources Department on the day on which the petition is filed.
3. A special meeting of the Senate shall be called by the Chair within ten (10) days after the petition is submitted. If the Senate refuses to change its position, a vote of the entire faculty on the Senate action under review shall be conducted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The voting procedure shall provide for a secret vote of the eligible faculty and for voting to continue for seven (7) calendar days. A majority vote of those faculty voting on the question shall determine whether or not the Senate action is reversed.
4. From the date of the filing of a valid petition for review, until the determination of the outcome of the vote of the faculty on the action under review, the Faculty Senate may not undertake action concerning or affecting the original action ~~of the Senate~~ under review.

**Rationale:**

(1) **Elimination of redundancy.** The current language in Bylaws Sect. VIII and Code Sect. IV Parts F-K is largely duplicated. We have therefore deleted from the Code a considerable amount of material which belongs only in the Bylaws. The material in question is that which concerns the *procedures* by which the various actions or duties are to be carried out. It is the job of the Bylaws to explain these procedures. The Code, by contrast, need only describe the *policies*. (We have, however, added references to the relevant section of the Bylaws so that a reader of the Code may easily find the description of the procedures relevant to the policy in the Code.) Most of the changes to the Code, then, involve the removal of material which need be stated only in the Bylaws. (One major exception is the removal of the entire section on 'Initiative', which does not appear in the Bylaws at all, and for good reason: it merely restates the policy for Faculty Senate Hearings, and thus is redundant.)

(2). **Procedural clarification and elaboration.** We have added considerable material to the Bylaws. Some of this is to clarify existing procedures, and some is to introduce new procedures which we have deemed necessary to ensure due process (as expressly requested in the charge). Of particular note:

(a) A section on Interpretation, which is currently wholly absent from the Bylaws despite its presence in the Code.

(b) We have considerably expanded the material on Faculty Senate Hearings. The current language is very truncated and hard to follow, so we have tried to spell out (what we take to be) the intended meaning. Further,

we deemed it appropriate and necessary that language be put in place to allow for the anonymity (as far as is possible) of any petitioners who desire it.

(c) Regarding the procedure for Review by Faculty (of a Senate decision), which occurs via a petition signed by ten percent of the faculty: we have inserted a specification of how it is to be determined whether the stated criterion of ten percent of the faculty has been met.

# Exhibit D

## Faculty Code. Section IV: FACULTY SENATE

### F. Interpretation ~~and Emergency~~ (Faculty Senate Bylaws VIII-A)

A request for formal interpretation of the Faculty Code must be ~~initially~~ submitted by a petitioner or petitioners to the Faculty Senate ~~Bylaw~~ Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee. ~~The Bylaw and Faculty Code Committee~~ That committee shall review the request and make a written recommendation to the Faculty Senate ~~within thirty (30) days of the date of receipt of the request.~~ ~~The Faculty Senate, which~~ shall take action on the ~~Bylaw and Faculty Code Committee's~~ recommendation ~~within sixty (60) days of its receipt.~~ If the recommendation is forwarded to the Board of Trustees, the Board of Trustees shall take action on the ~~proposed request~~ recommendation within sixty (60) days of its receipt from the Faculty Senate.

### G. Faculty Senate Forum (Faculty Senate Bylaws VIII-B)

The Faculty Senate forum is an ~~unofficial~~ open meeting, called by the Senate Chair and/or Executive Committee, to which all members of the faculty shall be invited. ~~and which shall be presided over by the chair of the Faculty Senate or by a faculty member designated by the chair.~~ ~~A Senate forum may be convened for the purposes of providing the Faculty Senate an opportunity~~ Its usual purpose is for the Senate to convey information to the faculty and to solicit their feedback. ~~The chair and/or the Senate Executive Committee shall decide whether, when, and for what purpose a faculty forum may be called.~~ All faculty are strongly encouraged to attend such a forum should it be called.

### H. Referendum (Faculty Senate Bylaws VIII-C)

The Faculty Senate may decide to refer any question or issue before it to the faculty-at-large for vote, ~~which shall be conducted with reasonable promptness according to such procedures as may be prescribed by the Senate Executive Committee.~~ All eligible faculty are strongly encouraged to vote should a referendum be called. Eligible faculty includes tenured and tenure-track faculty, and full-time non-tenure-track faculty or those who are senior lecturers.

