

6-2-1993

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 06/02/1993

Sue Tirotta

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Tirotta, Sue, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 06/02/1993" (1993). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 714.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/714>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [pingfu@cwu.edu](mailto:pingfu@cwu.edu).

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY****FACULTY SENATE MEETING - June 2, 1993**

Presiding Officer: Barney Erickson  
Recording Secretary: Sue Tirotta

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

**ROLL CALL**

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Bagamery, Hansen, Relan, Taylor and Thelen.  
Visitors: Gerald Stacy, Libby Street, Blaine Wilson, Tom Broberg, Connie Roberts, Bonnie Nelson and Ken Gamon.

**CHANGES TO AGENDA**

-Addendum distributed: Add one item under Communications; add information items on Faculty/Administrator BBQ and 1993-94 Distinguished Professor Awards under Chair's Report; add motion to approve 1993-94 Faculty Grievance Committee under Chair's report.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

\***MOTION NO. 2911** Jim Ponzetti moved and Owen Pratz seconded a motion to accept the minutes of the May 5, 1993, Faculty Senate meeting as distributed. Motion passed.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

-4/27/93 memo from Frank Cioffi, English, regarding Higher Education Coordinating (HEC) Board committee on faculty loads. Referred to Executive Committee.  
-5/12/93 letter from Provost Don Schliesman regarding summer compensation for Faculty Senate Chair. Referred to Executive Committee.  
-5/13/93 memo from Corwin King and Roger Garrett, Communication, regarding implementation of plan for reorganization of CLAS. Referred to Executive Committee.  
-5/22/93 memo from Libby Street, Psychology, regarding motions related to Salary Adjustment Proposal. See Personnel Committee report below.  
-5/24/93 letter from Thomas Broberg, Director of Cooperative Education Center, regarding Cooperative Education Policy Statement. See Curriculum Committee report below.  
-5/27/93 letter from Ken Hammond, Geography, requesting that the Faculty Senate investigate and identify the latitude administrators have to impose on faculty new and uncodified conditions such as those used this year to justify their initial recommendations for Professional Leaves. Referred to 1993-94 Senate Executive Committee.

**REPORTS**

1.

**CHAIR**

-Chair Erickson reported that Sidney Nesselroad, Music, will become Faculty Senate Chair effective June 15, 1993. Chair Nesselroad will be available during the nine weeks of Summer Session (June 21 - August 20, 1993).  
-The Faculty Senate Office will move from Bouillon Hall 240 to Barge Hall 409 on July 1, 1993.  
-The annual Faculty/Administrator Barbecue has been scheduled for Friday, October 1, 1993. Tickets will cost \$10 and be available at the SUB Ticket Office (by espresso bar) after September 6, 1993. Flyers regarding the BBQ will be mailed in August to all faculty and administrators at their home addresses.  
-The 1993-94 Distinguished Professor Awards will be presented at the Honors Convocation on June 11, 1993: Robert J. Carbaugh (Economics), Distinguished University Professor - Teaching; and Glenn A. Madsen (Education), Distinguished University Professor - Public Service. (No nominations were received this year for Distinguished University Professor - Research and Artistic Accomplishment.)

\* \* \* \* \*

-Chair Erickson reported that he has received several inquiries about the Senate's continuing support for MOTION NO. 2888A (approved unanimously February 3, 1993) regarding the proposed reorganization of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences:

**MOTION NO. 2888A:** Restructuring of academic units within Central Washington University [should] be addressed in Central's strategic plan. However, since the timeline for submission of the strategic plan does not allow for careful consideration of specific proposals at this time, the Faculty Senate recommends that no

1. CHAIR, continued

restructuring occur at this time and the plan contain detailed procedures for dealing with specific proposals for restructuring. These procedures should include formal participation of the Faculty Senate and of the entire faculty in the deliberations of the restructuring process.

The Chair asked Senators to express any change in their support for this motion, and there was no reply. Chair Erickson concluded that the Faculty Senate's position on restructuring of CLAS will remain that expressed in MOTION NO. 2888A.

\* \* \* \* \*

**\*MOTION NO. 2912** Barney Erickson moved approval of the 1993-94 Faculty Grievance Committee, as follows:

FACULTY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

Reports to: President  
 Purpose: Resolve, by informal means, specific grievances, disputes or conflicts of faculty members and recommends action to the President. (Members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and ratified by the Faculty Senate.)  
 Membership: 6 faculty (3 regular members and 3 alternates)

REGULAR MEMBERS:

Jack Dugan, faculty (SOC) (3 yrs)  
 Stephanie Stein, faculty (PSYCH) (1 yr)  
 Robert Jacobs, faculty (POLI SQ) (2 yrs)  
 Motion passed.

ALTERNATE MEMBERS:

Jim Hawkins, faculty (TH ARTS) . . . (3 yrs)  
 Patrick O'Shaughnessy, faculty (ACCT) (1 yr)  
 Kelton Knight, faculty (FDR LANG) . . (2 yrs)

-Gerald Stacy, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, reported that three finalists (Mark Young, John Cain, Margaret Marik) have been interviewed on campus for the position of Vice President for University Relations and Development. The fourth finalist (Lee Howard) will be on campus this week, and Dean Stacy noted that attendance by faculty at the university forums designed to introduce the candidates has been disappointing. The Dean strongly encouraged faculty members to attend the forums for the final candidate.

2. PRESIDENT

President Ivory Nelson reported that the University Budget Advisory Committee will meet at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, June 3, 1993 in Bouillon 143. The Budget Advisory Committee will meet with the Board of Trustees at 1:00 p.m. on June 3, 1993, in Bouillon 143, to brief Board members on the budgets they will be considering for adoption at their regular meeting on June 11, 1993. The President reported that the information collected this year as part of the strategic planning effort helped the Budget Advisory Committee prioritize expenditures and determine how many students Central can and should serve. Budgets were prioritized on the basis of 1) preserving student enrollments, 2) maintaining the General Education Program and 3) preserving Goods and Services budgets. The President stated that 7036 FTE students are currently enrolled (including off-campus programs), and the additional 215 FTE students fully funded by the legislature during the next biennium will generate \$900,000 in additional funds and bring Central's Fall 1993 enrollment goal to 7251 FTE. President Nelson noted that the student enrollment cap has been lifted, and Central will now collect and manage tuitions and fees; the university is free to enroll as many students as it is able to serve, but additional students would not be fully funded by the state.

David Dauwalder has been selected as the Dean of the School of Business and Economics, effective September 1, 1993. The selection process for the Dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences has not been concluded.

President Nelson reported that Initiatives 601 and 602 will probably be on a November 1993 ballot and may be strongly supported. Initiative 601 would make a vote of the people necessary in order to raise state taxes, and Initiative 602 would roll back all tax increases approved this year by the legislature in balancing the state's biennial budget. The President warned that passage of Initiative 602 would be "disastrous" for higher education in Washington state, and it is necessary for the

2. PRESIDENT, continued

university to be frugal with its resources because the budget may be modified by the legislature when it convenes next year.

In response to questions regarding when non-tenure-track faculty can expect to be offered 1993-94 contracts, the President and Dean Stacy replied that no term contracts would be issued until after the Board of Trustees approves a university operating budget on June 11, 1993.

3. ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

Connie Roberts, Associate Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment, distributed an update on program assessment by department and university-wide, including the "Status of Assessment at Central Washington University" (April 1993) report to the Higher Education Coordinating Board. She asked that Faculty Senators share this information within their departments.

Dr. Roberts reported that all freshmen have taken the Computerized Placement Test (CPT) and written an essay. Since the essay scoring created a delay in freshmen registration, the essay will not be used for placement into ENG 101, and only those students whose SAT scores are below 450 (Verbal or Math) or corresponding levels of the ACT will take the CPT placement test. The baseline data collected over the past three years indicates that approximately 30% of the entering freshmen should be placed in remedial courses.

Approximately 1300 students who have accumulated between 90 and 105 credits have taken the intermediate computer placement test. 12% of this population need remediation. Gain Score Analysis (random sample, no control group) was performed for the 79 students with Fall '90 entry scores and Fall '92 Intermediate Assessment scores; statistically significant score increases from Fall 1990 to Fall 1992 were identified. Director of Assessment and Evaluation Bonnie Nelson stated that the Assessment Office is still in the process of notifying students regarding the results of their Intermediate CPTs. Dr. Roberts emphasized that 1992-93 was largely a data-gathering year, and students should not be overly concerned about being held accountable or penalized for low scores this year.

Program Review and Evaluation will resume next year, and it is hoped that information gathered for strategic planning can be used to avoid duplication of effort.

Dr. Roberts stated that short videotapes of assessment forums are available and would be ideal for use in department meetings.

Senators questioned the high percentage of freshmen requiring remediation and the subsequent drain on university resources. Dr. Roberts replied that further analysis of this problem will be undertaken, including notifying high schools and investigating the implementation of interactive computer remedial courses. Senators stated that the initial philosophy behind assessment stressed assessment of programs rather than assessment of students, and they asked if this had changed. Dr. Roberts replied that a movement to hold students more accountable has gained impetus, and the intent of assessment has been somewhat modified.

4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

No report

5. BUDGET COMMITTEE

No report

6. CODE COMMITTEE

No report

7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

\*MOTION NO. 2913 Steve Olson moved approval of the Fashion Merchandising Minor (BEAM/HOEC) Program Addition as presented on the May 19, 1993, Faculty Senate agenda. Motion passed.

\*MOTION NO. 2914 Steve Olson moved approval of the Personal Computer Applications Minor (BEAM) Program Addition as presented on the May 19, 1993, Faculty Senate agenda. Motion passed.

7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, continued

\*MOTION NO. 2915 Steve Olson moved approval of the Cooperative Education Policy Statement, as follows:

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION POLICY STATEMENT1.0 Introduction

The Cooperative Education Program is an educational plan designed to integrate classroom study with planned, supervised, and evaluated field experience linking academic programs with students' career goals and interests. It offers undergraduate and graduate students a unique opportunity to combine career, social, and personal growth with the educational process. Additionally, it can provide them with opportunity to gain career entry opportunities, research experience related to project and/or thesis topics, and financial assistance.

Cooperative Education has a profound effect on the way learning takes place because it is interactive and reinforcing. Academic studies and field experiences connect to produce an overall learning environment that gives relevance to students' educational programs and direction to their career development. Students ascribe new value to what is learned in the classroom because, either in principle or practice, they are applying it to the test of a real job. The added ingredient for learning is experience.

1.1 Qualifying Parameters For Student Participation

The following are the University's minimum requirements (departments may have additional requirements) for student participation:

- A. The student is enrolled and pursuing a degree at Central Washington University.
- B. The student is in good academic standing.
- C. The field experience is directly related to the student's major field of study and/or career goal.
- D. The student has completed the appropriate prerequisite courses and possesses the skills and knowledge required for placement in a suitable level of field experience as determined by the student's department.
- E. The student must have a departmental faculty cooperative education (co-op) advisor for enrollment in a Cooperative Education course.
- F. The student's field experience is a practical position where the student is actively engaged in hands-on learning, and not just observing.

1.2 Program Enrollment

- A. The student must complete a formal learning agreement with a learning plan that contains relevant objectives and activities. The agreement form constitutes a field study plan that includes a description of academic requirements such as: term paper/project(s), assigned readings, research project/thesis, progress reports, final report, etc. The Learning Agreement must be endorsed by the employer/supervisor, the student, the faculty co-op advisor, department chair, and the Director of Cooperative Education.
- B. The student must submit a completed Cooperative Education Learning Agreement form to the Cooperative Education Center to complete the registration process for enrollment in the Cooperative Education course.
- C. Cooperative Education courses are numbered 290, 490 and 590. Credits are variable 1-5 for 290, 1-12 for 490, and 1-8 for 590 level courses.
- D. A freshmen student should complete at least 45 credits at CWU prior to enrolling in the Cooperative Education course. A transfer student should complete at least 15 credits at CWU and have a total of 45

7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, continued

- credits, including transfer credits, prior to enrolling in the Cooperative Education course.
- E. The student should complete a minimum of 90 total credit hours with 10 or more credits in his/her major to be eligible for enrollment in the 490 level course. Departments may have additional requirements for this level of experience.
  - F. A student who desires a career exploration experience, or who has not declared a major, is limited to enrolling for the Cooperative Education course at the 290 level.
  - G. The student may reenroll in a Cooperative Education course, but, in no case will a student be allowed to count more than 10 credits at the 290 level nor more than 20 total credits toward graduation requirements. No more than 10 credits are accepted in transfer. No more than 8 credits may be applied to a graduate degree.
  - H. Cooperative Education courses may be repeated if field experience learning objectives and activities are distinctly different from previous work or field experiences.

