

4-4-2012

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 04/04/12

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 - 04/04/12" (2012). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 40.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/40>

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, April 4, 2012, 3:10 p.m.**  
**BARGE 412**  
**Draft Minutes**

**Senators: All senators or their alternates were present except:** Gary Bartlett, Lori Braunstein, Jonathan Fassett, Barbara Flanagan, Vanessa Hunt, Susan Kaspari, Don Nixon, Stephen Robison, Matthew Wilson, Dale Wright

**Visitors:** Sheryl Grunden, Marla Wyatt and Richard DeShields

**CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA - None**

**MOTION NO. 11-36(Approved): APPROVAL OF MINUTES** of March 7, 2012

**COMMUNICATIONS - None**

**FACULTY ISSUES:** Senator Harper brought forward a concern regarding the wait list for courses. If a student has 15 credits or more they will not be advanced on the wait list. Students do not get any notice regarding their status in the class. Also, if a student is already enrolled in another section of the same course, they will not be advanced on the wait list. Senator Harper explained she had to over enroll a course because three students who were at the top of the wait list were not advanced. Senator Therese Young also indicated this is an issue with online courses as well.

**PRESIDENT:** President Gaudino reported that nothing is currently happening in Olympia. They are at a stalemate. Enrollment numbers are stable and we will meet enrollment numbers for this year. Admission numbers look good. The admission index is climbing. Saturday, April 14<sup>th</sup> there will be a family orientation for students who have been accepted by Central. They will be started at the SURC and will break out into session across campus.

**PROVOST:** Provost Levine expressed gratitude to the Admissions staff who have gone above and beyond against all the odds to help in our recruiting effort. Central is up 8% from normal this time last year of students who have been admitted and they have accepted. The 2013-14 academic calendar has been approved as endorsed by the Faculty Senate. The print catalog has been abolished and Central will go online next year. Jesse Nelson has accepted the Dean of Student Achievement position. Rick Byham has accepted the Continuing Education Director position. He will start May 1<sup>st</sup>. The Dean of College of Business and Dean of Student Success searches are progressing. Candidates will be on campus soon. The Academic Planning Task Force is preparing information that will be given to department chairs and then to UFC and Faculty Senate.

**Richard DeShields – Student Conduct –** Richard gave a brief overview of the purpose of the student conduct process. 1. It is to establish expectations of students by creating the responsibilities all students will be required to follow and provide rights for all students. 2. Provide due process where students can understand their rights and responsibilities in a timely manner and in a fair and consistent manner. 3. Provide response to negative student behaviors and coordinate responses for the University in partnership with the University community. The Student Conduct Code is established in the Washington Administrative Code. 1. It establishes proscribed student conduct and procedures for conduct hearings. 2. It defines the student conduct board and sanctions for violations of the student code. 3. Students are responsible to the code whether they are on campus or off campus. 4. Student Conduct is coordinated by the Chief Conduct Officer. 4. There is a Student Consultation Team that meets weekly to discuss campus situations and reports of student violations. 5. The team makes recommendations and assigns hearing officers. 6. This team is made up of the Chief Conduct Officer, Senior Conduct Officers, University Police, Counseling Center, Wellness Center, and the Diversity Education Center. There are 10 hearing officers and four senior conduct officers for the University. Senior Conduct Officers hear cases that potentially lead to suspension or expulsion. The Student Conduct Council is made up of eight students and six faculty members. This council hears appeals where students have been suspended or expelled from the University. The threat Assessment Team is a cross-functional, multi-disciplinary team that assess and intervenes with students who may be at risk for self harm or for causing harm to others and to give guidance to the university community members who may need to refer students for assistance and review. All members of the CWU community can report "Behaviors of Concern" on the CWU Intranet. Reports go to the Chief Conduct Officer, Senior Conduct Officer, and administrative coordinator of

conduct to make sure that someone can respond. Individuals can deliver a report to Bouillon 204 or via email. Reports may be received through off campus agencies or referrals. Through this process, the Chief Conduct Officer or Senior Conduct Officer will work with other University community members. Richard reported that there was approximately 6 students suspended last quarter. There were concerns in Faculty Senate several years ago about lack of response to faculty concerns. Student Success has taken steps to make sure that faculty concerns are not left hanging. They have also developed a tracking system of reports, so they can see patterns. This has also helped them in developing preventative educational resources where they are needed. If faculty have additional questions they may contact Student Success at 963-1515.

**OLD BUSINESS** – Chair Loverro reported that there were three forums regarding the online SEOs this past week. They were recorded and are available on the streaming site. They discussed adding custom questions and the different reports available to faculty. There will be a new Library Advisory Council to replace the former one that was disbanded. The make-up of the committee will be one faculty from College of Arts and Humanities, one from College of Education and Professional Studies, one from College of the Sciences, one from College of Business and one from the Library as well as one student member and someone from Student Success.

## REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS

### SENATE COMMITTEES:

#### **Bylaws & Academic Code Committee**

**Motion No. 11-33(Second reading of three):** "Approve changes to the Faculty Senate Academic Code Section V as outlined in Exhibit A."

**Motion No. 11-34(Second reading of three):** "Approve additions to the Faculty Senate Academic Code Section IV as outlined in Exhibit B."

#### **Curriculum Committee:**

**Motion No. 11-37(Approved):** Approve the Global Literacy Development Certificate – Type A as outlined in Exhibit C."

**Evaluation & Assessment Committee:** Jeff Snedeker reported on the activities of the Evaluation and Assessment Committee. The first is SEOs. Jeff thanked Tracy pellet and Tom Henderson for organizing the SEOI forums based on their recent Senate presentation. Second, the committee has sent out invitation to administrators to solicit input for the next Faculty Assessment of Academic Administrators which will be administered in Spring of 2013. There have not been individual responses as of yet. The committee reviewed the 2012 assessments of the Faculty Senate and Executive Committee. The committee made some recommendations to the Executive Committee for this year's assessment. The hope is to have the survey available to faculty by April 24<sup>th</sup> and open for three weeks to be able to present to Senate by the last meeting. The committee will be working on gathering resources for Peer Evaluation of Teaching for the rest of this quarter to present the information at the last Faculty Senate meeting.