### I. Faculty Senate Hearing (Faculty Senate Bylaws VIII-D)

Any ten (10) eligible faculty (as defined in H) members may, by written petition filed with the ~~chair of the Faculty Senate~~ Chair, secure an opportunity, as a body or by selected representatives, to address the Senate in order to convey information, request Senate action, or propose policy changes on any matter over which the Senate has the power to act. The petitioners do not, however, have the power to advance motions (which reside only with members of the Senate) or to compel the Senate to act on any matter that they raise. ~~If a Faculty Senate hearing is convened with the purpose of a specific policy change or action, the Senate chair shall submit the proposal to the Senate for consideration within two regularly scheduled Senate meetings.~~ Anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

### ~~J. Initiative~~

~~Any ten (10) faculty members may. By written petition filed with the chair of the Faculty Senate, secure consideration, with reasonable promptness, of any matter over which the Senate has power to act.~~

### J. Review by Faculty (Faculty Senate Bylaws VIII-E)

All actions (motions passed) by the Senate ~~(motions passed by the Senate)~~ of the Faculty Senate shall be subject to review by the ~~university faculty.~~ A review shall be conducted only after faculty if a written petition for review has been signed by at least ten (10) percent of the eligible faculty as



defined in H) and submitted to the Senate ~~chair~~ **Chair**. The petition ~~for review~~ must be filed no later than fourteen **(14)** days after the approval of the minutes of the **Senate** meeting during which the action to be reviewed was taken. ~~A special meeting of the Senate shall be called by the chair within ten days after the petition is submitted.~~ If the Senate refuses to change its position, a vote of the entire faculty on the Senate action under review shall be conducted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. ~~The voting procedure shall provide for a secret vote of the faculty and for voting to continue for seven calendar days. A majority vote of those faculty voting on the question~~ **This vote** shall determine ~~the outcome of the review and~~ whether or not the Senate action is reversed. ~~From the date of the filing of a valid petition for review, until the determination of the outcome of the vote of the faculty on the action under review, the Faculty Senate may not undertake action concerning or affecting the original action of the Senate under review.~~

#### **Rationale:**

(1) ***Elimination of redundancy.*** The current language in Bylaws Sect. VIII and Code Sect. IV Parts F-K is largely duplicated. We have therefore deleted from the Code a considerable amount of material which belongs only in the Bylaws. The material in question is that which concerns the *procedures* by which the various actions or duties are to be carried out. It is the job of the Bylaws to explain these procedures. The Code, by contrast, need only describe the *policies*. (We have, however, added references to the relevant section of the Bylaws so that a reader of the Code may easily find the description of the procedures relevant to the policy in the Code.) Most of the changes to the Code, then, involve the removal of material which need be stated only in the Bylaws. (One major exception is the removal of the entire section on 'Initiative', which does not appear in the Bylaws at all, and for good reason: it merely restates the policy for Faculty Senate Hearings, and thus is redundant.)

(2). ***Procedural clarification and elaboration.*** We have added considerable material to the Bylaws. Some of this is to clarify existing procedures, and some is to introduce new procedures which we have deemed necessary to ensure due process (as expressly requested in the charge). Of particular note:

(a) A section on Interpretation, which is currently wholly absent from the Bylaws despite its presence in the Code.

(b) We have considerably expanded the material on Faculty Senate Hearings. The current language is very truncated and hard to follow, so we have tried to spell out (what we take to be) the intended meaning. Further, we deemed it appropriate and necessary that language be put in place to allow for the anonymity (as far as is possible) of any petitioners who desire it.

(c) Regarding the procedure for Review by Faculty (of a Senate decision), which occurs via a petition signed by ten percent of the faculty: we have inserted a specification of how it is to be determined whether the stated criterion of ten percent of the faculty has been met.

# Exhibit E

## Section V. INQUIRY INTO DISPUTES AND SCHOLARLY MISCONDUCT

### A. Obligations

The University recognizes the right of faculty to express differences of opinion and to seek fair and timely resolutions of disputes or allegations of scholarly misconduct. It is the policy of the University that such disputes or allegations shall first be attempted to be settled informally and that all persons have the obligation to participate in good faith in the informal resolution 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 disputes or allegations.

