

## Introduction

The Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges has accredited Central Washington University continuously since 1918. The university had its regularly scheduled ten-year full-scale evaluation in October 1999. In preparation for the visit, the university conducted an extensive and introspective self-study (**Exhibit I.A: 1999 Self-Study**). The visiting team complimented the university on the collaborative effort that characterized the self-study process and on the thoroughness and frankness of the report (**Exhibit I.B: 1999 Evaluation Team Report**).

The period immediately prior to the 1999 visit was a challenging one for the university. Strong and well-qualified faculty and staff, vital academic programs, and a nurturing environment for students on the main campus and at the university centers were tempered by discontent between administrators and faculty and seriously lagging faculty salaries. At the time of the visit, an interim president, Dr. Dolph Norton, only recently had been appointed. The university's governance structure and organization were undergoing review. Even so, the visiting team found a university already in transition to increased vitality. The search for an installed president had begun, faculty retirements had resulted in an aggressive program of faculty recruitment and hiring, the Board of Trustees was active and supportive of growth and improvement within the university community, and the student body was engaged and engaging. Problems existed, but a sense of optimism pervaded the campus as issues were addressed under the leadership of the interim president.

The visiting team, in its comments, noted this vitality and optimism. The team commended the university in the following areas.

- An excellent approach to the self-study process
- Achieving and sustaining a high level of commitment on the part of faculty, staff, and students in fostering an effective learning environment
- The attractiveness of the campus
- Creative use of funds for information technology
- Institutional commitment to serving non-traditional students
- Student involvement in research and creative activities at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Progress in promoting diversity

These commendations accurately reflected strengths of the university, in which members of the university community take great pride.

At the same time, the visiting team cited six areas for improvement. Subsequently, the NASC commissioners recommended a focused visit after two years to evaluate the university's progress toward meeting the recommendations (**Exhibit I.C: Decision Letter from the Commission**).

At the direction of Dr. David Dauwalder, then provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, a team of faculty and staff was gathered together under the leadership of then associate vice president, Dr. Gregory Chan. The team was responsible for studying progress in the areas that had been identified and gathering information for inclusion in the interim report. Dr. Phil Backlund, professor of communication, was asked to draft the report for review by the university community and submission to the commission.

## **Overview of Changes at the University**

Since the 1999 report and review, the face of the university has changed considerably. Dr. Jerilyn S. McIntyre was appointed as the institution's 13<sup>th</sup> president and began her tenure in July 2000. Inaugural activities in October 2000 were spirited events that elicited wide participation, enthusiasm, and optimism. Searches for two new vice presidents to lead two of the four major divisions of the university (**Exhibit I.D: Central Washington University Organizational Charts**) began almost immediately after Dr. McIntyre's arrival and concluded by the end of spring quarter, 2001. Dr. David Soltz was appointed as provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, and Dr. Charlotte Tullos was appointed as vice president of student affairs and enrollment management. Searches will begin for the two remaining vice presidencies during the 2001-2002 academic year.

Awaiting permanent appointees to these first tier administrative positions, some positions in the second tier of the administrative ranks have been filled with interim appointees. As the current academic year begins, searches for permanent officials for these very important roles, which include associate vice presidents and deans, will be initiated.

These changes in leadership bring with them great promise for the institution, but they also have slowed somewhat the university's progress on some of the visiting team's recommendations. In the area of governance, for example, the university has made excellent strides in meeting the evaluators' recommendation, but the impact of its initiatives cannot be gauged fully because so many of the university's upper-tier administrative office-holders are new to their positions. In the area of assessment, many members of the faculty, working together with administrators, reviewed and restructured assessment processes, but some processes are only beginning or have not yet resulted in anticipated outcomes. In the area of the role of graduate studies, forums and focus groups have been useful in discovering the perspectives of various constituent groups, but it will take action by the newly appointed provost to change practices for the initiation, review, and approval of programs.

President McIntyre set as her first task the development of a viable strategic plan for the university, one that could guide progress for the next five years. Everyone with any connection to the university was given a means to participate, and the outcome was a

document that represented input from the university community and the leadership of the president and the Board of Trustees. Still, the work of prioritizing objectives, setting baselines, and establishing benchmarks only now is beginning.