1.3 Awarding of Credits:

- A. Cooperative Education credits are to be awarded on the basis of quality, magnitude, and the level of learning (learning plan, relevant objectives and activities) that takes place during the field experience.
- B. For university standardization practice, credits are awarded using a minimum of 40 or more clock hours of approved field experience for each credit earned. Clock hours will include time spent to complete the work phase and the academic phase (term paper/project(s), journal or log, progress reports, assigned readings, final report, etc.) of the field experience.
- C. An appropriate means for evaluation (progress reports, performance evaluations, final reports, etc.) of the learning is established between the student, the employer, and the faculty co-op advisor.
- D. The student will be awarded a letter grade (S-U grade optional) for the Cooperative Education course.
- E. If the field experience is terminated by the employer or academic department, the student will not receive credit.
- F. Credits will not be given for previous field or work-study experience.

1.4 Student Supervision and Coordination:

- A. Daily supervision of the student is to be provided by the cooperating company/agency work supervisor, who will be identified prior to the field experience.
- B. Cooperative Education courses shall be under the direct guidance, direction, and coordination of a faculty co-op advisor, as part of the regular teaching load. Credit for faculty load shall comply with faculty code, Part 4, Section 7.20, B, 1, a, (3) of the current (1992) code. The faculty co-op advisor is available to the student in the field. The faculty advisor arranges and coordinates visitations/contacts with the employer/supervisor and the student a minimum of twice each quarter. The faculty co-op advisor keeps a field on each student's work (term papers/project(s), final report, etc.) with his/her department office.
- C. The Cooperative Education Center is an academic support service which facilitates the advising of students in the placement and cooperative education process, the development and sharing of employment information to students among departments; marketing the program; maintaining program direction; sustaining quality control for the program; conducting program research, assessment, and evaluation; and providing training and development opportunities for faculty co-op advisors and staff.
- D. The Cooperative Education Center staff is available for field

7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, continued

visitations/contacts when suitable faculty representation is not available or upon request of the faculty co-op advisor or department chair.

1.5 Student Placement Process:

- A. The placement process is intended to be a real-life job seeking experience for the student, including competition for positions.
- B. Students may propose their own placement to the faculty co-op advisor. The faculty co-op advisor determines the suitability of the placement with a given employer for Cooperative Education course credit.
- C. The placement process must conform to affirmative action and EEO/Title IX/ADA guidelines.

1.6 Position Descriptions for Field Experience:

The cooperating employer/agency must agree to provide a written description of field experience tasks, identify a field supervisor and submit his/her qualifications to the appropriate university department and the Cooperative Education Center prior to the approval of the Learning Agreement.

1.7 Student Compensation:

- A. Paid field experience positions are sought where possible and practicable.
- B. Unpaid positions may be used but are limited to the equivalent of working full-time for one quarter (approximately 400 hours).
- C. Students should not be put in a position where they are exploited as a source of cheap labor, replace or are in direct competition with regular employees.
- D. Participation in Cooperative Education unpaid experiences should not become an undue financial burden for the student or be a cause of the student withdrawing from the University for financial reasons.

1.8 Program Evaluation:

The Cooperative Education Program is subject to periodic review and assessment, completed at least once every five years. Routine review of evaluations from employers, faculty, and students occurs on a quarterly basis along with a continuous review of field placement sites.

Steve Olson explained that this proposal was reviewed and approved by the Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council and Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.

Senators protested concerning section 1.4.B. that includes the duties of the faculty co-op advisor as part of the faculty member's "regular teaching load." They stated that, even though the Faculty Code includes field experience supervision in the determination of faculty contact-hour loads, cooperative education experiences cannot be planned far enough in advance to make this policy practicable. Senators criticized section 1.3.D. regarding assignment of a letter grade for cooperative education courses, stating that current policy requires an S-U [Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory] grade and that each cooperative education experience is too unique for comparative grading. Cooperative Education Director Tom Broberg concurred that there would probably be a tendency toward grade inflation in a letter graded system. Senators questioned at whose option, faculty or student, a letter or S-U grade would be awarded.

**\*MOTION AMENDMENT NO. 2915A** Charles McGehee moved and Jim Ponzetti seconded a motion to amend section 1.3.D. of the proposed Cooperative Education Policy, as follows:

1.3.D. The student will be awarded ~~a letter grade~~ an S-U grade (letter S-U grade optional with approval of the faculty co-op advisor) for the Cooperative Education course.

MOTION AMENDMENT NO. 2915A passed.

Vote was held on MOTION NO. 2915. MOTION NO. 2915, as amended by MOTION AMENDMENT NO. 2915A, passed.

8. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Personnel Committee Chair Libby Street presented a Salary Adjustment Proposal with a ~~motion to adopt the entire proposal~~ as well as options to divide the main motion into several submotions. Senators agreed that more discussion on the details of the proposal will be necessary, but some concrete action should be taken now.

\*MOTION NO. 2916 Sidney Nesselroad moved and Erlice Killorn seconded a motion that the Faculty Senate adopt the principle that eligibility for salary adjustment will be determined by a set of departmental criteria that the school dean certifies meet minimum university standards.

RATIONALE: A discussion of the minimum university criteria is a moot point unless there is agreement that criteria rather than rankings should be the basis for determining eligibility for salary adjustment. Certification by the school dean involves the dean in ensuring comparability of standards across departments.

Senators questioned the definition of "minimum university standards," and speculated that the proposed system for salary adjustment [i.e. merit awards] might foster as many inequities as does the current process. Senators recommended that "merit awards" be funded every year at a minimum level to minimize inequities, and expressed concern that the major weakness of a criteria based approach is that standards could be lowered over time as departments compared their standards with those of other departments. Dr. Street replied that, contrary to popular belief, other universities that utilize similar performance-based systems have found that performance improves, rather than deteriorates, under a criteria-based approach.

MOTION NO. 2916 passed.

\* \* \* \* \*

\*MOTION NO. 2917 Libby Street moved that the Faculty Senate adopt the principle that there will be two levels of salary adjustment in relation to established criteria at each level.

RATIONALE: Two levels allows recognition of both excellent and exceptional contribution to the university. While some universities have more than two levels, the Personnel Committee felt that there is some relation between the number of levels and the difficulty in making discriminations about faculty members' work.

Dr. Street explained that the Personnel Committee considered proposing more than two levels of criteria, but decided that such a complex system would be relatively unmanageable and more difficult to utilize. Senators noted the similarity of this proposed two level system with the university's old system of awarding "professional growth" (a virtually automatic, cost-of-living increment) and "merit" (an "earned" increment). Dr. Street confirmed that the Committee did not intend for this system to allow movement beyond current "ceilings" built into the salary scale. Senators discussed the value of using monies entirely for salary scale adjustments and the perceptions of the faculty regarding step movement on the salary scale.

MOTION NO. 2917 passed.

\* \* \* \* \*

\*MOTION NO. 2918 Libby Street moved that the Faculty Senate adopt the principle that a level 1 salary increment will be granted to all of those who meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

RATIONALE: The level 1 criteria are intended to specify reasonable performance for all faculty and are flexible enough that all members of the university faculty should be able to document their contributions to the university in terms of the criteria stated.

Dr. Street explained that the level 1 criteria should be reasonable and easily met, and work on clearly defining these criteria would begin during Fall quarter 1993. She stated that preliminary discussions of the proposal in Deans' Council resulted in a suggestion that service such as that on intra-departmental committees be assigned level 1 status, and service on university standing committees and the Faculty Senate



8. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE, continued

be assigned level 2 status.

**MOTION NO. 2918** passed.

\* \* \* \* \*

**\*MOTION NO. 2919** Libby Street moved that the Faculty Senate adopt the principle that a level 2 salary increment will be granted to all of those who meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and research, and who, in addition, meet the level 2 criteria in any one area of teaching, scholarship, and service.

**RATIONALE:** The level 2 criteria in any one area require exceptional performance from a faculty member; it is unlikely that one person could both meet the level 1 criteria in all areas and then meet level 2 criteria in more than one area.

**\*MOTION AMENDMENT NO. 2919A** Barry Donahue moved and Charles McGehee seconded a motion to amend MOTION NO. 2919 as follows: "...a level 2 salary increment will be granted to all of those who meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and research, and who, in addition, meet the level 2 criteria in any one two areas of teaching, scholarship, and service." MOTION AMENDMENT 2919A defeated.

Senators debated whether faculty members should be expected to achieve in more than one area of level 2 service in order to receive a second salary increment. Dr. Street noted that there are great differences between disciplines and departments, and attaining two areas of high achievement might be very difficult for some faculty. Senators stated that requiring more than one area of level 2 service would diminish the focus toward excellence and have the effect of "watering down" exceptional accomplishments.

**MOTION NO. 2919** passed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \* NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: October 20, 1993 \* \* \* \* \*

## **FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING**

**3:10 p.m., Wednesday, June 2, 1993**

**SUB 204-205**

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 5, 1993 [May 19, 1993, minutes not yet available]**
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS**
  - 4/27/93 memo from Frank Cioffi, English, re. HEC Board committee on faculty loads. Referred to Executive Committee.
  - 5/12/93 letter from Provost Don Schliesman re. summer compensation for Faculty Senate Chair. Referred to Executive Committee.
  - 5/13/93 memo from Corwin King and Roger Garrett, Communication, re. implementation of plan for reorganization of CLAS. Referred to Executive Committee.
  - 5/22/93 memo from Libby Street, Psychology, re. motions related to Salary Adjustment Proposal. See Personnel Committee report below.
  - 5/24/93 letter from Thomas Broberg, Director of Cooperative Education Center, re. Cooperative Education Policy Statement. See Curriculum Committee report below.
- V. REPORTS**
  - 1. CHAIR**
    - MOTION: 1993-94 Faculty Grievance Committee [addendum to be distributed at 6/2/93 Senate meeting]
    - MOTION: Modify the Faculty Senate Bylaws, 1993-94 only [see attached] - **to be voted on 10/20/93**
  - 2. PRESIDENT**
  - 3. ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION - Connie Roberts**
  - 4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**
  - 5. BUDGET COMMITTEE**
  - 6. CODE COMMITTEE**
  - 7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**
    - MOTION: Fashion Merchandising Minor - BEAM/HOEC Program Addition [printed on 5/19/93 Senate agenda]
    - MOTION: Personal Computer Applications Minor - BEAM Program Addition [printed on 5/19/93 Senate agenda]
    - MOTION: Cooperative Education Policy Statement [attached]
  - 8. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**
    - MOTION: Salary Adjustment Proposal [attached]
  - 9. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**
- VI. OLD BUSINESS**
  - Forum for Discussion - Continuity of Senate Leadership [see attached]
- VII. NEW BUSINESS**
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\*\* NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: October 20, 1993 \*\*\***

**FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING**  
**AGENDA - June 2, 1993**

Page 2

**CHAIR**

**MOTION: 1993-94 FACULTY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE**

Nominees to vacant positions to be announced at June 2, 1993, Senate meeting.

**FACULTY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE**

Reports to: President  
Purpose: Resolve, by informal means, specific grievances, disputes or conflicts of faculty members and recommends action to the President. (Members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and ratified by the Faculty Senate.)  
Membership: 6 faculty (3 regular members and 3 alternates)

**REGULAR MEMBERS:**

VACANCY, faculty . . . . . (3 yrs)  
Stephanie Stein, faculty (Psych) . . (1 yr)  
Robert Jacobs, faculty (Poli Sci) . (2 yrs)

**ALTERNATE MEMBERS:**

VACANCY, faculty . . . . . (3 yrs)  
Patrick O'Shaughnessy, faculty (Accounting) . . . . . (1 yr)  
Kelton Knight, faculty (Foreign Languages) . . . . . (2 yrs)

\* \* \* \* \*

**MOTION: SUSPENSION AND TEMPORARY AMENDMENT TO THE FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS**

[effective 1993-94 only]

[NOTE: Proposed amendments to the Senate's bylaws require a two-thirds vote of those present and voting and are formally adopted at the subsequent meeting after introduction. This modification will be presented for vote at the 10/20/93 Faculty Senate meeting.]

**IV. Committees**

**A. Executive Committee**

**1. Composition**

The Executive Committee shall have six members, consisting of the five officers of the Senate: the Chair of the Senate, the Vice Chair, the Secretary, the two at-large members elected from the Senate membership, and the immediate past Senate Chair. Unless a current Senator, the immediate past Senate Chair is without vote.