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

**Dispute:** A claim which occurs when a faculty member considers that any programmatic required activity or behavior, including actions or inactions by others, is unjust, inequitable, contrary to University regulations or policies, or a hindrance to effective faculty performance and student learning.

**Misconduct:** Fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or other practices that seriously deviate from those commonly accepted within the scholarly community for proposing, conducting or reporting scholarly activities including research. It does not include honest error or differences in interpretation of data or in judgments.

**Eligible Faculty Member:** Eligible faculty includes tenured and tenure-track faculty, and full-time non-tenure-track faculty or those who are senior lecturers.

**Parties:** The parties to the proceedings as described in this section shall be: in the case of an informal dispute resolution, the complaining faculty member and any other persons whose action or inaction caused or contributed to the incident or conditions which gave rise to the dispute; in the case of an inquiry into an allegation of scholarly misconduct, the accused faculty member(s) and the accuser(s) (who may or may not be faculty); and in both cases, any administrator whose participation may be required in implementing a resolution or finding.

### C. Scope

This procedure delineates an appeal and resolution process appropriate for disagreements or conflicts ~~disagreements/conflicts~~ involving faculty that fall outside the Collective Bargaining Agreement or other University policies. Issues covered by this policy include, but are not limited to:

disputes between faculty members on issues of collegiality, professionalism, civility, etc.;

disputes between administration and faculty regarding the grade of a student or other matters pertaining to classroom management and instruction; matters of academic policy administration (Cf. CWU Policies Manual PART 5);

allegations of scholarly misconduct made against any faculty member.

#### EXCLUSIONS:

Civil rights complaints properly addressed under the process provided in Part 2.2 of the General University Policies Manual.

Matters subject to the grievance process contained in Article 25 26 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, which includes allegations of violations of the terms of the CBA.

Matters subject to the complaint process contained in Article 25 26 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, which involves substantive academic judgments in matters of workload, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review.

#### D. The Faculty Disputes and Allegations Committee (FDAC)

##### 1. Composition

- a. The FDAC shall consist of three (3) faculty members who shall elect their own chair. At least three (3) and not more than six (6) alternate members shall also be selected, at the same time and in the same manner as the regular members, and be possessed of the same powers and subject to the same restrictions as regular members. Alternate members shall serve in the place of regular members in the event that a regular member, prior to any hearing or consideration of an issue, disqualifies himself or herself for any reason, resigns has a conflict of interest in a dispute or allegation, or is otherwise unable to serve as a member of the FDAC. The order of service of alternate members shall be determined by the chair of the committee.
- b. Any tenured member of the faculty is eligible to serve on the FDAC, with the exception of chief administrators, including but not limited to the President, Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Life, deans, and associate deans. Membership on the Senate will not be required for eligibility. No two (2) members or alternates shall be from the same department.
- c. Members of the FDAC shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and ratified by the Senate at the last regular meeting of each academic year. Members and alternates shall serve terms of three (3) calendar years beginning September 15. Service on the committee shall be treated as service on a Senate standing committee, and thus shall be subject to the provisions of the Senate Bylaws, Section IV, Part A.1.d. Members and alternates may thus serve no more than two (2) successive terms. Terms shall be staggered so that only one position will need to be filled in any one year for both member and alternate. When the original appointee is unable to complete the full term of office, an alternate shall complete the remainder of that three year term, at which time a new member and alternate will be appointed in the regular way. When an alternate replaces a member of the FDAC, a replacement alternate shall be appointed and ratified immediately to complete the remainder of the alternate's term.

## 2. Powers and Duties (General)

The FDAC shall have the following powers and duties:

- a. To select a chair at its first meeting and establish rules or procedures for the resolution of disputes and for inquiry into allegations of scholarly misconduct, provided that such rules or procedures are fair, are informal and are not inconsistent with provisions of the Faculty Code, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), or other University policies.
- b. To perform the functions assigned to it by the Faculty Code.
- c. To attempt to resolve by informal means any specific disputes or conflicts concerning members of the faculty as defined in Article 2.2 of the CBA.
- d. To determine whether an action or decision, as outlined in the petition, of any faculty body, faculty member or University official complained of by the petitioner was the result of adequate consideration of all of the relevant facts and circumstances. To determine that required policies and procedures of the University were followed.
- e. To decide whether an informal hearing is warranted by the determination described in 2(d).
- f. To recommend policy questions or issues, following or as part of its resolution of specific disputes or conflicts, to the attention of the President of the University or other appropriate administrators, and the Senate Executive Committee for further consideration by any Senate standing committees.