The two years since the full-scale NASC visit have been ones of intense effort to improve the university, both in the areas that were identified by the commission's evaluators and in areas that the university identified in its ongoing process of self-inspection. They have been years of enhancing the university's reputation among its alumni and other citizens of the state of Washington. It has been a time of re-evaluating the role of higher education in general and the specific mission and vision of Central Washington University in particular. We know that our work is not finished, but we are quite optimistic that the processes now in place stand us in good stead for continued progress and greater accomplishments.

### **Overview of the Report**

The interim report is divided into six sections--one for each of the visiting team's recommendations. The response to each recommendation is made up of four sections:

- **Historical Perspective:** The events that led to the recommendation
- **Response to the Recommendation:** A description of the university's efforts to address the recommendation
- **Appraisal:** Critical evaluation of the university's progress
- **Next Steps:** Steps the university has planned to continue its progress on the recommendation

Each recommendation has a number of associated exhibits. These exhibits are cited in the body of the response and listed at the end of each section. The exhibits will be available for the evaluator's review in the provost's office. Some sections cite appendices, which are included at the end of this report.

The university looks forward to this focused visit as another opportunity for feedback and development.

### **EXHIBITS**

**Exhibit I.A: Central Washington University 1999 Regional Accreditation Self-Study**

**Exhibit I.B: Visiting Team Report**

**Exhibit I.C: Decision Letter from the Commission on Colleges**

**Exhibit I.D: Central Washington University Organizational Charts**

## Recommendation One: Mission and Goals

### HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

At the time of its 1999 full-scale NASC evaluation, Central Washington University was operating with a mission statement, adopted March 19, 1993, that did not reflect accurately the purpose and activities of the university (**Exhibit 1.A: 1993 Mission Statement**). The mission statement had been developed through a collaborative process directed by the Strategic Planning Committee with subsequent approval by the Board of Trustees. Its language paralleled state statute, describing the institution's role as a comprehensive university and its authority as a state regional university to offer undergraduate and graduate education programs through the master's degree. The statement also clarified that citizens of the state of Washington were the university's major constituency. However, it did not provide insights into unique contributions of Central Washington University nor did it provide guidance for the development of new initiatives or programs.

In 1999, the university had been engaged in strategic planning for a number of years. The process might best be described as a bottom-up report of goals and accomplishments of individual units, but without obvious connections to university-wide goals and planning. Further, the unit plans did not appear to influence university-wide decision-making, and the link between unit plans and resource allocation was unclear.

Both the self-study team, in its appraisal of the institution's compliance with Standard I, and the visiting team recognized these issues and advocated a more focused mission statement, accompanied by university-wide goals and objectives. Of particular interest was the development of a mission statement that was widely endorsed by the university faculty, staff, students, and the surrounding communities. Ideally, the mission statement, in combination with a vision statement, would provide direction and lead to priority-setting goals and objectives. These goals and objectives, then, would inform the institution's program of university-wide assessment and evaluation. The visiting team's recommendations read:

*No more important task confronts the University than completing the current discussions on role and mission, taking action to improve and implement a statement, coupling a strategic planning process to the statement with explicit goals and objectives, and crafting an assessment program to gauge overall achievement of institutional objectives. Mission and goals define the institution. It is important that the Board continue to solicit advice from faculty, staff, students, and administration on this task, but a shared commitment to closure is in order. Ultimately, everything flows from mission and we strongly recommend that this become a priority concern for the entire University community.*

In addition, the team recommended that the university craft an “*assessment program to gauge overall achievement of institutional objectives.*”

### **RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION**

The university’s response to the recommendation has focused on three areas:

- Completing a new mission statement
- Developing a vision statement and areas of strategic emphasis
- Refining the planning process and selecting appropriate performance indicators for goals and objectives

### **Mission Statement**

Under the leadership of then interim president Dolph Norton, Central Washington University embarked on a process through fall 1999 and winter 2000 to complete its work in developing a new mission statement. Several recommendations noted in the appraisal section of the university’s self-study served as a guide for the development process, specifically:

- a sharper sense of Central Washington University as a unique institution in the northwest;
- increased application of the mission statement to university decision-making;
- greater university community acceptance of the sentiments of the statement;
- increased allocation of funds to university-wide goals in addition to funds allocated to specific units and departments; and
- greater clarity about the importance of the university centers and their individual contributions to the university's mission.

