

**REGULAR MEETING**  
**Wednesday, April 03, 2013, 3:10 p.m.**  
**BARGE 412**  
**Minutes**

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

**Senators:** All senators or their alternates were present except: Bill Bailey, Jason Dormady, Audrey Huerta, Jim Johnson, Cynthia Mitchell, Robert Pritchett, Dennis Szal, Matthew Wilson and Dale Wright.

**Visitors:** Jesse Nelson, Mary Lee Jensvold

**CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – President's report has been moved below the CHCI discussion. The student presentation will be moved to another meeting. Agenda was approved with the changes.

**MOTION NO. 12-22(Approved): APPROVAL OF MINUTES** of March 6, 2013

**COMMUNICATIONS** - Memo from General Education Committee.

**FACULTY ISSUES:** Senator Harbaugh expressed a concern about classes that are scheduled past the scheduled time the university has set for classes. Some courses are ending at quarter after the hour causing problems for students in other courses that start on the hour. Senator Harper brought a copy of the Seattle Times supplement that is designed to help students with college decisions. There is no mention of Central and no advertising from Central. Concerned why there was no mention. Senator Dittmer shared a concern about the General Education proposal. Faculty Senate has been working on different proposals for a number of years, using numerous hours of faculty time and resources. Trying again probably isn't an option. Maybe it is time we try another system since the current process isn't functional. Senator Stoddard received a request from a student for a letter of recommendation. This same student had failed his class earlier for plagiarism. The faculty in his department have been talking about somehow tracking students for plagiarism and similar occurrences. Senator Stoddard wanted to know what other departments have done? Jesse Nelson let the Senators know that Student Success has a process for tracking students and reminded faculty to either call or use the Report Behavioral Concerns on the Intranet to let them know about these students. Faculty can let them know that the department has handled the situation within the department, but this allows Student Success to track the student.

**iCAT** – Gene Shoda gave a brief presentation on iCAT (Improving Campus Applications & Technology). Working on some paper based systems such as travel, purchasing and time sheets and modernizing the day-to-day business practices. CedarCrestone is the firm that is working with Central to improve these systems. Online travel authorization, cash advance and expense vouchers are now all online as of this week. They have already updated Oracle and will be updating HR system. Faculty workload and activity reporting system is being worked on right now. There will be an employee portal system. The current systems have not been updated in a number of years and need to be refreshed and updated to take advantage of what the entire systems offer.

## OLD BUSINESS

**Motion No 12-20(Withdrawn):** Approve the General Education proposal as outlined in Exhibit B.

**Motion No. 12-28 (Approved, 1 abstention):** Senator Bowers remove Motion 12-20 from the table. Senator Donahoe seconded the motion.

**Motion No. 12-29 (Approved, 4 nay):** The General Education Committee moved to withdraw Motion No. 12-20.

CHCI discussion – John AP recognized Mary Lee Jensvold, CHCI Director to speak. Mary Lee presented a brief summary of the current situation. The floor was opened up for questions and answers. Summary of discussion: Chimpanzees can live 30 to 40 years. If younger chimpanzees are introduced to the current population, this is a question we will have to address in the future as well. NICH funding is being pulled for invasive research and not for any research at this time. CHCI is the only sign language research facility in the world. If younger chimpanzees are brought in they will be handpicked to try and create the best match for the current population. There is a capital budget request in Olympia to try and obtain funding for part of the renovation. President Gaudino will be speaking with Friends of Washoe to see what their long term plans are. All the data and input that has been received will be reviewed and will have to talk with the BOT about final decision.

**PROVOST:** Provost is almost complete with visiting all of the units under Academic and Student Life. Provost Reflection e-mail will be coming out next week. The Graduate Studies Dean, Holly Johnson, has returned to faculty. The Provost is conducting a search for an internal candidate. Graduate tuition waivers will continue at the amount they have been and will pay medical insurance. Graduate Council has been going over five issues: What are the primary mission, vision and role of the Graduate office? Consider issues of assessment and cost. What is longitudinal? What are the policies and procedures for TAs? What is the role of new trends, such as international graduate students? The Provost has started a two year plan to restore department Goods and Services budget lines that were cut during the budget cuts. The Provost will be having meetings with Faculty Senate and ADCO on reallocation of funds and positions. There will also be two open sessions for public comment.

**PRESIDENT:** President Gaudino reported that the iCat travel authorization process went online today. Workload projection and activity report is also being worked on and should be ready to go to testing this spring. Interesting things from Olympia were released at about noon today. It is still early in the process and nothing is definite at all.

Senator Loverro thanked the President for the university providing regalia rental for faculty participating in commencement.

## REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS

### SENATE COMMITTEES:

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

**Motion No. 12-19(Approved):** Approve adding the Director of Academic Planning as an ex-officio member to Faculty Senate Bylaws Section IV-A.3 a. Curriculum Committee and c. General Education Committee as shown in Exhibit A.

**Motion No. 12-23(First reading of two):** Approve changes to Faculty Senate Bylaws Section VIII Faculty Forum, Referendum, Initiative and Review as shown in Exhibit C.

**Motion No. 12-24(First reading of three):** Approve changes to the Faculty Code Section IV Faculty Senate as shown in Exhibit D.

**Motion No. 12-25(First reading of three):** Approve changes to the Faculty Code Section V Inquiry into Disputes and Scholarly Misconduct as shown in Exhibit E.

**Motion No. 12-26(First reading of two):** Approve changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws Section IV.A.3 e as shown in Exhibit F.

**Motion No. 12-27(First reading of three):** Approve changes to the Faculty Code Section IV.D.1.e) as shown in Exhibit G.

**Academic Affairs Committee** - See written report

**Curriculum Committee** - See written report

**Faculty Legislative Representative** - See written report

**CHAIR:** Chair Madlem gave part of her report time to David Rawlinson, FLR. The House Bill called the Dream Act that would provide state need grants for students of immigrant parents received an overwhelming response in the House. However, it doesn't look like it will pass through the Senate. There is a hearing today about the bill which effects tuition caps, provides a 10% funding increase and takes away tuition granting authority. David has been appointed to the technology in higher education work-group which is part of the Washington Student Achievement Council.