### E. ~~Dispute Resolution Procedure~~ Procedure for Dispute Resolution and for Inquiry into Alleged Scholarly Misconduct

1. The ~~dispute resolution~~ procedure hereinafter described is open to all faculty members who feel aggrieved in any matter or who believe that another faculty member has committed scholarly misconduct. The FDAC may accept a petition for review from a group of faculty members when substantially similar or identical complaints are made. The committee shall decide the issue of similarity and identity of complaints.
2. The following steps shall constitute the ~~dispute resolution procedure~~ procedure for dispute resolution and for inquiry into alleged scholarly misconduct:
  - a. Prior to petitioning the FDAC for a hearing, the complaining faculty member or, in the case of a group complaint, representatives chosen by the group, will discuss the complaint or allegation with the dean or member of the University administration having direct responsibility for the area of concern, ~~and both parties shall make a good faith effort to settle the dispute~~ whenever practical. (It is acknowledged that the nature of some disputes or allegations precludes such a step.) Both parties shall make a good faith effort to settle

the dispute or to reach an acceptable explanation for the alleged misconduct. ~~which may include the use of the Ombuds Office or other available resolution processes.~~

- b. If no mutually acceptable resolution of the dispute or explanation of the alleged misconduct can be reached through discussion with the appropriate dean or University administrator, the complaining faculty member or group may petition the FDAC for an informal hearing within 30 days of the termination of discussion. The petition shall be sealed, addressed to the FDAC and delivered to the office of the Faculty Senate ~~that, which~~ will deliver the petition to all members of the committee within five (5) working days after receiving it. The petition shall set forth in writing and in reasonable detail the nature of the dispute or allegation, and shall state against whom the complaint is directed ~~and the relief sought;~~ and in the case of a dispute, the relief sought. The petition may contain any information that the petitioner deems pertinent to the case. The petition may be revised or withdrawn by the petitioner at any time prior to the committee's decision on whether or not to hold an informal hearing, but thereafter, only with the permission of the committee.
- c. The FDAC shall meet and review the dispute or allegation presented to it. It shall decide whether the issue warrants an informal hearing and will establish rules or procedures for the handling of the complaint.
- d. The Chair of the FDAC will schedule a meeting with the faculty member(s), an appropriate representative of the administration, and a representative of the United Faculty of Central (UFC) to discuss the FDAC's determination and to discuss the next appropriate step(s) for dispute resolution or inquiry into the alleged misconduct. If, in the opinion of ~~the Chair of the~~ FDAC following ~~an investigation~~ its review and the subsequent discussion, a settlement is not possible, the ~~Chair will present the information to the full committee.~~ The committee shall decide by vote whether or not the facts merit an informal hearing. The committee's decision of cause or no cause for an informal hearing shall be issued in writing within twenty (20) working days of the delivery of the petition to the office of the Faculty Senate. If a regular academic session is scheduled to end before the expiration of such time, the committee shall have twenty (20) working days commencing with the first day of instruction of the next succeeding regular academic session to issue its decision.
- e. The FDAC shall issue a written opinion ~~embodying therein~~ stating its findings and recommendations ~~in any matter that comes before it.~~ The opinion will be presented to the parties, the President of the University (or the chair of the Board of Trustees in the event the President is a party to the dispute ~~resolution~~ or alleged misconduct), and to the chair of the Faculty Senate. It may be circulated more widely if in the judgment of the FDAC a matter of University-wide policy is involved.
- f. All decisions of the FDAC, including the decision whether to grant an informal hearing, shall be by a majority vote of all the members of the committee.

## F. Informal Hearing Procedure

1. In the event the FDAC decides to conduct an informal hearing, the chair shall notify the involved parties as soon as possible after the committee's decision. The notice shall state the date, time and place of the hearing and shall include a copy of the petition filed with the committee. The informal hearing shall be held not less than ten (10) days from the mailing of the notice of the hearing to the parties; unless all of the parties, with the consent of the chair of the FDAC, agree to shorten the time to less than ten (10) days.