A Strategic Planning Committee was commissioned by President Norton to oversee the development of the new statement. The committee sought and received university-wide participation in formulating and commenting on various drafts of the mission statement. These drafts culminated in a final version that was adopted by the Board of Trustees in February 2000 (**Exhibit 1.B: 2000 Mission Statement**). As part of the mission statement, a set of shared values also was adopted.

To ensure that the new mission statement was widely known outside the institution, it was distributed to the governor’s office, the state legislature, and Washington State representatives to the U.S. Congress. Internally, the mission was posted to the university web site under a link on the president’s page at <http://www.cwu.edu/~pres/mission.html>. Professionally designed posters were placed in major administrative and academic offices, and the revised mission statement also was incorporated into university publications (**Exhibit 1.C: Publications of Mission Statement**), including:

- Central Today magazine (twice)

- Central Washington University annual report for 2001 (to be published in 2002)
- Central Washington University Catalog
- A brochure outlining the university's mission, vision, and goals
- CWU Foundation's Annual Report

The university community recognized that a new mission statement was only the beginning of a series of steps that would be needed to establish a more integrated planning process that was guided by outcomes and that guided decision-making. However, the interim president and the Board of Trustees felt the development of the university vision statement and strategic goals should await the arrival of the new president. Following a successful and highly respected presidential search process, Dr. Jerilyn S. McIntyre assumed the presidency in July 2000.

### **Vision Statement and Areas of Strategic Emphasis**

The university's mission statement was meant to describe the university's present role and purpose. The vision statement and strategic emphasis areas would guide the university into the future and set parameters for developing new initiatives and programs and for evaluating present activities.

In August 2000, the Board of Trustees (BOT) and President McIntyre identified six areas of strategic emphasis that would become the focus for visionary planning. The six areas were based on the results of BOT theme discussions, meetings with faculty and staff, recommendations from the Strategic Planning Committee, a CWU climate report that had been commissioned by an earlier administration, the NASC evaluation team report, the NCATE evaluation team report, and appraisals in the NASC self-study. The six areas were:

- Provide an outstanding academic and student life experience on the Ellensburg campus.
- Provide an outstanding academic and student life experience at the university centers.
- Develop a diversified funding base to support our academic and student programs.
- Build mutually beneficial partnerships with industry, professional groups, and institutions, and with the communities surrounding our campus locations.
- Maintain our tradition in the preparation of teachers by being a leader in the field of education.
- Create and sustain a productive, civil, and pleasant campus and workplace.

To ensure university-wide commitment to and involvement in refining the six areas of emphasis, the president devoted a daylong university forum in September 2000 to the goals. Following the forum, she established an Ad Hoc Strategic Planning

Synthesizing Committee in November 2000 to continue the productive discussions that emerged. The synthesizing committee's charge was to engage faculty, staff, students, and community members from the Ellensburg campus and the university centers in conversations as part of a process to develop a university vision and a set of goals and objectives that would assist the university in achieving its mission and moving in the direction of its vision.

The committee announced 43 forums between December 2000 and January 2001 on the Ellensburg campus, in the community, and at the university centers (**Exhibit 1.D: Strategic Planning Process**). Some sessions that originated on the main campus also were telecast electronically to the university centers. Forums were advertised using the web, local newspapers, direct mail, and electronic mail. In addition, the president sent letters requesting input into the discussion to community college presidents, alumni, and public school superintendents. Members of the campus community also were invited to respond electronically and/or participate in an online threaded discussion. Special forums were held for students.

Two members of the synthesizing committee participated in each session –one as a facilitator and one as a recorder. Each area of emphasis was scheduled at least five different times to provide ample opportunities for the campus community to attend. The forums had from 2 to 44 attendees from all divisions of the university. All forums were summarized by recorders and sent electronically to the president's office for compilation. The summaries were then posted on the web for review and distributed to the synthesizing committee in a form that came to be known as the "textbook" (**Exhibit 1.E: Synthesizing Committee Textbook**).

On January 26, 2001 the committee reconvened and agreed upon definitions to guide the next phase of its responsibilities (**Exhibit 1.F: Report of the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Synthesizing Committee**). Committee members came to consensus on definitions (**Exhibit 1.G: Definition of Terms**) of the terms vision, emphases, subgoals, objectives, actions, and strategies. They also developed subgoals for each of the six (formerly emphases, now newly named) university goals. After the subgoals were developed, the committee was divided into six sub-committees, one for each goal. The primary task of each subcommittee was to review feedback from the forums and develop objectives for each sub-goal (**Exhibit 1.H: Goal Elements**).