**General Education Committee:** Phil Backlund reported that the Provost has asked for funding for a half-time General Education Coordinator position. Phil asked Senators to think about this position or if you know of someone who would be interested to speak with them. The details and funding for this position are still being worked on. The committee has been conducting a survey on the General Education requirements. There have been approximately 800 responses, but most of them are students. Need to get more perspective from faculty and administrators. The Faculty Senate office will send the survey link to faculty. The committee met with Jesse Nelson, Student Success, about DFW rates in General Education courses. The data is very informative. Courses range from 2% to 60% of DFWs. The national norm is approximately 15-20%. Jesse is working on some changes to the information and would like to get that data to faculty. The committee has put a hold on accepting new courses until they finish their work on learning outcomes for the current nine goals of the program. The committee is examining the "W" courses and looking at a proposal that would reduce the number of required "W" courses from four to three. In addition there would be a pre-requisite of ENG 101 prior to any "W" course being taken. The committee is also proposing a graduation requirement that students have a "writing in their major" course. This could be a course that is already taught to all majors or could be a portfolio. The committee is working out the details on this proposal and hopes to bring it to Faculty Senate soon.

**Faculty Legislative Representative:** Written report is available in the Faculty Senate office.

**CHAIR:** Chair Loverro reported that the Legislature is having difficulty in making final budget decisions.

**CHAIR-ELECT:** Chair-Elect Madlem reported on a proposal to the Higher Education Coordinating Board submitted by National American University, which is a for profit university, wanting to locate somewhere in Tacoma as well as online. This University will be offering both baccalaureate and masters degree. This means Central is going to have to be better at what we do here to compete with other for profit universities. Chair-Elect Madlem encouraged faculty to be involved with the commencement activities this spring.

**STUDENT REPORT:** Allyson reported that the students really want dead day back in the schedule, but understands the calendar has been set for 2013. Student Academic Senate has been doing publicity this year. ASCWU would like to see there be a more open line of communication between Faculty Senate and the Student Academic Senate. They are currently doing well with filling vacancies; there are only 5 or 6 open seats.

**NEW BUSINESS** – None

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

# Exhibit A

## Section V. DISPUTE RESOLUTION 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 dispute-resolution process before resorting to formal grievance procedures. The University encourages open communication and resolution of disputes-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.

**Faculty Member:** A person appointed to and serving in a faculty position as defined in Article 2.2 of the CBA.

**Parties:** The parties to an informal dispute resolution 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 of the dispute.

### C. Scope

This procedure delineates an appeal and resolution process appropriate for 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 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 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 Resolution~~ Committee (FDRCFDAC)

1. Composition

- a. The Faculty Disputes ~~and Allegations Resolution~~ Committee 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 or is otherwise unable to serve as a member of the Faculty Disputes ~~and Allegations Resolution~~ Committee. 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 Faculty Disputes ~~and Allegations Resolution~~ Committee, with the exception of chief administrators, including but not limited to the president, provost/senior vice president for academic affairs, 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 this committee 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 be reappointed and serve any number of 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 Faculty Disputes ~~and Allegations Resolution~~ Committee, a replacement alternate shall be appointed and ratified immediately to complete the remainder of the alternate's term.

2. Powers and Duties (General)

The Faculty Dispute ~~Resolutions and Allegations~~ Committee shall have the following powers and duties:

- a. To select a chair and establish rules or procedures for the resolution of disputes and for inquiry into allegations of scholarly misconduct/complaints, provided that such rules or procedures are fair, are informal and are not inconsistent with provisions of the Academic Code, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), or other university policies;
- b. To perform the functions assigned to it by the Academic 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 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.

## Exhibit B

### Section IV: FACULTY SENATE

#### F. Interpretation and Emergency

A request for formal interpretation of the Academic Code must be initially submitted by a petitioner or petitioners to the Faculty Senate Bylaw and Academic Code Committee. The Bylaw and Academic Code 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 shall take action on the Bylaw and Academic 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 within sixty (60) days of its receipt from the Faculty Senate.

#### G. Faculty Senate Forum

The Faculty Senate forum is an unofficial open meeting 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 to convey information to the faculty and 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.

#### H. Faculty Senate Hearing

Any ten 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. 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.

#### I. Referendum

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.

#### 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.

#### K. Review by Faculty

All actions (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 a written petition for review has been signed by at least ten percent of the faculty and submitted to the Senate chair. The petition for review must be filed no later than fourteen days after the approval of the minutes of the 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 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.

Formatted: Font: Arial, 10 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.31", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: A, B, C, ... + Start at: 10 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Formatted: Font: Arial, 10 pt

# Exhibit C

## NEW CERTIFICATE

### Global Literacy Development Certificate – Type A

Students in the Global Literacy Development Certificate program will gain knowledge of best practices in literacy development and effective communication strategies. They will be prepared to support professionals in creating and supporting literacy programs in communities across cultures and around the world. This certificate program will be offered at the Ellensburg campus and on-line.

#### **REQUIRED COURSES**

EDLT 317	Early Literacy	3
EDLT 418	Literacy and Linguistics	3
EDLT 421	Teaching Children's Literature	3
EDLT 414	Teaching Literacy in a Multi-Cultural and Multi-Lingual Setting	3
EDLT 498/499	Special Topic/Seminar	2
COM 365	Organizational Communication	4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>