2. The FDAC may rule at any time prior to commencement of the hearing that it is unnecessary to hold an informal hearing.
3. The informal hearing review shall be conducted as expeditiously as possible and on successive days if possible.
4. The parties to the dispute case, and any others the committee deems necessary for the review, shall make themselves available to appear at the hearing unless they can verify to the committee that their absence is unavoidable.
5. Members of the FDAC shall remove themselves from the case if they deem themselves biased or have a personal interest in its outcome. FDAC members of the same department as the complaining faculty member(s) parties to the case shall not serve at the hearing. Within ten (10) working days following the mailing of notice of the hearing to the parties, each party shall have the privilege of one challenge of the committee's membership without stated cause and unlimited challenges for stated bias or interest. A majority of the committee membership must be satisfied that the member challenged for cause cannot hear the issue impartially before the member is disqualified.
6. In informal hearings, petitioners shall be permitted to have with them a faculty member of their own choosing to act as advisor and counsel.
7. Any legal opinion or interpretation given to the FDAC may be shared with all parties to the case.
8. Informal hearings will be closed to all except those personnel directly involved. All statements, testimony and all other evidence given at the informal hearing shall be confidential to the extent allowed by law.
9. The FDAC shall file its findings and recommendations with the President of the University within ten (10) working days after the conclusion of the informal hearing. There shall be no review by the Faculty Senate.
10. Within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the findings and recommendations of the FDAC, the President or the President's designee shall inform all parties to the case, the chair of the FDAC and the Faculty Senate chair in writing of his/her decision. The action of the President or the President's designee shall constitute notice of the final decision in the informal hearing review procedure. In an extenuating circumstance, such as the unavailability of the President and/or appropriate legal counsel, an extension to 20 twenty (20) working days may be agreed upon by the parties involved.
11. Faculty members who disagree with the final decision in the informal hearing procedure maintain their rights to seek review by other appropriate agencies (e.g. UFC, Ombuds Office, civil court, etc.).
12. In the event that a petition is filed during official holidays or summer break, the notice provisions of this section shall become applicable beginning the first class day after the holiday or summer break. The FDAC may, at its discretion, hear a petition within that holiday or summer break period. In such cases, the notice provisions of this section become effective as of the date the petition is filed.

Rationale:

Since both charges concern Section V of the Faculty Code, we have addressed them together.

Here is a summary of the most significant changes and additions that we are recommending.

(1) It seemed unnecessary to constantly refer to the Faculty Disputes and Allegations Committee by its full name, so it has been shortened to 'FDAC' after its initial appearance in the title of Part D. These changes occur throughout Parts D, E, and F.

(2) In Part D.2, we have accepted the additions that were suggested by the FDAC itself. In particular:

- Their suggested language stipulating that it is the prerogative of the FDAC to decide whether or not a complaint brought before it warrants a hearing.
- Their suggestion that the language describing the general grounds for that decision be moved from Part E into Part D.

(3) In Part E there are two main kinds of changes:

- Additional language reflecting the fact that the FDAC's sphere of inquiry now includes allegations of scholarly misconduct as well as disputes involving faculty.
- Changes suggested by the FDAC itself: that some disputes or allegations may not be able to be discussed with the relevant member of the University administration (D.2.a), and that the FDAC's procedure includes a step in which it is decided whether a hearing is warranted.

# Exhibit F

Bylaws Section IV.A.3.

e. The Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee shall be concerned with assessment tools affecting Faculty or requiring Faculty input. It shall receive, review, initiate, and make recommendations ~~or proposals for~~ regarding assessment tools used for the quarterly Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) forms and reports, the biennial Faculty Assessment of Academic Administrators, and the biennial annual Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee Assessments, ~~and do such other similar things duties as charged by the Senate Executive Committee~~. It shall also perform other related tasks as charged by the Senate Executive Committee. In all of the above-mentioned tasks it shall coordinate ~~Coordinating~~ its efforts with other individuals, groups or committees as necessary or appropriate. The membership shall consist of five (5) faculty members (one from each college plus one from the library) nominated and ratified to staggered terms.