**CHAIR-ELECT:** No report

**STUDENT REPORT:** Brian reported that Jennifer Arledge has resigned due to some medical issues. The BOD has selected Jacklyn Spurlic to replace her. The students are continuing to gather information regarding the Audit of Central and do not want to make a rash or quick decision. The SAS took a vote on CHCI last week, but there were some issues and will be redoing that vote on Friday. The students are still working at getting on GoCentral. The next BOD meeting is next Friday from 5-7.

**NEW BUSINESS** - Army ROTC would like to thank those departments who have helped conduct some of our interviews. They have conducted 12-15 scholarship interviews. This year they decided to get faculty input and get feedback from those on campus.

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

# Exhibit A

Propose the following changes to the Bylaws, Section IV-A-3:

- a. The Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee shall be concerned with the study, development, and improvement of the curriculum, educational programs, and academic policy (section 5-10 of the CWU Policies manual, Curriculum Policies and Procedures) of at the university, shall cooperate with other individuals, groups or committees at the university in carrying out its duties, and shall do such other things as may be requested by or approved by the Senate Executive Committee. The membership of the Curriculum Committee shall consist of:
  1. two (2) faculty from each college,
  2. one (1) faculty from the Library,
  3. one (1) student selected by ASCWU, and
  4. the Director of Academic Planning, ex-officio, non-voting
  
- c. The General Education Committee shall be concerned with the study, development, and improvement of the General Education Program. The committee shall review and recommend courses, programs and policies of general education in close cooperation with appropriate academic administrators. It shall perform other duties as may be requested by or approved by the Senate Executive Committee. The membership of the General Education Committee shall consist of:
  1. two (2) faculty from each college with the exception of the Library,
  2. one (1) student selected by ASCWU, and
  - ~~3. one (1) ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost~~
  3. the Director of Academic Planning, ex-officio, non-voting

# Exhibit B

## Basic Skills Requirements.

### Academic Advising Seminar:

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Describe CWU students' rights and responsibilities, classroom expectations, and the importance of taking ownership of one's education.
2. Reflect on their own experiences that influenced their decision to attend the university and identify their anticipated needs for success.
3. Demonstrate knowledge and use of academic resources at CWU.
4. Explain CWU's general education requirements, graduation requirements, the process of declaring a major/minor, and the purpose of a liberal arts education.
5. Illustrate basic understanding of CWU library information resources.
6. Show the ability to access and utilize CWU web resources, such as GroupWise, Blackboard, and SAFARI.
7. Recognize the importance of extra-curricular opportunities to enhance your college experience.

**Basic Academic Writing:** (a minimum grade of C- is required in Basic Academic Writing before taking Academic Writing and the Research Paper or any Writing intensive (W) course)

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Read critically, distinguishing central ideas from evidence; identifying the author's purpose, assumptions, and attitudes; and using prior knowledge and experience to identify issues.
2. Respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations by considering the relevant context, focusing on a purpose, and addressing a specific audience.
3. Synthesize responses to common issues, various perspectives on a topic, or solutions to a problem and draw reasonable conclusions based on this synthesis.
4. Express ideas in clear, coherent, and balanced sentences and paragraphs.
5. Demonstrate the ability to follow the conventions of standard Academic English, demonstrating control of grammar, usage, and punctuation rules.

### Academic Writing and the Research Paper:

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Identify assumptions and criteria to use when analyzing the writing of others.
2. Take a position on an issue by developing a focused assertion based on a shared assumption, presenting evidence in support of a line of reasoning, addressing divergent stances on the issue, and using a variety of research methods.
3. Prepare and implement a research plan that outlines the quantity and quality of sources needed and the use of a variety of research methods. Use the internet to find specific sites and information.
4. Cite and document sources precisely and effectively, noting the connection between form and citation and/or documentation and rhetorical impact.
5. Describe the interrelationship between style and meaning in the writing of others and adjust style to enhance meaning in their own writing.
6. Demonstrate proficiency in the conventions of standard Academic English, demonstrating control of grammar, usage, and punctuation rules.

### Computer Fundamentals:

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Create documents using word processing software.
2. Create spreadsheets using a spreadsheet application.
3. Create a computer based presentation using presentation software.
4. Extract information from a database using database software.

Rationale: These are computer skills that are used by students in many General Education courses. Many majors and professions will also require these skills.

**Foreign Language Requirement:** Required—2 years of one high school foreign language or 1 year of college-

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Demonstrate comprehension of common structures and everyday vocabulary in spoken and written forms of the target language.
2. Demonstrate production of common structures and everyday vocabulary in spoken and written forms of the target language.
3. Demonstrate knowledge of the most common cultural features of the country or countries in which the target language is spoken.

**Basic Quantitative Skills:** Students must pass a Basic Quantitative Skills course or achieve a minimum established score on a Quantitative Literacy Assessment Exam to fulfill the Basic Quantitative Skills requirement) Goal: Develop the basic tools necessary for quantitative literacy.

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Use proportional reasoning to solve and analyze problems involving “per unit” quantities, indices and percentages.
2. Analyze, interpret and solve problems related to personal finance.
3. Interpret percentages, fractions and ratios as appropriate probabilities.
4. Use probability to analyze risks and their portrayal in the media.
5. Create and interpret basic statistical summaries.
6. Compare and contrast the behavior of various growth models.

Rationale: That our students “need” mathematics is a common assertion. What remains unclear, however, is what type of math they need. Do all students need the algebra skills necessary to succeed in calculus? Should every college-educated citizen be able to use the quadratic formula to solve quadratic equations? Or would our society and students be better served by understanding conditional probability? Or being able to read and comment critically on an article on the ramifications of changing the retirement age? Or understanding that the plural of anecdote is not data? The committee feels that this second type of math, often called quantitative literacy, is a more valuable skill for all students, and as a result, the committee feels that our students are better served by either taking a course in basic quantitative literacy skills or by passing a quantitative literacy test.