AMENDMENT: Since the 1992-93 Faculty Senate Chair, Barney Erickson, will be unable to serve on the Senate Executive Committee during 1993-94 as stipulated by section IV.A.1. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the 1991-92 Faculty Senate Chair, Charles McGehee, will serve on the Executive Committee as Past Chair during 1993-94.

Rationale: The Past Chair position on the Executive Committee supports continuity in the flow of information and in the academic decision making processes.

**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

MOTION: Approval of the Cooperative Education Policy Proposal [as approved by the Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council and Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee]  
- EFFECTIVE FALL 1993 - text attached

**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

MOTION: Approval of Salary Adjustment Proposal - text attached  
[may be divided into submotions as described in attached May 22, 1993, memo]

**OLD BUSINESS**

DISCUSSION: Continuity of Faculty Senate Leadership [see 5/19/93 Senate agenda]

## COOPERATIVE EDUCATION POLICY STATEMENT

Proposed New - 1993

### 1.0 Introduction:

The Cooperative Education Program is an educational plan designed to integrate classroom study with planned, supervised, and evaluated field experience linking academic programs with students' career goals and interests. It offers undergraduate and graduate students a unique opportunity to combine career, social, and personal growth with the educational process. Additionally, it can provide them the opportunity to gain career entry opportunities, research experience related to project and/or thesis topics, and financial assistance.

Cooperative Education has a profound effect on the way learning takes place because it is interactive and reinforcing. Academic studies and field experiences connect to produce an overall learning environment that gives relevance to students' educational programs and direction to their career development. Students ascribe new value to what is learned in the classroom because, either in principle or practice, they are applying it to the test of a real job. The added ingredient for learning is experience.

### 1.1 Qualifying Parameters For Student Participation:

The following are the University's minimum requirements (departments may have additional requirements) for student participation:

- A. The student is enrolled and pursuing a degree at Central Washington University.
- B. The student is in good academic standing.
- C. The field experience is directly related to the student's major field of study and/or career goal.
- D. The student has completed the appropriate prerequisite courses and possess the skills and knowledge required for placement in a suitable level of field experience as determined by the student's department.
- E. The student must have a departmental faculty cooperative education (co-op) advisor for enrollment in a Cooperative Education course.
- F. The student's field experience is a practical position where the student is actively engaged in hands-on learning, and not just observing.



## 1.2 Program Enrollment:

- A. The student must complete a formal learning agreement with a learning plan that contains relevant objectives and activities. The agreement form constitutes a field study plan that includes a description of academic requirements such as: term paper/project(s), assigned readings, research project/thesis, progress reports, final report, etc. The Learning Agreement must be endorsed by the employer/supervisor, the student, the faculty co-op advisor, department chair, and the Director of Cooperative Education.
- B. The student must submit a completed Cooperative Education Learning Agreement form to the Cooperative Education Center to complete the registration process for enrollment in the Cooperative Education course.
- C. Cooperative Education courses are numbered 290, 490 and 590. Credits are variable 1-5 for 290, 1-12 for 490, and 1-8 for 590 level courses.
- D. A freshmen student should complete at least 45 credits at CWU prior to enrolling in the Cooperative Education course. A transfer student should complete at least 15 credits at CWU and have a total of 45 credits, including transfer credits, prior to enrolling in the Cooperative Education course.
- E. The student should complete a minimum of 90 total credit hours with 10 or more credits in his/her major to be eligible for enrollment in the 490 level course. Departments may have additional requirements for this level of experience.
- F. A student who desires a career exploration experience, or who has not declared a major, is limited to enrolling for the Cooperative Education course at the 290 level.
- G. The student may reenroll in a Cooperative Education course, but, in no case will a student be allowed to count more than 10 credits at the 290 level nor more than 20 total credits toward graduation requirements. No more than 10 credits are accepted in transfer. No more than 8 credits may be applied to a graduate degree.
- H. Cooperative Education courses may be repeated if field experience learning objectives and activities are distinctly different from previous work or field experiences.

### 1.3 Awarding of Credits:

- A. Cooperative Education credits are to be awarded on the basis of quality, magnitude, and the level of learning (learning plan, relevant objectives and activities) that takes place during the field experience.
- B. For university standardization practice, credits are awarded using a minimum of 40 or more clock hours of approved field experience for each credit earned. Clock hours will include time spent to complete the work phase and the academic phase (term paper/ project(s), journal or log, progress reports, assigned readings, final report, etc.) of the field experience.
- C. An appropriate means for evaluation (progress reports, performance evaluations, final reports, etc.) of the learning is established between the student, the employer, and the faculty co-op advisor.
- D. The student will be awarded a letter grade (S - U grade optional) for the Cooperative Education course.
- E. If the field experience is terminated by the employer or academic department, the student will not receive credit.
- F. Credits will not be given for previous field or work-study experience.

### 1.4 Student Supervision and Coordination:

- A. Daily supervision of the student is to be provided by the cooperating company/agency work supervisor, who will be identified prior to the field experience.
- B. Cooperative Education courses shall be under the direct guidance, direction, and coordination of a faculty co-op advisor, as part of the regular teaching load. Credit for faculty load shall comply with faculty code, Part 4, Section 7.20, B, 1, a, (3) of the current (1988) code. The faculty co-op advisor is available to the student in the field. The faculty advisor arranges and coordinates visitations/ contacts with the employer/supervisor and the student a minimum of twice each quarter. The faculty co-op advisor keeps a file on each student's work (term papers/project(s), final report, etc.) with his/her department office.
- C. The Cooperative Education Center is an academic support service which facilitates the advising of students in the placement and cooperative education process, the development and sharing of employment information to students among

departments; marketing the program; maintaining program direction; sustaining quality control for the program; conducting program research, assessment, and evaluation; and providing training and development opportunities for faculty co-op advisors and staff.

- D. The Cooperative Education Center staff is available for field visitations/contacts when suitable faculty representation is not available or upon request of the faculty co-op advisor or department chair.

#### 1.5 Student Placement Process:

- A. The placement process is intended to be a real-life job seeking experience for the student, including competition for positions.
- B. Students may propose their own placement to the faculty co-op advisor. The faculty co-op advisor determines the suitability of the placement with a given employer for Cooperative Education course credit.
- C. The placement process must conform to affirmative action and EEO/Title IX/ADA guidelines.

#### 1.6 Position Descriptions For Field Experience:

The cooperating employer/agency must agree to provide a written description of field experience tasks, identify a field supervisor and submit his/her qualifications to the appropriate university department and the Cooperative Education Center prior to the approval of the Learning Agreement.

#### 1.7 Student Compensation:

- A. Paid field experience positions are sought where possible and practicable.
- B. Unpaid positions may be used but are limited to the equivalent of working full-time for one quarter (approximately 400 hours).
- C. Students should not be put in a position where they are exploited as a source of cheap labor, replace or are in direct competition with regular employees.
- D. Participation in Cooperative Education unpaid experiences should not become an undue financial burden for the student or be a cause of the student withdrawing from the University for financial reasons.

#### 1.8 Program Evaluation:

The Cooperative Education Program is subject to periodic review and assessment, completed at least once every five years. Routine review of evaluations from employers, faculty, and students occurs on a quarterly basis along with a continuous review of field placement sites.



Central  
Washington  
University



Community Psychological  
Services Center

Psychology Building, Suite 118  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-2501

May 22, 1993

To: Barney Erickson, Chair  
Faculty Senate

From: Libby Street, Chair  
Faculty Senate Personnel Committee

Re: Motions related to the Salary Adjustment Proposal

The Personnel Committee submits the following motions for consideration by the Senate.

Main Motion:

"....the adoption of the salary adjustment proposal."

Sub-Motions

1. "....the adoption of the proposal to determine eligibility for salary adjustment in relation to a set of departmental criteria that the school dean certifies meet minimum university standards."

Rationale: A discussion of the minimum university criteria is a moot point unless there is agreement that criteria rather than rankings should be the basis for determining eligibility for salary adjustment. Certification by the school dean involves the dean in ensuring comparability of standards across departments.

2. "...the adoption of the proposal to specify two levels of salary adjustment in relation to established criteria at each level."

Rationale: Two levels allows recognition of both excellent and exceptional contribution to the university. While some universities have more than two levels, the Personnel Committee felt that there is some relation between the number of levels and the difficulty in making discriminations about faculty members' work.

3. "...the adoption of the recommendation to grant a level 1 salary increment to all of those who meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service."

Rationale: The level 1 criteria are intended to specify reasonable performance for all faculty and are flexible enough that all members of the university faculty should be able to document their contributions to the university in terms of the criteria stated.

4. "...the adoption of the recommendation to grant a level 2 salary increment to all of those who meet the level 1 criteria all three areas of

teaching, scholarship, and research and who, in addition, meet the level 2 criteria in **any one** area of teaching, scholarship, and service."

Rationale: The level 2 criteria in any one area require exceptional performance from a faculty member; it is unlikely that one person could both meet the level 1 criteria in all areas and then meet level 2 criteria in more than one area.

5. "...the adoption of the recommendation that level 1 evaluations shall be based on performance since the last level 1 (or in the old system, merit) award and likewise, level 2 evaluations shall be based on performance since the last level 2 (or in the old system, merit) award.

Rationale: Faculty members should be able to accumulate service from one increment to another.

6. "...the adoption of the recommended criteria at level 1 and level 2 -- teaching, scholarship, and service."

Rationale: These criteria are an attempt at socially valid descriptions of the expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service of contributing faculty members. They are derived from current informal criteria at this university and the criteria used at other universities. In some areas, it is difficult to achieve uniformity across the performances that result in a recommendation for an increment; e.g., a significant scientific discovery may not be parallel to a juried publication; however, both typically have been characterized as important contributions and thus meet the criteria for an increment.

(If substantive difficulties are determined to exist in some but not all areas, the following sub-motions might be considered.)

6a. "...the adoption of the recommended criteria at level 1-- teaching, scholarship, and service."

6a1. "...the adoption of the recommended criteria at level 1-- teaching."

6a2. "...the adoption of the recommended criteria at level 1--scholarship."

6a3. "...the adoption of the recommended criteria at level 1--service."

6b. "...the adoption of the recommended criteria at level 2-- teaching, scholarship, and service."

6b1. "...the adoption of the recommended criteria at level 2--teaching."

6b2. "...the adoption of the recommended criteria at level 2--scholarship."

6b3. "...the adoption of the recommended criteria at level 2--service."

7. "...the adoption of the recommendation that the amount of the salary adjustment per person shall be determined by dividing the money available from the legislature (less that used for scale adjustment, equity adjustment, or promotion) by the number of individuals eligible at level 1 plus the number of people eligible at level 2 except that units shall always represent a minimum of a nominal .5% (technically .4939) scale adjustment or a multiple of .5%. Available money between multiples of .5% shall be distributed as scale adjustments."

Rationale: The .5% figure is recommended for purposes of discussion only. Some individuals have felt that the minimum for salary adjustments as opposed to scale adjustments should be 3%. Others have recommended 1.5%. The Senate will need to exercise its will both on the distribution plan and on the minimum amount to be thus distributed. An upper limit is not placed in the recommendations though it could be considered.

8. "...the adoption of the recommendation to require independent evaluations by the department chair, a departmental personnel committee, and the school dean using common criteria and to require a meeting to resolve disagreements between the chair, personnel committee, and the dean."

Rationale: Concurrence by several parties helps to ensure the validity of the process. Because the recommended system requires only a checklist and documentation, evaluation of files should be relatively speedy and not an undue burden on individual faculty members. Some departments with membership as large as 22 currently ask each department member to review the files of all other department members. The meeting to resolve disagreements ensures that interpretations of data can be shared to the benefit of individual faculty members and of the university.

9. "...the adoption of the recommendation to establish a University Wide Appeals Committee comprised of six members, two each elected by the faculty from each school."

Rationale: An appeals committee assures that each faculty member will have an opportunity to present a case for reconsideration should an application for salary adjustment be denied. Election of members from each school or college ensures that the group is representative of the University.



## EVALUATION OF AND SALARY ADJUSTMENT BASED ON CONTRIBUTION

Senate Personnel Committee Proposal: April 19, 1993

### Assumptions

>>> 1. Faculty members are expected to make contributions to the university through teaching, scholarship, and service. Minimum performance standards are implicit for most university faculty; however, standards can be explicitly articulated. Many faculty members contribute to the university in ways that exceed these minimum acceptable levels. These exceptional contributions enhance the university and the faculty members who make them.

>>> 2. While any number of possible levels of teaching, scholarship, and service contribution could be envisioned, the number of levels should be such that each level can be explicitly defined in terms of general criteria that are shared across the university and specific criteria that may be unique to individual departments.

>>> 3. Individual faculty members should receive feedback on a yearly basis about their performance in relation to the criteria. In all cases, feedback should identify whether a faculty member meets or does not meet the criteria; in no case should feedback be in the form of ranking in relation to peers.

>>> 4. A salary adjustment system should be derived that benefits individuals in relation to the degree (level) of contribution they are making.

>>> 5. Faculty, chairs, and deans are willing and able to fairly evaluate the performance of their peers.

>>> 6. The administration should advocate for salary adjustment packages that permit reasonable recognition of faculty contributions.

>>> 7. There may be times when the legislature provides no or limited salary adjustment funds to the university; it is virtually impossible to establish a system of evaluation and salary adjustment within this context that avoids all demoralizing components. This proposal attempts to ensure that clarity and equity within the university's evaluation system will exist and that to the degree the legislature funds salary adjustment, all individuals who are contributing to the university will benefit in salary adjustment.

>>> 8. The amount of the salary increment that shall be devoted to promotion and equity adjustment shall be recommended by the Provost; the amount that shall be devoted to the basic scale adjustment shall be recommended by the Faculty Senate. The remaining amount shall be distributed as described in this proposal. ALL recommendations require the approval of the President and the Board of Trustees.

### Proposal

>>> 1. Each faculty member's contributions will be evaluated each year. These evaluations will provide feedback to faculty and will form the basis for decisions about salary advancement, promotion in rank, and tenure. This proposal addresses only feedback and salary advancement.

>>> 2. Evaluations will be based on specific criteria that are developed at the departmental level in compliance with minimum university wide standards (see attached) and that are published in advance. The dean will work with department chairs to ensure that

individual departmental criteria are in compliance with minimum university wide standards and are comparable across departments.

>>> 3. For the purpose of translating evaluations into salary adjustment, two levels of criteria will be established. Individuals who meet the criteria specified in the first level will achieve one unit (see definition later) of salary adjustment; those who meet the criteria specified in both the first and second level will achieve two units of salary adjustment.

>>> 4. To be considered eligible for a level 1 salary increment, an individual must meet the level 1 criteria established in each of teaching, scholarship, and service.

>>> 5. To be considered eligible for a level 2 salary increment, an individual must have met the requirements for a level 1 salary increment and in addition must meet the criteria for a level 2 salary increment in any one area of teaching, scholarship, and service.

>>> 6. Eligibility is never automatic although the University is advantaged when ALL members of the faculty meet the criteria established for a level 1 increment. Level 2 increments are expected to be more rare than level 1 increments, though the number of people eligible should be completely a function of performance in relation to the criteria.

>>> 7. Evaluations will be conducted independently by the department chair, a departmental personnel committee (either elected or a committee of the whole) and the school dean using common criteria. The evaluations will identify whether a person meets or does not meet the criteria; in no case will individuals be ranked in relation to their peers.

>>> 8. Individuals who are judged to have met the criteria at either level by any two of the dean, chair, and personnel committee shall be awarded the salary unit increment except that when the dean's evaluation finds the faculty member not eligible and the other two bodies find him or her eligible, there shall be a resolution of the disagreement in a meeting between the dean, the chair and the personnel committee.

>>> 9. Faculty members shall receive copies of their own evaluations.

>>> 10. Individuals may appeal what they believe to be wrongful findings to a University Wide Evaluation Appeals Committee composed of six members, two each elected by the faculty from each school.

>>> 11. Level 1 evaluations shall be based on performance since the last level 1 (or in the old system, merit) award. Level 2 evaluations shall be based on performance since the last level 2 (or in the old system, merit) award.

>>> 12. A salary adjustment unit shall be established by dividing the money available from the legislature (less that used for scale adjustment, equity adjustment or promotion) by the number of individuals eligible only at level 1 plus two times those eligible at level 2. These units will then be distributed one each to all faculty at level 1 and two each to all faculty at level 2 except that units shall always represent a minimum of .5% (technically .4939) scale adjustment or a multiple of .5%. Available money between multiples of .5% shall be distributed as scale adjustments.



SCHOLARSHIP CRITERIA--LEVEL I	SCHOLARSHIP CRITERIA--LEVEL II
<div data-bbox="394 354 1045 427" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> <b>MUST ACHIEVE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CORE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</b> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;&gt;Author or co-author of a textbook</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Author or co-author of a chapter in a textbook</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Editor of a textbook</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Author or co-author of an article submitted and/or published in a refereed journal</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Development and performance, presentation, or publication of a major artistic work</li> <li>&gt;&gt;A major scientific discovery or innovation</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Major grant funded</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Presents papers at regional or higher conferences</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Publishes articles in scholarly, but non-refereed journals</li> </ul> <div data-bbox="394 841 1045 914" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> <b>OR ANY TWO OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPORTIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</b> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;&gt;Serves on an editorial board for a scholarly journal</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Reviews texts or other materials for a publishing firm</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Submission of a grant or proposal</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Evidence of substantial activity on works in progress</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Performance or development of an artistic work</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Development or dissemination of new or innovative educational technology</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Consultation to improve one's academic status or scholarship.</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Attends seminars, conferences, and other formal/informal professional development activities relevant to professional responsibilities</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Local performance or presentation of an artistic work</li> </ul>	<div data-bbox="1249 354 1900 427" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> <b>MUST ACHIEVE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CORE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</b> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;&gt;Author or co-author of a textbook</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Author or co-author of a chapter in a textbook</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Editor of a textbook</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Author or co-author of an article submitted and/or published in a refereed journal</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Development and performance, presentation, or publication of a major artistic work</li> <li>&gt;&gt;A major scientific discovery or innovation</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Major grant funded</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Presents papers at regional or higher conferences</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Publishes articles in scholarly, but non-refereed journals</li> </ul> <div data-bbox="1249 841 1900 914" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> <b>OR ANY THREE OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPORTIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</b> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;&gt;Serves on an editorial board for a scholarly journal</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Reviews texts or other materials for a publishing firm.</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Submission of a grant or proposal</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Evidence of substantial activity on works in progress</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Performance or development of an artistic work</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Development or dissemination of new or innovative educational technology</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Consultation to improve one's academic status or scholarship.</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Attends seminars, conferences, and other formal/informal professional development activities relevant to professional responsibilities</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Local performance or presentation of an artistic work</li> </ul>

TEACHING CRITERIA--LEVEL I	TEACHING CRITERIA--LEVEL II
<div data-bbox="346 313 1024 386" data-label="Section-Header"> <p><b>MUST ACHIEVE THE FOLLOWING CORE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</b></p> </div> <p>&gt;&gt;Student evaluation of instruction, according to departmental criteria for items and level of proficiency  &gt;&gt;Course content evaluations by peers, supervisors, or students reflects meets departmental criteria for content, approach, evaluation, and assessment  &gt;&gt;Teaching reflects stated philosophy and mission statement that is consistent with the departmental mission statement and philosophy</p> <div data-bbox="346 711 1024 784" data-label="Section-Header"> <p><b>PLUS ANY ONE OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPORTIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</b></p> </div> <p>&gt;&gt;Advising support and excellence, including availability and accessibility to students, appropriate support and representation of departmental policies and procedures, proportionate share of student advisement, and timely and competent advisement activity  &gt;&gt;Course development or development of new departmental programs in response to departmental mission  &gt;&gt;Upgrading of teaching through specific instructional or evaluative innovations such as the addition of technological advancements  &gt;&gt;Proportional participation on undergraduate and graduate thesis committees  &gt;&gt;Peer review of classroom teaching that evidences compliance with departmental criteria  &gt;&gt;Teaching recognition awards</p>	<div data-bbox="1203 313 1881 386" data-label="Section-Header"> <p><b>MUST ACHIEVE THE FOLLOWING CORE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</b></p> </div> <p>&gt;&gt;Student evaluation of instruction, according to departmental criteria for items and level of proficiency  &gt;&gt;Course content evaluations by peers, supervisors, or students reflects meets departmental criteria for content, approach, evaluation, and assessment  &gt;&gt;Teaching reflects stated philosophy and mission statement that is consistent with the departmental mission statement and philosophy  &gt;&gt;Advising support and excellence, including availability and accessibility to students, appropriate support and representation of departmental and university-wide policies and procedures, proportionate share of student advisement, and timely and competent advisement activity.</p> <div data-bbox="1203 881 1881 954" data-label="Section-Header"> <p><b>PLUS ANY TWO OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPORTIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</b></p> </div> <p>&gt;&gt;Course development or development of new departmental programs in response to departmental mission  &gt;&gt;Upgrading of teaching through specific instructional or evaluative innovations such as the addition of technological advancements  &gt;&gt;Proportional participation on undergraduate and graduate thesis committees  &gt;&gt;Peer review of classroom teaching that evidences compliance with departmental criteria  &gt;&gt;Teaching recognition awards</p>



SERVICE CRITERIA-LEVEL I	SERVICE CRITERIA-LEVEL II
<div data-bbox="352 342 1003 415" data-label="Section-Header"> <p><b>MUST MEET DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA IN AT LEAST TWO AREAS</b></p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;&gt;Uses professional expertise to assist in community improvement</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Coordinates or participates in activities related to one's discipline for groups outside of the university population (e.g., Senior Ventures)</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Serves as an officer or committee member of a scholarly or governmental organization</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Serves on juries related to field of expertise (e.g., music competition)</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Provides service to University students in a non-university setting</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Serves as an advisor to student organizations</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Serves on university committees</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Completes efforts for the public good (e.g., costuming for a publicly presented play, designs art exhibit for public dissemination)</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Consultation where the primary emphasis is community service</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Presentations for the community good</li> </ul>	<div data-bbox="1209 342 1860 415" data-label="Section-Header"> <p><b>MUST MEET DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA IN AT LEAST FOUR AREAS</b></p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;&gt;Uses professional expertise to assist in community improvement</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Coordinates or participates in activities related to one's discipline for groups outside of the university population (e.g., Senior Ventures)</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Serves as an officer or committee member of a scholarly or governmental organization</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Serves on juries related to field of expertise (e.g., music competition).</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Provides service to University students in a non-university setting</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Serves as an advisor to student organizations</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Serves on university committees</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Completes efforts for the public good (e.g., costuming for a publicly presented play, designs art exhibit for public dissemination)</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Consultation where the primary emphasis is community service</li> <li>&gt;&gt;Presentations for the community good</li> </ul>



### Current Salary Steps with Proposed Unit Increments

1	26,727	26,859	26,992	27,125	27,259	27,394
2	27,529	27,665	27,802	27,939	28,077	28,216
3	28,355	28,495	28,636	28,777	28,920	29,062
4	29,206	29,350	29,495	29,641	29,787	29,934
5	30,082	30,230	30,380	30,530	30,680	30,832
6	30,984	31,137	31,291	31,446	31,601	31,757
7	31,194	32,072	32,230	32,389	32,549	32,710
8	32,871	33,033	33,196	33,360	33,525	33,691
9	33,857	34,024	34,192	34,361	34,531	34,702
10	34,873	35,045	35,218	35,392	35,567	35,743
11	35,919	36,096	36,275	36,454	36,634	36,815
12	36,997	37,180	37,363	37,548	37,733	37,920
13	38,107	38,295	38,484	38,674	38,865	39,057
14	39,250	39,444	39,639	39,835	40,031	40,229
15	40,428	40,628	40,828	41,030	41,233	41,436
16	41,641	41,847	42,053	42,261	42,470	42,679
17	42,890	43,102	43,315	43,529	43,744	43,960
18	44,177	44,395	44,614	44,835	45,056	45,278
19	45,502	45,727	45,953	46,179	46,408	46,637
20	46,867	47,098	47,331	47,565	47,800	48,036
21	48,273	48,511	48,751	48,992	49,234	49,477
22	49,721	49,967	50,213	50,461	50,711	50,961
23	51,213	51,466	51,720	51,975	52,232	52,490
24	52,749	53,009	53,271	53,534	53,798	54,064
25	54,331	54,599	54,869	55,140	55,412	55,686
26	55,961	56,237	56,515	56,794	57,075	57,357
27	57,640	57,925	58,211	58,498	58,787	59,077
28	59,369	59,662	59,957	60,253	60,550	60,849
29	61,150	61,452	61,756	62,061	62,367	62,675
30	62,985					

**FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING**  
**June 2, 1993 - ADDENDUM TO AGENDA**

**COMMUNICATIONS**

-5/27/93 letter from Ken Hammond, Geography, requesting that the Faculty Senate investigate and identify the latitude administrators have to impose on faculty new and uncodified conditions such as those used this year to justify their initial recommendations for Professional Leaves. Referred to 1993-94 Senate Executive Committee.

\* \* \* \* \*

**CHAIR**

**INFORMATION ITEMS:**

1) **FACULTY/ADMINISTRATOR BARBECUE**

Annual Faculty/Administrator BBQ sponsored by Central Women and the Faculty Senate has been scheduled for Friday, October 1, 1993, at the Fairgrounds. Tickets will cost \$10 and be available at the SUB Ticket Office (by espresso bar) after September 6, 1993. Flyers will be mailed in August to all faculty and administrators at their home addresses.

2) **1993-94 DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR AWARDS**

Distinguished University Professor - Teaching:  
Robert J. Carbaugh, Economics

Distinguished University Professor - Public Service:  
Glenn A. Madsen, Education

The awards will be presented at the Honors Convocation on June 11, 1993. Each distinguished professor will receive a \$1500 monetary award to be prorated over the 1993-94 academic year.

**1993-94 FACULTY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE**

**MOTION:** Approval of the following faculty members to vacancies on the 1993-94 Faculty Grievance Committee:

Jack Dugan, Sociology (3 yrs) - Regular Member

Jim Hawkins, Theatre Arts (3 yrs) - Alternate Member

**FACULTY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE**

Reports to: President

Purpose: Resolve, by informal means, specific grievances, disputes or conflicts of faculty members and recommends action to the President. (Members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and ratified by the Faculty Senate.)

Membership: 6 faculty (3 regular members and 3 alternates)

**REGULAR MEMBERS:**

VACANCY, faculty . . . . . (3 yrs)

Stephanie Stein, faculty (Psych) . . (1 yr)

Robert Jacobs, faculty (Poli Sci) . (2 yrs)

**ALTERNATE MEMBERS:**

VACANCY, faculty . . . . . (3 yrs)

Patrick O'Shaughnessy, faculty (Accounting) . . . . . (1 yr)

Kelton Knight, faculty (Foreign Languages) . . . . . (2 yrs)



Bruce BAGAMERY  
✓ Linda BEATH  
✓ Andrea BOWMAN  
✓ John BRANGWIN  
✓ Peter BURKHOLDER  
✓ Robert CARBAUGH  
✓ David CARNS  
✓ Ken CORY  
✓ Bobby CUMMINGS  
✓ Barry DONAHUE  
✓ Barney ERICKSON  
✓ Ed GOLDEN  
✓ Ken HAMMOND  
       Russ HANSEN  
✓ Kris HENRY  
✓ Erlice KILLORN  
✓ Charles MCGEHEE  
✓ Deborah MEDLAR  
✓ Ivory NELSON  
✓ Sidney NESSELROAD  
       Vince NETHERY  
✓ Steve OLSON  
✓ Patrick OWENS  
       Rob PERKINS  
✓ Jim PONZETTI  
✓ Owen PRATZ  
✓ Dan RAMSDELL  
       Anju RELAN  
✓ Don RINGE  
✓ Dieter ROMBOY  
✓ Sharon ROSELL  
✓ Eric ROTH  
✓ Stephanie STEIN  
       Alan TAYLOR  
✓ Thomas THELEN  
✓ Rex WIRTH  
✓ Thomas YEH  
✓ Mark ZETTERBERG

       Hugh SPALL  
       Dan FENNERTY  
       Madalon LALLEY  
        
       John UTZINGER  
       David HEDRICK  
       Walt KAMINSKI  
       Margaret SAHLSTRAND  
        
       George TOWN  
       Ken GAMON  
       Connie NOTT  
       Morris UEBELACKER  
       Michael OLIVERO  
        
       Patricia MAGUIRE  
       David KAUFMAN  
       Gary HEESACKER  
       Don SCHLIESMAN  
       Andrew SPENCER  
✓ Stephen JEFFERIES  
        
✓ Cathy BERTELSON  
       Ethan BERGMAN  
       Jim GREEN  
       Beverly HECKART  
       Sylvia SEVERN  
       Robert BENTLEY  
       Stella MORENO  
       Roger YU  
       Geoffrey BOERS  
       Stephen SCHEPMAN  
       Robert GARRETT  
       John CARR  
        
       Jerry HOGAN  
       Wesley VAN TASSEL

June 2, 1993

Date

### VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

*Handwritten signature*

*Larry Smees*

*Blaine R. Wilson*

*Tom Breberg*

*Cassie Roberts*

*Sonnie C. Nelson*

*Ken Gannon*

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.

RECEIVED

APR 29 1993

CWU FACULTY SENATE

To: Barney Erickson, Faculty Senate Chair  
From: Frank L. Cioffi, Chair, English  
Date: 27 April 1993  
Subject: HEC Board Committee on Faculty Loads

*Frank L. Cioffi*

At the Governor's reception for CWU last week, I spoke at some length with Katrina Meyer, HEC Board member. She told me that she is putting together a committee composed of one faculty member and one administration representative from each of the state's universities in order to examine, along with a HEC Board contingent, the issue of faculty teaching loads in Washington. I expressed great interest in this committee because I feel that it must be very careful indeed about how faculty teaching loads are construed (especially when comparing different universities), and about how, quite literally, hour counts are made. At any rate, she asked me if I would represent CWU's faculty on this committee, and I agreed to do so, provided that you approve my appointment.

Just so you know my position, I think CWU faculty are teaching a quite heavy load as it is, have much "hidden" teaching in the form of 496's and 700's, and at the same time must shoulder a substantial administrative and research load.

This memo indicates my willingness to serve on the committee.

4A

Central  
Washington  
University



Office of the Provost and  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

208B Bouillon  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-1400

May 12, 1993

(5/12/93-203.PRV)

Dr. Barney Erickson  
Faculty Senate Chair  
Campus

RECEIVED

MAY 17 1993

CWU FACULTY SENATE

Dear Barney:

I am in receipt of your letter of May 10, 1993, addressed to President Nelson, requesting funds for the purpose of employing the Chair of the Faculty Senate on a half-time basis during the nine-week summer session, with total remuneration amounting to 1/9th of the chair's academic year salary. Further, you suggested this be started in the Summer of 1993. President Nelson has approved your request.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the President and to Mr. Vern LaBay as a reminder to include this item in the next fiscal year budget.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Schliesman  
Interim Provost and  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

/kb

c: President Nelson  
Mr. Vern LaBay

4B

Central  
Washington  
University



Department of Communication

252 Bouillon  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926-7500

(509) 963-1066

MEMORANDUM

TO: Barney Erickson, Chair  
Faculty Senate

FROM: Corwin King and Roger Garrett

C.K. [Signature]

RE: Implementation of Plan for the Reorganization of CLAS

DATE: May 13, 1993

Along with the rest of the campus community we were surprised to learn via President Nelson's May 10th memorandum that Dean Cummings' plan for restructuring of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences was to be implemented. The principal reason for surprise was the fact that quite vocal objections to such restructuring prior to the arrival of a new Provost and Dean of CLAS had apparently led to a most sensible delay of such implementation. The Faculty Senate passed a formal motion expressing the concern for greater participation of the Faculty and procedures for dealing with specific proposals for restructuring on Feb. 3, 1993. The need for such procedures related to specific proposals is vital!

Dean Cummings' plan calls for the elimination of the Communication Department. Beginning July 1, 1993, we have one year to implement this plan. This, despite written assurances from Provost Don Schliesman stating, "...I am sure you will have a chance to make your case to the new Provost as well as the new Dean of CLAS." This was crucial because our efforts have proven futile in attempting to discuss with Dean Cummings his decision to discontinue the Public Relations major and dismember the department by reallocating the faculty between the English Department and the School of Professional Studies.

If the concept of "shared governance" means anything then the degree of upset created by the present restructuring demands some responsible questioning of the process and the seeming haste in making unilateral decisions. We appreciate the fact that the Senate is on record regarding the need for Faculty review of restructuring decisions. Presumably this applies doubly when an entire department is slated for dismemberment.

In any case we would appreciate knowing what is planned by the Faculty Senate at this juncture. Additionally, we are seeking directions on how we as faculty who are being affected can appeal via an appropriate Faculty Senate committee. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

c: President Nelson

4C

Several options have been presented to both the Dean and President about Communication Dept. None of these have received

- ① Senate reaffirms the commitment made in February.
- ② Budget meeting today - bring up the reorganization.
- ③ Resolution to the Board on June 11 mtg. about restructuring.
- ④ Curricular impact w/ change in restructuring. New majors in dept? How are these effected.
- ⑤ Possible news coverage on Wednesday regarding restructuring.



Central  
Washington  
University



Cooperative Education Center  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926-7500  
(509) 963-2404

RECEIVED

MAY 25 1993

CWU FACULTY SENATE

May 24, 1993

Dr. Barney Erickson  
Chair of the Faculty Senate  
Central Washington University  
Campus

Dear Dr. Erickson:

The Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate has met and approved the new Cooperative Education Policy Statement with some minor changes. Dr. Wolfgang Franz informs me that he has forwarded a memo to the Faculty Senate Office verifying this information.

The changes have been made and the most updated version is enclosed. It is ready to be sent to the Faculty Senate for their approval. If you have any questions please contact me. Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Broberg  
Director

TJB/svw  
Enclosure



Department of  
Geography & Land  
Studies

CENTRAL  
WASHINGTON  
UNIVERSITY  
Ellensburg, WA  
98926

119 Lind Hall  
(509)963-1188  
FAX (509) 963-1047

May 27, 1993

RECEIVED

JUN 2 1993

CWU FACULTY SENATE

Barney Erickson, Chair  
Faculty Senate  
CAMPUS

Dear Barney,

The process leading to professional leave awards for the 1993-94 academic year was, by any measure, unduly and unnecessarily burdensome. The ultimate decision to award eleven leaves rectified this particular administrative error of judgment and injustice. Clearly, it was an error and wrong to impose new "conditions" on eligibility and criteria for professional leave; conditions not in, and contrary to, the Code.

Ms. Gould found, as stated in her letter of April 20, 1993. 1) "no intent...to circumvent the Faculty Code" and, 2) the "guidelines [conditions] used. . . appropriate." I find neither of these arguments persuasive. The Code was violated, whatever the intent, and the conditions, however appropriate, were unknown to the applicants prior to our submission of applications. Worse, within the bounds stated by Ms. Gould, nothing would prevent the administration from inventing new and different criteria every year and not just for professional leave but for any aspect of faculty rights and obligations covered by the Code. If all parties are not legally required to apply fairly the Code provisions as written, and our experience proves the administration does not feel ethically so constrained, then there is no working agreement at all. This surely is an intolerable situation for faculty and hence the university.

I request that the Faculty Senate investigate and identify exactly the latitude administrators have to impose on us new and uncoded "conditions" such as those used this year to justify their initial recommendations for Professional Leaves.

If there is the slightest ambiguity in the Code on this matter, I request every effort be made to reduce to somewhere near zero (on the Kelvin scale) the possibilities for arbitrary imposition of new conditions or criteria simply because the Code does not explicitly prohibit them. If the Code cannot serve this purpose, there is clearly a need to consider other, more effective means to achieve that goal.

Sincerely,



Kenneth A. Hammond  
Professor

ljb



## MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Connie Roberts, Associate Provost  
Institutional Research and Assessment

*Connie Roberts*

DATE: June 2, 1993

RE: Assessment Report

The student outcomes assessment movement has been gaining momentum on the national level for almost a decade now. Although the "Nation at Risk" report created great concern about our K-12 public schools, higher education did not escape the scrutiny of the public eye as well. The university community needs to be aware of the growing emphasis on student outcomes assessment by the accrediting agencies, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), and the legislature. This report will summarize the assessment activities and some findings for the 1992-93 year. In addition, some faculty forum and conference activities are presented.

The assessment plan was developed in 1989-90 and implemented in 1990-91. The assessment plan follows the 5 components set forth by the HECB. The plan includes the following: Baseline, Intermediate, End of Program, Employer, Alumni. The attached status report submitted to the HECB summarizes all activities in all areas. This memo will highlight key points of information for each of the areas.

### I. Baseline

All freshmen have taken the Computerized Placement Test and written an essay; the essay scoring created a delay in freshmen registration. As a result of two motions, the essay will not be used for placement into Eng 101, and only those students whose SAT scores are below 450 (Verbal or Math) or corresponding levels of the ACT will take the CPT placement test. Details for notifying students of need for placement testing will be performed by the Admissions Office. This should reduce the CPT testing load by at least 30%.

The baseline data collected over the past three years indicates that approximately 30 percent of the entering freshmen should be placed in remedial courses. More remedial courses need to be offered Fall Quarter to accommodate the appropriate sequencing of courses for incoming freshmen. As a result of assessment, effort is also underway to articulate the remedial courses with the Eng 101 course. Investigative work is underway to determine if an interactive computer remedial course would be appropriate for our student needs.

## **II. Intermediate**

Approximately 1,300 students who have accumulated between 90 and 105 credits have taken the intermediate computer placement test. This year will be a data-gathering year.

Preliminary findings from the Fall 1992 sample indicate that approximately 12 percent of this population need remediation; however, of the 514 students in the Fall sample, only 79 were matched to the Fall 1990 freshmen group. This N of 514 represents a different population. Gain Score Analysis was performed for the 79 students with Fall 90 entry scores and Fall 92 Intermediate Assessment scores; statistically significant score increases from Fall 1990 to Fall 1992 were identified.

A transcript analysis of the matched scores is underway to determine if students who have completed General Education do better on intermediate assessment. The analysis has not been completed for Winter 93 and Spring 93 sample.

## **III. End-of-Program Assessment**

All departments except one have submitted assessment plans; a summary chart appears on pages 6 to 15 in the assessment report. The following list shows the variety of assessment measures used by the departments:

<b>Number of Departments</b>	<b>Method of Measure</b>
18	Portfolio
23	Examinations
13	Field Projects/Internships/Student Teaching
12	Capstone Courses or required course
3	Senior Thesis
3	Surveys/exit interviews of graduating seniors
4	Alumni
5	Advisory Committees

Many departments are using multiple measures to provide a comprehensive evaluation and feedback process. Dr. Bonnie Nelson has summarized below some of the techniques and procedures.

## **Portfolio (18)**

Portfolio methods may utilize both cumulative and administered assessment components. Cumulative assessment components may take advantage of work students do in class, projects completed over time, results of supervised practical experiences, internships, or field projects. Administered assessments may include presentations, tests, on-demand written assignments. Portfolio materials do not necessarily have to be written. In the Graphic Design program, slides showing samples of student work and actual design pieces. The Special Education portfolio project has found that video tapes of student performance, originally considered an enhancement option for the portfolio, are very much desired by school personnel. Portfolios must be evaluated by faculty in order to determine strength and weaknesses of the program curriculum. Portfolio evaluation can be a very time consuming task. It is very important to have agreement among faculty about what is being sought from the portfolio in order to have some definition for the portfolio components and the appropriate evaluation criteria.

## **Examinations (23)**

For some departments, a large number of graduates may be required to take a professional certification test. These tests provide useful information to the program. Nationally standardized tests may be available from professional organizations and from the major testing companies that can be used. Medical Technology utilizes the licensure exams. Since the Geology department prepares students for graduate school as a goal, results from the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) and the associated subject matter test is one of the components for end-of-program assessment. Other programs utilize the Major Field Achievement Tests. Some departments are developing major tests that fit the unique aspects of their programs.

## **Field Projects/Internships/Student Teaching (13)**

Field projects, internships and student teaching experiences are opportunities for the student to gain in experience and to be assessed in an "authentic" situation. Feedback from the supervisors during these experiences are useful for evaluating student attainment of educational objectives and for determining if the program had prepared the student for the experience.

## **Capstone courses or required course (12)**

Capstone courses are courses where students are expected to synthesize the skills and knowledge gained in major courses into a coherent whole. The course may require the student to produce a major project to demonstrate this synthesis. Some departments already have capstone courses in place and others have proposed them. Staffing issues become important with

capstone courses as these will be senior courses that may be relatively small in size. It should be noted that a capstone course provides only a mechanism whereby end-of-program assessment can occur. That meaningful end-of-program assessment information is obtained will be dependent on the faculty involved and the requirements of the course. These various projects that may be required of the student within the capstone framework will provide the valuable assessment information.

### Senior Thesis (3)

Senior theses or projects including oral presentations may be part of a capstone course or seminar. If part of a course, they may be used to assign grades to individual students. Departments may also use these products to make judgments about the program. When used in this way, the focus changes from the individual student performance to patterns of performance (strengths and weaknesses) among groups of students.

### Surveys/exit interviews of graduating seniors (3)

Surveys of exiting students gain students' perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the program as close to graduation as possible. An exit survey is given to all graduating students as they apply for graduation.

### Alumni surveys (4)

Alumni surveys are important sources of information for program assessment. They are generally conducted after the student has been away from the university for a period of time. Hopefully the student has had time to settle into a job and develop a perspective on their university experience. A graduating student survey has been used with all students applying for graduation. Surveys of program graduates for the previous five years are part of the CWU Program Review and Evaluation process. The Program Review survey contains a common set of questions pertinent to education in the State of Washington and at Central Washington University in particular. Departments may add departmentally specific questions if they wish. Departments may also use additional alumni surveys when involved in the accreditation process or considering program changes.

### Advisory Committees (5)

Some departments have formed advisory committees to provide input to program needs and revisions. These committees help determine the structure of the end-of-program assessment process as well as review the results.

#### **IV. & V. Employer and Alumni Perceptions**

These two components will be conducted with the Departmental Program Review and Evaluation. These components need to be incorporated into the strategic planning process to prevent duplication of effort and insure continuous quality improvement. A new schedule to include all departments on a five-year rotation cycle needs to be developed.

---

#### **Faculty Forums**

Four faculty forums were held throughout the year to allow our professors to showcase their assessment projects. Some of these presentations were videotaped and are available for departments to use; the presentations were less than an hour. These videos could be used nicely for department meetings to focus a discussion on assessment.

#### **Assessment Conferences**

Faculty teams have attended three assessment conferences this year. In October, the following people attended the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Conference, **TURNING RESULTS INTO IMPROVEMENT**, in Seattle:

Frank Cioffi, English	Skip Smith, Biology
Osman Alawiye, Education	Judith Kleck, Writing Across the Curriculum
Carolyn Thomas, Home Economics	Jim Bradley, Business Administration
Rob Perkins, Business Ed/ADOM	Connie Roberts

The following team of 14 attended the Fourth Annual Washington State Assessment Conference in Olympia May 5 - 7, **MAKING A DIFFERENCE IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**:

Jan Boyungs, P.E.	Ginny Erion, Education
Bob Fordan, Communications	Charlotte Green, South Seattle Director
David Kaufman, Sociology	Erlice Killorn, P.E.
David Majsterek, Education*	Carlos Martin, Foreign Language
Dan Fennerty, Education*	Bonnie Nelson, Assessment Director
Debra Prigge, Education*	Bill Vance, Leisure Services
Lin Douglas, Associate Dean, SPS	Judith Kleck, Writing Across the Curriculum
Connie Roberts	

\*David, Dan, and Debra presented their findings from their portfolio project.

The people listed below are scheduled to attend the AAHE National Assessment and Continuous Improvement Conference in Chicago, June 9-11:

Anne Denman, Anthropology  
Russ Schultz, Music  
Ross Byrd, BEAM  
Joe Schomer, Education  
Connie Roberts

Phil Tolin, Psychology  
Carlos Martin, Foreign Language  
Ginny Erion, Education  
Bonnie Nelson, Assessment Director  
David Kaufman, Sociology

#### **Assessment Committee**

The Assessment Committee has worked diligently all year and is almost ready to present a proposal which would modify the current assessment plan. Assessment committee members have met with a variety of faculty from different departments to gather feedback on the proposal before actually submitting it to the Deans' Council for approval. The following people have served on the Assessment Committee this year:

Bob Fordan, Communications  
Rosemary Ross, Library  
Rob Perkins, BEAM

Bill Vance, Leisure Services  
Jim Bradley, Business Administration  
Bonnie Nelson, Director of Assessment

#### **Conclusion**

The legislature has continued the assessment funding of \$372,000 to each four-year institution and \$58,500 (less 3.3% annual reduction) to each community college. At the Annual Assessment Conference, Dr. Hugh Walkup, Assessment Liaison for the HECB, emphasized the need for assessing assessment. He cited that legislators will be asking the following questions as you defend biennial budget proposals: What do we want to know about ourselves and our students? What will we do with this information? What is the plan for improving undergraduate education? How will the institutions know if they've achieved it? As a result of assessment, what changes have you made and has it resulted in improvement? Show me. How creatively are you using it in planning? Identify programs and plans for improvement. Program proposals must be tied to assessment and assessment should be driving the priorities within the institution.

We need to continue developing assessment projects, classroom research, and end-of-major/program assessment. Your interest and efforts will be supported; just call Cathy Hyde at 1855 for guidelines for developing an assessment grant request.



**Departmental Grants and University Workshops  
in Support of Assessment**

**1990-1991**

	<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>GRANT</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Industrial and Engineering Technology</b>	<b>Development of Loss Control Management End-of-Major Assessment and external evaluation of program</b>	<b>\$1350</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Sociology</b>	<b>End-of-Program planning retreat</b>	<b>\$192</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Biology</b>	<b>Major Field Achievement Test in Biology - for End of Major Assessment</b>	<b>\$ 360</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Foreign Language</b>	<b>German Computer Adaptive Placement Examination (G-CAPE)</b>	<b>\$1000</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Communication</b>	<b>G-S-P (Grammar-Spelling-Punctuation) Software package for use in entry to program assessment</b>	<b>\$ 500</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Art</b>	<b>Camera for making slides of student work to build portfolios and departmental documentation for end-of-program assessment</b>	<b>\$ 650</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>University-Wide Workshop</b>	<b>Workshop on end-of-program assessment strategies and consulting with individual departments (Gerald Gillmore - UW)</b>	<b>\$ 590</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Workshop - Holistic Scoring of Writing</b>	<b>Workshop on holistic scoring of writing for evaluation on entry writing samples.</b>	<b>\$1100</b>
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$5742</b>

**Departmental Grants and University Workshops  
in Support of Assessment**

**1991-1992**

	DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	GRANT
1	Communication	Development and initiation of end-of-major assessment project for Public Relations major.	\$2350
2	Computer Science	Development of end-of-major assessment test for computer science majors.	\$2000
3	Music	Grant for equipment to initiate entry/exit recordings of student performances for end-of-program assessment	\$3605
4	Industrial and Engineering Technology	Development of end-of-major test for construction management majors.	\$1200
5	English	Development of end-of-major assessment procedures for English majors	\$ 500
6	Political Science	Books to support development of capstone course.	\$ 86
7	Biology/Psychology/Physics	Major Field Achievement Tests	\$ 795
8	Workshop - Portfolio Assessment	Interdisciplinary workshop on portfolio assessment sponsored with Graduate Studies	\$ 800
9	Workshop - Holistic Scoring of Writing	Workshop on holistic scoring of writing for entry assessment and evaluation of writing in the major. (Consultant/travel)	\$2458
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$13,794</b>

**Departmental Grants and University Workshops  
in Support of Assessment**

**1992-1993**

	DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	GRANT
1	Mathematics S. Hinthorne	Development of an intermediate level quantitative reasoning test. Was piloted fall quarter, still being analyzed.	\$ 1500
2	Mathematics S. Hinthorne	Development of an End-of-Major test for use with mathematics majors.	\$ 1500
3	Business Administration G. Kessler	Survey and report of alumni from the program	\$ 1500
4	Special Education D. Priggee, D. Fennerty D. Majsterek	Development and presentation of portfolio project for Special Education. Presentation of project to clientele groups in the state. Development of video tape for project.	\$8000
5	Education O. Alawiye	Support for Alawiye to present a paper "Assessment in Higher Education: State Mandates and the Public's Insatiable Thirst for Accountability" at National Social Science Association Conference.	\$ 592
6	Art	Presentation of student portfolios at national juried meeting in Portland. Students received commendatory reviews.	\$ 980
7	Art	Critique of work of senior studio majors and graduate students.	\$ 200
8	Family and Consumer Studies J. Ponzetti	Convening an advisory group for the Family Studies specialization in the Family and Consumer Studies program.	\$ 150
9	English/General Education P. Callaghan	Support for General Education Coordinator to attend Association for General and Liberal Studies meetings	\$ 649
10	Fashion Merchandising B. Wilson, C. Thomas	Development of a follow-up instrument to assess the effectiveness of the program in meeting fashion merchandising needs.	\$2757
11	Anthropology/ General Education A. Denman	Student involvement in Assessment of General Education/Breadth class (Anthropology 130) initiated Spring Quarter utilizing a team of students to provide feedback to instructor on all aspects of course. Weekly review of syllabus topics with student evaluation has already initiated some changes in presentations.	\$900

**Departmental Grants and University Workshops  
in Support of Assessment**

	DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	GRANT
12	English/ Anthropology/ Learning Communities B. Cummings B. Smith	Initiation of longitudinal assessment project to measure the impact of interdisciplinary learning communities on students' intellectual development. Workshop for faculty orientation to Perry Scheme of Intellectual Development and the Measure of Intellectual Development (MID)	\$3000
13	Workshop - Holistic Scoring of Writing	Workshop on holistic scoring of writing - applied to intermediate assessment and application to writing in the major. (Consultant/travel)	\$2756
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$24,484</b>

**STATUS OF ASSESSMENT AT  
CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

**April 1993**

**A Report to  
The Higher Education Coordinating Board**

**Central Washington University  
Office of Institutional Research and Assessment**

# **CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

**AREA:**     Baseline Student Data

## **ACTIVITIES COMPLETED:**

1.     Entry Assessment of all entering freshmen for basic skills proficiency in Reading Comprehension, Grammar (Sentence Skills), Arithmetic, and Elementary Algebra via the Computerized Placement Tests (CPTs) has continued.
2.     Entry assessment of all entering freshmen writing skills through a writing sample has continued.
3.     Administration of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program Freshman Survey (CIRP/UCLA) of interests and attitudes to the 1992 entering freshmen was completed in August.

**Results:**    Entering student performance on the measures utilized in the Baseline Data (Computerized Placement Tests in Reading Comprehension, Sentence Skills, Arithmetic, and Elementary Algebra and on the Writing Sample) has exhibited only small fluctuations over the 1990-1992 assessment years. The percentage of students not meeting the basic skills proficiency levels has also fluctuated only slightly.

## **WORKS IN PROGRESS:**

**Status Report:** Collection and update of Baseline Student Data (CPT and Essay scores) continues as an ongoing activity. Because of space limitations for test retake information in the Student Information System (SIS), a relational database system for baseline data is being implemented.

**INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES:** Review of 1990-1992 Baseline Student Data results by the Assessment Committee, English, mathematics and Academic Skills faculty, and Admissions personnel concerned with pre-registration for entering freshman have resulted in proposed changes in baseline testing for placement for the 1993-1994 academic year.

**Recommendations and Decisions:** The Baseline Student Data provide information about incoming students concerning readiness for the General Education sequence. This information is utilized for advising and placement of students and thus has implications for course offerings and staffing.

The Assessment Committee presented motions that the entry essay not be used for placement in ENG 101 and that only students entering with SAT scores below 450 be required to take the baseline placement tests. Motions were passed by the Committee and accepted by the Dean's Council.

**CHANGES TO ASSESSMENT PLAN:** Pending.

**EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATED ASSESSMENT FUNDS TO DATE:**

As of April 27, 1993, \$61,853.66 from the biennial assessment allocation has been expended on the baseline student data effort.



**AREA:** Intermediate Assessment

**ACTIVITIES COMPLETED:**

1. Intermediate assessment of students who have completed 90-105 credits was begun Fall Quarter 1992. Students completed a posttest on the Computerized Placement Tests in Reading Comprehension, Sentence Skills, Arithmetic, and Elementary Algebra.
2. Students also completed a writing sample which was scored using the same rubric as used for the Freshman essay.

**Results:** Means for the Fall 1992 Intermediate group on the tests of Reading Comprehension, Sentence Skills, Arithmetic, and Elementary Algebra were higher than for the 1990 Freshman group (also for 1991 and 1992 freshman groups). Gain score analysis for the cohort with matched scores indicated statistically significant score increases for these areas.

Results from the intermediate writing assessment cannot be directly compared to those from the baseline writing assessment. The prompt for the entry writing sample was selected to elicit writing which would exhibit prerequisite skills and abilities and elicited expository prose which required students to explore their personal experiences. The intermediate assessment prompts were selected to elicit more sophisticated, mature writing which required students to analyze the assumptions, behaviors and identifying features of social groups and evaluate the function, usefulness or limitations of group identifications. While the same scoring criteria were used, the entry and intermediate essays were read separately. The nature of the holistic scoring process is such that a set of papers will array itself across a set of criteria, even when those criteria describe discrete analytical traits, thus while both sets of scores will span the score scale (1 - 6); when compared, the scores will thus evidence little improvement.

However, the scores for the intermediate samples demonstrated a significant level of mastery of the literacy and critical thinking expectations of upper level students. Even higher levels would be expected if all students in the sample had completed the composition sequence, including the upper division writing requirement ENG 301. (A transcript analysis is being used to investigate the completion of Basic requirements including the junior level writing course.

Comparison of student performance at the Lynnwood and South Seattle Extended University Centers and the Ellensburg campus found

a significant difference in the Sentence Skills (grammar) area only.

### **WORKS IN PROGRESS:**

**Status Report:** Full implementation of intermediate assessment in verbal and math skills (CPT post-test) and writing assessment for students who have completed 90-105 credits began Fall Quarter 1992 with students entering the Extended University Programs at the Lynnwood and South Seattle Centers and on the Ellensburg campus. Intermediate assessment of students at the Steilacoom and Yakima Centers began Winter Quarter and is continuing this year.

**INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES:** Results of the initial intermediate assessment information are being reviewed by the Assessment Committee and other concerned faculty. Discussions regarding the revision of the intermediate assessment to be more reflective of college level work and the CWU General Education Program are ongoing. A proposal will be forthcoming from the Assessment Committee regarding changes for Intermediate Assessment.

**Recommendations and Decisions:** None at this time.

**CHANGES TO ASSESSMENT PLAN:** Pending.

### **EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATED ASSESSMENT FUNDS TO DATE:**

As of April 30, 1993, \$48,352.48 of the biennial assessment funds have been expended.

**AREA:**      End-of-Program

**ACTIVITIES COMPLETED:**

**Results:**    See attached summary of end-of-program assessment plans currently in implementation process. An additional five departments have established their end-of-program assessment procedures. There are now thirty-one departments covering 126 different majors and/or program options are implementing end-of-program assessments and/or evaluating initial data. The more detailed plans are on file in the Assessment Office. Given the time-table for graduates, most end-of program assessments are done Spring quarter. Evaluation, recommendations, and revisions of plans will be done Summer and Fall for further assessment recommendations and implementation.

**WORKS IN PROGRESS:**

**Status Report:** End-of-Program assessment plans related to the Education majors have been developed. The portfolio project established by the Special Education program has been well received students and by their clientele groups. Curricular changes resulting from feedback are already being implemented and faculty report increased collaboration and teaching improvements. The recently established inter-disciplinary Center for the Preparation of School Personnel will facilitate continued assessment and revision of these programs as necessary to meet state and societal needs.

Four End-of-Program Assessment forums have been held this year where faculty are sharing their progress in end-of-major assessment in their various disciplines. These have been well attended and meaningful dialogue has occurred. The programs have been videotaped for availability at department meeting for more convenience and participation.

**INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES:** Review of End-of-Program assessments will be done by the respective program faculty with recommendations to the Provost as needed.

**Recommendations and Decisions:**    Pending.

**CHANGES TO ASSESSMENT PLAN:**      None.

**EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATED ASSESSMENT FUNDS TO DATE:**

As of April 27, 1993, \$57,606.54 the biennial assessment allocation has been expended in these efforts.

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

<b>COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SCIENCES</b>	
<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN</b>
<b>ANTHROPOLOGY</b> ♦ BA (3 options) 1. General Option 2. Museology Option 3. Teaching Option  ♦ BS	<b>ANTH 458 - Senior Survey - research paper televised</b> Student Involvement in Assessment of General Education/Breadth class (Anthropology 130) initiated Spring Quarter utilizing a team of students to provide feedback to instructor on all aspects of course. Weekly review of syllabus topics with student evaluation team has already initiated some changes in presentations.
<b>ART</b> ♦ BA (3 majors) 1. Graphics Majors 2. Studio Majors 3. Art Education Majors	1. Portfolio 2. Juried art show/slides 3. Portfolio and video-tape of student classroom presentation.
<b>BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES</b> ♦ BA - Biology ♦ BS - Biology	<b>Major Field Test - Biology</b> The mean performance of CWU students participating in the Major Field Achievement Test in Biology Spring 1992 was at the 62nd percentile of the national norm group. CWU mean scores were above the national mean on the 7 assessment indicators provided. <b>Capstone Course - BISC499 Senior Seminar</b>
<b>CHEMISTRY</b> ♦ BA 1. Chemistry 2. Teaching Major ♦ BS 1. Chemistry Major 2. Biochemistry Option	<b>American Chemistry Society examinations</b>

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

<b>COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SCIENCES</b>	
<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN</b>
<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b> ♦ BA 1. Speech Communication 2. Public Relations 3. Mass Communication a. Print Journalism b. Broadcast Journalism	Five year survey of graduates Portfolio assessment procedures The portfolio process has been fine tuned in pilot projects in Speech Communication and Advanced Advertising. Being Fall 93, completion of a portfolio will be required in at least one upper division course in each of the 4 majors. Introduction of portfolio components will be introduced earlier in the major. Recent alumni/employer surveys continue to need for stronger writing skills, thus stricter writing requirements are being implemented for the portfolio.
<b>COMPUTER SCIENCE</b> ♦ BS - 5 options 1. Artificial Intelligence 2. Computer Systems 3. Information Systems 4. Scientific Computing 5. Software Design and Applications	Major Field Achievement Test in Computer Science
<b>DOUGLAS HONORS COLLEGE</b>	Portfolio of student essays - 4 essays per quarter for 12 quarters in DHC.
<b>DRAMA</b> ♦ BA - 2 majors 1. General Major 2. Teaching Major - Secondary	Portfolio/audition materials and admission interview and end-of-program portfolio. Standardized test from National Association for Schools of Theater.
<b>ENGLISH</b> ♦ BA 1. General Major 2. Teaching Major/Secondary 3. Teaching Major 4. Bilingual/Language Arts Major: Middle School 5. Bilingual/Language Arts Major: High School 6. Language Arts Major: Elementary Emphasis 7. Language Arts Major: Middle Level Emphasis	Questionnaire for graduating seniors Portfolio - scoring rubric developed

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

<b>COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SCIENCES</b>	
<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN</b>
<b>FOREIGN LANGUAGES</b> ♦ BA - (3 majors) 1. French 2. German 3. Spanish 4. Individual Studies Major - Japanese	Portfolio-Materials from each course & interview with major and one or more professors
<b>GEOGRAPHY/LAND STUDIES</b> ♦ BA - General Major (3 tracks) 1. Geography 2. Land Studies 3. Environmental and Resource Management ♦ BA - Teaching Major	Pre-Post Assessment using material from GEOG 101 & 107
<b>GEOLOGY</b> ♦ BS - Geology ♦ BA - Geology Earth Science Major (Teaching)	Field Curriculum Project/GRE
<b>HISTORY</b> ♦ BA 1. History Major 2. Teaching Major: Elementary or Secondary 3. Teaching Major 4. Teaching Major: Broad Area	Capstone course. History 481 - Understanding History. Course will be team taught by faculty utilizing the various skills and techniques practiced in history. The emphasis will be on historical synthesis.
<b>HUMANITIES</b> No Degree Programs	Service courses - no plan required
<b>MATHEMATICS</b> ♦ BA, BS 1. BA - Mathematics 2. BS - Mathematics 3. BA - Teaching Major	Core Examination in Mathematics before end of junior year. Portfolio of programmatic projects or papers. Faculty interview with written evaluation of general mathematical abilities and for BA-Secondary Teaching, teaching abilities.
<b>MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY</b>	National Examinations



**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SCIENCES	
DEPARTMENT	END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN
<b>MUSIC</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Bachelor of Music (9 majors)               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Theory-Composition</li> <li>2. Keyboard &amp; Guitar Performance</li> <li>3. Percussion Performance</li> <li>4. String Performance</li> <li>5. Vocal Performance</li> <li>6. Wind Performance</li> <li>7. Music Education - Broad</li> <li>8. Music Education -Instrumental</li> <li>9. Music Education - Choral</li> </ol> </li> <li>◆ BA - Music Major               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Performance majors</li> <li>2. Composition majors</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>Composition Majors - Composition Requirements Performance Majors - Performance requirements</p> <p>Comparison of entry/exit performance tapes are being initiated. Entry performance measures were initiated during the Academic year 1992-993.</p>
<b>PHILOSOPHY</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ BA - (2 majors)               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Philosophy major</li> <li>2. Philosophy:Religious Studies Concentration</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>Senior Thesis (5 cr) Senior Thesis (5 cr)</p>
<b>PHYSICS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ BA - Physics</li> <li>◆ BS - (2 options)               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Physics</li> <li>2. Physics/Engineering</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>Major Field Achievement Test in Physics (Amended) Mean performance of CWU students participating in the Major Field Achievement Test in Physics Spring 1992 was at the 64th percentile on the national norms. CWU means were above the national means on the 5 Assessment Indicators. Follow-up 1 and 5 year alumni questionnaires.</p>
<b>POLITICAL SCIENCE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ BA (2 majors) Bachelor of Arts Major Teaching Major</li> </ul>	<p>Capstone Course - POSC 487 <u>Studying Politics</u></p>

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SCIENCES	
DEPARTMENT	END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN
<b>PSYCHOLOGY</b> ♦ BA - (5 majors) 1. General Psychology 2. Community Psychology 3. Personnel/Industrial/Organizational 4. Experimental Psychology 5. Developmental Psychology	<b>Major Field Test - Psychology</b> The mean performance of CWU psychology students participating in the testing program Spring 1992 was at the 89th percentile of the national norm group. The CWU group means were above national group mean on the 7 assessment indicators.
<b>SOCIOLOGY</b> ♦ BS - Sociology Major ♦ BA - Teaching Major ♦ BS - Social Services	<b>Capstone course - SOC493 Sociological Research</b> <b>Capstone course/paper - SOC465 Required Research Paper</b> <b>Field Experience and enhanced project report - SOC490 Field Experience sequenced with PSYC454 &amp; SOC310 and enhanced project report.</b>

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES	
DEPARTMENT	END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN
AEROSPACE	All students are required to maintain the standards required by the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps (AFROTC) curriculum. The procedures used result in a cumulative assessment of the student over the entire program. A pre-commissioning review of each candidate is also conducted.
<b>BUSINESS EDUCATION &amp; ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ BS - Teaching (2 majors)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Business Education</li> <li>2. Marketing Education</li> </ul> </li> <li>◆ BS - Administrative (Office) Management (4 majors)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Office Management</li> <li>2. Office Systems</li> <li>3. Administrative Assistant</li> <li>4. Retail Management</li> </ul> </li> <li>◆ BS - Fashion Merchandising</li> </ul>	Portfolio procedures have been developed for each of the BEAM majors.
<b>EDUCATION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ BA in Education               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elementary Education</li> <li>2. Early Childhood Education</li> <li>3. Special Education</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Criterion-referenced test on knowledge base               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical thinking Essay</li> <li>Evaluation of video-taped lesson</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Survey Form</li> <li>3. Portfolio               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Special Education faculty report that they have made curricular changes as a result of the portfolio and feedback from students, faculty, and educators in the K-12 system. Collaborative efforts and teaching has improved.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES	
DEPARTMENT	END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN
<b>HOME ECONOMICS, FAMILY AND CONSUMER STUDIES</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ BA - Family &amp; Consumer Studies               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Family Studies</li> <li>2. Fashion Design</li> </ul> </li> <li>◆ BS - Home Economics               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Home &amp; Family Life Education</li> </ul> </li> <li>◆ BS - Food Science and Nutrition               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nutrition &amp; Dietetics</li> <li>2. Nutrition Science</li> </ul> </li> <li>◆ BS - Fashion Merchandising</li> </ul>	<p>HOEC 490, Community Advisory Board Portfolio</p> <p>Exit Interview &amp; Portfolio, Community Advisory Board</p> <p>HOFN 440 Experimental Foods, Community Advisory Board, Annual Questionnaire of interns/internship director &amp; HOEC 490 HOFN 440 Experimental Foods, Community Advisory Board</p> <p>HOCT 485, ME 367, ME 461; Community Advisory Board, Internship evaluation, Portfolio, Biannual survey of alumni</p>
<b>HEALTH EDUCATION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ BS               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. School Health Education</li> <li>2. Community Health Education</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Senior Seminar - capstone course</p>

# CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

## END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION

SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES	
DEPARTMENT	END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN
<b>INDUSTRIAL &amp; ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ BS - Construction Mgmt</li> <li>◆ BS - Industrial Technology (5 options)               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Industrial Electronics</li> <li>2. Power Option</li> <li>3. Cast Metals Option</li> <li>4. Metal Fabrication Option</li> <li>5. Production Wood Option</li> </ol> </li> <li>◆ BS - Electronics Engineering Technology Major</li> <li>◆ BS - Manufacturing Engineering Technology Major</li> <li>◆ BS - Mechanical Engineering Technical Major</li> <li>◆ BS - Vocational-Technical Trade &amp; Industrial Major</li> <li>◆ BS - Industrial Education Major</li> <li>◆ BS - Loss Control Management</li> <li>◆ BS - Flight Technology Major (5 options)               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Flight Officer</li> <li>2. Airway Science (Systems)</li> <li>3. Airway Science (Management)</li> <li>4. Airway Science (Maintenance)</li> <li>5. Airway Science (Electronics)</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ - Comprehensive Exam &amp; Exit Interview, Follow-up Survey</li> <li>◆ - Internships and/or senior presentation</li>   <li>◆ - Senior Presentation</li> <li>◆ - Senior Project</li> <li>◆ - Senior Project or Comprehensive Design Problem</li> <li>◆ - National Boards - State Boards/Exams - NOCTI Exam</li> <li>◆ - Dr. Weiking working on National committee to develop and validate instrument</li> <li>◆ - Comprehensive Exam, Exit Interview</li>   <li>◆ - Flight Officer - FLT488, FAA written &amp; flight exams</li> <li>- AWS(Systems) - FLT 488, FAA written &amp; flight exams</li> <li>- AWS(MGT)-Contracted Field Experience with Seattle Center</li> <li>- AWS(Maintenance)- A&amp;P license and Contracted Field Experience</li> <li>- AWS(Electronics)-Comprehensive Exam &amp;/or Technical Presentation</li> </ul>
<b>LEISURE SERVICES</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ BS - Leisure Services</li> </ul>	Capstone Course - LES 420 Senior Project - primarily research applied to contemporary problems in the profession. CFE (Internship) Evaluations
<b>MILITARY SCIENCE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ BS - Military Science</li> </ul>	Leadership Assessment Process (LAP) required of all cadets

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES	
DEPARTMENT	END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN
<b>PHYSICAL EDUCATION</b> ♦ BS 1. Physical Education Major - Teaching K-12  2. Fitness & Sport Management	1. Student teaching evaluation Portfolio of selected coursework demonstrating academic ability Video of student teaching in methods courses and student teaching Professional points AAHPERD Health Related Fitness Test 2. End of Major examinations 20 professional points Written evaluations from internship supervisor Oral presentations 2.5 GPA



**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS	
DEPARTMENT	END OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN
<b>ACCOUNTING</b> ♦ BS 1. Accounting Major	Achievement Test in Accounting (Psychological Corporation)
<b>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</b> ♦ BS - 5 Majors 1. Business Administration 2. Finance 3. General Business 4. Management & Organization 5. Marketing Management	No plans submitted
<b>ECONOMICS</b> ♦ BS - (3 majors) 1. Applied Economics 2. General Economics 3. Operations Analysis	Revised Test of Understanding in College Economics - Macro and Micro Forms

**AREA:**     Program Review and Evaluation

**ACTIVITIES COMPLETED:** Given that the entire university has been involved in a strategic planning process this year which has implications for the program review process, the Program Review and Assessment Committee felt that the Program Review process should be held in abeyance. Proposed reorganization in the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences will also have impact on the Program Review process. A new schedule for Program Review will be developed to accommodate the 5-year cycle and any changes from reorganization.

Central Washington University supports the program review concepts and guidelines outlined in Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major (AAC 1992) as proposed by the Higher Education Coordinating Board.

**Results:**

**WORKS IN PROGRESS:** Reviews of the Political Science, Law and Justice and Loss Control Management programs are being completed.

**Status Report:**

**INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES:** The University Assessment Committee reviews the completed packet (departmental self-study, survey of alumni and external review documents and makes recommendations when the package is forwarded to the Provost.

**Recommendations and Decisions:** Recommendations are pending to allow for either University or School/College sharing of the process, findings, and plan of action to accommodate recommendations.

**CHANGES TO ASSESSMENT PLAN:** A new Program Review cycle will be established incorporating changes from strategic planning and reorganization.

**EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATED ASSESSMENT FUNDS TO DATE:**

As of April 27, 1993, \$26,075.67 of the biennial assessment funds have been expended.

**AREA:**     Alumni Satisfaction

**ACTIVITIES COMPLETED:**

**Results:**    Alumni surveys are an integral part of the program review and evaluation process. Graduates of programs for the previous 5 years are surveyed as to the usefulness of the course and programmatic offerings of their degree programs. Information is used by the departments for recommendations for program improvements.

Graduating students are surveyed regarding their satisfaction with the University's contribution to their academic and personal growth. Results are used to identify areas of strength and weakness and improve offerings.

The one-year follow-up of the 1990-1991 graduates was conducted during the Summer of 1992. Results on the statewide common items indicated the alumni were quite positive about Central Washington University's contribution to their academic and/or personal growth. Respondents were most satisfied with quality of instruction in their major and least satisfied with academic advising. Alumni indicated that the General Education Basic components writing and reasoning were supportive of their major. They also indicated that the Breadth requirements in the Social Sciences were more supportive than Breadth requirements in Arts and Humanities or Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

**WORKS IN PROGRESS:**

**Status Report:**

**INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES:** Alumni survey results initiated by program review are reviewed by the University Assessment Committee, the department, and the Provost.

Results of graduating student surveys are forwarded to the Provost for review by Academic Affairs.

**Recommendations and Decisions:**    Pending

**CHANGES TO ASSESSMENT PLAN:**            None

**EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATED ASSESSMENT FUNDS TO DATE:**

**As of April 27, 1993, \$27,100.30 from the biennial assessment allocation has been expended on alumni surveys.**

**AREA:**     Employer Perceptions

**ACTIVITIES COMPLETED:**

**Results:** Employer perception surveys have been included in the Program Review and/or accreditation studies for programs where employers of program graduates were a readily identifiable cohort.

**WORKS IN PROGRESS:**

**Status Report:** Several programs have Advisory Groups consisting of employers and community leaders to provide information about community, state and employer needs from the specific programs. (Education, Industrial & Engineering Technology, and others.)

**INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES:** Results of such employer surveys and Advisory Group recommendations are used for curricular and program changes.

**Recommendations and Decisions:**

**CHANGES TO ASSESSMENT PLAN:**     None

**EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATED ASSESSMENT FUNDS TO DATE:**

As of April 27, 1993, \$25,307.48 of the biennial assessment allocation has been expended in these efforts.



**AREA:** Collaborative Assessment Efforts

**ACTIVITIES COMPLETED:**

**Results:** The Assessment Office sponsored a workshop on holistic scoring of writing in December which was opened to all interested faculty at Central and nearby community colleges. It was well attended by faculty from CWU, Big Bend and Columbia Basin Community Colleges. Information was also provided for holistic scoring of writing in the major. The workshop was video taped. The video and workshop materials are available for departments to use.

**WORKS IN PROGRESS:** A workshop will be held May 21-22, 1993, for faculty orientation to the Perry Scheme of Intellectual Development and the Measure of Intellectual Development (MID). Faculty involved in the interdisciplinary learning communities and other interested faculty are being invited to participate. A longitudinal assessment project to measure the impact of interdisciplinary learning communities on students' intellectual development is being initiated.

**Status Report:**

**INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES:** Faculty teams will be attending the statewide assessment conference in Olympia in May and the AAHE Assessment Forum in Chicago in June.

**Recommendations and Decisions:** Pending.

**CHANGES TO ASSESSMENT PLAN:** None

**EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATED ASSESSMENT FUNDS TO DATE:**

As of April 27, 1993, \$29,046.00 of the biennial assessment allocation had been expended on this effort.