## Exhibit G

Faculty Code Section IV.D.1.

e) The Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee shall be concerned with assessment tools affecting ~~F~~faculty or requiring ~~F~~faculty input. It shall receive, review, initiate, and make recommendations ~~or proposals for~~ regarding assessment tools used for the quarterly Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) forms and reports, the biennial Faculty Assessment of Academic Administrators, and the ~~biennial~~ annual Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee Assessments, ~~and do such other similar things duties as charged by the Senate Executive Committee~~. It shall also perform other related tasks as charged by the Senate Executive Committee. In all of the above-mentioned tasks it shall coordinate ~~Coordinating~~ its efforts with other individuals, groups or committees as necessary or appropriate. The membership shall consist of five (5) faculty members (one from each college plus one from the library) nominated and ratified to staggered terms.

# Exhibit H

<b>CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY</b>	<b>PILOT STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION</b>	<b>FIELD EXPERIENCE/ STUDENT TEACHING</b>
--	--	---

Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

**1. STUDENT LEARNING ENVIRONMENT. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the...**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. field supervisor fostered a fair and respectful learning environment?					
b. field supervisor seemed genuinely concerned with whether you learned?					
c. field supervisor met appointments, observations, and seminars at scheduled times unless otherwise arranged?					
d. field supervisor maintained confidentiality and professionalism?					

**2. Did you seek help from the field supervisor?**

Yes	No	

**3. If YES, was the field supervisor available to provide help?**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

**4. SUPERVISION OF FIELD EXPERIENCE/STUDENT TEACHING. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the...**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. field supervisor clearly communicated expectations for the field experience, including standards of behavior for the teacher candidate?					
b. assignments and assessments were related to the expectations?					
c. evaluation methods were clearly communicated?					
d. field supervisor provided useful feedback?					
e. field supervisor provided timely feedback?					
f. conferences with your field supervisor were efficient and well organized?					
g. field supervisor interpreted and explained observation data and evaluations in a clear manner?					
h. seminars were useful in understanding the responsibilities and developing the skills required of a teacher?					
i. course handbook and other materials were applicable to the field experience?					
j. field supervisor encouraged reflection and self-analysis?					

**5. GENERAL INFORMATION. Considering the number of credits given, how would you compare this course to all other courses you have taken at CWU? Was the...**

	Much more than most courses?	More than most courses?	About average?	Less than most courses?	Much less than most courses?
a. amount of work					
b. your level of engagement/active learning					
c. intellectual challenge present to you					

**6. About how many hours did you spend in a typical 7-day week preparing for field experience responsibilities (studying, reading, conducting research, writing, lesson plans, preparing materials, writing your responses for the edTPA, etc.)?**

1-3 hrs/wk	4-6 hrs/wk	7-10 hrs/wk	11-15 hrs/wk	16-20 hrs/wk	21+ hrs/wk

7. What is your class standing?					
First year (0-44 credits)	Sophomore (45-89 credits)	Junior (90-134 credits)	Senior (135 or more credits)	Graduate	Other (e.g. post-baccalaureate)

8. What grade do you expect to earn in this class?		
S	U	

9. What changes could be made to improve learning in this course?

10. What aspects of this course do you feel were especially good?

# Exhibit I

## **Proposal to the Faculty Senate from the FS Evaluation and Assessment Committee, May 1, 2013**

In February, the FS Executive Committee charged the Evaluation and Assessment Committee to take a comprehensive look at evaluation of faculty teaching that could be used as part of every department's retention, tenure and promotion guidelines. We were asked to provide a recommended structure and framework to better evaluate faculty teaching that goes beyond relying only on the current SEOI structure.

Since then, amid other charges, the committee has taken time to consider this charge very carefully. It is clear that this is a potentially volatile topic among faculty, and will require more time to do this responsibly. That said, we consulted several resources, including a broad view of evaluation of teaching offered in a Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Instruction report submitted March 2005. The research supports a balanced approach to faculty evaluation, whether of teaching or otherwise.