**Quantitative Literacy course requirement:** Note: Students are urged to take a quantitative literacy (Q) class that is also a breadth requirement course or a quantitative literacy (Q) course in their selected major. Goal: Apply the concepts and tools of Basic Quantitative Skills in context.

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Read, interpret and generate graphical representations of relevant data.
2. In context, describe the uses and limitations of statistical data.
3. Analyze and critique claims involving quantitative data.
4. Interpret and explain quantitative relationships expressed in symbols.

Rationale: In addition to the basic skills, students need to use quantitative literacy in context. It is in these contexts that these important skills are truly learned. As a result, all students should take a class where the basic skills are practiced in context.

**Critical Thinking course requirement:** Goal: Be able to analyze arguments and their constituent parts, as well as be aware of the assumptions one makes in an argument.

Learner Outcomes: Students will be able to:

1. Accurately summarize an argument, identifying its thesis, premises, and assumptions.
2. State the general distinction between the truth of an argument's premises and the validity or strength of its reasoning; and display awareness of this in their writing.
3. Identify whether a given argument is deductive or inductive, and accordingly evaluate it for either validity or soundness of the strength and cogency; and recognize whether it commits any common argumentative fallacies.
4. Display awareness of their own assumptions, and a willingness to question them; and hence an ability and willingness to engage seriously and respectfully with others who disagree with those assumptions.
5. Show awareness and tolerance of complexity; that is, be able to take a reasoned position on a complex question while acknowledging that their position might be incorrect.

Rationale: The committee feels that the current reasoning requirement should be split apart into two components: a quantitative literacy requirement and a critical thinking requirement.

- a. Quantitative Literacy is best learned in context, and as a result, such classes should not be the sole responsibility of the math department. Quantitatively literate students are prepared to analyze arguments involving quantitative claims. Thus, requiring such a course in the General Education program ensures that our students will be well-prepared, thoughtful citizens.
- b. Critical Thinking. In addition to analyzing arguments involving quantitative claims, students need to be able to analyze more general arguments. As a result, the committee feels that a course in critical thinking, involving analysis of the logical structure of arguments, is necessary. One of the goals of such a class is to make students aware of the distinction between facts and assumptions.

**Writing Requirement:** Note: Students are urged to take a writing intensive (W) class that is also a breadth requirement course or a writing intensive (W) course in their selected major.

1. Require Basic Academic Writing (a minimum grade of C-) as a prerequisite for general education writing intensive (W) courses.
2. Require three (3) writing intensive (W) courses in the General Education program for graduation.
  - a. Writing intensive courses must include at least seven pages of assigned writing that is assessed for content and mechanics (grammar, spelling, punctuation, and organization).
1. Departments will complete an assessment of student writing in the major. Note: The means by which students' writing in their major courses is assessed is to be determined by the departments and approved by the General Education Committee and may be specific to individual majors.

Possible assessment models include:

  - a. Compilation of a portfolio of student writing to be included in a student's end of the major assessment.
  - b. Create or commission a "writing in the major" course that teaches and assesses the type/forms of writing used specifically in the major.
  - c. Establish designed writing intensive courses in the major, similar to those in the General Education Program, in which writing is a significant aspect of the courses' learning outcomes and assessment.

**Explanation and Rationale for changes to the Writing Requirement:**

Part 1: Basic Academic Writing will become a prerequisite to all writing intensive (W) courses.

Rationale:

- CWU puts itself at a disadvantage by assessing student writing (for NWCCU and other accrediting organizations) in writing intensive courses which students take before they have completed Basic Academic Writing and Academic Writing and the Research Paper.
- Writing intensive (W) courses are intended to reinforce skills learned in Basic Academic Writing and Academic Writing and the Research Paper. According to Scott Carlton, Interim Registrar and former Director of Academic Advising Services, to require both Basic Academic Writing and Academic Writing and the Research Paper as prerequisites to all writing intensive courses would create a significant logjam for students trying to complete their coursework in four years.
- Although requiring Basic Academic Writing as a prerequisite to all writing intensive (W) courses will create some problems in students' progress to degree, we believe those problems will be mitigated by the second part of the proposal.

Part 2: The number of writing intensive (W) courses in General Education will be reduced from four (4) to three (3).

Rationale:

- The writing intensive (W) course requirement was established for the purpose of reinforcing skills learned in college-level composition courses, to ensure that students write on a regular basis in their general education courses, and to assist in the institutional assessment of writing in the General Education Program.
- The reduction in the number of required writing intensive (W) courses is intended to alleviate the logjam created by requiring Basic Academic Writing as a prerequisite to all writing intensive courses.
- However, the reduction in writing intensive courses runs counter to the expressed intentions of the writing intensive (W) course requirement. The solution proposed to this reduction is outlined in Part 3 of the proposal.

Part 3: Establishes a graduation requirement that all departments will complete an assessment of student writing in their majors.

Explanation:

- The means by which students writing in their major courses is assessed is to be determined by the departments and approved by the General Education Committee and may be specific to individual majors.
- One possible assessment model that might be used is the compilation of a portfolio of student writing to be included in a student's end of the major assessment.
- Using another model, departments may also choose to create or commission a "writing in the major" course that teaches and assesses the type/forms of writing used specifically in the major. e.g. A Public Relations major would be expected to produce press releases, reports, etc. while a chemistry major might be expected to produce lab reports, experiment proposals, research papers, etc.
- A third might be establishing designated writing intensive courses in the major, similar to those in the General Education Program, in which writing is a significant aspect of the courses' learning outcomes and assessment. These courses would be most effective if they were required for all majors and include a designated writing outcome and assessment so that all instructors of the course would be required to fulfill the requirement. In this way, students could be assured of the experience of discipline/major-based writing no matter who taught the course.

