

5-2-2012

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/02/12

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 - 05/02/12" (2012). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 41.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/41>

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 2, 2012, 3:10 p.m.**  
**BARGE 412**  
**Draft Minutes**

**Senators:** All senators or their alternates were present except: Susan Donahoe, Lori Gray, Don Nixon, Darren Olson, Patrick Owens, Robert Pritchett, Keith Salyer, Theresa Sloan and Matthew Wilson

**Visitors:** Kirk Johnson, Patricia Cutright, Connie Lambert and Marla Wyatt

**CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – Senator Čuljak moved to approve the agenda. Senator Alsoszatai-Petheo seconded and motion was approved.

**MOTION NO. 11-38(Approved): APPROVAL OF MINUTES** of April 4, 2012

**COMMUNICATIONS** - Registrar commencement memo is available for review in the Faculty Senate Office.

**FACULTY ISSUES:** None

**PRESIDENT:** The President reported that early next week they will have a highlight of the budget for next fiscal year. Central should start seeing a return to traditional budget levels next year. There will be approximately \$6 million added back into the budget for next year. This should bring the funding levels back to somewhere around the 2008 numbers. There will be smaller group meetings after the budget comes out in each area. President Gaudino has received feedback from departments that there is a belief that student success is a code word for lowering standards. President Gaudino wanted it noted that nothing could be farther from the truth as this is a recipe for long-term decline of the University. While there is a desire to keep graduation rates, retention and recruitment going, it is not desirable at the risk of lowering standards of rigor. President Gaudino reported that after July 1<sup>st</sup> the curriculum process for new programs will stop with the BOT as the Higher Education Coordinating Board will no longer exist in the manner it did before. .

**PROVOST Reorganization Report:** Provost Levine gave an update on the current searches. Two searches have been completed. The Dean of Student Success position has been accepted by Sarah Swager and Kathryn Martell has accepted the Dean of Business position. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research search process is underway. Provost reported on the reorganization process in Academic and Student Life. While there have been a number of reorganizations she is now focusing on Academic Life. The Provost handed out an updated organizational chart of the Provost division. Provost Levine indicated she has spoken to the Executive Committee about the details of the reorganization. Undergraduate Studies will now become the Office of Associate Provost. The Office of Undergraduate Studies that dealt with a wide array of duties from accreditation, to advising, testing, curriculum as well as many others. The Provost handed out the basic duties of the Office of the Associate Provost. (This document is available for review in the Faculty Senate office.) Enrollment Management will be moving under Business and Financial Affairs, however, the Registrar will be moved under the Associate Provost. As part of this reorganization she is creating four new coordinator or director positions. Under the leadership of the Office of the Associate Provost there will be a .50 release time Multimodal Initiatives Director and a .25 release time Program Assessment Coordinator. Under the leadership of the Provost there will be a .75 release time Director of General Education/Curriculum & Program Development as well as a .25 release time Professional Development Coordinator. The Provost will be announcing the start for these internal searches next week. Applications will be due May 15<sup>th</sup> with the searches starting immediately after. Anyone can

apply or nominate someone for these positions. Need to provide a letter of application and a CV.

**Provost Q&A:** Senator Alsoszatai-Petheo indicated that in nearly 30 years of working at this institution he has heard a lot about shared governance, but had never seen it work like it did on this. Senator Alsoszatai-Petheo applauded the Provost's diligence in this process. Senator Harbaugh asked about the release time. Provost Levine indicated if they find the right person for these positions there could be some flexibility. The release time was calculated based on adjunct replacement costs. Kathy Temple asked about how the Curriculum/General Education/Program Development Coordinator would mesh with the existing Curriculum and General Education committees? Provost Levine indicated that this individual would work as a close liaison with the committees and would more than likely serve as the Provost's designee on the committee. Senator Smith asked about the timeline for these positions? Provost Levine hopes to advertise the positions next week and would like to start the search process around May 15<sup>th</sup>.

**Kirk Johnson APTF Report:** Kirk Johnson presented the Academic Planning Task Force (APTF) final report. In December, the APTF released their review of 197 degree granting programs and program specializations located in 35 departments and 6 interdisciplinary programs. The APTF recommendations at that time were that 115 programs be continued, 41 programs were recommended for revision and 41 programs were recommended for elimination. In February and March the APTF reviewed department and interdisciplinary program responses. The APTF final recommendations are 28 of the 82 programs were recommended to continue without conditions. 34 programs were given the recommendation to be continued with the stipulation that the program be reevaluated in 2015-16. 20 programs were given the recommendation of elimination. Departments had already taken steps toward or agreed that these programs should be eliminated. The committee have given some general observations and recommendations of the process. One is that program elimination does not generate net savings; faculty are typically reassigned to other department activities. The task force is recommending an analysis of Ellensburg vs. Center-based programs in 2015-16. The task force is recommending that this process be put on a regular five year cycle. It could possibly be combined with the 5 year program review cycle. The Provost should work with IR to define variable and data needs for future analysis.

