

12-5-2001

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 12/05/2001

Nancy Bradshaw

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Bradshaw, Nancy, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 12/05/2001" (2001). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 491.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/491>

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).

## MINUTES

### CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

#### FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: December 5, 2001

<http://www.cwu.edu/~fsenate>

**Presiding Officer:** Lad Holden  
**Recording Secretary:** Nancy Bradshaw

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

#### ROLL CALL:

**Senators:** All Senators or their Alternates were present except Bryan, Coleman, Eubanks, Richmond, Singh  
**Visitors:** Jan Bowers, Amber Eagar, Jim Pappas, Tracy Schwindt, David Soltz, Carolyn Wells

**CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA: MOTION NO.01-56 (Passed):** The agenda was approved as amended: "Move VI. 3. President's Report after IV. Communications."

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes of the November 7, 2001, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as presented.

#### COMMUNICATIONS: (Available for viewing in the Senate Office or distribution on request)

No communications.

**PRESIDENT:** 1. President McIntyre presented an update on the state's current budget process. The governor's budget scenario will be the first released and should be out in the next few days. The legislature will then work towards a response to the governor's budget. Central will work through its legislative representatives in order to have some impact in shaping the budget. Information from the legislature regarding institutional level budget cuts and possible tuition increases should soon be determined. 2. President McIntyre presented a brief report regarding a P-16 proposal. The P-16 proposal is meant to make the transition from high schools to college as "seamless" as possible. There was much discussion between conference attendees and the governor resulting in no resolution to the matter. 3. The Higher Education Coordinating Board's (HECB) next meeting is December 13, 2001 in Spokane. The board has invited presidents from the six public institutions to attend and discuss implications budget decisions may have to their institutions. President McIntyre expressed a concern that since the governor's budget is still unknown it is difficult to determine what impacts may occur as a result of any decisions made in terms of the budget. The HECB will also be setting their agenda for the upcoming legislative session. 4. The president informed senators that the Board of Trustees would meet tomorrow, Thursday, December 6, 2001. She indicated that among other things, the board plans to authorize issuing bonds for the renovation of Kamola Hall. 5. President McIntyre reminded senators of the Christmas holiday party scheduled for tomorrow, Thursday, December 6 in Barge Hall.

#### REPORTS:

##### A. ACTION ITEMS:

###### Chair:

**Motion No. 01-57 (Passed):** Chair Holden presented a motion that was approved: "That grades 31, 32, 33 and their associated steps (3% per grade and 1% per step) be added to the faculty salary scale."

**Rationale:** The addition of these three grades and associated steps are needed in order to make the transition from the current faculty salary scale to the CUPA salary scale. Also, last year there were faculty who were unable to receive merit because they were at the top of the current salary scale. This motion addresses issues in a grievance those faculty members filed.

**Discussion:** Robert Carbaugh and Don Cocheba spoke in favor of the motion. They explained that they were approved for merit level I and II, but were unable to receive the merit award because they were at the top of the salary scale and could not go beyond the cap. They then went through the grievance process where ultimately President McIntyre requested that the salary scale be extended to accommodate their merit increases. They further pointed out that in looking at the faculty versus administrators there is a differential in terms of the salary structure. The Faculty Senate recommended creating a salary cap on the faculty salary scale. The administration does not have the same constraint. The result is a perverse incentive system that faculty have imposed on themselves. Carbaugh and Cocheba felt very strongly that this is a discriminatory salary policy to have for the university at large. They also stressed the fact that the process recommended in the motion is only an interim step. It will allow faculty to receive merit for the next two or three years, and then the same situation will occur. Therefore, they requested that the senate remove the statement in the code that refers to the salary cap.

**Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee**

**Motion No. 01-58 (Passed):** Senator Čuljak, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, made a motion that was approved: "Addition of a physical education, health education and leisure services program: minor in exercise science attached as Exhibit A."

**Faculty Senate Academic Affairs' Committee**

**Motion No. 01-55 (Tabled):** Senator Donahoe, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs' Committee, made a motion that was tabled: "Revisions to section 5-9.23 of the *Central Washington University Policies Manual* attached as Exhibit B."

Senators still had concerns regarding the clarity of the motion.

**Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee**

**Motion No. 01-59 (Tabled):** Senator Charles Li, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee, proposed a motion that was tabled: "Recommendation to distribute the \$100,000 faculty development funds attached as Exhibit C."

Concerns were expressed that the distribution of these funds are to only academic departments and, in some cases, faculty have half-time appointments in areas that are not defined as an academic department. Therefore, they are not receiving their full FTEF in the current distribution calculation.

**Motion No. 01-60 (Passed):** Senator Charles Li, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee, proposed a motion that was approved: "Change the name of the Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee to Faculty Senate Development and Appropriations Committee."

**B. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

1. **CHAIR:** 1. Chair Holden informed senators that the executive committee is recommending changes to several standing committee assignments. The committee proposed having the development and appropriation's committee oversee the faculty development days, the budget committee conduct the faculty salary equity study, and the personnel committee conduct the evaluation of administrators. Holden asked senators to be thinking about this proposal and be ready to act on it in its entirety at a future senate meeting. 2. Chair Holden explained that since there is a sense that the code has some serious deficiencies, he is asking the code committee to create a process to evaluate the code. He made it clear that the code committee will not actually do the evaluating, but create a process to evaluate the entire code. Holden asked senators to contact the executive committee with any recommendations regarding the development of this process. 3. The senate concerns section of the senate agenda will be changed to answers to senate concerns. The present way that senate concerns are handled has resulted in receiving incomplete or no answers to concerns expressed at meetings. Senators were asked to E-mail their concerns to the senate 10 days prior to a senate meeting so that the appropriate person at the next meeting may address them. Senators were also asked to inform faculty in their department of this change. 4. Chair Holden referred to the current SEOI system and stated that he feels there needs to be a more comprehensive system of evaluation of instruction then just the student evaluation of instruction. An ad hoc committee will be formed to review the entire process; peer, self and student, faculty evaluation of instruction. A recommendation was made to include a student on the ad hoc committee.
2. **CHAIR ELECT:** 1. Chair Elect Braunstein asked the provost if he could present a report at the next meeting to discuss the issues raised at the last three university-wide faculty development meetings with respect to scholarship and the progress that has been made in addressing those issues as a data point for the development and appropriation's committee in considering how effectively that time could be used. The provost is working on that report and will present it at a future senate meeting. 2. Chair Elect Braunstein informed senators that he attended the November Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) meeting. He explained that the CFR is a group of representatives from the Washington state four-year institutions and is supported by the Council of Presidents. The council meets to address particular legislative issues that are of specific concern to faculty at all the four-year institutions. The issues discussed at the November meeting were the Washington state budget and what higher education's response is going to be with respect to the budget shortfall this year. Another issue that was discussed was institutions' faculty salary base. Increases to the faculty salary base at the four-year regional institutions were as follows: Central Washington University .4 percent, Eastern Washington University 3.6 percent and Western Washington University 4.5 percent. He stated that although there were severe budget problems at Central last year, the information is something to consider. A significant amount of discussion was centered on how each institution might approach the tuition

issue, specifically whether the four-year institutions should push for more latitude on the part of the schools in setting their own tuition. There seems to be a division among the schools particularly highlighted by the University of Washington who would like an almost "private" model so that they can have as much latitude in setting tuition as possible. Another issue discussed was the current enabling legislation. He explained that at this point there are two enabling legislation bills that will be examined by the legislature. These bills are legislation that would allow the four-year institution's faculty to form unions that would be recognized as bargaining units. One version of the enabling legislation has been developed by the Washington Education Association (WEA), and at some level is being presented as the CWU bill. The University of Washington is preparing the other version of the enabling legislation bill. The CFR strongly encouraged the two groups with competing legislation to come to an agreement and present only one bill to the legislature. It is unlikely that the legislation will be passed if there are two bills. The CFR will work towards that end before the legislature is in session. Senators questioned the authority the WEA has in presenting this bill as the CWU bill since it does not represent the university faculty as a whole. The WEA states that they realize they are representing only the union members at Central and not the faculty as a whole, but until they are pressured, will not present that fact. Senator Donahoe further explained that the union has two affiliates, WEA and the WFT, that are incorporating part-time issues into their bill. The bill the University of Washington put forward does not include part-time faculty issues. A representative from the WFT is working with the University of Washington to include a section covering part-time faculty as part of their legislation. Donahoe informed senators that she would share any information she has with interested faculty.

3. **FACULTY SALARY BASE REPORT:** Provost Soltz presented the 2000-01 Faculty Salary Base Report attached as Exhibit D. The provost explained that, as mentioned before, there was a very slight increase to the faculty salary base that in dollars amounted to \$88,783. The reason for the small increase was a result of the significant funding cut to Central last year. The faculty pool is 68.62% of the total academic affairs budget, so there was some protection of the faculty salaries in the reduction scenario. Given the magnitude of the reduction and the fact that most of the money in academic affairs is in faculty salaries, a very large portion of the budget reduction came out of faculty salaries. The provost further explained that he was not involved in making these decisions, but the sources in the report show that the salary savings came from 12 vacant tenure-track positions, eight phased retirement positions that were converted to full retirement and 14 faculty lines reduced due to hiring of new faculty at salaries lower than the retirees.

**Discussion:** Senator Culjak asked what percentage of the budget reductions were taken out the administrative salary base? The provost was not sure but would find out and report back to the senate. Chair Holden asked what the total percentage that academic affairs took in the budget cut last year? The provost was unsure of the percentage but had dollar amounts. Chair Holden also stated that a certain percent was lost because of the enrollment shortfall, but there was also a 2% budget reduction from the legislature last year that was allocated from nonacademic units. The belief is that academic affairs did take a share of that cut. The provost answered by stating that was true but he did not know the magnitude of the impact to academic affairs. Within academic affairs there was less of a cut to the faculty salary base than to the other budgets. Chair Holden stated that he felt that the vice president for business affairs had too much influence and now that there are changes in personnel occurring he asked the provost if he would argue for less cuts to the academic budget? The provost stated that he has not yet had the opportunity to present any arguments and that he would not be doing his job if he did not do so. Senator Nethery expressed a desire to have the provost provide the senate with some other general central tendency measures other than the average because if the median income of faculty across the campus has increased to the same extent, that would represent some maintenance of the normal distribution as opposed to loading on one end of the distribution which would skew the mean in a certain direction without necessarily changing a lot of the faculty salaries. He asked the provost for some other measure of the distribution of salary beyond simply the average. It may clarify the question of what it is to be a constant significant increase and how it may have been distributed. The provost agreed and stated that he used the same format that the senate was used to seeing and that it makes sense to look at other measures. Senator Alsoszatai-Petheo stated that when these cuts to the base were being contemplated last year, he brought the issue to the attention of the senate chair and informed the chair that the code did not permit cuts to the faculty salary base. (Section 8.30 of the faculty code, "All funds authorized and appropriated by legislative action for faculty salaries (ledger one funds, including tuition monies) shall be used primarily for the award of merit and across the board increases for faculty. Salary savings from full time tenure-track positions not filled permanently or replaced at a lower salary shall remain in the faculty salary base . . . Adjustments to the faculty salary base shall occur as a result of collaboration between the provost/senior vice president for academic affairs and the faculty senate budget committee.") Questions were raised as to whether or not funds were taken from the salary base from legislatively appropriated funds last year and if so, it is a *de facto* violation of the code. Chair Holden stated that the budgetary benchmark report would answer a lot of questions and show how much the salary base has been eroded. The base should have gone up from last year at least 2.9% plus promotions and it did not,

so there is no question that the base has eroded. However, the senate has been unable to get the data needed to run the benchmark report that includes the current CUPA data and a list of the exempt salaries. Senator Alsoszatai-Petheo expressed concerns as to why it is taking so long to collect the data and asked that the issue not be dropped. Chair Holden reassured him by stating that his concerns are noted and that they are concerns we all have. Provost Soltz stated that when an institution suffers the kind of budget reductions Central has suffered it is very difficult to take it out of non-salary lines. Senator Čuljak said that the erosion of the salary base is a long-standing problem and that the reality of last year's budget situation wasn't the origin of this problem, it was simply an additional "hit" on the salary base coupled with those that have occurred over the past 10-years. Senator Alsoszatai-Petheo again expressed his concern regarding the violation of the faculty code, urged that the pertinent facts be collected, and then proposed the following motion:

**Motion 01-61 (Passed):** Senator Alsoszatai-Petheo proposed a motion that was approved: "The executive committee of the senate investigate whether or not we have any recourse and if so what recourse to address this violation of the faculty code represented by the erosion of the salary base and that the committee report back at the next senate meeting their findings."

4. **ACADEMIC SERVICE LEARNING:** Jim Pappas, Professor, Teacher Education and Jan Bowers Chair, Family and Consumer Sciences, presented a report on the academic service learning program. Academic service learning is a course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of the course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility. Various state and federal grants are used to facilitate the program. There will be a workshop at the December 7 faculty development day to explain, in more detail, the academic service learning program. Senators were given a draft copy of the definition of service learning and were asked to send comments to either Pappas or Bowers. Senators were also asked to send them questions or comments concerning the program.
5. **STUDENT REPORT:** Senator Scarth presented an update on the new student course evaluations. She informed senators that the evaluations had been distributed to faculty for fall quarter and apologized to faculty who received them to late for their final class. There were several issues that caused this, but they have been resolved for winter quarter evaluations. Senator Scarth also thanked the faculty who have chosen to participate in this process. Senators expressed concerns that last year the senate reviewed the evaluation forms and made comments as to some of the problems with the questions. The senate at that time was reassured that some of those problems would be looked at. However, in looking at the final forms, none of the things that were mentioned in the senate were recognized. Consequently, because of the ambiguity and the poor quality of the questions, it was the decision of some faculty members not to have their students evaluate their courses based on the forms. Senator Sutton replied to the concerns by stating that the evaluation committee discussed the contents of the forms with many other universities across the country and felt that they were quality questions in their present form.
6. **SENATE CONCERNS:** Senator Chenyang Li stated that one issue discussed at the fall faculty conference was the possibility of moving to a more flexible class scheduling model and that the provost was going to look into this issue. He asked if there was any development on this proposal. The provost answered by stating that the proposal was one of many issues mentioned at the conference and has not yet been discussed.

Senator Donahoe, speaking on behalf of the academic affairs' committee, expressed concerns regarding the lag time between senate recommendations and actual changes getting into university policy. She referred to last year's recommendation from the senate to date all revisions in the CWU policies manual and stated that it still does not appear that the recommendation has been placed into policy. She asked how recommendations are tracked once they leave the senate. Donahoe stressed the importance of receiving feedback to their recommendations and see their final form. The provost will look into this matter.

Senator Sutton asked the senate if the SEOI forms are mandatory for students to complete. The answer was no. She informed senators that students are concerned with the confidentiality of completing the written comments section of the evaluation. Students are under the impression that these comments are transcribed before they are given to faculty so that they cannot be identified. Consensus was that departments do not have the support needed to transcribe written comments on the evaluations and that it is not a concern that the senate can address.

7. **FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS' COMMITTEE:** Senator Donahoe, chair, reported that the committee is currently working on the issue of "double dipping." Double dipping occurs when academic programs allow students to obtain an additional minor without completing additional courses work.

**BUDGET COMMITTEE:** No report.

**CODE COMMITTEE:** No report.

**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:** No report.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE:** Senator Gazis, chair, reported that the general education surveys are being processed and the committee is hoping to be able to use them as a starting point to revise the outcomes and better define the goals of the general education program. The committee is also creating guidelines and criteria for adding a course to the general education program.

**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE:** No report.

**PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE/CFR:** No report.

**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:** Senator Charles Li, chair, reported that the committee's next meeting will be January 16, 2002. The agenda for that meeting will be to discuss specific criteria and application for distributing the university-wide faculty development funds. He informed senators that anyone who has inquired about the distribution of these funds would not be answered until after the committee has met in January. Senator Li also informed senators that there has been a question regarding the use of \$15,000 for university-wide faculty development projects. He explained that the \$15,000 has historically been used exclusively for university-wide faculty development projects. After discussion it was the consensus of the senate to keep the \$15,000 for university-wide faculty development projects.

**OLD BUSINESS:** No old business.

**NEW BUSINESS:** Discussion continued regarding the administering of the SEIOs. Student senators explained that the concern students have is that some instructors tell them that the SEOs are transcribed, taking from the student the right to decline to complete the evaluation out of fear of being identified. If there is no support to transcribe written comments, then students should at least be informed of this before completing the evaluation. Faculty senators explained to student senators that all instructors have the responsibility to administer their SEOs in as honorable a fashion as possible.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

**\*\*\*NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: January 9, 2001\*\*\*  
BARGE 412**

**Exhibit A**

New Program: PEHLS – Minor in Exercise Science

**Physical Education, Health Education and Leisure Services minor in Exercise Science**

**Rationale:** Inquiries are regularly received from students majoring in other disciplines including nutrition, community health, and biology about a minor in Exercise Science. The response to date has been to provide a number of classes from the current Exercise Science major that would be useful for them to take as general electives. This proposal requests the formalizing of a listing of classes appropriate for a minor to meet the desire of students interested in Exercise Science as a secondary area.

There are no new courses being added for this minor.

There is no impact on departmental load as students will be absorbed into the current offerings of the listed classes. There will be no additional costs.

A total of 20-25 students are estimated to be involved in this minor program at any one time and they will assimilate into the classes as they are offered to the Exercise Science majors. Several classes already have additional lab fees associated with them. No additional course fees beyond those currently in place will be imposed.

Program as it is proposed to be offered:

Required Courses:

PE 250	Anatomical Kinesiology	5 Credits
PE 254	Foundations of Fitness	3 Credits
PE 351	Scientific Foundations of Health & Fitness	5 Credits
PE 450	Physiology of Exercise	5 Credits
PE 455	Fitness Assessment & Exercise Prescription	5 Credits

**Select from one of the following:**

- PE 360 Scientific Principles of Strength Training (4)
- PE 456 Exercise Programming for Special Populations (4)
- PE 457 Exercise Adherence Strategies (3)

**Total Credits Required 26-27 Credits**

**Exhibit B**

Proposed change:

- 5-9.4.23.2 To earn a grade, work of for the course must be completed as prescribed by the instructor by the indicated date on Report of Incomplete form on forms filed in the appropriate department office. After the date indicated on the form, up to a year, the instructor may file a Change of Grade form with the Registrar.
- 5-9.4.23.3 As report of Incomplete forms are filled out by the instructor, copies of the report are placed on file with the department, with the registrar, and sent to the student.
- 5-9.4.23.3.4 If a date is not indicated on the Report of Incomplete, and the work it is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will automatically convert to an "F."
- 5-9.4.23.4.5 Students may not re-register for a course in which they receive a grade of incomplete.
- 5-9.4.23.6 It is the student's responsibility to contact the professor and make arrangements as to how to change the grade of Incomplete.

**Rationale:**

The charge to the Academic Affairs Committee was to clarify the following:

- 5-9.4.23.2 To earn a grade, work of the course must be completed as prescribed by the instructor on forms filed in the appropriate department office.
- 5-9.4.23.3 If it is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will convert to an "F."

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate respectfully reports on the proposed changes to assigning an Incomplete. Tracy Schwindt visited the committee and discussed due dates for incompletes and conversion to an "F." There is confusion on dates set by faculty and dates in the catalog that give the student the end of one calendar year for conversion to an "F" if work is not completed.

The committee felt that often a date is given for a particular reason by the instructor, but the policy provides for a year as it is now stated. To clarify and to inform the student of university expectations and to allow the faculty to make the decision on date, the Incomplete Form must have more meaning. We discovered the registrar cannot monitor dates except by quarter which can automatically turn "I" to "F" at one year unless a Grade Change form is used. Therefore, we suggest the following additions to the policy clarifying what will happen and allowing the instructor to change the grade by the indicated date on the Incomplete Form.



**Exhibit C**

The Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee met two times in the fall quarter and, at its November 14, 2001 meeting, passed the following recommendation to distribute the \$100,000 faculty development funds as follows:

1. \$24,000 distributed evenly to academic departments (excluding Military Science/ROTC and Aerospace Studies/AFROTC).
2. \$60,000 distributed to academic departments (excluding Military Science/ROTC and Aerospace Studies/AFROTC), with each department receiving an amount proportional to its annual teaching FTE, using the most recent staffing data.
3. \$500 to Military Science/ROTC.
4. \$500 to Aerospace Studies /AFROTC.
5. The above funds are to be used exclusively for individual faculty development. In order to receive these monies, each department must provide a rationale and explanation for the use of these funds.
6. \$15,000 for projects intended to serve the faculty development needs of the university as a whole (rather than the needs of individual faculty members or departments). Specific criteria and application for using this fund are to be discussed at the Committee's January 12, 2001 meeting.

The \$100,000 faculty professional development funds for this year have been transferred into the Faculty Senate account. It is ready to be distributed as soon as a formula has been approved by the Faculty Senate.



# CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

ELLENSBURG • LYNNWOOD • MOSES LAKE • SEATAC • STEILACOOM • WENATCHEE • YAKIMA

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST / VICE PRESIDENT  
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Date: November 1, 2001

RECEIVED  
NOV 1 2001  
CWU FACULTY SENATE

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Faculty Senate

**FROM:** David Soltz, Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

**COPIES:** J. McIntyre, President's Cabinet, Academic Affairs Council,  
Academic Department Chairs Organization, Budget Office

**SUBJECT:** Faculty Salary Base

Section 8.30 of the Faculty Code calls for a yearly report to the Faculty Senate conveying information related to faculty salaries. This report conveys information related to the faculty salary base, the average salary of the university's tenured and tenure-track faculty, the disposition of all funds authorized and appropriated for faculty salaries, and funds paid to faculty from all sources. I have chosen to use the format of the reports for the previous three years for ease of comparison. I intend to change the format in the future to provide more, and hopefully more useful, information.

**Faculty Salary Base**

The 2001-2002 faculty salary base at Central Washington University equals \$21,477,459. This reflects an *increase* of \$88,783 over the faculty salary base of 2000-2001, which totaled \$21,388,676.

The faculty salary base is the sum of the budget lines of tenured, tenure-track, and full-time-non-tenure-track faculty plus adjunct lines and phased retirees in the 2001-2002 baseline budget.

**Average Salary of the University's  
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty**

The average faculty salary of the university's tenured and tenure-track faculty can be computed two ways. One approach includes only tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty but not phased retirees. The second approach includes tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and phased retirees. Both figures are reported below.

- ◆ The average salary in Fall 2001 of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, excluding phased retirees is \$52,820.19.

- ◆ The average salary in Fall 2000 of the tenured and tenure-track faculty including phased retirees is \$52,690.26.

The HECB uses a third method of computing the average faculty salary for its yearly report to the legislature. That report also identifies a national percentile ranking for Washington's universities and The Evergreen State College. The HECB has used data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) reports. This data measures a different set of faculty from those used to compute the average salaries reported above.

The annual salary survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education collects data regarding full-time instructional faculty. That set includes full-time tenured and non-tenured faculty, including lecturers. Faculty not included in the IPEDS data are (a) tenured and non-tenured faculty in positions less than full time, (b) librarians holding faculty rank, (c) coaches, and (d) exempt administrators with tenure. The table below reports the average faculty salary for the comparable set of faculty reported to IPEDS for Fall 1997, 1998, and 1999.

Fall 1997	\$43,619
Fall 1998	\$44,666
Fall 1999	\$49,268 (48,939)*

\*Beginning with Fall 1999, faculty in International Studies and Programs were added to the list of faculty reported to IPEDS. Adding the International Studies and Programs full-time faculty creates an average faculty salary of \$48,939.

However, the IPEDS faculty survey was cancelled for Fall 2000. The reporting method used for Fall 2000 was the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) faculty compensation survey. This survey reported an average salary for Fall 2000 of \$50,978. The AAUP collected faculty salary data in the same format as the previous IPEDS data.

### Disposition of All funds Authorized and Appropriated for Faculty Salaries

Table 1 reports the adjustments to the faculty salary base from the 2000-2001 faculty salary base. The Budget Office currently estimates benefits for new full-time faculty positions at 26 percent and benefits for new part-time faculty positions at 10 percent. When additional funds are allocated to existing positions, the Budget Office estimates the need for an accompanying increase to the benefits pool of 16 percent. In Table 1, the figures reported as "adjustments to salaries" (column 2) represent funding added or deleted from the existing salary lines in the baseline budget. Therefore, the benefits column (column 3) in Table 1 reports 16 percent of the amount showing on each line in column 2.

During 2000-2001, some of the funds generated from salary savings on faculty lines were distributed back to college adjunct accounts to supplement funds available for adjunct salaries. Because of the enrollment shortfall experienced in 2000-01 and the resultant significant budget reduction all such funds were not available for distribution back to colleges. Position changes totaling \$854,628, as reflected in line f of Table 1, were "contributed" to the budget reductions in 2000-01 and the rebasing of the budget for

2001-02. The contribution of faculty salary saving to the budget reduction represents 55.34% of the total Academic Affairs reduction of \$1,544,187. The faculty salary pool represents 68.62% of the total budget of Academic Affairs. The salary savings contributed to the budget reduction were generated by: (a) 12 vacant tenure track positions, (b) eight phased retirement positions which converted to full retirement, and (c) 14 faculty lines reduced due to hiring of new faculty at salaries lower than individuals who retired or resigned.

**Table 1**  
**Faculty Salary Base Report (2001-2002)**  
**Central Washington University**  
**November 1, 2001**

	Salaries <i>(Excluding Benefits)</i>	Adjustments to Salaries <i>(Excluding Benefits)</i>	Estimated Benefits <i>(Additions to Benefits Pool - - Equals 16 Percent of Adjustment to Salaries)</i>	Total <i>(Salary Plus Estimated Benefits)</i>
a 2000-2001 Faculty Salary Base	\$21,388,676			
b 1.9% Across the Board Increase		\$406,333	\$65,013	\$471,346
c Promotions		164,110	26,258	190,368
d Merit		311,622	49,860	361,482
e Grievance		12,910	2,066	14,976
f Position Changes		(854,628)	(136,740)	(991,368)
g Retention Funding		46,581	7,453	54,034
h Administrative Stipends		1,855	297	2,152
i Sum of Changes		88,783	14,205	102,988
j Adjustments to Salaries	88,783			
k Faculty Salary Base	<u>\$21,477,459</u>			

- a) This figure is the beginning faculty salary base for 2000-2001.
- b) This figure represents a 1.9-percent across the board increase to faculty salary lines in the 2000-2001 base allocations. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column three.
- c) The figure in column 2 represents the without-benefits portion of the faculty promotions. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3. The Board of Trustees approved up to \$250,000 for promotions. Promotions equaled \$164,110 plus a 16-percent estimated benefits amount of \$26,258 for a total of \$190,368. The balance of the funds approved for promotions, \$59,632, was allocated to replenish the faculty salary adjustment pool used for retention and grievance allocations.
- d) The figure in column 2 represents the without-benefits portion of the faculty merit. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3.
- e) This line reflects the additions to faculty lines for the grievance adjustments awarded during 2000-01. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3.
- f) This line reflects the additions and deletions from faculty lines for adjustments to vacant positions, addition of new positions, new and completed phased positions, and budget reductions. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3.
- g) This line reflects the additions to faculty lines in accordance with university retention policy (2-2.48 Faculty and Exempt Staff Retention Policy). The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3.
- h) This line represents increases in administrative stipends in the 2001-2002 baseline budget for department-chair and/or program director stipends. Please note that the university system used for posting and tracking positions within the baseline budget administrative stipends are reported on salary lines and cannot be entered on separate lines.
- i) This line reports the sum of each column 2, 3 and 4.
- j) The line reflects the sum of changes to the faculty lines (items b through h).
- k) The 2001-2002 faculty salary base.

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING  
Wednesday, December 5, 2001, 3:10 p.m.  
BARGE 412  
AGENDA

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. MOTION NO. 01-56: CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS  
*President's Report moved to here.*
- V. REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS (30 Minutes)

Chair

Motion No. 01-57: "That grades 31, 32, 33 and their associated steps (3% per grade and 1% per step) be added to the faculty salary scale." *passed*

Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee

Motion No. 01-58: "Addition of a physical education, health education, and leisure services program: minor in exercise science attached as Exhibit A." *passed*

Faculty Senate Academic Affairs' Committee

Delayed Motion No. 01-55: "Revisions to section 5-9.23 of the *Central Washington University Policies Manual* attached as Exhibit B." *Tabled*

Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee

Motion No. 01-59: "Recommendation to distribute the \$100,000 faculty development funds attached as Exhibit C." *Table*

Motion No. 01-60: "Change the name of the Faculty Senate Research and Development committee to Faculty Senate Development and Appropriations committee." Rationale attached as Exhibit D.

VI. REPORTS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. CHAIR (10 Minutes)
2. CHAIR ELECT (10 Minutes)
3. PRESIDENT (10 Minutes)
4. FACULTY SALARY BASE REPORT: Provost David Soltz, (15 minutes)
5. ACADEMIC SERVICE LEARNING: Jim Pappas, Professor, Teacher Education Programs (5 minutes)
6. STUDENT REPORT (5 Minutes)
7. SENATE CONCERNS (5 Minutes)
8. SENATE COMMITTEES (10 Minutes)
  - Academic Affairs Committee: Susan Donahoe
  - Budget Committee: Thomas Yeh
  - Code Committee: David Dauwalder
  - Curriculum Committee: Toni Čuljak
  - General Education: Carey Gazis
  - Personnel Committee: Rob Perkins
  - Public Affairs Committee/Council of Faculty Representatives: Michael Braunstein
  - Research and Development: Charles Li

- VII. OLD BUSINESS
- VIII. NEW BUSINESS
- IX. ADJOURNMENT

\*\*\*NEXT REGULAR SENATE MEETING: January 9, 2002\*\*\*  
BARGE 412

## Exhibit A

New Program: PEHLS – Minor in Exercise Science

### Physical Education, Health Education and Leisure Services minor in Exercise Science

**Rationale:** Inquiries are regularly received from students majoring in other disciplines including nutrition, community health, and biology about a minor in Exercise Science. The response to date has been to provide a number of classes from the current Exercise Science major that would be useful for them to take as general electives. This proposal requests the formalizing of a listing of classes appropriate for a minor to meet the desire of students interested in Exercise Science as a secondary area.

There are no new courses being added for this minor.

There is no impact on departmental load as students will be absorbed into the current offerings of the listed classes. There will be no additional costs.

A total of 20-25 students are estimated to be involved in this minor program at any one time and they will assimilate into the classes as they are offered to the Exercise Science majors. Several classes already have additional lab fees associated with them. No additional course fees beyond those currently in place will be imposed.

#### Program as it is proposed to be offered:

##### Required Courses:

PE 250	Anatomical Kinesiology	5 Credits
PE 254	Foundations of Fitness	3 Credits
PE 351	Scientific Foundations of Health & Fitness	5 Credits
PE 450	Physiology of Exercise	5 Credits
PE 455	Fitness Assessment & Exercise Prescription	5 Credits

##### Select from one of the following:

PE 360	Scientific Principles of Strength Training (4)
PE 456	Exercise Programming for Special Populations (4)
PE 457	Exercise Adherence Strategies (3)

Total Credits Required 26-27 Credits

## Exhibit B

### Proposed change:

#### 5-9.4.23 Incompletes

5-9.4.23.1 An "I" means the student was not able to complete the course by the end of the term, but has satisfactorily completed a sufficient portion of it and can be expected to finish without having to re-enroll in it.

5-9.4.23.2 To earn a grade, work of for the course must be completed as prescribed by the instructor by the indicated date on Report of Incomplete form ~~on forms~~ filed in the appropriate department office. After the ~~date~~ <sup>completion</sup> indicated on the form, up to a year, the instructor may file a Change of Grade form with the Registrar.

5-9.4.23.3 As report of Incomplete forms are filled out by the instructor, copies of the report are placed on file with the department, with the registrar, and sent to the student. *- who responsible for sending the copy to*

5-9.4.23.3.4 If a date is not indicated on the Report of Incomplete, and the work <sup>the student,</sup> it is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will automatically convert to an "F."

5-9.4.23.4.5 Students may not re-register for a course in which they receive a grade of incomplete.

5-9.4.23.6 It is the student's responsibility to contact the professor and make arrangements as to how to change the grade of Incomplete.

### Rationale:

The charge to the Academic Affairs Committee was to clarify the following:

5-9.4.23.2 To earn a grade, work of the course must be completed as prescribed by the instructor on forms filed in the appropriate department office.

5-9.4.23.3 If it is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will convert to an "F."

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate respectfully reports on the proposed changes to assigning an Incomplete. Tracy Schwindt visited the committee and discussed due dates for incompletes and conversion to an "F." There is confusion on dates set by faculty and dates in the catalog that give the student the end of one calendar year for conversion to an "F" if work is not completed.

The committee felt that often a date is given for a particular reason by the instructor, but the policy provides for a year as it is now stated. To clarify and to inform the student of university expectations and to allow the faculty to make the decision on date, the Incomplete Form must have more meaning. We discovered the registrar cannot monitor dates except by quarter which can automatically turn "I" to "F" at one year unless a Grade Change form is used. Therefore, we suggest the following additions to the policy clarifying what will happen and allowing the instructor to change the grade by the indicated date on the Incomplete Form.



### Exhibit C

The Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee met two times in the fall quarter and, at its November 14, 2001 meeting, passed the following recommendation to distribute the \$100,000 faculty development funds as follows:

1. \$24,000 distributed evenly to academic departments (excluding Military Science/ROTC and Aerospace Studies/AFROTC).
2. \$60,000 distributed to academic departments (excluding Military Science/ROTC and Aerospace Studies/AFROTC), with each department receiving an amount proportional to its annual teaching FTE, using the most recent staffing data.
3. \$500 to Military Science/ROTC.
4. \$500 to Aerospace Studies /AFROTC.
5. The above funds are to be used exclusively for individual faculty development. In order to receive these monies, each department must provide a rationale and explanation for the use of these funds.
6. \$15,000 for projects intended to serve the faculty development needs of the university as a whole (rather than the needs of individual faculty members or departments). Specific criteria and application for using this fund are to be discussed at the Committee's January 12, 2001 meeting.

The \$100,000 faculty professional development funds for this year have been transferred into the Faculty Senate account. It is ready to be distributed as soon as a formula has been approved by the Faculty Senate.

*16 Friendly amendment*

### Exhibit D

The Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee proposes to change our committee's name to "Faculty Senate Development and Appropriations Committee" to better reflect the charges of the committee and to avoid possible confusion with the "Faculty Development and Research Committee" in the Office of the Graduate Studies and Research.

*Full Transcription of  
Salary Based discussion Page 1  
Not the official minutes.*

**MINUTES**

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: December 5, 2001**

<http://www.cwu.edu/~fsenate>

**Presiding Officer:** Lad Holden  
**Recording Secretary:** Nancy Bradshaw

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

**ROLL CALL:**

**Senators:** All Senators or their Alternates were present except Bryan, Coleman, Eubanks, Richmond, Singh  
**Visitors:** Jan Bowers, Amber Eagar, Jim Pappas, Tracy Schwindt, David Soltz, Carolyn Wells

**CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA: MOTION NO.01-56 (Passed):** The agenda was approved as amended: "Move VI. 3. President's Report after IV. Communications."

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes of the November 7, 2001, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as presented.

**COMMUNICATIONS: (Available for viewing in the Senate Office or distribution on request)**

No communications

**PRESIDENT:** 1. The budget issues confronting the state are now being deliberated. The Governor's budget will be the first to be issued which should happen in the next few days. From that point on, we will be in the legislative process. The legislature will react to the governor's budget and we try through our legislative representatives to have some impact in shaping the budget. Something should come along fairly soon that will relate to whatever cuts are necessary at the institutional level and what consequences there might be to tuition. What level of tuition increase there will be. 2. Attended a conference that was designed to get public support behind issues, it was a discussion of P-16 school system, suggested that there should be seamless transition P-16, identified all the problems that are associated with it. As you can imagine no solution came out of the discussion. The Governor was there, significant thing. He said that public education is as much as possible will be held harmless in the budget process. I found the timing of this particular thing interesting. 3.) The HECB is meeting December 13 for its regular meeting in Spokane, and they have asked the presidents of the six public institutions to attend and talk about implications of the budget decisions on their institutions and I have indicated my concern with that from the standpoint that we won't know what the governor's budget is so it is hard to say what your reaction is and I don't know that it is a good idea to tip your hand about what you might be going to do in anticipation of knowing what the question is. That will be another public discussion if all of that comes off. Again, we will be basically setting the agenda for the legislative session coming up. 4. The BoT are meeting tomorrow so that they can attend the holiday party. Issue of concern on the agenda is they will be taking a step that will lead in February, to the issuing of a bond to remodel Kamola. That will be a bond and the revenue in that will be housing and dining fees. I think that will be a real opportunity for the campus. Kamola is a marvelous old facility and could become kind of a tool of the residence hall system. Drew attention to the importance of Kamola and invited senators to watch the meeting. Invited everyone to the holiday party tomorrow.

No questions were asked of the president.

**REPORTS:**

**A. ACTION ITEMS:**

**Chair:**

**Motion No. 01-57 (Passed):** Chair Holden presented a motion that after debate was approved: "That grades 31, 32, 33 and their associated steps (3% per grade and 1% per step) be added to the faculty salary scale."

Chair Holden presented rationales for motion no. 01-57. Reason for this is that 1. with the CUPA data we know what the top salary step is and to include everybody in the ability to move to the CUPA data we would need to have grade 33 and 2. there are faculty who were not able to receive merit last year because of the ceiling on the salary scale. The personnel committee suggested that we eliminate the ceiling to the scale all together, so this is a compromise between not moving it all and taking the lid off. It would allow everyone the ability to get to the CUPA and everyone to receive merit. Clarify the role of the senate doing this as opposed to having parallel input from the administration and the role of the BoT in making this decision. Are simply voting to recommend and what is the process beyond that. Holden answered: We are just voting to recommend because the pay

scale does not reside in the code, it resides in the provost office in a different part of the manual, so it just a recommendation that this is where the top of the scale should be moved to. Discussion followed. Robert Carbaugh remarks: Have been involved in this issue for the last two years being denied merit for the last two years, received a letter from our dean that I have been approved for level I and level II merit, for both years, and at the same time the letter stated that "however you are unable to receive this merit on the grounds that you are at the top of the scale when you can't go beyond the scale. This went through the grievance process and ultimately President McIntyre. Summarized the points: 1. When you look at the salary structure of faculty versus administrators there is a differential in terms of the salary structure, the faculty senate imposed a recommendation many years ago to have the merit go up to a certain level, and we as faculty members would abide by that. However, administration does not have that constraint, in other words a salary cap. So here we are as faculty we have a salary cap and the administration do not have a salary cap. A fair number of other faculty members have advanced to administration with regard to various slots around the university and we felt very strongly that that is discriminatory and really not a fair salary policy to have for the university at large. 2. I feel that this sends the wrong message. Not just to senior faculty, but to younger faculty members throughout the university. You work hard in terms of teaching, service and scholarship and perform meritorious work and all of a sudden you get to a certain level and then the merit stops. No matter how productive you are or how hard you try, your work is no longer recognized. Is very demoralizing. For people moving up the ladder, what kind of a system do they have to look forward to but a system where you advance and your work is recognized and appreciated and then finally you get to a certain level and it stops at that point and merit is no longer recognized.

Cocheba remarks: We have in the code a statement that says that there is a salary cap on faculty it says you rise to the top of the scale you cannot rise any further. That is a odd situation for us to impose on ourselves when the administration has no limits whatsoever. We have faculty who may consider this and figure that the only way that I can continue to progress is to move into administration. Wouldn't mind seeing some of those faculty have the incentive to stay as good productive teachers and researchers and so forth. So we have a perverse incentive system here in place that we have imposed on ourselves. The administration can make sure that they get there salary increases in any way they so see fit and can expedite through the Board of Trustees. We can't do anything about it because we put the lid on ourselves. This is not an argument between the faculty and administration, it is an argument in saying that we have a perverse incentive system in place and we should remove it. I would argue that we should change that code statement and I would like to see that as an amendment to the code proposed later. Right now this is a compromised position that says, let's raise this salary cap now, it will allow everyone to be rewarded for meritorious for the next two or three years. This is an interim step. It is probably more palatable to some of you who think this is not an incentive system question, but a fairness question, which I don't think it is. It is a discrimination question. It is a discrimination against faculty who perform well, but cannot be rewarded while other people who perform well, both faculty below the top scale and the administration can be rewarded. We have singled out one group of people who ought to be rewarded for their good performance who cannot be by faculty code dictate. We are here to speak in behalf of passing this motion and the president says that she supports it to us both individually and in this forum before. I think we need to project to our faculty that meritorious service will be rewarded and not discriminated against and we need to also reflect the same fact to the community around us that we value productivity. And I add with a footnote, I recognize financial incentives are not the only reason that people behave as they do and perform meritoriously, but it is one dimension and it is an important dimension and we should recognize it by passing this motion.

#### **Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee**

**Motion No. 01-58 (Passed):** Toni Culjak, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee made a motion that was approved: "Addition of a physical education, health education and leisure services program: minor in exercise science attached as Exhibit A."

#### **Faculty Senate Academic Affairs' Committee**

**Delayed Motion No. 01-55 (Tabled):** Senator Donahoe, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs' Committee made a motion that after debate was approved: "Revisions to section 5-9.23 of the *Central Washington University Policies Manual* attached as Exhibit B."

Give Lad the discussion from this so he can see what he wants to do. Extra charge to include the concerns from Susan Donahoe, Toni and Michael. Susan explained that the committee only charged with what is in their rationale in on the agenda.

Senator Donahoe explained that the committee meets once a week and works closely with Carolyn Wells, the registrar, in reviewing academic policy. She further explained that the charge to the committee did not include why the senate delayed the motion (clarity in students responsibility and the timeline for completing incompletes). She believes that the new wording addresses the concerns from the last meeting.

**Motion was tabled because of the following concerns:** Section 5-9.4.23.2 is not clear. Clarify which date "After the date indicated . . ." The AAC is attempting to word so that students are clear in that they must complete the incomplete by the date the instructor sets and not an automatic one full year. Braunstein – section 5-9.4.23.2, not clear which date is being referred to "After the date indicated . . ." Donahoe explained that as the policy is written it is not clear whether the student has a full year regardless of what date the instructor places on the Report of Incomplete. Nothing in our policy to indicate which one takes precedent over the other. That is why the AAC very carefully chose the term "after the date indicated on the form." There was a question whether this referred to the date the instructor signed the form or is that the date indicated on the form in which to complete the incomplete. Which date is this referred to. As it is written it is the date that the instructor signs this. And then they have up to a year from that date unless I made a requirement for less than one year. Suggestion made to add "completion date" to the sentence. Still does not grammatically make sense.

Culjak request for clarification: would like it to be clear who is responsible for sending the copy of the report of incomplete to the student. Our department thinks the registrar's office is responsible. There is nowhere to tell us, on the form or otherwise, who is responsible for sending that information to the student. Request that it go directly to the executive committee before it is put back on the table.

Still very unclear language. Donahoe will meet with the executive committee to receive direction before bringing back to the floor of the senate. If anyone has any recommendations please E-mail Donahoe so the committee can work them into the policy. AP go directly to the executive committee for complete review before coming before this body again.

#### **Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee**

**Motion No. 01-59 (Tabled):** Senator Charles Li, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee, proposed a motion that after debate was approved: "Recommendation to distribute the \$100,000 faculty development funds attached as Exhibit C."

**Discussion:** Question was raised; the distribution is to academic departments and in my case I have a half time appointment in a program, so none of the faculty in the science ed program under this policy get professional development money, and neither does the chemistry department. I was thinking that 1 FTE would be going to the chemistry department and I would be able to get that half of that professional development anyway. But the way it is worded. Granted that affects very few people in my program, but there may be other programs under the same circumstance. Lad stated, your saying that you are eliminated from the total number of faculty members that the \$60,000 is being distributed to. Answer: I am getting counted as .50 in the chemistry department. Science ed is not getting any money under number 1 or number 2.

Suggestion made to change number 2 to "\$60,000 distributed to academic departments and independent programs . . ."

Lad had it tabled because he did not want to make a list on the senate floor.

Senators were asked to send any input to Charles by E-mail at <lix@cwu.edu>. Also were asked to take back to their departments to make sure we account for everyone. Hopefully when it comes back at the next meeting we won't have to have this discussion.

**Motion No. 01-60 (Passed):** Senator Charles Li, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee, proposed a motion that after debate was approved: "Change the name of the Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee to Faculty Senate Development and Appropriations Committee."

Rationale: The Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee proposes to change

Must make a bylaw and code change. The description will also change. We should do all at the same time.

#### **B. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

1. **CHAIR:** 1. Will bring a change to the bylaws at the next meeting regarding this. Change in assignments to several standing committees. The Development and Appropriations Committee: change to do appropriations and deal with the faculty development days. Many faculty were not happy with the way the faculty development day for Friday was handled. Since this will be ongoing for at least the next two years, this has a place for concerns from the senate to go and they can work with the provost office to deal with that. The equity study would be moved to the budget committee and the evaluation of administrators would be moved to the personnel committee. Asked senators to think about the proposed change and if you have any concerns about the proposal please give them to the exec committee as soon as possible. Would like to

make just one change and have it go through all at once. These changes seem to be more in line with what people believe they are going to do in the committee than what they are actually doing in the committees as they sit not. 2. I am getting a sense from many people that the code has some serious deficiencies and that it is not all put together in a good way. Will ask the code committee to come up with process to look at evaluating the code. I'm not going to ask them to evaluate the code, just a process to look at the getting the code evaluated. If you have ideas about what needs to go into the evaluation of the code, please contact the executive committee. 3. Senate concerns; In order to make sure questions raised during senate concerns are answered the executive committee is asking senators to E-mail questions to the executive committee 10-days prior to a senate meeting or faculty member in your department might have, then we could get those questions to the appropriate people in advance so they could come to the meeting with and answer to the question. Would speed up receiving responses and changes to the process. Senators were asked to inform their departments so that they could give you concerns, E-mail to senate and will have the answer at the meeting. Present way senate concerns are handled takes way too long, receive incomplete answers and things get let go. 3. SEOI issue. We are trying to see if we can locate a report in Phil Backlunds E-mail from the early 90's. A report was created and the only thing that was taken out of the report was the SEOI section.

So, my concern and others is that we should have a more comprehensive system of evaluation of instruction then just the student evaluation of instruction. It looked like maybe that had happened. If we can locate the report then that would be a place for an ad hoc committee to start to look at this whole process and how we deal with student evaluation of instruction. If we can't locate the report, then hopefully we can get some of the information built back up so we are not starting from zero again. We need to also survey the departments and colleges because different people assign different weights to different things in the evaluation of instruction. The provost stated that his office is looking for a copy of the report. He also stated that one of the recommendations of the NASC visit is that we continue to develop a thorough and comprehensive faculty evaluation process. It is very appropriate to work on this issue. Not sure how to proceed. Holden stated that unless there is an objection, there will end up being an ad hoc committee. AAC has enough to do for now. An ad hoc committee could concentrate on just this issue. Sutton asked if there is student representatives on the ad hoc committee. Holden stated that it is not a committee yet. Suggestion to Include all forms of evaluation; peer, self and student evaluation. Sutton suggested that students be a part of the ad hoc committee.

2. **CHAIR ELECT:** 1. Also state that the development and appropriation committee is going to look at the faculty development days and asked the provost that if at the next senate meeting to report the issues that have been raised at the last three university-wide faculty development meetings with respect to scholarship and progress that has been made in addressing those issues as a data point for the committee examine in considering how effectively that time could be used. Provost Soltz agreed to make a report at the next senate meeting. He promised to summarize, if you recall, the group discussions from this fall's meeting and I am part way through that and will finish it over the Christmas holiday. I realize I made that promise at the beginning of the term, and apologized for not completing it yet. 2. Attended the November CFR meeting. He explained that the CFR is a small group of faculty from the Washington state four year institutions that is supported by the Council of Presidents. They encourage us to meet and address particularly legislative issues and issues that are concern to all of the four year institutions. The issues discussed in detail at the November meeting were the Washington state budget and what higher ed's response is going to be with respect to the budget shortfall this year. Another issue that was discussed was faculty salary bases at the four year institutions. I have Information about the faculty salary bases at eastern, western and centrals. Our base increased by 4/10 of a percent Easterns increased by 3.6 percent, Westerns 4.5 percent increases. Of course we know that there were severe budget problems at our university last year, but that information is something to consider. There is a significant amount of discussion about how the different institutions might approach the tuition issue, whether the four year institutions should push for more latitude on the part of the schools in setting their own tuition. I think there is a division among the schools, particularly highlighted by the University of Washington who would like to almost a private model, just as much latitude as they can get in setting their tuition. They think that they can best serve their budget in that way. Another issue that came up that I think you need to be aware of is enabling legislation. At this point there are two enabling legislation bills that are preparing to be examined by the legislature when they are in session. These bills would be legislation that would allow the four year institution faculty to be form unions and the union be recognized as a bargaining unit. One version of the enabling legislation has been developed by the Washington Education Association (WEA) and it at some level it is being presented as a CWU bill. Another version of the enabling legislation is being prepared by the University of Washington. The University of Washington faculty representative indicated that they are willing in that legislation to include CWU as well and we are really on the point between those two different bills. The CFR strongly encourage the two groups who have the competing legislation to come to some sort of an agreement. They think that it will be unlikely for the legislation to be passed if there are in fact two bills that go before the legislature. What we will be working towards before the legislature starts with, is to try and come to a single form of enabling legislation. Question: You stated that the WEA is putting the enabling legislation proposal as a CWU bill, where did they

get the authority to do this. Can we do anything about that if we choose to? The WEA states that they represent the union members at Central and not the faculty as a whole. Until you pressure them about it they won't say that. Culjak; then the WEA is trying to present this as representing the faculty as a whole. Senator Donahoe explained that the union has two affiliates, WFA and the WFT and those two affiliates are really looking at part time issues and the bill that UW put forward does not include part time. A representative for the WFT had been working with the UW to include a section on the part time because have excluded them in their legislation. Our union felt that Eastern and Central we would be all inclusive and include the part time faculty as part of the legislation. The discussion is still taking place. I have all the proposed legislation in my office. The exclusion of the part time is a concern. She will be glad to share the information with any interested faculty.

**3. PRESIDENT**

**4. FACULTY SALARY BASE REPORT:** Provost Soltz presented a report on the 2000-01 Faculty Salary Base Report attached as Exhibit C. He explained that as mentioned before there was a very slight increase to the salary base. The increase was \$88,783. This obviously has to do with the significant funding cut to Cwu last year. If you go through to the last two paragraphs on page two, this is where I tried to deal with this directly, infact the last paragraph is really the relevant one. He read the paragraph which stated, "During 2000-2001, some of the funds generated from salary savings on faculty lines were distributed back to college adjunct accounts to supplement funds available for adjunct salaries. Because of the enrollment shortfall experienced in 2000-01 and the resultant significant budget reduction all such funds were not available for distribution back to colleges. Position changes totaling \$854,628, as reflected in line F of Table 1, were "contributed" to the budget reductions in 2000-01 and the rebasing of the budget for 2001-02. The contribution of faculty salary saving to the budget reduction represents 55.34% of the total Academic Affairs reduction of \$1,544,187." To put that in perspective, the faculty pool is 68.62% of the total academic affairs budget. So there was some protection of faculty salaries in the reduction scenario. But given the magnitude of the reduction and the fact that most of the money in academic affairs is in faculty salaries, a very large portion of the budget reduction came out of faculty salaries. There was really no alternative. A disclaimer here is I wasn't involved in making these decisions, but the sources are in the very last sentence, and that is, the salary savings came from 12 vacant tenure-track positions, eight phased retirement positions which were converted to full retirement and 14 faculty lines reduced due to hiring of new faculty at salaries lower than the retirees. Senator Cujak asked when the legislature makes decisions as to raising faculty salaries, they are basically raising there salary base aren't they. Provost Soltz: No functionally they are raising the salary of the employee faculty. Culjak: So the fact that this money was eliminated from the salary base must have a negative impact on what they legislature does when they decide what they are going to do with our salaries. Provost Soltz: As I understand it there are across the board percentage salary given. Your right, that's percentage is applied towards the salary base so that's the amount of money we received. Culjak: So we have a hypothetical 20 million dollar salary base the legislature promised us a 4 percent increases they give us an additional 4 percent of that 20 million dollars. Provost Solz: Correct. Culjak: So if its not 20 million dollars, instead its 19 million dollars because we have reduced the base through contributed budget savings then we are digging ourselves a hole aren't we? Sotz: You are getting less money, that is correct. If the money came from other places, however, and I didn't have a chance to give you specific dollar examples we would have no telephones and no paper for exams and things like that, because the size of services budget is sufficiently small. Culjak: What percentage of the budget reductions taken out of administrative salary base. Soltz: I don't know. I can find that out for you. Question: So those 20 positions are they now gone. Soltz: They are gone from the base. Unfortunately that's what base money is. Question: What is the department that loose the positions to expect then, do they just have one less FTE? Soltz: That is correct. Holden: Do we know what the total percentage that academic affairs took in the budget cut last year. Soltz: Not the percent we know the dollar amount. Holden: I know part of the money was lost because of the enrollment shortfall, that was a certain percentage. But then there was a 2% budget reduction from the legislature into this year. But then that 2% was allocated from nonacademic units and I believe that we took a share of that cut in academics too. Is that true? Soltz: That's true. I don't know the magnitude of that. But the president has tended to spread these cuts across the board so far. Then within academic affairs we took less of a cut out of the faculty salary base then we did out of the other budgets. Holden: Well, I guess my feeling is that the vice president for business affairs had too much influence on the president and now we have a change, your senior vice president, are you going to try and make so we don't share so much when they are not supposed to be academic cuts? Soltz: Obviously, I wouldn't be doing my job otherwise. I haven't had the opportunity to make the arguments. Holden: I just want to make sure to get a feeling that you are going to try and do that for us. Soltz: Certainly. Nethery: Referred to table, some impressive increases in the average salary since 1997 according to the table. In, I believe it was about this time two years ago, Provost Dauwalder presented us with essentially the same type of report and at that time I asked whether or not he would be able to provide us with some other general central tendency measures other than the average because if the median income of faculty across the campus has increased to the same extent, that would represent some maintenance of the normal distribution as opposed to loading on one end of the

distribution which would skew the mean in a certain direction without necessarily changing a lot of the faculty salaries. So let me ask the same question I asked two years ago, which was, is it possible for us to have some other measures of the distribution of salary beyond simply the average? Soltz: There certainly is and I would be willing to produce those. What I did was I chose to use exactly the same format that you were use to seeing. Nethery: Yes I see that and I am asking the same question and I understand that your not responsible. Soltz: It makes sense to look at other measures. Nethery: It might clarify some of the questions that I have in my mind and other might have in terms of what it is to be a constant significant increase and how it may have been distributed. John AP: When these cuts to the base were being contemplated last year, I specifically spoke to the chair of the senate at that time saying that it was my understanding that the code did not permit cuts to the base. Unknown: It doesn't, 8.30 is there in black and white. Braunstein: "All funds authorized and appropriated by legislative action for faculty salaries, ledger one funds including tuition monies, shall be used primarily for the award of merit and across the board increases for faculty." So there is a question to whether or not that was done with legislatively appropriated funds las year. And then additionally, "Salary savings from full time tenure-track positions not filled permanently or replaced at a lower salary shall remain in the faculty salary base. Adjustments to the faculty salary base shall occur as a result of collaboration between the provost senior vice president for academic affairs and the faculty senate budget committee." John AP: My comment is if this in fact is a defacto violation of the code, I would like to see this figured out and rectified. As a member of the senate in fact I want to have the facts straight and then if it is a violation, I want action on this. Culjak: I requested information on administrative contributions to the adjustment of the budget, I would also request exempt status so that we see the numbers and see where the pain went. Holden: If you remember we ran the budgetary benchmark last year and that will answer a bunch of questions when that is run this year. Right now we haven't been able to get all the data. The list from last year is the starting place for it doesn't have several new salaries on it and it also is missing a couple of positions that will change the data on it. We can't say what happened to exempt, we know the base was eroded, but we don't have all the data yet. We don't know how much we gained or lost compared to CUPA either because we don't have the CUPA data to us yet. So, we need to get the CUPA data and we need to get the exempt salary scale. We need all three things to make any observations. John AP: How soon can we have these made available? Who are we dependent upon to get that data. Holden: The CUPA data comes from Mark and I would have thought we would have already had it. Hopefully we will have it quickly. To run the budget benchmarks basically is we have to get a complete list of the people in the other divisions and then a faculty member from the budget committee has to go over it and verify everybody's salary. The list as a whole only goes to the Board once a year at the end of the year. The budget committee hasn't been able to get the time and the man power to deal with this issue. Last year Nasser provided most of the data individually for the people and Nasser isn't here. We'll have to go to the new person and get them to provide the data. John AP: Let's not drop this please. Holden: We won't drop it, don't worry. But your concerns are noted, there certainly concerns that we have. The question is about the process to deal the data once it is received. Point of information Gunn: The salary base has been eroded in violation of the faculty code and at this point in time we just don't know by how much is that correct? Holden: Correct, we know by how much. It should have gone up from last year's base 2.9% at least plus promotions and it didn't. So there is no question that it eroded. The question to the provost was we thought we fixed it. Soltz: Probably not, that is my initial answer. Unknown: We just have to move forward. Culjak: Can we stop doing this? Soltz: Hopefully, or at least to some extent. When an institution suffers the kind of budget reductions we have suffered it is very hard to take it out of none-salary line. Culjak: The erosion of the salary base is a long standing problem, is it not? Soltz: Yes. Cujak: So the reality of last year's budget situation wasn't the origin of this problem, it was simply an additional "hit" on the salary base coupled with those that have occurred over the past 10 years. How are we going to be able to stop this from happening? Holden: The reason that I am concerned about the exempt salaries in the picture is that, cause we ~~find~~ <sup>find</sup> everything out of empty slots in faculty here, we have at least for the last 10 years, because it is an easy place to do it because the people are gone and you are just taking the money and not replacing them. Whereas if we go to another division or we look at the exempt positions, they are all here and they require action to deal with instead of inaction. But, still we need the comparison of how much they didn't take a loss of personnel. We also have to consider that we have taken on many more students and those other places say well if we laid off people you would have a reduction in service. And here, faculty just get an increased work load. John AP: Earlier in this meeting you brought up the issue of evaluating the code to see if it is o.k. the way it is. The bottom line is if the code, which says you cannot do what happened to the faculty salary base, is not able to protect us from such changes, then we are literally wasting our time around this table. Holden: That's exactly my point. John AP: We need to find out as quickly as possible from however many sources what are the recourses that we have as a faculty to what is clearly a violation of the code that was approved by the Board of Trustees. "The executive committee take this matter in hand and report back to this body at the next meeting with clear idea of what happened, how much, who can do what, so that we can have as a body a basis for judgment." Discussion led to the following motion.

*Send*

**Motion 01-61 (Passed):** Senator AP proposed a motion that was approved: "The executive committee of the senate investigate whether or not we have any recourse and if so what recourse to address this violation of the faculty code represented by the erosion of the salary base and that the committee report back at the next senate meeting their findings."

5. **ACADEMIC SERVICE LEARNING:** Jim Pappas and Jan Bowers presented a report on academic service learning. Purpose to give information about academic service learning. Jan Bowers, project director of the FIPSE grant. Three grants that support academic service learning. Summarized the handout. Pappas explained that this Friday at the faculty development day they will present a workshop with about 6-7 faculty who have been involved with service learning to explain this in more detail. Summarize his handout regarding the workshop. He asked senators to take a look at what the definition is in the first two paragraphs and give any feedback on the definition to him or Dr. Bowers. They are looking at creating a university-wide definition of service learning. You can see what our students have to say about service learning. Put in things that instructors would be interested in. Examples of students being motivated to learn on the first page. Critical reflection, helping students reframe the way they think about complex problems, reflection coupled with other complex social issues and then strategies. Several strategies to accomplish this. Many of you are doing it. We would like to see it become more prevalent. I know anthropology is involved, phil, ed, leisure services, psy, soc, and some people embed it in their course content. That is one way, the second way is project focused. The third one comes through student affairs, a student directed service learning. The three approaches we follow here. Trying to get faculty people more interested in the first two. In the rest of this you can read. If anyone has a questions, refer questions to Pappas or Bowers.
6. **STUDENT REPORT:** Senator Scarth reported that she had been working on the new course evaluations. Have been distributed. Received a few back. Apologized to faculty who received them too late for their final classes. Had a few issues that caused this. Thanked those faculty who have chosen to in this process. Senator Čujak stated that last year when this body looked at the evaluations forms presented faculty members made comments as to some the problems with the questions, and we were reassured that some of those problems would be looked at. However, when I looked at the forms that I received in my mailbox, none of the things that were mentioned were dealt with at all. So it was my decision as a faculty member because of the ambiguity and the poor quality of the question, not to have my students evaluate based on those forms. Senator Sutton commented by saying that the committee discussed it with many other campuses and universities across the country and they are quality questions.
7. **SENATE CONCERNS:** Senator Chenyang Li stated that at the fall faculty conference, one issue we discussed was the possibility of moving to a more flexible scheduling moving to a two or three day schedule. I recall that the provost was going to look into it. Is there any development on this, is someone working on it. Provost Soltz answered by saying that it is not being worked on at this time. It is one of the many things that were mentioned at the conference, it doesn't mean that it won't be looked at.

Senator Donahoe speaking on behalf of the academic affairs committee expressed their concern that when changes are made in the faculty senate that there is a lag time in things getting into policy. We also had a motion last year that passed saying that we wanted things dated with the body that last saw it as it went into the policy manual just like we do in the faculty code. That does not seem to be in progress right now. Once these things are voted on, we want it to be implemented and put into policy. Motion made at the senate last year and forwarded to the provost and has not been done at this point. It is important in some of these cases that when a student is going by a certain rule when was it in effect. It involves other policies we just want the record to be clear and have those placed in policy. How are things tracked after they leave the senate office. We never hear back if it is approved or not. We only recommend changes and we would like to have a response. The other issue is when something leaves the faculty senate do we have any procedure to follow to find out if it is going to be rejected along the way or approved. Track the recommendation. If it doesn't make it all the way then we need feedback. We also would like to know how much it got changed after leaving the senate and placed into policy. Senator Sutton asked if the SEOI forms mandatory for students to complete. Answer is no. The other question was a student concern that was brought to me and that was a student employee that worked in an office in one of the departments, said that last spring quarter written comments were not typed, they were left in the student's hand writing. Concerned that students can be identified who take the same professor for different classes. You may jeopardize the rest of your career in that major if you evaluate a professor negatively.

8. **FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS' COMMITTEE** – Working on a issue of double dipping. Especially between majors and minors. The idea the courses that count for the major could also count for the minor. Looking at individual departments. If you have any ideas about this you may attend an academic affairs committee who meets every Thursday from 3 – 5 in Barge 201.

**BUDGET COMMITTEE** – No report.



**CODE COMMITTEE** – No report.

**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE** – No report.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE** – Senator Gazis reported that the General Education surveys although they are flawed they are being processed and hope to use them as a starting point to revise the outcomes and better define the goals of the general education program. The other thing that we are working on is creating guideline for addition of courses to the general education program.

**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE** – No report.

**PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE/CFR** - No report.

**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT** - The committee's next meeting will be January 16, 2002 where they will discuss specific criteria and application for distributing the university-wide faculty development funds. He informed senators that anyone who has inquired about the distribution of these funds will not be answered until after the committee has met in January. There has been a question regarding the \$15,000 for university-wide faculty development projects. The explained that the money currently and historically has been used exclusively for university-wide faculty development projects. So the question now is are there any restrictions on using that part of the funds for individual faculty development proposal. Our answer here will help us evaluate the call for faculty development project proposals. Asked for input from senators. John AP commented that of consistent concern in terms of these monies is that there is wide spread a belief by the departments that because they manage these funds before it gets to the faculty member that they can ride "rough-shod" and get those funds and use for other means. Reminded senators that the point of this fund is to help faculty in their own development in terms of there jobs. He extended his appreciation to the committee for their work in ensuring the criteria are met. Consensus of the senate was to keep the \$15,000 university-wide faculty development project.

**OLD BUSINESS:** No old business.

**NEW BUSINESS:** How are the policies on how departments proctor SEOs and the inconsistencies.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

**\*\*\*NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: January 9, 2001\*\*\*  
BARGE 412**

**REPORT OF INCOMPLETE**

Faculty are required to submit this form with each "I" granted. Course requirement section must be completed or Registrar Services will return the form.

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Birth \_\_\_\_\_

QRT/YR: \_\_\_\_\_ Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Course: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Dept.) (Number/Section)

To complete the course, the following requirements must be completed by \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

The student has satisfactorily completed a sufficient portion of this course and can be expected to finish without having to re-enroll. If a date is not indicated, and the work is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will automatically convert to and "F".

Verbal agreement has been made between faculty and student.

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Student: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Rev: 12/4/2001

**REPORT OF INCOMPLETE**

Faculty are required to submit this form with each "I" granted. Course requirement section must be completed or Registrar Services will return the form.

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Birth \_\_\_\_\_

QRT/YR: \_\_\_\_\_ Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Course: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Dept.) (Number/Section)

To complete the course, the following requirements must be completed by \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

The student has satisfactorily completed a sufficient portion of this course and can be expected to finish without having to re-enroll. If a date is not indicated, and the work is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will automatically convert to and "F".

Verbal agreement has been made between faculty and student.

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Student: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Rev: 12/4/2001

## Report of Incomplete Procedures

1. Instructor and student discuss course completion requirements.
2. Instructor and student complete the Report of Incomplete (ROI) form making sure the specific course requirements, and completion date (if work must be completed prior to one academic year) are filled in.
3. Instructor and student should both sign the form. If the student is not available to sign the form, the instructor should discuss the course requirements with the student, and check the "verbal agreement" box on the ROI.
4. Student should retain the bottom copy of the triplicate form unless they are not present. In this case, the academic department should mail a copy to the student.
5. Instructor enters the grade into SIS and retains one copy for the department office, and the original ROI to Registrar Services (if the grades are being submitted in hardcopy form, the ROI should accompany the grade roster, and Registrar Services will post the "I").
6. If the instructor enters a date of completion on the form, it is the responsibility of the instructor to submit a "Change of Grade" form at that time. Otherwise, the "I" will automatically convert to an "F" after one year.
7. Registrar Services will distribute a quarterly report to the Academic Departments indicating all "I" grades. The list will indicate student name, date of birth, course, term the "I" was posted.
8. Registrar Services will notify the student the quarter the "I" will be converting to an "F."

MEMO:

**To:** Lad Holden, Chair, Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Senators  
**From:** Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee: Bob Benton, Phil Diaz, Susan Donahoe, Barney Erickson, Nick French, Ed Gellenbeck, Eldon Johnson, Robert Lupton, Richard Mack, Lynn Richmond, Alyssa Scarth, David Shorr, and Jeff Snedeker,  
**Date:** December 5, 2001  
**Re:** Report on the Proposed Changes to Assigning an Incomplete

The charge to the Academic Affairs Committee was to clarify the following:

5-9.4.23.2 To earn a grade, work of the course must be completed as prescribed by the instructor on forms filed in the appropriate department office.

5-9.4.23.3 If it is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will convert to an "F."

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate respectfully reports on the proposed changes to assigning an Incomplete. Carolyn Wells and Tracy Schwindt visited the committee and discussed due dates for incompletes and conversion to an "F." There is confusion on dates set by faculty and dates in the catalog that give the student the end of one calendar year for conversion to an "F" if work is not completed.

The committee felt that often a date is given for a particular reason by the instructor, but the policy provides for a year as it is now stated. To clarify and to inform the student of university expectations and to allow the faculty to make the decision on date, the Incomplete Form must have more meaning. We discovered the registrar cannot monitor dates except by quarter which can automatically turn "I" to "F" at one year unless a Grade Change form is used. Therefore, we suggest the following additions to the policy clarifying what will happen and allowing the instructor to change the grade by the indicated date on the Incomplete Form.

Proposed change:

5-9.4.23.2 To earn a grade, work ~~of~~ for the course must be completed as prescribed by the instructor by the indicated date on Report of Incomplete form ~~on forms~~ filed in the appropriate department office. After the date indicated on the form, up to a year, the instructor may file a Change of Grade form with the Registrar.

5-9.4.23.3 As report of Incomplete forms are filled out by the instructor, copies of the report are placed on file with the department, with the registrar, and sent to the student.

5-9.4.23.3.4 If a date is not indicated on the Report of Incomplete, and the work ~~it~~ is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will automatically convert to an "F."

5-9.4.23.4.5 Students may not re-register for a course in which they receive a grade of incomplete.

5-9.4.23.6 It is the student's responsibility to contact the professor and make arrangements as to how to change the grade of Incomplete.



# CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

ELLENSBURG • LYNNWOOD • MOSES LAKE • SEATAC • STEILACOOM • WENATCHEE • YAKIMA

## OFFICE OF THE PROVOST / VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Date: November 1, 2001

RECEIVED  
NOV 1 2001  
CWU FACULTY SENATE

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Faculty Senate

**FROM:** David Soltz, Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

**COPIES:** J. McIntyre, President's Cabinet, Academic Affairs Council,  
Academic Department Chairs Organization, Budget Office

**SUBJECT:** Faculty Salary Base

Section 8.30 of the Faculty Code calls for a yearly report to the Faculty Senate conveying information related to faculty salaries. This report conveys information related to the faculty salary base, the average salary of the university's tenured and tenure-track faculty, the disposition of all funds authorized and appropriated for faculty salaries, and funds paid to faculty from all sources. I have chosen to use the format of the reports for the previous three years for ease of comparison. I intend to change the format in the future to provide more, and hopefully more useful, information.

#### Faculty Salary Base

The 2001-2002 faculty salary base at Central Washington University equals \$21,477,459. This reflects an *increase* of \$88,783 over the faculty salary base of 2000-2001, which totaled \$21,388,676.

The faculty salary base is the sum of the budget lines of tenured, tenure-track, and full-time-non-tenure-track faculty plus adjunct lines and phased retirees in the 2001-2002 baseline budget.

#### Average Salary of the University's Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

The average faculty salary of the university's tenured and tenure-track faculty can be computed two ways. One approach includes only tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty but not phased retirees. The second approach includes tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and phased retirees. Both figures are reported below.

- ◆ The average salary in Fall 2001 of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, excluding phased retirees is \$52,820.19.

- ◆ The average salary in Fall 2000 of the tenured and tenure-track faculty including phased retirees is \$52,690.26.

The HECB uses a third method of computing the average faculty salary for its yearly report to the legislature. That report also identifies a national percentile ranking for Washington's universities and The Evergreen State College. The HECB has used data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) reports. This data measures a different set of faculty from those used to compute the average salaries reported above.

The annual salary survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education collects data regarding full-time instructional faculty. That set includes full-time tenured and non-tenured faculty, including lecturers. Faculty not included in the IPEDS data are (a) tenured and non-tenured faculty in positions less than full time, (b) librarians holding faculty rank, (c) coaches, and (d) exempt administrators with tenure. The table below reports the average faculty salary for the comparable set of faculty reported to IPEDS for Fall 1997, 1998, and 1999.

Fall 1997	\$43,619
Fall 1998	\$44,666
Fall 1999	\$49,268 (48,939)*

\*Beginning with Fall 1999, faculty in International Studies and Programs were added to the list of faculty reported to IPEDS. Adding the International Studies and Programs full-time faculty creates an average faculty salary of \$48,939.

However, the IPEDS faculty survey was cancelled for Fall 2000. The reporting method used for Fall 2000 was the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) faculty compensation survey. This survey reported an average salary for Fall 2000 of \$50,978. The AAUP collected faculty salary data in the same format as the previous IPEDS data.

### **Disposition of All funds Authorized and Appropriated for Faculty Salaries**

Table 1 reports the adjustments to the faculty salary base from the 2000-2001 faculty salary base. The Budget Office currently estimates benefits for new full-time faculty positions at 26 percent and benefits for new part-time faculty positions at 10 percent. When additional funds are allocated to existing positions, the Budget Office estimates the need for an accompanying increase to the benefits pool of 16 percent. In Table 1, the figures reported as "adjustments to salaries" (column 2) represent funding added or deleted from the existing salary lines in the baseline budget. Therefore, the benefits column (column 3) in Table 1 reports 16 percent of the amount showing on each line in column 2.

During 2000-2001, some of the funds generated from salary savings on faculty lines were distributed back to college adjunct accounts to supplement funds available for adjunct salaries. Because of the enrollment shortfall experienced in 2000-01 and the resultant significant budget reduction all such funds were not available for distribution back to colleges. Position changes totaling \$854,628, as reflected in line f of Table 1, were "contributed" to the budget reductions in 2000-01 and the rebasing of the budget for

2001-02. The contribution of faculty salary saving to the budget reduction represents 55.34% of the total Academic Affairs reduction of \$1,544,187. The faculty salary pool represents 68.62% of the total budget of Academic Affairs. The salary savings contributed to the budget reduction were generated by: (a) 12 vacant tenure track positions, (b) eight phased retirement positions which converted to full retirement, and (c) 14 faculty lines reduced due to hiring of new faculty at salaries lower than individuals who retired or resigned.

*Missed Aug 01-02  
and see infra*

**Table 1  
Faculty Salary Base Report (2001-2002)  
Central Washington University  
November 1, 2001**

	Salaries <i>(Excluding Benefits)</i>	Adjustments to Salaries <i>(Excluding Benefits)</i>	Estimated Benefits <i>(Additions to Benefits Pool - - Equals 16 Percent of Adjustment to Salaries)</i>	Total <i>(Salary Plus Estimated Benefits)</i>
a 2000-2001 Faculty Salary Base	\$21,388,676			
b 1.9% Across the Board Increase		\$406,333	\$65,013	\$471,346
c Promotions		164,110	26,258	190,368
d Merit		311,622	49,860	361,482
e Grievance		12,910	2,066	14,976
f Position Changes		(854,628)	(136,740)	(991,368)
g Retention Funding		46,581	7,453	54,034
h Administrative Stipends		1,855	297	2,152
i Sum of Changes		88,783	14,205	102,988
j Adjustments to Salaries	88,783			
k Faculty Salary Base	<u>\$21,477,459</u>			

- a) This figure is the beginning faculty salary base for 2000-2001.
- b) This figure represents a 1.9-percent across the board increase to faculty salary lines in the 2000-2001 base allocations. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column three.
- c) The figure in column 2 represents the without-benefits portion of the faculty promotions. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3. The Board of Trustees approved up to \$250,000 for promotions. Promotions equaled \$164,110 plus a 16-percent estimated benefits amount of \$26,258 for a total of \$190,368. The balance of the funds approved for promotions, \$59,632, was allocated to replenish the faculty salary adjustment pool used for retention and grievance allocations.
- d) The figure in column 2 represents the without-benefits portion of the faculty merit. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3.
- e) This line reflects the additions to faculty lines for the grievance adjustments awarded during 2000-01. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3.
- f) This line reflects the additions and deletions from faculty lines for adjustments to vacant positions, addition of new positions, new and completed phased positions, and budget reductions. The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3.
- g) This line reflects the additions to faculty lines in accordance with university retention policy (2-2.48 Faculty and Exempt Staff Retention Policy). The accompanying 16-percent estimate for benefits is shown in column 3.
- h) This line represents increases in administrative stipends in the 2001-2002 baseline budget for department-chair and/or program director stipends. Please note that the university system used for posting and tracking positions within the baseline budget administrative stipends are reported on salary lines and cannot be entered on separate lines.
- i) This line reports the sum of each column 2, 3 and 4.
- j) The line reflects the sum of changes to the faculty lines (items b through h).
- k) The 2001-2002 faculty salary base.



12-05-01  
11/8

**This is an abbreviated version of the December 7<sup>th</sup> workshop  
"Enhancing Our Teaching While Maintaining Our Sanity"  
December 7, 2001**

**Workshop Notes For  
Academic Service-Learning (AS-L):  
A Teacher-Learner, Student Centered Pedagogy  
James G Pappas, Director of Academic AS-L**

**What is academic service learning?** The Academic Service-Learning Faculty Fellows has recently adopted the following definition from Bringle and Hatcher's book *A Service-Learning Curriculum For Faculty*. We would like to receive your comments and reactions to it.

**..Academic Service-learning is course a based, credit bearing educational experience in which students a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and 2) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of the course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and enhanced sense of civic responsibility.**

Put in another way Academic Service-Learning can be used as a method for teaching and learning that engages and motivates students to become more interested about key issues and problems that instructors raise in class. It usually stimulates students to read more about a subject. Why? Because when S-L activities are used effectively they connect out of class events and issues with course content. Also thoughtful and structured reflection in the classroom is very important

**What do students say about the value of AS-L?** Below are a few authentic student testimonies taken from a research- based study by Janet Eyler, Dwight Giles Jr., and Angela Schmiede, *A Practitioner's Guide To Reflection In Service-Learning: Student Voices and Reflection* (1996). Have included several statements from my CWU Service-Learning classes. All of these student quotes are from critical reflection statements about the causes and solutions to issues and problems related to their service or volunteer time.

**Examples of students being motivated to learn:**

- I learned more this quarter than all of my last three years. I have just learned so much. I know why. It is because I found something I am so passionate about and it makes you care more to learn more about it---and you get involved to do more. You're not just studying to take a test and forget about it. You're learning and the experiences we have are staying with us. It's not cram for a test the night before... I know when I take a test I just want to get it over with and that doesn't happen with community service, it stays with you." University of San Diego Student
- You're actually working with the people you are talking about in class with your professors and fellow students: it makes it seem much more real and much more urgent to do something..." CWU Student

**Examples of AS-L coupled with critical reflection helping students reframe the way they think about complex problems:**

- "I think I have become more politicized in my service. Growing up I didn't have the questions, the structural questions. I didn't see the inequities on a day to day basis that exist in our society that I see now or that I'm now connecting my service with...I see it much more as interconnected now. Before, social problems were, like each problem needed to be attacked separately. I didn't see

the correlation between, for example, racism and economic injustice...I grew up just not seeing the interconnection.” Vanderbilt University Student

- “My reflection makes me look back on my observations notes from last month. I see that I need to be less critical of this person, and look more toward the positives in his teaching. Students can only take so much criticism and then they shut down. Why should this person be any different? How would I feel about these observations notes?” CWU Student

**Examples of AS-L coupled with critical reflection that helps students reframe the way they think about complex social issues:**

- “I come from a middle class upbringing and what struck me was the environment the students were living in... I never was confronted with the problems that faced these students—stabblings, poverty, and evacuation of the school because we learned there was going to be a gang related drive by shooting. *The conditions were terrible, but amazing—a part of America that I didn't even know existed at the time.*” University of Washington Student
- “I learned what it meant to look at an issue and break it down, to see the interconnectedness and the complexity of an issue such as homelessness, to brainstorm and initiate strategies that addressed root causes and to avoid slapping a band-aid on a symptom...” Clark Atlanta University Student

**There are several strategies to accomplish AS-L. They are:**

- Learning goals are integrated or built into the course content,
- Project focused courses with a faculty mentor, a well-defined practicum and a journal that is part of a specialized credit-based course. (At CWU EDSC 309 and 509 and FCS 309 and 509 open to all students)
- Student directed Service-Learning.

**Academic Service-learning integration accomplishes the following:**

- Promotes active learning,
- Connects students and learning outside the classroom and the world,
- Offers excellent opportunities to integrate and synthesize knowledge—theory to practice
- Provides opportunities to understand and learn about cultural diversity,
- Fosters civic literacy and responsibility.

**The value of using the AS-L Pedagogy is multifaceted because it:**

- Is an effective teaching and learning strategy,
- Provides opportunities for service to assist with community needs
- Motivates students to learn,
- Aids in personal development,
- Helps students connect to others,
- Helps students develop a commitment to active citizenship,
- Enhances an understanding of issues and subject matter,
- Helps students apply knowledge and skills learned in one setting to other settings,
- Is effective when coupled with critical reflection as it helps students reframe the way they think about complex issues,
- Helps students explore and prepare for a career

Revised on 12-4-01:JGP

*Jan*

**Academic Service Learning  
at  
Central Washington University**

**1. What is Academic Service Learning?**

We consider academic service-learning to be a course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of the course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility (Bingle and Hatcher, 1995).

**2. What are the CWU Academic Service Learning Priorities for 2001-2002?**

- Facilitate adoption of a definition for Academic Service Learning that is used consistently by campus and community partners.
- Develop and implement a strategic plan for institutionalizing Academic Service Learning at CWU.
- Increase faculty usage of Academic Service Learning as a teaching pedagogy.
- Increase faculty incentives and rewards for using Academic Service Learning as a teaching pedagogy (merit, promotion and tenure criteria).
- Increase student opportunities for participating in Academic Service Learning activities.
- Increase student incentives and rewards for participating in Academic Service Learning activities.
- Develop and facilitate community partnerships for Academic Service Learning.
- Increase campus internal support for facilitating Academic Service Learning.

**3. What external support is CWU receiving to facilitate Academic Service Learning?**

State and federal grants are used to enhance and facilitate Academic Service Learning at CWU.

- FIPSE - Funding for Improvement of Post Secondary Education Faculty Fellow Program - Supports ten faculty per year, for three years in utilizing Academic Service Learning as a teaching pedagogy. \$15,000 per year  
for three years
- Higher Education Board - Work Study Project - Students are paid and/or receive university credit for helping faculty conduct research and serve communities. \$37,500 per year  
for two years
- Campus Compact
  - A. Faculty Professional Development - funding is used to support Travel for professional development for Academic Service Learning Faculty Fellows. \$4,333 per year  
for three years
  - B. Partners in Service - training program for faculty, students and community partners. \$2,500 for one year
  - C. Building Virtual Service Learning Partnerships - supports University consultation with national leaders. \$500 for one year

**4. What internal support is CWU using to facilitate Academic Service Learning?**

- College of Education and Professional Studies provides a total of 10.5 credits of reassigned time per year to Pappas and Bowers for facilitating grant projects and for providing campus leadership for Academic Service Learning. Dr. Pappas has been appointed to serve as the Director for Academic Service Learning.
- Office of Graduate Studies and Research is providing a \$2,500 cash match for grant project activities.
- College Deans recommend and encourage faculty participation in the Faculty Fellow Program.

**Roll Call 2001-02  
Faculty Senate Meeting: December 5, 2001**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ADAMSON	Karen	<input type="checkbox"/>	HOLTFRETER	Robert
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ALSOSZATAI-PETHEO	John	<input type="checkbox"/>	FUENTES	Agustin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BEAGHAN	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/>	VACANT	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BOWMAN	Andrea	<input type="checkbox"/>	JONES	Kim
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BRAUNSTEIN	<b>Lori</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	LOCHRIE	Mary
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BRAUNSTEIN	<b>Michael</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PALMQUIST	Bruce
<input type="checkbox"/>	BRYAN	Patrick	<input type="checkbox"/>	SUN	Lixing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BURNHAM	Tim	<input type="checkbox"/>	VACANT	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CANNCASCIATO	Daniel	<input type="checkbox"/>	JORGENSON	Jan
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAPLES	Minerva	<input type="checkbox"/>	BUTTERFIELD	Carol
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CARBAUGH	Robert	<input type="checkbox"/>	GHOSH	Koushik
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CHALMERS	Stephen	<input type="checkbox"/>	BACH	Glen
<input type="checkbox"/>	COLEMAN	Bea	<input type="checkbox"/>	OGDEN	Michael
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	COOK	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/>	HECKART	Beverly
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CULJAK	Toni	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ABDALLA	Laila
<input type="checkbox"/>	DELGADO	Cyril	<input type="checkbox"/>	SALYER	Keith
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DONAHOE	Susan	<input type="checkbox"/>	HARPER	Jim
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ENGLUND	Timothy <i>-no note</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	STAHESKI	Anthony
<input type="checkbox"/>	EUBANKS	James <i>notebook</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIRBURN	Wayne
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GUNN	Gerald	<input type="checkbox"/>	BENDER	William
<input type="checkbox"/>	HOLDEN	Lad	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	Michael
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HUBBARD	Brenda	<input type="checkbox"/>	ALWIN	John
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HUCKABAY	James	<input type="checkbox"/>	DUGAN	Jack
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	JOHNSON	Kirk	<input type="checkbox"/>	DIAZ	Anthony
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KURTZ	Martha	<input type="checkbox"/>	DRAKE	George
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LI	<b>Charles X.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DIPPMANN	Jefferey
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LI	<b>Chen-yang</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GAZIS	Carey
<input type="checkbox"/>	MELBOURNE	Tim	<input type="checkbox"/>	BRANSDORFER	Rodney
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NELSON	Joshua	<input type="checkbox"/>	D'ACQUISTO	Leo
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NETHERY	Vince	<input type="checkbox"/>	REASONS	Charles
<input type="checkbox"/>	OLIVERO	Michael	<input type="checkbox"/>	BROOKS	Joe
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	REHKOPF	Carrie	<input type="checkbox"/>	BRADLEY	James
<input type="checkbox"/>	RICHMOND	Lynn	<input type="checkbox"/>	WIRTH	Rex
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCARTH	Alyssa	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GELLENBECK	Ed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCHAEFER	Todd	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SNEDEKER	Jefferey
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHWING	James	<input type="checkbox"/>	PLOURDE	Lee
<input type="checkbox"/>	SINGH	Vijay	<input type="checkbox"/>	PENICK	Jeff
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SUTTON	Jessica	<input type="checkbox"/>	BUERGEL	Nancy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WILLIAMS	<b>Henry</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WILLIAMS	<b>Wendy</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WYATT	Marla			

**Quorum: 21**

Date: December 5, 2001

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Amber Eagar - observer

Please sign your name if you are not a Faculty Senator.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER  
FINANCIAL RECORDS SYSTEM (FRS)

PETTY CASH REIMBURSEMENT/RECEIPT

I. REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT:

TO: \_\_\_\_\_

PETTY CASH STATION \_\_\_\_\_

FROM: \_\_\_\_\_

DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_

DESCRIPTION

AMOUNT

*Supplies picked by Senate meeting*

Tax

TOTAL -1 25 25 - 53 LTD

\$ 32.97

FRS ACCOUNT CODE

I certify that the item(s) listed above (from attached original receipted sales slip) were purchased and paid for by me and are a proper charge to the state of Washington, Central Washington University, and the departmental account shown above.

*James Bradshaw*  
SIGNATURE OF PURCHASER

12/5/01  
Date

*James Bradshaw*  
AUTHORIZED DEPT. SIGNATURE

II. RECEIPT OF REIMBURSEMENT:

Payee's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

1/1  
Date

P C F Custodian's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

CWU ACC-002 (REV. 4/90)

FRED MEYER

Ellensburg 509-962-0500

WHAT'S ON YOUR LIST TODAY?

UPC/SKU/PLU	ITEM	PRICE
2072650000	TURKEY SAND	3.49 B
2073470000	AU GRATIN	2.99 T
7110000577	HV RANCH 16Z	2.89 F
1 @ 2/4.00	4116539020 SOLO CUPS	2.00 T*
1 @ 2/4.00	4116539020 SOLO CUPS	2.00 T*
	1111084426 FM KETCHUP	.88 F
	3040002380 MD TISSUE	.99 T
	4390994334 BASTER	2.39 T
1 @ 2/1.00	1111041691 FM 1% MILK	.50 F
	2833229524 TABLECLOTH	7.99 T*
	7644069869 A/H PITCHER	8.99 T*
	7644069869 A/H PITCHER	8.99 T*

\*\*\*\* TAX 3.07 BAL 47.17  
\*\*\*\*\*  
0652 - Ellensburg  
201 South Water 29.97  
Ellensburg, WA 98926

12/04/01 20:32  
OPR# 888000 TERM 003 TRAN 148

DEBIT CARD 4862  
REF # PAYMENT  
SEQUENCE # 030823

Total Purchase 47.17

\*\*\*\*\*  
DEBIT CARD 47.17  
CHANGE .00  
TOTAL NUMBER OF ITEMS SOLD = 12  
12/04/01 8:32 PM 0652 03 0148 888000

CCK RANG YOUR ORDER TODAY

KEEP THIS RECEIPT FOR HASSLE FREE REFUNDS OR ADJUSTMENTS

**FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING**  
**Wednesday, December 5, 2001, 3:10 p.m.**  
**BARGE 412**  
**AGENDA**

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. MOTION NO. 01-56: CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
- V. REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS (30 Minutes)

**Chair**

Motion No. 01-57: "That grades 31, 32, 33 and their associated steps (3% per grade and 1% per step) be added to the faculty salary scale."

**Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee**

Motion No. 01-58: "Addition of a physical education, health education, and leisure services program: minor in exercise science attached as Exhibit A."

**Faculty Senate Academic Affairs' Committee**

Delayed Motion No. 01-55: "Revisions to section 5-9.23 of the *Central Washington University Policies Manual* attached as Exhibit B."

**Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee**

Motion No. 01-59: "Recommendation to distribute the \$100,000 faculty development funds attached as Exhibit C."

Motion No. 01-60: "Change the name of the Faculty Senate Research and Development committee to Faculty Senate Development and Appropriations committee." Rationale attached as Exhibit D.

VI. REPORTS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 1. CHAIR (10 Minutes)
- 2. CHAIR ELECT (10 Minutes)
- 3. PRESIDENT (10 Minutes)
- 4. FACULTY SALARY BASE REPORT: Provost David Soltz, (15 minutes)
- 5. ACADEMIC SERVICE LEARNING: Jim Pappas, Professor, Teacher Education Programs (5 minutes)
- 6. STUDENT REPORT (5 Minutes)
- 7. SENATE CONCERNS (5 Minutes)
- 8. SENATE COMMITTEES (10 Minutes)
  - Academic Affairs Committee: Susan Donahoe
  - Budget Committee: Thomas Yeh
  - Code Committee: David Dauwalder
  - Curriculum Committee: Toni Čuljak
  - General Education: Carey Gazis
  - Personnel Committee: Rob Perkins
  - Public Affairs Committee/Council of Faculty Representatives: Michael Braunstein
  - Research and Development: Charles Li

- VII. OLD BUSINESS
- VIII. NEW BUSINESS
- IX. ADJOURNMENT

**\*\*\*NEXT REGULAR SENATE MEETING: January 9, 2002\*\*\***  
**BARGE 412**

## Exhibit A

New Program: PEHLS – Minor in Exercise Science

### Physical Education, Health Education and Leisure Services minor in Exercise Science

**Rationale:** Inquiries are regularly received from students majoring in other disciplines including nutrition, community health, and biology about a minor in Exercise Science. The response to date has been to provide a number of classes from the current Exercise Science major that would be useful for them to take as general electives. This proposal requests the formalizing of a listing of classes appropriate for a minor to meet the desire of students interested in Exercise Science as a secondary area.

There are no new courses being added for this minor.

There is no impact on departmental load as students will be absorbed into the current offerings of the listed classes. There will be no additional costs.

A total of 20-25 students are estimated to be involved in this minor program at any one time and they will assimilate into the classes as they are offered to the Exercise Science majors. Several classes already have additional lab fees associated with them. No additional course fees beyond those currently in place will be imposed.

#### Program as it is proposed to be offered:

##### Required Courses:

PE 250	Anatomical Kinesiology	5 Credits
PE 254	Foundations of Fitness	3 Credits
PE 351	Scientific Foundations of Health & Fitness	5 Credits
PE 450	Physiology of Exercise	5 Credits
PE 455	Fitness Assessment & Exercise Prescription	5 Credits

##### Select from one of the following:

PE 360	Scientific Principles of Strength Training (4)
PE 456	Exercise Programming for Special Populations (4)
PE 457	Exercise Adherence Strategies (3)

Total Credits Required	26-27 Credits
------------------------	---------------



## Exhibit B

Proposed change:

### 5-9.4.23 Incompletes

5-9.4.23.1 An "I" means the student was not able to complete the course by the end of the term, but has satisfactorily completed a sufficient portion of it and can be expected to finish without having to re-enroll in it.

5-9.4.23.2 To earn a grade, work of for the course must be completed as prescribed by the instructor by the indicated date on Report of Incomplete form on forms filed in the appropriate department office. After the date indicated on the form, up to a year, the instructor may file a Change of Grade form with the Registrar.

5-9.4.23.3 As report of Incomplete forms are filled out by the instructor, copies of the report are placed on file with the department, with the registrar, and sent to the student.

5-9.4.23.3.4 If a date is not indicated on the Report of Incomplete, and the work it is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will automatically convert to an "F."

~~5-9.4.23.4.5~~ Students may not re-register for a course in which they receive a grade of incomplete.

~~5-9.4.23.6~~ It is the student's responsibility to contact the professor and make arrangements as to how to change the grade of Incomplete.

### Rationale:

The charge to the Academic Affairs Committee was to clarify the following:

5-9.4.23.2 To earn a grade, work of the course must be completed as prescribed by the instructor on forms filed in the appropriate department office.

5-9.4.23.3 If it is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will convert to an "F."

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate respectfully reports on the proposed changes to assigning an Incomplete. Tracy Schwindt visited the committee and discussed due dates for incompletes and conversion to an "F." There is confusion on dates set by faculty and dates in the catalog that give the student the end of one calendar year for conversion to an "F" if work is not completed.

The committee felt that often a date is given for a particular reason by the instructor, but the policy provides for a year as it is now stated. To clarify and to inform the student of university expectations and to allow the faculty to make the decision on date, the Incomplete Form must have more meaning. We discovered the registrar cannot monitor dates except by quarter which can automatically turn "I" to "F" at one year unless a Grade Change form is used. Therefore, we suggest the following additions to the policy clarifying what will happen and allowing the instructor to change the grade by the indicated date on the Incomplete Form.

### **Exhibit C**

The Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee met two times in the fall quarter and, at its November 14, 2001 meeting, passed the following recommendation to distribute the \$100,000 faculty development funds as follows:

1. \$24,000 distributed evenly to academic departments (excluding Military Science/ROTC and Aerospace Studies/AFROTC).
2. \$60,000 distributed to academic departments (excluding Military Science/ROTC and Aerospace Studies/AFROTC), with each department receiving an amount proportional to its annual teaching FTE, using the most recent staffing data.
3. \$500 to Military Science/ROTC.
4. \$500 to Aerospace Studies /AFROTC.
5. The above funds are to be used exclusively for individual faculty development. In order to receive these monies, each department must provide a rationale and explanation for the use of these funds.
6. \$15,000 for projects intended to serve the faculty development needs of the university as a whole (rather than the needs of individual faculty members or departments). Specific criteria and application for using this fund are to be discussed at the Committee's January 12, 2001 meeting.

The \$100,000 faculty professional development funds for this year have been transferred into the Faculty Senate account. It is ready to be distributed as soon as a formula has been approved by the Faculty Senate.

### **Exhibit D**

The Faculty Senate Research and Development Committee proposes to change our committee's name to "Faculty Senate Development and Appropriations Committee" to better reflect the charges of the committee and to avoid possible confusion with the "Faculty Development and Research Committee" in the Office of the Graduate Studies and Research.