Rationale:

- The additional graduation requirement would compensate for the elimination of one writing intensive course in general education.
- It would also assist students in becoming more literate in their chosen careers. In past alumni surveys, students were asked about things they wished they had learned more about or had more experience with. Many students listed writing in their major and stated that they felt inadequately prepared for writing in their chosen career field.
- Additionally, the university has frequently expressed a belief in the significance of “teaching writing across the curriculum.” The addition of this graduation requirement would demonstrate the university’s commitment to this important educational goal.

## **Proposing courses for the basic or breadth areas:**

If a department wishes to propose a course for a basic skill or breadth area, department must:

1. Identify the block for the proposed course.
2. Describe in detail how the primary learner outcomes of the course meet the general education learner outcomes identified for that block.
3. Provide a detailed sample syllabus that highlights sections that will be common to all syllabi used for this course.
4. Provide documentation for the ways in which the learner outcomes will be assessed.

Note: Individual courses may include additional learner outcomes specific to the course, but must include as their primary learner outcomes those associated with the basic or breadth area under which the course is located.

## **BREADTH AREAS**

### **SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES GENERAL EDUCATION**

#### **Perspectives on the Cultures and Experiences of the United States.**

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Identify the influence of the various institutions, cultures and traditions of the United States.
2. Critically analyze ways in which the past affects the present and future.
3. Articulate the requirements of informed citizenship based on analysis of social, economic and/or political processes issues and events.
4. Apply critical thinking and ethical reasoning to individual and collective decision making.

#### **Perspectives on World Cultures.**

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Identify the influence of the various institutions, cultures and traditions of nations, groups or societies outside the United States.
2. Critically analyze the dimensions of human diversity and similarity within and outside the United States.
3. Articulate contemporary national and transnational issues that provide perspective on one's relationship to world cultures.
4. Apply critical thinking and ethical reasoning to individual and collective decision making.

#### **Foundations of Human Adaptations and Behavior.**

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Identify basic principles which underlie human interaction.

2. Critically analyze the fundamental patterns of human interaction with natural and man-made environments.
3. Articulate ways in which we can foster a better understanding of the human condition by analyzing the informed judgments of how humans interact with their immediate and distal environments.
4. Explain and apply scientific methods to investigate and analyze individual, groups or institutional behavior.

## **ARTS AND HUMANITIES GENERAL EDUCATION**

### **Literature and the Humanities.**

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Read and respond in oral and written forms to literary works from a variety of cultures.
2. Examine artifacts with an awareness of the cultural context in which they were produced.
3. Read and respond in oral and written forms to literary works of different genres.
4. Synthesize one's understanding of past humanistic knowledge with one's current knowledge, making connections between past and present.

### **The Aesthetic Experience.**

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Acquire a vocabulary for the discussion of aesthetic genres.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of aesthetic activities within their historical, artistic, and cultural traditions.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of several artistic genres and how they relate to one another.
4. Apply aesthetic judgment and critical thinking by experiencing and evaluating works of art.

### **Religions and Philosophies of the World.**

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Identify their own linguistic, conceptual and normative presuppositions.
2. Analyze alternative ways of articulating and interpreting human experience.
3. Reflect on the implications of these frameworks in the wider social and political sphere.
4. Integrate unfamiliar vocabularies, principles, and systems of thought into their existing ideas.
5. Critically evaluate their use of language, perception of reality, and values.

## **NATURAL SCIENCES GENERAL EDUCATION**

**Learner Outcomes for all Natural Sciences general education courses.** Students will be able to:

1. Demonstrate how scientific discovery and research contribute to our lives.
2. Recognize the natural sciences as a system in which observations and measurement must ultimately verify theories that explain and predict natural phenomena.
3. Distinguish between data and analysis.
4. Apply mathematical and quantitative skills to solve problems in the natural sciences.
5. Engage in systematic critical thinking (analysis, inference, evaluation, induction, deduction).

In addition, each of the following breadth areas also has specific learner outcomes:

### **Fundamental Disciplines of Physical and Biological Sciences**

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Make inquiry-driven laboratory and/or field observations.
2. Rigorously describe and analyze fundamental processes and components of one or more natural systems.

### **Patterns and Connections in the Natural World**

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of conceptual models of complex natural systems.
2. Analyze the processes and cause-effect relationships in complex natural systems.

### **Application to Natural Sciences**

Learner Outcomes. Students will be able to:

1. Articulate the scientific or technological basis of real-world issues.
2. Use scientific data and method to accurately describe or predict consequences of technology on natural systems.
3. Make informed decisions about real-world issues based on an understanding of the underlying science.
4. Apply scientific principles to real-world issues.

# Exhibit C

## Bylaws. VIII. Faculty Forum, Referendum, Initiative, and Review Additional Powers and Duties of the Senate

### A. Interpretation (Academic Code Section IV-F)

A request for formal interpretation of the Academic Code must be submitted by a petitioner or petitioners to the Bylaws and Academic Code Committee. That committee shall review the request and make a written recommendation to the Senate within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the request. The Senate shall take action on the Bylaws and Academic Code Committee's recommendation within sixty (60) days of its receipt, and may forward it to the Board of Trustees if necessary.

### B. Faculty Senate Forum (Academic Code Section IV-G)

The faculty Faculty Senate forum is an ~~unofficial~~ open meeting of the faculty to which all members of the faculty shall be invited. ~~and which shall be presided over by the Chair of the Faculty Senate or by a faculty member designated by the Chair. A faculty forum may be called for any purpose. The Senate Chair and/or the Senate Executive Committee shall decide whether, when, and for what purpose such a faculty forum may be called; but the usual purpose would be for the Senate to convey information to the faculty and to solicit their feedback. The forum shall be presided over by the Chair or by a faculty member designated by the Chair.~~

### C. Referendum (Academic Code Section IV-H)

The Faculty Senate may decide to refer any questions or issues before it to the faculty-at-large for vote, which shall be conducted ~~with reasonable promptness~~ according to such procedures as may be prescribed by the ~~Senate Executive Committee~~. The vote shall be conducted within ninety (90) days of the Senate meeting in which the decision to hold a referendum was made.

### D. Faculty Senate Hearing (Academic Code IV-I)

1. Any ten (10) eligible faculty members may, by written petition filed with the Chair of the ~~Faculty Senate~~, secure an opportunity, as a body or by selected representatives, to address the Senate in order to convey information, request Senate action, or propose policy changes on any matter over which the Senate has the power to act. The petitioners do not, however, have the power to advance motions or to compel the Senate to act on any matter that they raise. Eligible faculty includes tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty holding the title of assistant professor or senior lecturer.

2. Anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

3. The Chair shall ensure that the petitioners or their designated representatives are given a hearing by the Senate within two regularly scheduled Senate meetings from the date of the petition's receipt.

4. At the hearing, if the petitioners propose a specific Senate action or a specific policy change, then the Senate shall vote on whether to consider the proposal further. If the Senate votes not to consider it further, there shall be no further discussion and the matter shall be closed. If the Senate votes to consider the proposal further, the Chair shall submit the proposal to the Senate for consideration by the Senate within two regularly scheduled Senate meetings of the petitioners' hearing.

- The Executive Committee shall ensure that the petitioners' proposal and any relevant issues are presented fully, from all sides, to the Senate. If other groups on campus have views that differ from those of the petitioners, the Senate should endeavor to hear those views prior to taking any formal action. Ultimately, formal action on the petitioners' proposal requires that a senator make a motion, be seconded and passed. If no senator is prepared to do so, the matter shall be closed.

E. Review by Faculty (Academic Code IV-J)

- All actions (motions passed) by the Senate (~~motions passed by the Senate~~) of the Faculty-Senate shall be subject to review by the university faculty. A review shall be conducted if and only if ~~only after~~ a written petition for review has been signed by at least ten (10) percent of the eligible faculty and submitted to the Senate Chair. The petition ~~for review~~ must be filed no later than fourteen (14) days after the approval of the minutes of the meeting during which the action to be reviewed was taken. Eligible faculty includes tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty holding the title of assistant professor or senior lecturer.
- In the event of a dispute over whether the petition has been signed by at least ten percent of the eligible faculty, the relevant comparison shall be the number of faculty employees as recorded by the university's Human Resources Department on the day on which the petition is filed.
- A special meeting of the Senate shall be called by the Chair within ten (10) days after the petition is submitted. If the Senate refuses to change its position, a vote of the entire faculty on the Senate action under review shall be conducted by the ~~Faculty Senate~~ Executive Committee. The voting procedure shall provide for a secret vote of the eligible faculty and for voting to continue for seven (7) calendar days. A majority vote of those faculty voting on the question shall determine whether or not the Senate action is reversed.
- From the date of the filing of a valid petition for review, until the determination of the outcome of the vote of the faculty on the action under review, the Faculty Senate may not undertake action concerning or affecting the original action of the ~~Senate~~ under review.

**Rationale:**

(1) **Elimination of redundancy.** The current language in Bylaws Sect. VIII and Code Sect. IV Parts F-K is largely duplicated. We have therefore deleted from the Code a considerable amount of material which belongs only in the Bylaws. The material in question is that which concerns the *procedures* by which the various actions or duties are to be carried out. It is the job of the Bylaws to explain these procedures. The Code, by contrast, need only describe the *policies*. (We have, however, added references to the relevant section of the Bylaws so that a reader of the Code may easily find the description of the procedures relevant to the policy in the Code.) Most of the changes to the Code, then, involve the removal of material which need be stated only in the Bylaws. (One major exception is the removal of the entire section on 'Initiative', which does not appear in the Bylaws at all, and for good reason: it merely restates the policy for Faculty Senate Hearings, and thus is redundant.)

(2). **Procedural clarification and elaboration.** We have added considerable material to the Bylaws. Some of this is to clarify existing procedures, and some is to introduce new procedures which we have deemed necessary to ensure due process (as expressly requested in the charge). Of particular note:

(a) A section on Interpretation, which is currently wholly absent from the Bylaws despite its presence in the Code.

- (b) We have considerably expanded the material on Faculty Senate Hearings. The current language is very truncated and hard to follow, so we have tried to spell out (what we take to be) the intended meaning.
- (c) Regarding the procedure for Review by Faculty (of a Senate decision), which occurs via a petition signed by ten percent of the faculty: we have inserted a specification of how it is to be determined whether the stated criterion of ten percent of the faculty has been met.

# Exhibit D

## Academic Code. Section IV: FACULTY SENATE

### F. Interpretation and Emergency (Faculty Senate Bylaws VIII-A)

A request for formal interpretation of the Academic Code must be initially submitted by a petitioner or petitioners to the Faculty Senate ~~Bylaw~~ Bylaws and Academic Code Committee. ~~The Bylaw and Academic Code Committee~~ That committee shall review the request and make a written recommendation to the Faculty Senate ~~within thirty (30) days of the date of receipt of the request.~~ The Faculty Senate, which shall take action on the ~~Bylaw and Academic Code Committee's~~ recommendation ~~within sixty (60) days of its receipt.~~ If the recommendation is forwarded to the Board of Trustees, the Board of Trustees shall take action on the ~~proposed request~~ recommendation within sixty (60) days of its receipt from the Faculty Senate.

### G. Faculty Senate Forum (Faculty Senate Bylaws VIII-B)

The Faculty Senate forum is an ~~unofficial~~ open meeting, called by the Senate Chair and/or Executive Committee, to which all members of the faculty shall be invited. ~~and which shall be presided over by the chair of the Faculty Senate or by a faculty member designated by the chair.~~ A Senate forum may be convened for the purposes of providing the Faculty Senate an opportunity its usual purpose is for the Senate to convey information to the faculty and to solicit their feedback. ~~The chair and/or the Senate Executive Committee shall decide whether, when, and for what purpose a faculty forum may be called.~~ All faculty are strongly encouraged to attend such a forum should it be called.

### H. Referendum (Faculty Senate Bylaws VIII-C)

The Faculty Senate may decide to refer any question or issue before it to the faculty-at-large for vote, ~~which shall be conducted with reasonable promptness according to such procedures as may be prescribed by the Senate Executive Committee.~~ All eligible faculty are strongly encouraged to vote should a referendum be called. Eligible faculty includes tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty holding the title of assistant professor or senior lecturer.

### I. Faculty Senate Hearing (Faculty Senate Bylaws VIII-D)

Any ten (10) eligible faculty (as defined in H) members may, by written petition filed with the ~~chair~~ of the Faculty Senate Chair, secure an opportunity, as a body or by selected representatives, to address the Senate in order to convey information, request Senate action, or propose policy changes on any matter over which the Senate has the power to act. The petitioners do not, however, have the power to advance motions (which resides only with members of the Senate) or to compel the Senate to act on any matter that they raise. ~~If a Faculty Senate hearing is convened with the purpose of a specific policy change or action, the Senate chair shall submit the proposal to the Senate for consideration within two regularly scheduled Senate meetings.~~ Anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

### J. Initiative

~~Any ten (10) faculty members may. By written petition filed with the chair of the Faculty Senate, secure consideration, with reasonable promptness, of any matter over which the Senate has power to act.~~

### J. Review by Faculty (Faculty Senate Bylaws VIII-E)

All actions (~~motions passed by the Senate~~) of the Faculty Senate shall be subject to review by the university faculty. A review shall be conducted only after faculty if a written petition for review has been signed by at least ten (10) percent of the eligible faculty (~~as defined in H~~) and submitted to the Senate chair ~~Chair~~. The petition for review must be filed no later than fourteen (14) days after the approval of the minutes of the ~~Senate~~ meeting during which the action to be reviewed was taken. A special meeting of the Senate shall be called by the chair ~~within ten days after the petition is submitted~~. If the Senate refuses to change its position, a vote of the entire faculty on the Senate action under review shall be conducted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The voting procedure shall provide for a secret vote of the faculty and for voting to continue for seven calendar days. A majority vote of those faculty voting on the question ~~This vote~~ shall determine the outcome of the review and whether or not the Senate action is reversed. From the date of the filing of a valid petition for review, until the determination of the outcome of the vote of the faculty on the action under review, the Faculty Senate may not undertake action concerning or affecting the original action of the Senate under review.

### Rationale:

(1) **Elimination of redundancy.** The current language in Bylaws Sect. VIII and Code Sect. IV Parts F-K is largely duplicated. We have therefore deleted from the Code a considerable amount of material which belongs only in the Bylaws. The material in question is that which concerns the *procedures* by which the various actions or duties are to be carried out. It is the job of the Bylaws to explain these procedures. The Code, by contrast, need only describe the *policies*. (We have, however, added references to the relevant section of the Bylaws so that a reader of the Code may easily find the description of the procedures relevant to the policy in the Code.) Most of the changes to the Code, then, involve the removal of material which need be stated only in the Bylaws. (One major exception is the removal of the entire section on 'Initiative', which does not appear in the Bylaws at all, and for good reason: it merely restates the policy for Faculty Senate Hearings, and thus is redundant.)

(2). **Procedural clarification and elaboration.** We have added considerable material to the Bylaws. Some of this is to clarify existing procedures, and some is to introduce new procedures which we have deemed necessary to ensure due process (as expressly requested in the charge). Of particular note:

(a) A section on Interpretation, which is currently wholly absent from the Bylaws despite its presence in the Code.

(b) We have considerably expanded the material on Faculty Senate Hearings. The current language is very truncated and hard to follow, so we have tried to spell out (what we take to be) the intended meaning.

(c) Regarding the procedure for Review by Faculty (of a Senate decision), which occurs via a petition signed by ten percent of the faculty: we have inserted a specification of how it is to be determined whether the stated criterion of ten percent of the faculty has been met.

# Exhibit E

## Section V. INQUIRY INTO DISPUTES AND SCHOLARLY MISCONDUCT

### A. Obligations

The University recognizes the right of faculty to express differences of opinion and to seek fair and timely resolutions of disputes or allegations of scholarly misconduct. It is the policy of the University that such disputes or allegations shall first be attempted to be settled informally and that all persons have the obligation to participate in good faith in the informal resolution process before resorting to formal procedures. The University encourages open communication and resolution of such matters through the informal processes described herein. The University will not tolerate reprisals, retribution, harassment or discrimination against any person because of participation in this process. This section establishes an internal process to provide University faculty a prompt and efficient review and resolution of disputes or allegations.

All University administrators shall be attentive to and counsel with faculty concerning disputes arising in areas over which the administrators have supervisory or other responsibilities, and shall to the best of their ability contribute to timely resolution of any dispute brought to them.

### B. Definitions

**Dispute:** A claim which occurs when a faculty member considers that any programmatic required activity or behavior, including actions or inactions by others, is unjust, inequitable, contrary to University regulations or policies, or a hindrance to effective faculty performance and student learning.

**Misconduct:** Fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or other practices that seriously deviate from those commonly accepted within the scholarly community for proposing, conducting or reporting scholarly activities including research. It does not include honest error or differences in interpretation of data or in judgments.

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

**Parties:** The parties to the proceedings as described in this section shall be: in the case of an informal dispute resolution, the complaining faculty member and any other persons whose action or inaction caused or contributed to the incident or conditions which gave rise to the dispute; in the case of an inquiry into an allegation of scholarly misconduct, the accused faculty member(s) and the accuser(s) (who may or may not be faculty); and in both cases, any administrator whose participation may be required in implementing a resolution or finding.

### C. Scope

This procedure delineates an appeal and resolution process appropriate for disagreements or conflicts ~~disagreements/conflicts~~ involving faculty that fall outside the Collective Bargaining Agreement or other University policies. Issues covered by this policy include, but are not limited to:

- disputes between faculty members on issues of collegiality, professionalism, civility, etc.;
- disputes between administration and faculty regarding the grade of a student or other matters pertaining to classroom management and instruction; matters of academic policy administration (Cf. CWU Policies Manual PART 5);
- allegations of scholarly misconduct made against any faculty member.

#### EXCLUSIONS:

Civil rights complaints properly addressed under the process provided in Part 2.2 of the General University Policies Manual.

Matters subject to the grievance process contained in Article ~~25~~ 26 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, which includes allegations of violations of the terms of the CBA.

Matters subject to the complaint process contained in Article ~~25~~ 26 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, which involves substantive academic judgments in matters of workload, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review.

#### D. The Faculty Disputes and Allegations Committee (FDAC)

##### 1. Composition

- a. The FDAC shall consist of three (3) faculty members who shall elect their own chair. At least three (3) and not more than six (6) alternate members shall also be selected, at the same time and in the same manner as the regular members, and be possessed of the same powers and subject to the same restrictions as regular members. Alternate members shall serve in the place of regular members in the event that a regular member, prior to any hearing or consideration of an issue, disqualifies himself or herself for any reason, resigns, has a conflict of interest in a dispute or allegation, or is otherwise unable to serve as a member of the FDAC. The order of service of alternate members shall be determined by the chair of the committee.
- b. Any tenured member of the faculty is eligible to serve on the FDAC, with the exception of chief administrators, including but not limited to the President, Provost/~~Senior~~ Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Life, deans, and associate deans. Membership on the Senate will not be required for eligibility. No two (2) members or alternates shall be from the same department.
- c. Members of the FDAC shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and ratified by the Senate at the last regular meeting of each academic year. Members and alternates shall serve terms of three (3) calendar years beginning September 15. Service on the committee shall be treated as service on a Senate standing committee, and thus shall be subject to the provisions of the Senate Bylaws, Section IV, Part A.1.d. Members and alternates may thus serve no more than two (2) successive terms. Terms shall be

staggered so that only one position will need to be filled in any one year for both member and alternate. When the original appointee is unable to complete the full term of office, an alternate shall complete the remainder of that three year term, at which time a new member and alternate will be appointed in the regular way. When an alternate replaces a member of the FDAC, a replacement alternate shall be appointed and ratified immediately to complete the remainder of the alternate's term.

## 2. Powers and Duties (General)

The FDAC shall have the following powers and duties:

- d. To select a chair at its first meeting and establish rules or procedures for the resolution of disputes and for inquiry into allegations of scholarly misconduct, provided that such rules or procedures are fair, are informal and are not inconsistent with provisions of the Academic Code, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), or other University policies.
- e. To perform the functions assigned to it by the Academic Code.
- f. To attempt to resolve by informal means any specific disputes or conflicts concerning members of the faculty as defined in Article 2.2 of the CBA.
- g. To determine whether an action or decision, as outlined in the petition, of any faculty body, faculty member or University official complained of by the petitioner was the result of adequate consideration of all of the relevant facts and circumstances. To determine that required policies and procedures of the University were followed.
- h. To decide whether an informal hearing is warranted by the determination described in 2(d).
- i. To recommend policy questions or issues, following or as part of its resolution of specific disputes or conflicts, to the attention of the President of the University or other appropriate administrators, and the Senate Executive Committee for further consideration by any Senate standing committees.

### E. ~~Dispute Resolution Procedure~~ Procedure for Dispute Resolution and for Inquiry into Alleged Scholarly Misconduct

1. The ~~dispute resolution~~ procedure hereinafter described is open to all faculty members who feel aggrieved in any matter or who believe that another faculty member has committed scholarly misconduct. The FDAC may accept a petition for review from a group of faculty members when substantially similar or identical complaints are made. The committee shall decide the issue of similarity and identity of complaints.
2. The following steps shall constitute the ~~dispute resolution procedure~~ procedure for dispute resolution and for inquiry into alleged scholarly misconduct:

- a. Prior to petitioning the FDAC for a hearing, the complaining faculty member or, in the case of a group complaint, representatives chosen by the group, will discuss the complaint or allegation with the dean or member of the University administration having direct responsibility for the area of concern, ~~and both parties shall make a good faith effort to settle the dispute whenever practical. (It is acknowledged that the nature of some disputes or allegations precludes such a step.) Both parties shall make a good faith effort to settle the dispute or to reach an acceptable explanation for the alleged misconduct, which may include the use of the Ombuds Office or other available resolution processes.~~
- b. If no mutually acceptable resolution of the dispute or explanation of the alleged misconduct can be reached through discussion with the appropriate dean or University administrator, the complaining faculty member or group may petition the FDAC for an informal hearing within 30 days of the termination of discussion. The petition shall be sealed, addressed to the FDAC and delivered to the office of the Faculty Senate ~~that~~, which will deliver the petition to all members of the committee within five (5) working days after receiving it. The petition shall set forth in writing and in reasonable detail the nature of the dispute or allegation, and shall state against whom the complaint is directed ~~and the relief sought;~~ and in the case of a dispute, the relief sought. The petition may contain any information that the petitioner deems pertinent to the case. The petition may be revised or withdrawn by the petitioner at any time prior to the committee's decision on whether or not to hold an informal hearing, but thereafter, only with the permission of the committee.
- c. The FDAC shall meet and review the dispute or allegation presented to it. It shall decide whether the issue warrants an informal hearing and will establish rules or procedures for the handling of the complaint.
- d. The Chair of the FDAC will schedule a meeting with the faculty member(s), an appropriate representative of the administration, and a representative of the United Faculty of Central (UFC) to discuss the scope of FDAC's determination and to discuss the next appropriate step(s) for dispute resolution or inquiry into the alleged misconduct. If, in the opinion of the Chair of the FDAC following an investigation its review and the subsequent discussion, a settlement is not possible, ~~the Chair will present the information to the full committee.~~ The committee shall decide by vote whether or not the facts merit an informal hearing. The committee's decision of cause or no cause for an informal hearing shall be issued in writing within twenty (20) working days of the delivery of the petition to the office of the Faculty Senate. If a regular academic session is scheduled to end before the expiration of such time, the committee shall have twenty (20) working days commencing with the first day of instruction of the next succeeding regular academic session to issue its decision.
- e. The FDAC shall issue a written opinion ~~embedding therein~~ stating its findings and recommendations ~~in any matter that comes before it~~. The opinion will be presented to the parties, the President of the University (or the chair of the Board of Trustees in the event the President is a party to the dispute ~~resolution~~ or alleged misconduct), and to the chair of the Faculty Senate. It may be circulated more widely if in the judgment of the FDAC a matter of University-wide policy is involved.
- f. All decisions of the FDAC, including the decision whether to grant an informal hearing, shall be by a majority vote of all the members of the committee.

## F. Informal Hearing Procedure

1. In the event the FDAC decides to conduct an informal hearing, the chair shall notify the involved parties as soon as possible after the committee's decision. The notice shall state the date, time and place of the hearing and shall include a copy of the petition filed with the committee. The informal hearing shall be held not less than ten (10) days from the mailing of the notice of the hearing to the parties; unless all of the parties, with the consent of the chair of the FDAC, agree to shorten the time to less than ten (10) days.
2. The FDAC may rule at any time prior to commencement of the hearing that it is unnecessary to hold an informal hearing.
3. The informal hearing review shall be conducted as expeditiously as possible and on successive days if possible.
4. The parties to the ~~dispute~~ case, and any others the committee deems necessary for the review, shall make themselves available to appear at the hearing unless they can verify to the committee that their absence is unavoidable.
5. Members of the FDAC shall remove themselves from the case if they deem themselves biased or have a personal interest in its outcome. FDAC members of the same department as the ~~complaining faculty member(s)~~ parties to the case shall not serve at the hearing. Within ten (10) working days following the mailing of notice of the hearing to the parties, each party shall have the privilege of one challenge of the committee's membership without stated cause and unlimited challenges for stated bias or interest. A majority of the committee membership must be satisfied that the member challenged for cause cannot hear the issue impartially before the member is disqualified.
6. In informal hearings, petitioners shall be permitted to have with them a faculty member of their own choosing to act as advisor and counsel.
7. Any legal opinion or interpretation given to the FDAC may be shared with all parties to the case.
8. Informal hearings will be closed to all except those personnel directly involved. All statements, testimony and all other evidence given at the informal hearing shall be confidential to the extent allowed by law.
9. The FDAC shall file its findings and recommendations with the President of the University within ten (10) working days after the conclusion of the informal hearing. There shall be no review by the Faculty Senate.
10. Within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the findings and recommendations of the FDAC, the President or the President's designee shall inform all parties to the case, the chair of the FDAC and the Faculty Senate chair in writing of his/her decision. The action of the President or the President's designee shall constitute notice of the final decision in the informal hearing review procedure. In an extenuating circumstance, such as the unavailability of the President

and/or appropriate legal counsel, an extension to 20 twenty (20) working days may be agreed upon by the parties involved.

11. Faculty members who disagree with the final decision in the informal hearing procedure maintain their rights to seek review by other appropriate agencies (e.g. UFC, ~~Ombuds Office~~, civil court, etc.).
12. In the event that a petition is filed during official holidays or summer break, the notice provisions of this section shall become applicable beginning the first class day after the holiday or summer break. The FDAC may, at its discretion, hear a petition within that holiday or summer break period. In such cases, the notice provisions of this section become effective as of the date the petition is filed.

Rationale:

Since both charges concern Section V of the Academic Code, we have addressed them together.

Here is a summary of the most significant changes and additions that we are recommending.

- (1) It seemed unnecessary to constantly refer to the Faculty Disputes and Allegations Committee by its full name, so it has been shortened to 'FDAC' after its initial appearance in the title of Part D. These changes occur throughout Parts D, E, and F.
- (2) In Part D.2, we have accepted the additions that were suggested by the FDAC itself. In particular: 
  - Their suggested language stipulating that it is the prerogative of the FDAC to decide whether or not a complaint brought before it warrants a hearing.
  - Their suggestion that the language describing the general grounds for that decision be moved from Part E into Part D.
- (3) In Part E there are two main kinds of changes:
  - Additional language reflecting the fact that the FDAC's sphere of inquiry now includes allegations of scholarly misconduct as well as disputes involving faculty.
  - Changes suggested by the FDAC itself: that some disputes or allegations may not be able to be discussed with the relevant member of the University administration (D.2.a), and that the FDAC's procedure includes a step in which it is decided whether a hearing is warranted.

## Exhibit F

Bylaws Section IV.A.3.

e. The Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee shall be concerned with assessment tools affecting ~~F~~faculty or requiring ~~F~~faculty input. It shall receive, review, initiate, and make recommendations ~~or proposals for~~ regarding assessment tools used for the quarterly Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) forms and reports, the biennial Faculty Assessment of Academic Administrators, and the biennial annual Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee Assessments, ~~and do such other similar things as charged by the Senate Executive Committee~~. It shall also perform other related tasks as charged by the Senate Executive Committee. In all of the above-mentioned tasks it shall coordinate ~~Coordinating~~ its efforts with other individuals, groups or committees as necessary or appropriate. The membership shall consist of five (5) faculty members (one from each college plus one from the library) nominated and ratified to staggered terms.

## Exhibit G

Academic Code Section IV.D.1.

e) The Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee shall be concerned with assessment tools affecting ~~F~~faculty or requiring ~~F~~faculty input. It shall receive, review, initiate, and make recommendations ~~or proposals for~~ regarding assessment tools used for the quarterly Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) forms and reports, the biennial Faculty Assessment of Academic Administrators, and the ~~biennial~~ annual Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee Assessments, ~~and do such other similar things as charged by the Senate Executive Committee~~. It shall also perform other related tasks as charged by the Senate Executive Committee. In all of the above-mentioned tasks it shall coordinate ~~Coordinating~~ its efforts with other individuals, groups or committees as necessary or appropriate.