With this in mind, **the Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee proposes that the following be adopted in principle by the Faculty Senate:**

**1. That the following parameters of teaching be used as a preliminary structure for further study by the FS E&A Committee in 2013-14:**

- **Content Expertise**
- **Instructional Design Skills**
- **Instructional Delivery Skills**
- **Instructional Assessment Skills**
- **Course Management**

**2. These five parameters should be examined in the context of the sources of information, specifically the participation of:**

- **Student Evaluation**
- **Peer Evaluation** <http://www.cwu.edu/faculty-senate/sites/cts.cwu.edu/faculty-senate/files/PETeach.pdf>
- **Supervisor Evaluation**
- **Self-Evaluation**

**3. The opportunity to move forward with this preliminary structure assumes the following:**

1. **Systematic consultation with all stakeholders will take place (faculty, department chairs, students, personnel committees, UFC, etc.)**
2. **The assessment materials used in actual evaluation will be based on current, existing systems of Student, Peer, Supervisor, and Self evaluation—it is not the intent to foist more work onto faculty, but to bring each aspect of evaluation of instruction already in place into a more balanced whole.**
3. **The role of the information gathered and produced in formative and summative assessment of instruction will be considered carefully, with recommendations offered.**
4. **In the fall, the committee will conduct a preliminary assessment of committee/faculty workload and budget needs associated with this study; financial needs will be communicated to the Executive Committee and Provost Office.**

## **RATIONALE**

Raoul Arreola (*Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 2007) identifies Five Dimensions for Evaluation of Teaching. These are:

1. **Content Expertise:** actual expertise that can be evaluated by peers and supervisor (teaching assignment) and perceived expertise as evaluated by students. The parameters of content expertise include (but are not limited to) evidence of faculty currency in the field, and accuracy and appropriate level of information presented to students.

2. **Instructional Design Skills:** the designing and sequencing of information or activities to promote learning/achievement. Course syllabi, learner objectives, handouts, media, content organization, grading standards and tools would be evaluated by peers, with student perceptions added (e.g., course difficulty, connections to examinations, etc.). The parameters of instructional design skills include syllabi, grading standards, and appropriateness of learning objectives.

3. **Instructional Delivery Skills:** these involve human interaction—the ability to motivate, generate enthusiasm, and communicate effectively using various forms of transmittal—thus contributing to the creations of an environment conducive to learning. These would include oral and written communication skills, as well as use of technology, appropriate to content and setting (lecture, lab, etc.). Written skills include clarity of syllabi, handouts, feedback to students, graphs/charts/maps, notes, case studies. Skills in technology include utilization of video, audio, computers, etc. appropriate to content/objectives. Students are in the best position to evaluate delivery (interactive skills) and learning environment in the context of the appearance of competence as a teacher. Peers and other experts in delivery can participate, too, but videotaping for later study is considered much better than classroom visitation. The parameters of instructional delivery skills include presentation skills, clarity of speech, use of media.

4. **Instructional Assessment Skills:** the development of tools, procedures, and strategies for assessing student learning and then providing meaningful feedback during the course, leading to achievement and learning—effective grading practices. These skills would be evaluated primarily by peers, tempered by student perceptions. The parameters of instructional assessment skills include valid and reliable exams, timely feedback.

5. **Course Management Skills:** these skills include timely feedback to students, handling student/course paperwork, ensuring working, useable technology, placing appropriate materials on reserve for availability, arranging field trips, coordinating guest speakers. These can be evaluated by peers and supervisors, with some student input. The parameters of course management skills include availability of learning support materials (e.g., timely feedback, etc. above), and the proper physical environment (including speakers, field trips, etc.).

Thus, faculty instruction in these areas could possibly be evaluated by (but not limited to):

#### **Students**

- SEOIs (snapshot of course in a given quarter)
- Combined summary reports over time (showing improvement in student responses/perceptions)
- Participate in measures to evaluate “deep learning”—student performance in subsequent classes, alumni surveys
- Students meet with Chair/faculty to clarify or offer more comments???

#### **Peers**

- Classroom visitations (preferably for formative evaluation only)
- Observations of video-recorded classes (preferably for formative evaluation only)
- Peer review of SEOIs (individual quarters and long-term)
- Evaluation of syllabi, course materials, course content and design, assessment strategies and tools
- Meet with students???
- Create/review measures to evaluate “deep learning”—student performance in subsequent classes, alumni surveys

#### **Department Chairs**

- Provide evidence/documentation of Classroom management concerns
- Review of SEOIs
- Meetings with students???
- Classroom observations (personal or review of documented observations)
- Observations of video-recorded classes

#### **Self-Evaluation**

- Reflection on SEOI and other results of assessments
- Presentation of evidence of development activities
- Explanation of goals and objectives of courses
- Evidence of success in teaching (student success, deep learning)
- Participate in review of video-recorded classes