**OLD BUSINESS** – Chair Loverro reported on the Semester feasibility survey. Full survey results are available in the Faculty Senate office. 76% of the over 500 respondents indicated yes to conduct a feasibility study of converting to the semester system.

## **REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS**

### **SENATE COMMITTEES:**

**Academic Affairs Committee:** Marla Wyatt reported that the committee has been reviewing potential changes to academic policy. The changes have been completed and will be ready for next the Senate meeting.

**Bylaws & Academic Code Committee:** Gary Bartlett reported the committee has been working on revisions to the template for the committee procedures manual. The manuals haven't been updated in a while. The committee has standardized the structure and will be presenting it to the committees so they can update their manuals as needed. Next year the committee will be introducing information into the Bylaws to include language to try to encourage attendance of committee members. .

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

**Motion No. 11-34(Approved):** “Approve additions to the Faculty Senate Academic Code Section IV as outlined in Exhibit B.”

**Motion No. 11-39(First reading):** “Approve addition of meeting times in the Faculty Senate Bylaws as outlined in Exhibit C.”

**Curriculum Committee:**

**Motion No. 11-40(Approved):** “Approve updates to the Curriculum policy manual as outlined in Exhibit D.”

**Motion No. 11-41(Approved):** “Approve the addition of the hold policy to section 5-90-090 in the Curriculum policy manual as outlined in Exhibit E.”

**CHAIR:** Chair Loverro reported on the vacancies that will be coming up on the Executive Committee. There will be two from the College of Arts and Humanities. One will be a seat that Senator Čuljak current holds. This will be an election for a three year term. The second is Senator Garcia’s seat will be stepping down from the Executive Committee in June. This will be a one year appointment. There will be two elections at May 30<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate meeting. The first will be for a Member-At-Large position on the Executive Committee. This may be a senator from any college. The other election will be for the chair-elect for next academic year. This must be some who is on the Executive Committee.

**CHAIR-ELECT:** Chair-Elect Madlem gave a friendly reminder regarding graduation. She urged faculty members to attend. Chair-Elect Madlem thanked Provost Levine for her inclusiveness of Executive Committee regarding faculty concerns about very broad reaching issues.

**STUDENT REPORT:** The student representative read a memorandum from Steven Ross regarding the change to the wildcat logo. The ASCWU BOD and Student Academic Senate have voted to oppose the change to the wildcat log. There will e other student organizations that will be opposing it as well. There will be an article in the Observer regarding this as well. One of the concerns is that no students have been involved in this process. BOD elections will e happening soon.

President Gaudino indicated that the logo in question is the athletic logo. The logo was reviewed by the Foundation and Alumni boards as well as the Board of Trustees, where the students have a seat. The artist working on the project is a student as well as a student committee has worked to refine the logo.

**NEW BUSINESS** – Senator Wright thanked the professors that supposed the ROTC students who recently competed at WestPoint. The students did very well. They won their brigade as well as too 13<sup>th</sup> in the international competition. They are planning on competing again next year.

Senator T Young reminded senators that SOURCE is May 15<sup>th</sup>.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:56 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~~ 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 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 Dispute 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 Dispute 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 Dispute 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.

## **Exhibit C**

**The FSBACC proposes** that the following language be inserted into Section IV.A.2 of the Bylaws:

The first meeting of each committee shall ordinarily occur before October 31st. Academic Affairs, Curriculum and General Education committee's will meet according to the published meeting day and time as established by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

The other Faculty Senate committees shall determine their schedule of meetings for that entire academic year. The schedule may be determined either at the committee's first meeting, or via communication between the committee members prior to the first meeting. Once the year's meeting schedule is determined, the chair shall ensure that the schedule is forwarded to the Faculty Senate office.

### **Rationale:**

Stability and predictability in the committees' meeting schedules is desirable, since:

- (a) it would allow committee members to better plan their other commitments so as to avoid scheduling conflicts with the committee meetings, and
- (b) it would save the committees themselves from having to hold repeated discussions during the year about when to schedule their next meeting or meetings.
- (c) it would allow other university staff who attend committee meetings more predictability in meeting dates and times.

However, the smaller committees typically suffer issues with quorum if meeting dates and times are not somewhat flexible. Therefore, the recommendation is to have established date and time for the three larger, more global committees (Academic Affairs, Curriculum and General Education) and allow the smaller committees to set their meeting dates each year.

## Exhibit D

CWUP 5-50 Curriculum Policies and Procedures – **actual changes are in a separate document**

Summary of changes:

Many changes are housekeeping to change to current titles or practice and/or typographical or grammatical:

- Page 1 – housekeeping of title
- Page 3 – housekeeping and/or current practice
- Page 4 – current practice
- Page 5 – information moved to another section
- Page 6 – housekeeping to renumber sections
- Page 7 – housekeeping to renumber sections; title update, removal of HECB (Higher Education Coordinating Board) reference that no longer exists; removal of duplicate language
- Page 8 – housekeeping to renumber sections; addition of current practice information and removal of old practices
- Page 9 – housekeeping to renumber sections; add clarifying language to (14) C; update title information and update statement to reflect current practices on ADA
- Page 10 – housekeeping to renumber sections; (A) 4 deleted as no longer needed; (B) 1 updated to reflect current practice; (B)2 & 3 deleted; (C) updated to reflect current practice; 5-50-030 (1) not a curriculum definition
- Page 11 – housekeeping to renumber sections; (1) updated to reflect current practice; (2) updated to reflect current practice; (4) clarification language; (6) updated language; (7) moved from previous sections
- Page 12 – (8) & (9) update language that was passed Senate earlier but never put into the policy manual; (10) update language to eliminate HECB; (13) deleted to reflect current practice
- Page 13 – (12) update language to remove HECB reference; 5-50-040 (1) – (3) updated to reflect current practice
- Page 14 (5) deleted to remove HECB reference; (5) deleted HECB references; 5-50-050 updated to reflect current forms;
- Page 15 - 17 – 5-50-070 deleted to remove reference to HECB
- Page 18 – 5-50-080 renumbered; (2) updated to reflect current title
- Page 19 – (10) deleted reference to HECB; 5-50-090 renumbered; (3) & (4) deleted HECB reference
- Page 20 – (7) changed to reflect current practice; (8) delete HECB reference; 5-50-100 added clarifying language and deleted definition of program.
- Page 22 - 24- renumbered
- Page 25 – added Listing Program requirements that was approved by Faculty Senate June 2, 2010, but never added to the policy manual.

# Exhibit E

## 5-90-090 Procedures for Curriculum Change

(4) Review Process. Deans begin the review process. New degree programs are forwarded to the associate vice president for undergraduate studies for review of completeness according to ~~HECB~~ and NWCCU requirements. If additional information is required, the proposal will be returned to the dean. If the proposal is complete, it is forwarded to registrar services. All other curriculum proposals are forwarded by the dean directly to registrar services. The proposals are checked for availability of course number, clarity and accuracy of course description, title, credits, cross listings, and arithmetic. If errors have been identified the proposals are returned to the dean and the dean's office in turn contacts the department to make corrections or additions. When appropriate, registrar services sends the proposal to CTL and/or to the graduate office. Upon approval by the graduate office and/or CTL, the proposal is sent to the provost's office. The provost's office prepares a curriculum summary log for review by the FSCC and distributes electronically to the academic community before action by the FSCC and/or the faculty senate. The process must include checks for (a) consistency of course/program with department goals, (b) academic integrity, (c) clarity of student learning outcomes and assessment plans, and (d) availability of sufficient funds. New degree program proposals are reviewed by the board of trustees. Rejected proposals will be returned to the dean with an explanation.

(5) Hold Petition. Any member of the academic community can request a hold on FSCC action by submitting a completed hold petition to the Office of Undergraduate Studies or the FSCC Chair prior to the next FSCC meeting.

The hold petition form requires a justification for the hold, a list of the affected department(s), and written, dated proof of notification of the affected department(s) and dean(s). The form must be submitted to the office of undergraduate studies or FSCC chair prior to the next FSCC meeting.

Resolution of Holds. The party originating the hold must notify the affected department(s) of the justification for the hold. A memo of resolution must be submitted to the FSCC within two weeks after the hold has been recorded. If a resolution has not taken place, a representative for the department(s) involved will appear before the FSCC for a decision at the next scheduled FSCC meeting.

(6) Notification. Curriculum summary logs, which are compiled in the provost's office, will be used to notify the academic community.

(7) Approval Process. Items appearing on the curriculum summary log (except those requiring approval by the faculty senate) will be approved automatically on the proposed approval date unless a completed hold petition has been received according to 5-90-090(5). The proposed approval date, assigned in the provost's office, is the date of the FSCC meeting immediately following the day the committee first reviews the log (notification date on the log). The time

between the notification date and the proposed approval date will be at least two weeks. If concerns are raised, approval may be delayed while the curriculum committee contacts the originator of the proposal and concerned departments.

# HOLD Petition Form

Directions: Faculty Senate Curriculum Policies and Procedures Sections 5-50-090 (4) & (5) require that this form be completed and submitted to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee prior to the next FSCC meeting. The policy also states that if a Memo of Resolution for the hold is not received by the FSCC within two weeks after the hold has been recorded, the departments involved will appear before the FSCC at the next scheduled FSCC meeting (generally the first and third Thursdays of each month during the academic year) for a decision. If attendance at an FSCC meeting is necessary, all parties will be asked to submit any written handouts to the Faculty Senate office at least 48 hours before the scheduled meeting.

**Curriculum Item:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Curriculum Log Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Curriculum Log Approval Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Petitioner's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Petitioner's Department:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Hold Justification/Concern/Issue:**

**List the Department/Program (s) and Dean(s) affected. Attach written, dated proof of notification to each:**

**Department/Program** \_\_\_\_\_

**Dean** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department/Program** \_\_\_\_\_

**Dean** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department/Program** \_\_\_\_\_

**Dean** \_\_\_\_\_

**Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee Use Only**

Date Hold Petition received: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Memo of Resolution received: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of FSCC meeting attended, if necessary: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: