

2-3-1993

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 02/03/1993

Sue Tirota

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Tirota, Sue, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 02/03/1993" (1993). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 708.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/708>

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).

Presiding Officer: Barney Erickson  
Recording Secretary: Sue Tirota

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

#### ROLL CALL

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Carbaugh, Cummings, Killorn, Relan, Ringe and Zetterberg.  
Visitors: Gary Frederick, Jan Johnson, Gerald Stacy, Carolyn Wells, Terry Devietti, Warren Street, Kent Richards, Anne Denman, Connie Roberts, Jim Pappas and Corwin King.

#### CHANGES TO AGENDA

Delete President's Report (#3) -- President is out of town; delete Grade Distribution report by Academic Affairs Committee.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

\*MOTION NO. 2886 Rob Perkins moved and Jim Ponzetti seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the January 13, 1993 Faculty Senate meeting with the following changes in the numbering of motions: 2877 becomes 2882; 2878 becomes 2883; 2879 becomes 2884; 2880 becomes 2885. Motion passed.

#### COMMUNICATIONS

-1/18/93 memo from Academic Affairs Committee regarding Grade Distribution. Referred to Executive Committee.  
-1/21/93 letter from Dan Ramsdell, History, regarding 1993-94 professional leaves. Referred to Executive Committee.  
-1/26/93 memo from Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators regarding recommendations concerning survey. Referred to Executive Committee.  
-1/27/93 memo from Academic Affairs Committee regarding proposed reorganization of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences. Referred to Executive Committee. See Academic Affairs Committee report below.

#### REPORTS

1.

##### CHAIR

-Chair Erickson reminded the Senate that elections for the 1993-94 Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be held at the last Senate meeting of Winter quarter (March 10, 1993), per Senate Bylaws section III.A. Current Executive Committee membership is: Barney Erickson (Math), Chair; Alan Taylor (Communication), Vice Chair; Erlice Killorn (PE), Secretary; Jim Ponzetti (Home Economics), At-Large Member; Don Ringe (Geology), At-Large Member; Charles McGehee (Sociology), Past Chair. Nominations from the floor for Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and the two At Large positions will be entertained at the February 24, 1993, Faculty Senate meeting. Before making a nomination, please contact your candidate and ascertain that he or she would be willing and able to serve if elected. It should be noted that the Faculty Senate Chair receives 50% released time from departmental duties (Faculty Code section 7.25C.). The deadline for departmental election of Faculty Senators [beginning service June 15, 1993] is February 15, 1993.

-The Chair reported that it has become increasingly difficult to arrange university committee meetings due to faculty scheduling conflicts. He therefore recommended to the Deans' Council that a block of time be set aside during which faculty members would not be asked to teach classes and could be considered available for committee service, which may count toward the 20% nonteaching workload required of faculty (Faculty Code 7.20B.2.). The Deans' Council established 3:00-5:00 p.m. Thursdays as a common meeting time for all university standing committees beginning Fall 1993. The Provost instructed Deans, Department Chairs and Program Directors in a January 13, 1993, memo to "schedule classes for the 3:00 to 5:00 meeting time on Thursdays only for faculty who do not serve on university committees, including renewable and part-time faculty." The Faculty Senate meeting time of 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. on Wednesdays is not affected by this scheduling change.

-The Senate Executive Committee has so far been unsuccessful in recruiting a Faculty Legislative Representative for 1993.

-Chair Erickson noted that the Executive Committee is examining the implications for the Faculty Senate of university department/program reorganization.

1. CHAIR, continued

-Senator Charles McGehee (Sociology), chair of the Provost Search Committee, reported that the five Provost candidates have completed their visits to the C.W.U. campus. The Search Committee met on February 1 to review the written evaluations of the candidates by faculty, staff, students and others and plans to deliver an oral summary report to President Nelson on February 4. Senator McGehee stated that the President has asked that the Committee not formally rank order the finalists. The Committee plans to send a representative to one or more campuses of the selected finalist(s).

2. DIVERSITY ACTION PLANS COMMITTEE

Jim Pappas (Dean of Academic Services), Chair of the Diversity Action Plans Committee [Keith Champagne, Assistant Vice President for Diversity/Student Affairs; Bobby Cummings, English; Nancy Howard, Director of Affirmative Action; Charles McGehee, Sociology; Rosie Zwanziger, Director of Special Services/Access Program], reported that the Committee has invited comments on the university's "Diversity Action Draft Report of Goals and Strategies." Copies of the draft report have been distributed to all department offices and have been placed on file for review at the Library circulation desk. The Committee also held public forums for discussion of the draft on January 28 and 29. Dean Pappas invited comments and questions from the Faculty Senate.

3. PROVOST  
SUMMER SESSION POLICY MANUAL

Don Schliesman, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, reported that a new "Summer Session Policy Manual" has been approved by the Deans' Council. The Provost stated that development of the policy manual resulted from the reorganization of Summer Session management under the Schools/College deans. He explained that the policy manual was largely derived from the "Summer Session Handbook," but it includes general policies rather than detailed procedures and deadlines. He noted a new section on class size states that "policies governing minimum class size enrollments during Fall, Winter and Spring quarters shall apply to the Summer Session" [minimum class size of 20 students in lower division courses; minimum class size of 12 students in upper division courses; minimum class size of 8 students in Graduate courses; and including exceptions to this policy]. The Provost reported that the manual is available in all department offices, and he asked that faculty review it for errors and omissions and bring them to his attention. The manual is subject to change as we gain experience with the current management system for summer school.

1993-94 PROFESSIONAL LEAVE

The Provost reported that the Faculty Development and Research Committee [Ray Riznyk, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research - CHAIR; Connie Nott, Business Administration; Phil Garrison, English; Dolores Osborn, BEAM; Glenn Madsen, Education; Warren Street, Psychology; Peter Saunders, Economics] was asked to assume the duties of the Professional and Retraining Leave Committee (Faculty Code section 9.00). The Faculty Development and Research Committee received 17 professional leave applications for 1993-94, reviewed the leave requests per Faculty Code guidelines, and submitted a rank ordering of the 17 applications to the Provost.

The Provost explained that:

When it became obvious that there would be far fewer applications for professional leave approved or recommended, then it was necessary for us to decide how we would arrive at the number that was to be recommended. And we were talking at that point about four leaves being approved. So, sitting with the deans, we looked at the 17 names in priority order from the Committee, and it seemed to me that if we were going to have such a few number of leaves awarded and if we were going to restrict that much, that priority ought to go to faculty who had never received any. And that's what I suggested to the deans: that priority go to those faculty who had never received a leave. Because there were people whose names on the list who had had leaves before -- one leave, two leaves. And it seemed to me that, thinking of our professional leave program as a faculty development program, that it's important for us to do the very best we can do in helping to develop, and provide opportunities for development, for as many faculty as possible. And so I felt quite strongly about giving priority to people who had not had leaves previously, in determining four. There was concern raised by at least one dean and raised by me about more than one person from a department being gone next year. So we agreed that a second priority would

3. PROVOST, continued

be no more than one leave per department, and that those two criteria would be applied within the priority order recommended by the committee. And so that's what we did. The number one person on the priority list, for example, had leave before, so that name [was] dropped. The second one had not had a leave, was the only one from that department; [so] that one was included. The next one had not, was the only one from that department; that name was included. The next one had had two leaves before; that [was] dropped. That's how we went down the list. And that's how we arrived at four names. Now, a number of people are quite upset about [what we did]. Upset not only because of establishing that kind of priority, but because I didn't [follow] the priority order recommended by the Committee. And I can understand that they're upset. [It was] a lot of work on their part, going through all of the applications. [Senator Charles McGehee: Could you repeat that last sentence? You did not follow the order?] That's right. We did not. For example, if there were only going to be four leaves, the thing that I think the Committee might have wanted us to do was to take the top four, and that's it. [Senator Charles McGehee: No, you pointed out how you removed certain... But did you reverse order, for instance?] No, we followed [the] priority order applying those other two criteria. And I've received a number of letters from people complaining about it and challenging what we did, and I've received letters expressing appreciation for what we've done and letters saying it was the right thing to do. I believe quite strongly that it's very important for people who have not had leaves, in this particular situation, with the conditions under which we were faced, be given priority. I've talked with a lot of faculty about that, and I've heard support for that all over the place. Now, I recognize that the criteria we applied are not in the Code. The Code criteria speak to the Committee's responsibilities and the Committee's actions, and the Committee is asked and instructed by the Code to make a 'recommendation' -- it doesn't say 'directive' -- to the Provost. And so that's how I accepted [its work]: as a 'recommendation.' There are some conditions that come into play that the Committee may not have known about. The Committee...had, I assume, the application on which to base its judgment. But when we think of the professional leave program as a faculty development program, then there are other concerns that have to come in beyond just 'how well is this application written?' For example, it may very well be, and was the case, that there was a faculty member that the dean felt strongly needed ...development. It seems to me there's an obligation to try to help those people. And that's part of what professional development is about. That's part of what the professional leave program is about, it seems to me. And it seems to me it's on the basis of that that we fight for the professional leave. It's coming under attack, as you know, nationally and certainly in this state. Most recently...word came in from the HEC Board [that] they're initiating a faculty load study. Next July they're starting it, a two and half year study. One of the things they're...recommending [is] to do away with professional leaves. I don't think we can let that happen. But I think we fight for it on the basis of faculty development, not reward for having done a good job. Several letters came in to me that talked about 'I've done this... I've been honored by this... I've done 24 years' work that's been very good... And I deserve a professional leave.' ...I had to say professional leave is not a reward program. Being recommended or not recommended for professional leave does not make any kind of statement about past performance, it seems to me. Past performance speaks for itself, and quite well, particularly in those cases. So then I sent out letters to 13 people saying 'I'm sorry, your name is not being forwarded,' and to four people saying 'Your name is being forwarded.' ...At that time we were talking about a Board of Trustees meeting in January, [which later]...was cancelled. ...The President said to me 'I'm approving these four applications for professional leave, so you can go ahead and tell the four people and the deans and chairs that those leaves will be approved and I will be asking the Board of Trustees for ratification [of my] action at the next meeting.' Since then I've been responding to the letters that I've gotten [about my recommendation]. ...I'm keeping those letters...to share those with the President...so that the President knows how people feel about the professional leave program. That's where we are, and that's

3. PROVOST, continued

how we got there.

Senator Jim Ponzetti, Home Economics, asked if the Provost had been in touch with the other state universities to ascertain whether they were also curtailing their professional leave programs. The Provost replied that, as of the November Interinstitutional Committee of Academic Officers (ICAO) meeting, there was generally little indication that the other state colleges/universities would be offering fewer professional leaves. Provost Schliesman added that the budget situation for the next biennium is very uncertain and referred to provisions in the Faculty Code [section 9.15.A.: "The awarding of professional leaves is dependent upon internal academic decisions involving class scheduling, replacement personnel and budgetary constraints."] The Provost reported that the Governor's Office has indicated in both Book 1 and Book 2 budgets that state universities need to cut back on the number of professional leaves, and the HEC Board has recently talked about doing away with professional leaves. The Provost indicated that there have also been an unusually large number of student complaints this year regarding students' inability to get into courses, and since part of the Provost's job is to assure that a sufficient number of class sections are offered, fewer faculty can be spared from teaching assignments. He stated that some courses must be cancelled or temporary faculty hired to teach them when faculty are granted leave.

Senator Ken Hammond, Geography, asked the Provost under what conditions "it became obvious that there would be fewer leaves recommended." The Provost replied that "it became obvious to us because we didn't believe that more than four would be recommended." Senator Hammond asked the Provost "why didn't you believe that?" The Provost replied "because that's what we heard. I don't think it's necessary [to state from whom]; I think it's well known." Senator Hammond stated that

I'd like to have you put it on the record. I think that's the right thing to do. In addition, all of us have concerns about next year. We have concerns about every year. But I think it's just preposterous on its face for you to say that the Code gives restrictions on what can be considered by the Committee or that you can do anything that you want. If you can put in additional steps and additional criteria, then there is no procedure. At least there's no agreed upon procedure. And furthermore, to eliminate a group of people based upon their class -- that is, they have had a leave before -- violates specifically section 9.10 [Professional Leave -- Eligibility] of the Code which mentions an equal basis, and it specifically mentions both groups of people: 'those who have served 6 years, 18 full-time quarters and those who have been employed by the university 6 calendar quarters and served 18 full-time quarters since their last professional leave.' It says 'those who have served 18 quarters are eligible. To take one group and say 'Well, you can apply but you're not going to get one' is a violation of the Code, a violation of due process... The Code [section 9.35A.] says that 'Final recommendations regarding candidates for professional leave made by the Professional Leave Committee [nee Faculty Development and Research Committee] to the provost and vice president for academic affairs shall be presented to the president of the university and the Board of Trustees for final approval.'

The Provost replied "I didn't violate that." Senator Hammond continued: There is no provision for an additional step in the process, and if you can add one step, you can add six or ten. If you can add one condition, you can add five, and you can make them up every year. That's why a process is set out. To prevent that kind of chicanery, to prevent that kind of manipulation.

The Provost replied, "Well, I didn't read it as a violation of the Code." Senator Hammond replied, "I'm sure you didn't, and I'm not actually certain what will happen to it, but it certainly has to be tested."

Senator Vince Nethery, PE, asked who constituted the "we" referred to by the Provost and responsible for adding the final two criteria. Provost Schliesman replied that "we" referred to the Provost and the three academic deans. Senator Charles McGehee stated that a similar situation occurred last year when the Committee itself interjected last minute, unpublished, additional criteria for summer research grants, and it is the Code's intent to make all criteria known in advance. He added that, historically, competition for leaves and grants has been based upon the merits of the proposal.

Senator Hammond quoted one of the four major criteria for recommendation for leave from Faculty Code section 9.20C.2.: "Ability of applicant to achieve the goals

3. PROVOST, continued

of the project or plan as based on past experience and academic background." He stated that this is in direct opposition to the Provost's statement that leave should not be based on good work. The Provost stated that professional leave should not be used as a "reward system" based upon good work.

Senator John Brangwin, ASCWU/BOD, stated that those who were not granted leave may be twisting the interpretation of the Code to their own purposes. He praised the Provost for figuring out how to make the difficult selection and for making students' need for classes a high priority.

Senator Barry Donahue, Computer Science, pointed out to Senator Brangwin the importance of knowing evaluation criteria in advance. Senator Donahue added that the Code [section 9.20] specifies the Professional and Retraining Leave Committee [see Faculty Development and Research Committee] will be "constituted of tenured, full-time faculty members," and this has been violated. The Provost responded that the Code has not been updated to the recent changes in committee structure.

Senator Hammond stated that a continuing policy of allowing only one leave per faculty member may encourage qualified faculty to leave Central after receiving their allotted leave. He speculated that, if all of the highest ranked applicants were eliminated based on the new criteria, the lowest ranked applicants would receive leave. Senator McGehee stated that the process as conducted this year is potentially destructive to the professional leave program and will lead to both diminished quality and a further erosion of legislative/HEC Board confidence. The Provost replied that if more leaves had been awarded, additional criteria would probably not have been added.

Senator Donahue observed that an argument has been made by the administration in the past that salary savings are realized when faculty go on leave. The Provost explained that Central has a higher student/faculty ratio now, and more teaching faculty are required on campus. Senator Russ Hansen, Law and Justice, noted the Provost's statement that professional leave programs are under attack from external sources, and he asked how the faculty could differentiate between external assaults and internal attacks like this one, which violates the Faculty Code.

Warren Street, Psychology, [Faculty Development and Research Committee member] stated:

I came today because I'm a member of the Committee whose work was disregarded by the Deans' Council and the Provost in making these decisions. When we were notified of the results of the professional leave awards, we were uniformly outraged and disappointed by the final actions that were taken. That out of our list of 17 rank ordered proposals ---- rank ordered by consideration of their merits and prospective benefits to the university -- that those ranked second, third, ninth and thirteenth were the ones that had been awarded. The awards, as the Provost has rightly said, were made first on the basis of having received a prior award; second, if you were the highest ranked person without a prior award in your department, then only one per department was funded, regardless of the size of the department; and then, finally, the last consideration was our rank ordering of the merit of the proposal. The point has already been made by Charlie [McGehee] that it's just exactly this sort of procedure that will discredit the faculty [leave] program. When the awards are made on some basis other than the merit of the proposal and the benefit that will accrue to the university -- its faculty and students -- but instead made on arbitrary and unannounced grounds, there isn't an observer around that wouldn't say 'the university's not taking this seriously.' In the past, faculty have sometimes been suspected by legislators and the general public of regarding the professional leave or sabbatical program as a 'vacation:' 'You get to take this whole year off and they pay you!' Well, our professional leave Committee regarded this not as a vacation, but as a serious faculty development effort. We tried to choose those that we thought would best benefit the university and ranked them high. And it was the administration and the Deans' Council that regarded it as a trivial affair, and the award would be made on some basis other than the best interests of the university and the state. I found it ironic that during this presentation the Provost mentioned that he suspected that we made our decisions based on the merits of the proposal and reading the proposals. I'm not sure at all whether the Deans' Council read each of those programs. It took us about eight hours to read through these 17 proposals and rate them on the four criteria that we had been given and that had been announced to the applicants beforehand. At one point in his presentation, the Provost said

3. PROVOST, continued

that it was justified to choose first time applicants instead of those who had more meritorious proposals because this was a 'faculty development' program. Well, there is a way for first time applicants to win one of these awards, and that is to arrange ahead of time for professional leave activities that will be so impressive that the university will award the leave. You can actually, if you're a first time, write a meritorious proposal. That's how to get the proposal funded if you're a first timer. Two of the four awards that were given this year, would have been given in any event because those two people were ranked second and third in our 17 applicants. So this gives us evidence that first timers are certainly capable of competing on even terms with people who have had awards in the past. For those other two that were awarded, there is a way to get an award, and that is, write a meritorious proposal. Decide on something ahead of time that will return benefits to the university, show that you know what you're going to do when you leave. And we weren't convinced in the case of, as it turns out, two who have been funded, that they had a secure idea of what they were going to do and the benefits that would return to us. The Provost has said that it was necessary for us to reduce the number of professional leaves, but I'm still unconvinced that there's anything about current procedure that's going to return a great deal more money to the university than if what has become the 'usual' 12 professional leaves were given. At this rate, with four professional leaves a year and 300 faculty to spread them among, it would mean that you'd work your way through the faculty at the rate of one professional leave every 75 years. It would take 75 years to award a professional leave to every faculty member if we go at the rate of four a year. What this will mean is that if that number maintains constancy over the years and if there's a preference for first timers, then we should tell all the faculty who apply for positions here that half of you will receive one professional leave sometime during your career here. The other half of you will receive none. And, of those that do receive one, you better make sure that it's someplace you really want to go because it's the last professional leave you'll ever see. And finally, to address the concerns of the student representative and the Provost that we need people to teach classes, that's certainly true. What one could do is spring loose some of the 25% of the faculty salary that's retained to hire people to teach those classes. Now, a second consideration is that I hope that people would want to take classes from faculty who have had some professional contact with the world outside the Kittitas valley sometime during the years since they left graduate school. And given this professional leave procedure, there's no guarantee that that would take place. We'd have a professoriate made up of people who had never seen the light of day outside the Kittitas valley for their entire professional careers. And I'm not sure that students want to take classes, no matter how abundant, from a faculty like that.

Chair Erickson pointed out that the Deans' Council, which includes the Faculty Senate Chair, was not involved in this professional leave process, and it was never discussed in a Deans' Council meeting. Only the three academic deans and the Provost were involved in the discussion and the decision making process. In response to questions regarding whether the issue was discussed "behind closed doors," the Provost answered in the affirmative.

Warren Street added:

In addition to telling applicants for faculty positions they have one-half chance of getting a professional leave, I think that it would be a good idea to tell people who volunteer for committee service such as this what the fate of their work is likely to be. It could make a difference to many of us. You were saying earlier that you were having trouble getting committees together. It may not be very important.

Senator Peter Burkholder, Philosophy, stated that "as a matter of civility, it would have been nice to have informed potential applicants that there would very likely have been just a small number of awards this year." He asked the Provost if that could have been done, and the Provost replied that it would have been possible. He quoted from a letter that he sent to the Faculty Development and Research Committee:

You need to know that we are restricted by state law to no more than 4% of our faculty on professional leave each year. During 1992-93, that would be about 14 FTE. If we are required to reduce budgets during the next biennium,

3. PROVOST, continued

the maximum FTE could be less in 1993-94. For every percentage point reduction in budget that we have, we estimate approximately 3 FTE faculty. If we are required to reduce budgets next year, it may not be possible for the President to recommend that the Board of Trustees approve any leaves. However, it will be several months before we are certain of our level of state support for the next two years. In the meantime, we'll move ahead with evaluation of applications.

Senator Dan Ramsdell, History, observed that a tremendous amount of good will among the faculty has been lost as a result of these actions, both in the prioritizing and reduced number of leaves. The Provost concurred. Senator Hammond remarked that even if the Provost's letter [above] had gone to the potential leave applicants, they would have had no way of knowing that they were going to be disqualified on arbitrary grounds that were unknown to them. He reiterated that the good will of the faculty is vital to the productivity and efficiency of the university.

Senator Donahue asked the Provost if he felt that the President supports a strong professional leave program. The Provost stated his belief that the President "will support a professional leave program." Senator McGehee questioned the Provost whether a decision has been made that no faculty should ever have more than one leave per career. The Provost replied that he was unaware of any such position or decision. Senator Hammond asked how four leaves were settled on, rather than five. The Provost replied that the number four was "a negotiation between something and nothing."

Senator Ed Golden, Business Administration, expressed concern about reducing the number of leaves at this time because it gives an impression of balancing the budget with faculty leave. He asked the Provost why faculty leave in particular is being so greatly reduced and how many dollars are actually being saved by cutting leaves from a theoretical 14 [Faculty Code section 9.15C] to four. The Provost replied that he did not know how much money was being saved, but he stressed that 13 faculty on leave would translate to 117 sections not being taught next year, of which only 29 sections could be covered by the 25% salary savings. Senator Nethery stated that this rationale is invalid because professional leaves are offered every year, so no sections are really being "lost." Senator Hammond agreed with the Provost about the need for more classes and smaller class sizes, but he pointed out that the Provost's letter to those denied leave deals mainly with fiscal matters as the rationale for reducing the number of leaves, and the need for classes is not mentioned.

Gerald Stacy, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, noted that the Governor's Book 2 budget, if approved, will require a 3% "efficiency cut" in the first year, and it is likely that the faculty leaves not awarded can be counted toward this amount.

Kent Richards, History [former Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research], stated that the administration's arguments do not agree with precedents, as in past years, including during Reduction in Funding (RIF) situations, a "normal" number of leaves were maintained. He pointed out that in 1972-73, the stipend for professional leaves was increased from 50% to the current 75%. The 25% salary savings has customarily been used to hire replacements in areas where they are most needed, while peers efficiently cover their department member's workload in their absence, often by unpaid overloads.

Senator Eric Roth, Music, stated that the Provost is working under very difficult circumstances and commended him for his presentation to the Senate. Warren Street indicated that precisely because Central is a "teaching" institution, it is especially vital for its faculty to maintain active, continued contact with their professions and academic specialties outside of the confines of the campus and community. He called for renewal of the faculty through an active professional leave program.

The Provost noted that President Nelson received a letter from Senator Phil Talmadge with appended testimony before the U.S. Congress earlier this year of students and others concerning the cost of higher education. Faculty were criticized as "not doing anything," and the general perception was that higher education "is costing more and we're getting less." The Senator asked President Nelson for his reaction to the testimony and expressed a particular interest in knowing "how many hours per week Central's tenured faculty spend teaching."

Senator Tom Thelen, Biology, cautioned against trying to translate the number of hours spent teaching into the quality of teaching.



3. PROVOST, continued

**\*MOTION NO. 2887** Dan Ramsdell moved and Owen Pratz seconded a motion that the Faculty Senate recommend, retroactive to those leaves approved for 1993-94, restoration of a professional leave policy which will offer opportunity for a great number of grants and is consistent with the existing Faculty Code. Motion passed unanimously.

Senators speculated on the possibility of faculty grievances arising from this issue, and it was pointed out that Faculty Code section 12.25 states that "The Faculty Grievance Committee may accept a petition for review from a group of faculty members when substantially similar or identical complaints are made. The Faculty Grievance Committee shall decide the issue of similarity and identity of complaints."

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OPINIONS

Provost Schliesman reported that, in response to a request by the Senate Code Committee and Senate Executive Committee, he asked Assistant Attorney General Teresa Kulik for an interpretation of Faculty Code sections dealing with the Layoff Policy (section 11.00). In response to the question of whether or not financial exigency was necessary in order to lay off tenured faculty, she replied that financial exigency is not necessary: tenured faculty can be laid off due to program need. The Provost sent copies of Ms. Kulik's January 19, 1993 interpretation to the deans with a request that it be shared with department chairs and faculty.

The Provost also requested an interpretation regarding Faculty Code section 11.30G., "Order of Layoff." The Code states that "Where it is necessary to lay off one or more of the faculty within a particular department, program or unit within a department or program, layoffs will be made in the following order: a) part-time faculty members; b) full-time, non-tenured faculty members in order of seniority; c) full-time tenured faculty members in order of seniority; d) between tenured faculty members with equal seniority, the faculty member who has obtained the highest academic degrees shall have the greatest retention priority." The Provost explained that layoff category (b) is not clear regarding the ranking of 1) full-time, tenure-track faculty and 2) full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, and this distinction has become very important since there are many more faculty now in this second category than there were at the time the Code was written. An interpretation is expected from the Assistant Attorney General in the near future.

4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Academic Affairs Committee member Peter Burkholder stated that university restructuring is a very serious undertaking which should not be rushed into and which should have a well-defined procedure. The Faculty Senate, the faculty, and the entire university community must have adequate opportunity to participate in this process.

**\*MOTION NO. 2888** Peter Burkholder moved that restructuring of academic units within Central Washington University be addressed in Central's strategic plan. However, since the timeline for submission of the strategic plan does not allow for careful consideration of specific proposals, the Faculty Senate recommends that the plan contain detailed procedures for dealing with specific proposals for restructuring. These procedures should include formal participation of the Faculty Senate and of the entire faculty in the deliberations of the restructuring process.

Senators expressed their belief that faculty should always be included in any restructuring/reorganization process and voiced concern that faculty may not be sufficiently involved in current proposals for change. Senator Burkholder reported that the Academic Affairs Committee generally supports faculty involvement in all decision making, regardless of the planning process. He stated that it is not the Academic Affairs Committee's intent with this motion to stop progress toward change but to influence the process by implementing specific procedures that will be known and accepted.

Senators stated that involvement in a reorganization process at this time is premature due to the imminent hiring of a new Provost and new Dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences. When asked why the Committee did not deal specifically in its recommendation with the proposed reorganization of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, Senator Burkholder replied that the Committee was more concerned with an overall, long-term philosophy that would deal with all future efforts toward reorganization. It was questioned whether the Strategic Plan, considering its ongoing, changeable nature, was an appropriate place for such a procedure. It was

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING - February 3, 1993**

4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, continued  
pointed out that the intent of the motion is to affect the restructuring process rather than impede strategic planning. Senators concluded that internal examination and planning by departments is healthy, especially in light of potential budgetary cutbacks, but raised serious concerns that there is no policy in place that encourages administrators to consult the faculty as part of the decision making process.

\*MOTION AMENDMENT 2888A Ken Hammond moved and Rob Perkins seconded a motion to amend MOTION NO. 2888 as follows: "...Restructuring of academic units within Central Washington University [should] be addressed in Central's strategic plan. However, since the timeline for submission of the strategic plan does not allow for careful consideration of specific proposals at this time, the Faculty Senate recommends that no restructuring occur at this time and the plan contain detailed procedures for dealing with specific proposals for restructuring. These procedures should include formal participation of the Faculty Senate and of the entire faculty in the deliberations of the restructuring process." Motion amendment passed unanimously.

Vote was held on MOTION NO. 2888. Motion passed unanimously. Chair Erickson stated that the text of MOTION NO. 2888 would be forwarded to the Strategic Planning Committee, Deans' Council and the President.

5. BUDGET COMMITTEE  
Budget Committee Chair Barry Donahue deferred the Committee's report on a faculty survey regarding the budget process until the February 24 Senate meeting.
6. CODE COMMITTEE - No Report
7. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - No Report
8. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - No Report
9. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - No Report

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS - None

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

\*\*\* NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: February 24, 1993 \*\*\*

**FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING**  
**3:10 p.m., Wednesday, February 3, 1993**  
**SUB 204-205**

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - January 13, 1993**
  - NOTE CHANGE IN MOTION NUMBERING: 2877 becomes 2882; 2878 becomes 2883; 2879 becomes 2884; 2880 becomes 2885.
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS**
  - 1/18/93 memo from Academic Affairs Committee re. Grade Distribution. Referred to Executive Committee. See report below.
  - 1/21/93 letter from Dan Ramsdell, History, re. 1993-94 professional leaves. Referred to Executive Committee.
  - 1/26/93 memo from Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators re. recommendations concerning survey. Referred to Executive Committee.
  - 1/27/93 memo from Academic Affairs Committee. re. proposed reorganization of CLAS. Referred to Executive Committee. See report below.
- IV. REPORTS**
  - 1. **CHAIR**
    - 1993-94 Senate Executive Committee (over)
    - 3:00-5:00 p.m. every Thursday set aside for university committee meetings
  - 2. **DIVERSITY ACTION PLANS COMMITTEE**
    - Jim Pappas, Dean of Academic Services (Chair)
  - 3. **PRESIDENT**
  - 4. **PROVOST**
    - Summer Session Policy Manual
    - Professional Leave
    - Faculty Code Interpretation by Assistant Attorney General Teresa Kulik - Layoff Policy
  - 5. **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**
    - Proposed Reorganization of College of Letters, Arts and Sciences (motion attached)
    - Grade Distribution
  - 6. **BUDGET COMMITTEE**
    - Faculty Survey regarding Budget Process
  - 7. **CODE COMMITTEE**
  - 8. **CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**
  - 9. **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**
  - 10. **PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**
- VI. OLD BUSINESS**
- VII. NEW BUSINESS**
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\*\* NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: February 24, 1993 \*\*\***

**CHAIR**

Elections for the 1993-94 Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be held at the last Senate meeting of Winter quarter (March 10, 1993), per Senate Bylaws section III.A. Current Executive Committee membership is:

Barney Erickson, Math - **CHAIR**  
 Alan Taylor, Communication - **VICE CHAIR**  
 Erlice Killorn, PE - **SECRETARY**

Jim Ponzetti, Home Economics - **AT LARGE**  
 Don Ringe, Geology - **AT LARGE**  
 Charles McGehee, Sociology - **PAST CHAIR**

Nominations from the floor for Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and the two At Large positions will be entertained at the February 24, 1993 Faculty Senate meeting. Please refer to the partial roster below; deadline for department elections is February 15 --- names of more prospective candidates will be available at the next Senate meeting. Before making a nomination, please contact your candidate and ascertain that he or she would be willing and able to serve if elected. NOTE: The Faculty Senate Chair receives 50% released time from departmental duties.

**1993-94 FACULTY SENATE ROSTER**

<u>Department</u>	<u>Senator</u>		
Accounting	Deborah Medlar	History	*** OPEN POSITION ***
Anthropology		Home Economics	*** OPEN POSITION ***
Art	Ken Cory	IET	David Carns
Biology	Thomas Thelen	Law and Justice	Russell Hansen
Business Admin	Bruce Bagamery	Library	Thomas Yeh
	*** OPEN POSITION ***		*** OPEN POSITION ***
BEAM	Rob Perkins	Mathematics	Barney Erickson
Chemistry	*** OPEN POSITION ***	Music	Sidney Nesselroad
Communication	Alan Taylor		*** OPEN POSITION ***
Computer Science	Barry Donahue	Philosophy	Peter Burkholder
Economics	Robert Carbaugh	Physical Education	*** OPEN POSITION ***
Education	*** OPEN POSITION ***		*** OPEN POSITION ***
	Andrea Bowman	Physics	Sharon Rosell
	*** OPEN POSITION ***	Political Science	Rex Wirth
English	Bobby Cummings	Psychology	Stephanie Stein
	Steve Olson		*** OPEN POSITION ***
Foreign Language	Dieter Romboy	Sociology	Charles McGehee
Geography	Ken Hammond	Theatre Arts	Mark Zetterberg
Geology	Don Ringe		

\*\*\*\*\*

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

On January 25, 1993, the Academic Affairs Committee met with Don Cummings, Dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, and Professor Barry Donahue to discuss the reorganization of CLAS. The committee met again on January 26, 1993, to continue the discussion. As a result of these discussions, the Academic Affairs Committee present the following recommendation to the Faculty Senate:

**MOTION:**

Restructuring of academic units within Central Washington University should be addressed in Central's strategic plan. However, since the timeline for submission of the strategic plan does not allow for careful consideration of specific proposals, the Faculty Senate recommends that the plan contain detailed procedures for dealing with specific proposals for restructuring. These procedures should include formal participation of the Faculty Senate and of the entire faculty in the deliberations of the restructuring process.

**Rationale:**

Restructuring is a very serious undertaking which should not be rushed into and which should have a well-defined procedure. The Faculty Senate, the faculty, and the entire university community must have adequate opportunity to participate in this process.



- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bruce BAGAMERY   | <input type="checkbox"/> Hugh SPALL                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrea BOWMAN    | <input type="checkbox"/> Madalon LALLEY            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John BRANGWIN    | <input type="checkbox"/>                           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peter BURKHOLDER | <input type="checkbox"/> John UTZINGER             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Robert CARBAUGH             | <input type="checkbox"/> David HEDRICK             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David CARNS      | <input type="checkbox"/> Walt KAMINSKI             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken CORY         | <input type="checkbox"/> Margaret SAHLSTRAND       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bobby CUMMINGS              | <input type="checkbox"/>                           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barry DONAHUE    | <input type="checkbox"/> George TOWN               |
| <del><input type="checkbox"/> Lin BOUGLAS</del>      | <input type="checkbox"/> Daniel FENNERTY           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barney ERICKSON  | <input type="checkbox"/> Ken GAMON                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ed GOLDEN        | <input type="checkbox"/> Connie NOTT               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken HAMMOND      | <input type="checkbox"/> Morris UEBELACKER         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Russ HANSEN      | <input type="checkbox"/> Michael OLIVERO           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kris HENRY       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Erlice KILLORN              | <input type="checkbox"/> Patricia MAGUIRE          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charles MCGEHEE  | <input type="checkbox"/> David KAUFMAN             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deborah MEDLAR   | <input type="checkbox"/> Gary HEESACKER            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ivory NELSON                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Don SCHLIESMAN |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sidney NESSELROAD           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrew SPENCER |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vince NETHERY    | <input type="checkbox"/> Stephen JEFFERIES         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steve OLSON      | <input type="checkbox"/>                           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patrick OWENS    | <input type="checkbox"/> Cathy BERTELSON           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rob PERKINS      | <input type="checkbox"/> Ethan BERGMAN             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim PONZETTI     | <input type="checkbox"/> Jim GREEN                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owen PRATZ       | <input type="checkbox"/> Beverly HECKART           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan RAMSDELL     | <input type="checkbox"/> Sylvia SEVERN             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Anju RELAN                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Robert BENTLEY            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don RINGE                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Stella MORENO             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dieter ROMBOY    | <input type="checkbox"/> Roger YU                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sharon ROSELL    | <input type="checkbox"/> Geoffrey BOERS            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eric ROTH        | <input type="checkbox"/> Stephen SCHEPMAN          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stephanie STEIN  | <input type="checkbox"/> Robert GARRETT            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alan TAYLOR      | <input type="checkbox"/> John CARR                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas THELEN    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Brown</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rex WIRTH                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Jerry HOGAN               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas YEH       | <input type="checkbox"/> Wesley VAN TASSEL         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mark ZETTERBERG             |  |



MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 13, 1993

(1/26/93-025.PRV)

TO: Deans  
Department Chairs  
Program Directors

c: President Nelson

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

SUBJ: Common Meeting Time for Committees

---

From time to time the topic of establishing a common meeting time for university committees has been discussed. Most recently it was raised in the Deans' Council by the Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Barney Erickson, when he requested that such a time be established. The need for a regular period of time reserved for meetings grows out of the extreme difficulty in arranging meetings and getting people to serve on committees. It has become more difficult with each passing year -- this year being the very worst. The Senate office is still trying to get committee membership completed and meeting times arranged!

Therefore, I am hereby acting to set aside the period of 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. on Thursdays as a common meeting time for all university standing committees beginning Fall, 1993. This applies only to committees included on the list of university committees.

Chairs, directors and deans, when developing and approving class schedules for Fall 1993, should schedule classes for the 3:00 to 5:00 meeting time on Thursdays only for faculty who do not serve on university committees, including renewable and part-time faculty.

If you have any questions, please consult the school/college dean.

/kb

RECEIVED

JAN 25 1993

CWU FACULTY SENATE

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Kris Henry, Acting Coordinator  
Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee

DATE: January 18, 1993

SUBJECT: Committee Report on Grade Distribution

Recently the Academic Affairs Committee discussed grad distribution at Central as compared to Northern Michigan. We reviewed the implications and found the data to be, perhaps, misleading. As an example, the grade distribution apparently takes all grades, graduate and undergraduate as a group which will tend to raise the overall grade point average.

After this review, we have the following recommendation.

An ad hoc committee be appointed and be charged with at least the following tasks:

1. Collect data on grade distribution at Central.
  - a. Grades by academic department.
  - b. Grades by schools/college.
  - c. Grades by course level (100, 200, 300, 400, 500). (Data which could perhaps prove valuable, would be the levels of the students enrolled in these classes. For example, seniors in 100 level classes could, perhaps, raise the GPA for those classes.)
2. Study the impact of uncontested and hardship withdrawals on grade distribution.
3. Study the impact of transfer students on the grade point average at Central.
4. Formulate possible University-wide grading policies.
5. Hold small group faculty forums to discuss possible grading policies.
6. Using the information from faculty forums, develop University-wide grading policies to be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for action.

If you need further information or have any questions, please feel free to contact the Committee.

7



Central  
Washington  
University



History Department

Language & Literature 100T  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-1655

RECEIVED

JAN 25 1993

CWU FACULTY SENATE

January 21, 1993

Dr. Barney Erickson, Chair  
Faculty Senate  
CWU Campus

Dear Barney:

The recent communications to faculty who applied for professional leave have raised a number of questions and concerns that are of interest to the entire university committee. In particular, I question the wisdom of limiting the number of sabbaticals to such a small number for 1993-94. In view of this, I would like answers to the following questions:

1. Why and by whom was the decision made to limit the number of professional leaves?
2. Why were criteria for selection not announced in advance to all faculty?
3. Why was the final decision delayed until so late, making it difficult for persons to make plans sufficiently in advance for remote travel and other contingencies?

The decision made to reduce the sabbatical allotments will surely have a deleterious effect on faculty morale and may hamper future recruitment and retention of highly qualified persons. In the past, the granting of professional leaves was regarded as a means of "saving" money rather than an expensive proposition. The reduction in number, particularly when accompanied by after-the-fact criteria for selection, appears to indicate a low regard for the scholarly and other professional activities of members of the faculty.

I request the Faculty Senate to look into this matter and report to the faculty on the justification for the decision as well as the prospects and intentions for the future.

Depending upon the Senate's response, I propose to introduce to the Faculty Senate a resolution recommending restoration of a sabbatical policy which will offer opportunity for a greater number of grants upholding the policy enumerated in the existing Faculty Code.

Sincerely,

Daniel B. Ramsdell  
Professor of History

kjs

cc: Donald Schliesman, Provost

6

Central  
Washington  
University



Office of the Provost and  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

208B Bouillon  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-1400

(1/25/93-002.PRV)

sal~ first~ last~  
address~

Dear sal~ last~:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that your application for professional leave during 1993-94 is not being recommended to the President. The deans and I met recently and decided that because of the (1) austere fiscal outlook for the State, (2) intention of the Governor in "Book I" budget to reduce support for professional leaves, (3) Governor's proposal that we make a three percent efficiency cut, and, (4) a very uncertain CWU budget situation for 1993-95, it would be prudent to limit the number of applications recommended to four. In determining the four, the following conditions were applied:

- Adherence to the order of priority established by the Faculty Research and Development Committee.
- Preference to those applicants who had not previously been awarded a professional leave.
- Award no more than one professional leave in any single department.
- Preference to those applications which proposed leave activities most directly related to the academic mission of the University.

I regret it is not possible to recommend more leave applications, however I do encourage you to apply again. Hopefully the financial situation of the University and the State will improve soon so that more leaves can be awarded.

Sincerely,

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

/kb

c: dean~  
chair~

Central  
Washington  
University



Department of Psychology  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926  
(509) 963-2381

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1993

CWU FACULTY SENATE

**TO:** Sue Tirotta  
Faculty Senate

**FROM:** Ad Hoc Committee on the Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators (1992-1993):  
Jim Eubanks (Chair), Susan Madley, Jim Nimnicht

**DATE:** January 26, 1993

**RE:** Committee Recommendations

Attached please find a recommended addendum to each administrator's survey (a sample for the Presidents position is provided) that would allow for additional comments by each faculty respondent. The additional page for each survey instrument, while adding to the length of the survey, would encourage individuals to elaborate or provide additional information related to each administrator's perceived effectiveness. Other than these additional open-ended questions, the Committee recommends that the current format and questions remain intact as much as possible in order to maximize the opportunity to compare this year's data with information from previous surveys. We await updated position descriptions in order to ascertain whether recent administrative changes, particularly the newly created Dean of Academic Services position, will necessitate any revisions in the instruments.

Regarding administrators to be surveyed, the Committee recommends that the Dean of B & E survey clearly indicate that Joan Mosbar's performance as Acting Dean is being evaluated, since she has either held or assisted with this position for most of the biennium review period. Also, it is not clear from Senate Motion No. 2874 that this year's survey would include Linda Murphy as Dean of SPS. The Committee recommends that this year's survey does include Dr. Murphy's position.

With respect to the issue of who should receive the survey, the Committee recommends that it be distributed to all full-time contract faculty. Regarding the timing of the survey, given that the updated administrator position descriptions are received shortly, the Committee intends to comply with the Executive Committee's recommended distribution before the end of Winter quarter 1993, with a return date just before Spring break.

As in previous surveys, the Committee will require the optical scanning and numerical analysis support services of the Testing Office. Compilation and distribution of the survey instruments should be accomplished by the Faculty Senate Office. The Committee will be responsible for compiling the additional comments provided in the open-ended response portion of the survey, preparing the final report of the survey results, as well as forwarding the report to Faculty Senate, the surveyed administrators and to the board or individuals to whom they report.

10B

FACULTY OPINION SURVEY OF THE PRESIDENT, CONT'D

---

Written Comments

A. If you would like to elaborate on a response given to any item(s) in this survey, please do so below (please refer to specific item numbers).

B. What is your overall evaluation of the president's performance?

C. If you could make one or two recommendations to the president that would most improve his effectiveness, what would they be?

---

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
FROM: Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee  
Jan M. Rizzuti, Acting Recorder  
DATE: January 27, 1993  
RE: Committee Report on CLAS Reorganization

On January 25, 1993, the Academic Affairs Committee met with Dean Cummings and Professor Barry Donahue to discuss the reorganization of the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences. The committee met again on January 26, 1993 to continue the discussion. As a result of these discussions the Academic Affairs Committee presents the following recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

Recommendation: Restructuring of academic units within Central Washington University should be addressed in Central's strategic plan. However, since the timeline for submission of the strategic plan does not allow for careful consideration of specific proposals, we recommend that the plan contain detailed procedures for dealing with specific proposals for restructuring. These procedures should include formal participation of the Faculty Senate and of the entire faculty in the deliberations of the restructuring process.

Rationale: Restructuring is a very serious undertaking which should not be rushed into and which should have a well-defined procedure. The Faculty Senate, the faculty, and the entire university community must have adequate opportunity to participate in this process.

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1993

CWU FACULTY SENATE