After this was accomplished, the full committee then reconvened to review the work of the subcommittees and further refine the university vision statement, subgoals, and objectives. A final document was created listing these elements (**Exhibit 1.I: Vision, Goals, Subgoals, and Objective Recommendations**). The draft document was submitted to the President's Advisory Council, the Board of Trustees, and the campus community for final review and feedback. The committee also submitted a list of action items from the feedback that were recommended for each sub-goal and objective. After reviewing the feedback, the committee made minor adjustments and forwarded the goals, objectives, and similar but alternate forms of a vision statement to the president. The materials were reviewed and discussed by the President's Cabinet and her advisory

council. President McIntyre completed the final editing of the vision statement and it was presented, along with the committee's goals and subgoals, to the Board of Trustees in June 2001 (**Appendix 1.A: Central Washington University Strategic Plan 2001 - 2006**).

The work of the synthesizing committee was the second step in following the NASC committee's recommendation to redefine the university mission and develop unified institutional objectives. Its specific purpose was to "couple a strategic planning process to the mission statement with explicit goals and objectives."

### **Planning and Institutional Effectiveness**

The third step in responding to recommendation one was to refine the institutional planning process and to develop appropriate indicators of institutional performance.

**Planning.** Virtually every department and unit of the university has been and is involved in planning. The strategic planning approach used by the institution up to the time of the 1999 full-scale NASC evaluation required all units to identify goals and objectives and provide them to their respective vice presidents to be incorporated into an overall planning document. This "filtering up" approach encouraged broad involvement on the part of the university community. It also led to greater cross-unit knowledge, better sharing of information, increased cooperation between units, and better articulation of the university's priorities to external bodies such as the state legislature.

Even though the process had provided a number of benefits to the university, a number of concerns pointed to the need for further refinement. A particular weakness of the approach was the limited relation between goals identified by a particular unit and institutional mission and goals. Additional suggestions in the 1999 self-study called for the university to differentiate between the goals of strategic and operational planning, between planning and reporting, and between non-budget related planning and budget-related planning, engaging in each of these activities as appropriate.

These recommendations reflected the self-study and visiting teams' common conclusion that much of what had been called strategic planning in the past had been more operational than strategic, had emphasized reporting rather than planning, and had placed a higher priority on planning that had fiscal implications than on other cost-neutral planning that could benefit specific units and the university as a whole.

These concerns led the president, in her charge to Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Synthesizing Committee, to focus on **what** the university hoped to accomplish, not **how** these outcomes would be accomplished. She encouraged the committee to develop a document that was powerful but also succinct. It was not to be a report of what had been done, but rather a roadmap for what would be done in the future. Last, she encouraged the committee to solicit ideas that could improve the university regardless of fiscal implications.

**Effectiveness.** Judgments of institutional effectiveness center on three interrelated components: clear goals and performance indicators, accurate and accessible data, and a process through which progress toward goals is analyzed.

*A. Setting Goals and Performance Indicators.* Setting goals and establishing standards of performance is not new to the university, but these processes often have stopped short of providing a tool through which progress and effectiveness can be assessed. Past efforts sometimes have been prompted by state-level requirements; for example, improvements in the graduation efficiency index were state-mandated, and have not always been tied directly to the university's mission or vision. President McIntyre initiated two processes that have been instrumental in moving the university toward a common and commonly accepted set of goals, objectives, and performance indicators that could become the basis for evaluation of effectiveness: a revised strategic planning process and a performance-based budgeting process.

The revised **strategic planning initiative** was implemented almost immediately after President McIntyre's arrival. While Central Washington University is generally perceived to be an effective institution and had engaged in strategic planning processes previously, there was little common agreement on the specific criteria by which its effectiveness should be judged. Clearly, faculty and staff have been quite engaged in improving the university, but efforts sometimes lacked the focus that would be brought to bear by a clear and common set of goals and objectives. The strategic planning effort provided an opportunity for the faculty and staff to be more thoughtful about desired outcomes of the work they do. The goals set parameters for decision-making and a standard by which decisions could be judged. Most important, the university now has common and commonly accepted outcomes that provide the basis for determining its effectiveness and accountability to both internal and external audiences. Currently, vice presidents, deans, and directors are reviewing the long list of possible objectives that resulted from the strategic planning process, prioritizing them, developing baseline measures, setting targets, and establishing benchmarks according to which judgments of progress can be made. The Office of Institutional Research will work with the vice presidents to identify useful data elements and generate reports that can be used to track progress on these objectives for evaluation and university planning.

**Performance-based budgeting** provided an opportunity for individual divisions of the university to develop criteria by which the productivity and quality of its units would be judged. Shortly after the revised strategic planning process was initiated, the president began working with each vice president to develop a set of common performance indicators for the units within his or her division, emphasizing equally quality and productivity. This work was done in the context of performance-based budgeting. The president clarified in her conversations with the vice presidents, in communications with the faculty, and in conversations with the Board of Trustees that the ultimate goal was to have a way of distributing the limited monetary and human resources of the university (**Exhibit 1.J: Performance-Based Budget Documents**). Ultimately, each unit would be asked to justify resource requests on the basis of the productivity and quality of the unit.

The president and vice presidents worked throughout the 2000-01 academic year to draft performance indicators related to quality and productivity. These indicators are tied to the university's goals and objectives and identify data categories that exist in or will be added to the university's data warehousing system. As the system develops, data related to each indicator will be reported and analyzed to support resource allocation decisions and to shape priorities.

*B. Accurate and Accessible Data.* To evaluate progress toward goals and to allocate resources on the basis of productivity and quality, the university must have an effective method for gathering, storing, and reporting data. To this end, the university has spent much of the past two years improving data management systems and making needed data more easily accessible in a timely fashion. Partially to achieve these goals and partially in response to an old and failing database system, the university is migrating to PeopleSoft's relational database. This effort requires a considerable re-engineering of the university's business processes.

Primary responsibility for coordinating efforts to improve data integrity is assigned to the Office of Institutional Research which is working with other units to develop processes that ensure periodic and routine updates to key tables and improved integrity of all the university's data management systems. The office developed a list of reports that are to be maintained consistently and distributed routinely to university decision-makers (**Appendix 1.B: Surveys and Reports Regularly Produced by Institutional Research; Exhibit 1.K: Sample Data Sets**).

At the time of the last full-scale NASC visit, the Office of Institutional Research was beginning a data-warehousing project. This project was begun in response to several longstanding data management problems.

- Institutional research data files had not been constructed or stored in a consistent manner over the years.
- Data and codes were not always entered and maintained in a consistent manner on the university's central information systems.
- Insufficient mechanisms existed for systematic error checking in the data systems.
- Data systems often were organized with specific operational purposes in mind, and insufficient consideration was given to reporting needs.
- Reports were slow in coming, and often data displayed in one report appeared to be inconsistent with those of another.

The data-warehousing project has progressed steadily. In 1999, none of the university's files were warehoused; today, four years of data are warehoused. This includes data on enrollment, admissions, and student demographics. Problems remain with processes used to extract admissions data, but these problems received considerable attention during Spring 2001 and will be a continuing focus of attention in the coming

year. Routine reports now are generated directly from warehoused data. In addition, edit checks have reduced substantially the amount of inaccurate or missing data. A number of reports and data now are posted to the web. These include departmental and college profiles, a common data set used by external organizations for guidebooks, surveys and student advisement results and information, basic enrollment statistics for the university, and alumni survey results. Degree reports and "facts at a glance," a set of basic information about the university, also are scheduled to be online by fall 2001 at <http://www.cwu.edu/~ir>.

The president's increased emphasis on data-based evaluation and planning is reflected in the relocation of the Office of Institutional Research in the university's organizational structure. This unit previously reported to the provost and vice president for academic affairs but now reports directly to the president and serves all divisions of the university. The move also positions the unit better for the coordinating and oversight role that is vitally important to an institution's data management efforts. More recently, the president moved the budget analysis function and personnel from the Division of Business and Financial Affairs to join the staff of the Office of Institutional Research in a new unit, tentatively named the Office of Budget Planning and Institutional Research, that reports directly to the president. The intent is to establish closer ties between these two functions that ultimately provide information critical to decision making.

*C. A Monitoring Process.* University governance structures already are in place to provide an avenue for monitoring. The Board of Trustees meets regularly throughout the academic year and receives updates on elements of university operations. The President's Cabinet and the President's Advisory Committee review progress on university-level goals in weekly meetings. The Office of Institutional Research provides data as requested to facilitate this review process. At the beginning of fall, 2001, the president and vice presidents will meet in retreat to prioritize objectives for the coming year, to continue work on the performance indicators, and to discuss the system whereby progress toward goals and objectives is monitored.

Each division of the university has an oversight council. In the Division of Academic Affairs, the Academic Affairs Council meets twice monthly and the Council of Deans meets weekly. The Business Affairs Council, the oversight council for the Division of Business and Financial Affairs, also meets weekly. The Council of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and the directors in the Division of University Relations each meet twice monthly. The university also has strong staff and student organizations that provide feedback on and input about ongoing initiatives of the university: the Faculty Senate, the Exempt Employee Association, the Employee Council, and the Associated Students of Central Washington University. All of these long-standing mechanisms provide an avenue for review of progress on important goals and objectives. In addition, minutes of all council meetings are either emailed to all faculty and staff or posted to a website.

Most important for the short term will be the assignment of responsibilities to the various divisions and units of the university for accomplishing specific objectives that

address each of the goals and sub-goals. This work is a primary agenda item for the President's Cabinet retreat scheduled for the second week in September 2001. At the same time, the president and vice presidents will develop a framework and timeline for reporting progress on objectives of the highest priority. They also will discuss mechanisms for reporting progress to members of the campus community and the Board of Trustees.

### APPRAISAL

The university response to the visiting team's first recommendation has been significant. The mission statement, vision statement, and university goals and objectives were developed through a collaborative process and have been adopted by the President's Advisory Council and the Board of Trustees. Objectives are being prioritized and measurement systems are being devised. Performance indicators have been drafted and currently are being tested. The university's system for gathering, storing, and reporting data is vastly improved. A system is being developed for routinely reviewing results related to goals, objectives, and performance indicators. As all of these pieces emerge, the university is much better positioned than it was two years ago to tie decision-making to planning, to sustain effective procedures and discard ineffective ones, and to allocate resources on the basis of productivity and quality in relation to stated goals of the university.

The performance-based budgeting system ties together strategic planning, decision-making, and budgeting. The process was slowed somewhat while the strategic plan, which forms the basis for the budget system, was being finalized. During the 2000-2001 academic year, each division began the work of developing a common set of performance indicators for all of its units. During the coming year, definitions for each indicator will be clarified. Unit-level and university-level baseline data will be collected in anticipation of the budget decisions that will be made in April, 2002. Although the work was not completed in time to inform resource allocation decisions during the academic year just past, the stage is now set for each unit to identify areas for improvement with deans, directors, and vice presidents and for university leadership to allocate resources in the 2002-2003 academic year.

The university has made significant strides in improving data collection, storage, and application systems. The availability of more reliable and consistent data to support planning and decision making has improved the ability of deans, chairs, and university administrators to make informed decisions in a timely manner. Even so, there is more work to do as the PeopleSoft project comes fully online, and the Office of Institutional Research will need to remain focused on the data warehousing project and on improving existing data collection and data reporting systems.

The Board of Trustees has taken an active interest in the planning processes of the university. They have advocated for a more coherent and integrated process for programmatic decisions and resource allocations. Members request and receive reports at

each meeting on the progress of these planning initiatives and encourage the administration to press ahead with the process. Their enthusiastic involvement, their individual professional skills, and their intelligent review of processes and progress greatly have benefited the university.

All of these improvements in the planning process have required considerable effort on the part of faculty, staff, and students and determined leadership by the president and vice presidents. President Nelson, in the early 90s, envisioned a collaborative planning process and laid the groundwork for strategic planning at Central Washington University. Interim President Norton and President McIntyre brought additional focus to the current planning process. Clearly, their leadership has been instrumental in achieving today's more sophisticated approach to planning and evaluation. Through their leadership, Presidents Nelson, Norton, and McIntyre have brought the mission statement, vision, and goal development process to closure.

The product of this work was important, but equally important was the collaborative process through which it was accomplished. During the development of the mission and vision statements and the goals and objectives, campus-wide constituents provided significant input. The process provided an opportunity for all members of the university community to engage in productive conversations regarding the future of the university. The conversations were lively and, as they continued, common themes emerged. In the end, the process revealed that the various groups who contribute to the health and welfare of the institution are in considerable agreement about the direction the university should take. The synthesizing committee took seriously its charge and made every effort to listen carefully to multiple voices and represent them in its report to the president. The process appears to have increased the confidence of faculty, staff, students, and the community in the ability of the president and vice presidents to lead the university.

### *NEXT STEPS*

The focus of the past year-and-a-half has been to develop the pieces of a system of planning, decision-making, and resource allocation. The task that remains is the integration of these elements into a smoothly operating process that is characterized by continuous monitoring, feedback, and refinement. Goals and objectives will need to be revisited routinely to ensure they are being met and to assess their impact on achieving the vision of the university of the future. This work will require continued leadership, collaboration, and persistence.

Progress on performance indicators is predicated on the availability of good data. The university has made significant process toward providing useful and reliable data about its operations, but areas for improvement remain. Some additional data sources are needed. Useful data must be available more rapidly and in consistent formats that allow comparisons across time. Internal studies of the relation between a number of variables

need to be conducted; for example, the relation of various demographic data about students to retention.

The Office of Institutional Research anticipates that during the summer of 2001, it will have the vast majority of data routinely used for academic reporting incorporated into the data warehouse structure. Along with this, the office will develop a data dictionary. The dictionary will contain the description of the original data elements from the central computing system, the business practices in place to maintain those elements, the edit checks in place to maintain data integrity, and any changes made to the information as it is brought into the data warehouse (**Exhibit 1.L: Data Dictionary**). At the same time, the office is continuing to work on new report formats for benchmark data and procedures for routine generation of data sets of information pertinent to management and academic evaluation. Focus groups representing all divisions of the university will be established to provide input on the usefulness of data and the format of reports.

Further, data must inform decision-making. To achieve this end, the three steps already underway must be continued. First, there must be greater confidence in the integrity of the data that are being collected. The President's Advisory Council approved a new university committee: the University Data Integrity and Reporting Committee. The Office of Institutional Research has been gathering information to support the work of this committee, which will begin in fall 2001. The committee's stated purpose is to formalize procedures for ensuring accurate and timely data. Second, the university must continue to identify questions of importance and collect the necessary data to answer them. This will require on-going attention to the effectiveness of stated objectives in moving the university along toward meeting its goals and sub-goals and in achieving the university mission. Responsibility for oversight falls heavily on the President's Cabinet and the Board of Trustees, but it will require continued conversation and collaboration within the university community as well to ensure that all perspectives are represented. Third, there must be clarity about the interactive effects of each decision. The leadership will need to be attentive to unexpected consequences of individual actions on other functions of the university.

As baseline data are gathered for performance measures, they will be used to inform both budget and program decisions. This process will serve to integrate multiple university processes, strategic planning, accreditation, resource allocation, and aspects of program review and development, into a mutually influential decision-making process. This will significantly reduce duplication of effort and instances of isolated decision-making. It is likely that this process will take at least one complete budget cycle to be fully implemented. Once in place, the university will be in a far better position to make defensible decisions based on documented performance. This will close the planning loop, tying the university's mission and goals to assessment of strategic and practical plans and the subsequent modification of those plans based on accurate and timely data.

The university already has plans to resolve some of its short-term challenges, including refining the university strategic planning process, improving data management,

and defining targets of institutional effectiveness. The following list identifies short-term goals and primary assignment of leadership for this work.

- Improve articulation between strategic planning and resource allocation (President's Cabinet)
- Improve data systems and their use (Office of Institutional Research, ASSP)
- Name members to the newly established University Data Integrity and Reporting Committee in Fall 2001 (Office of Institutional Research)
- Develop internally driven criteria for assessing institutional effectiveness to accompany externally driven criteria (Board of Trustees, President's Cabinet, Faculty Senate)

We recognize that the work we describe here is difficult to do well and will require continued monitoring and refinement. We are prepared to take these steps.

### APPENDICES

**Appendix 1.A: Central Washington University Strategic Plan 2001 - 2006**

**Appendix 1.B: Surveys and Reports Regularly Produced by Institutional Research**

### EXHIBITS

**Exhibit 1.A: 1993 Mission Statement**

**Exhibit 1.B: 2000 Mission Statement**

**Exhibit 1.C: Publications of Mission Statement**

**Exhibit 1.D: Strategic Planning Process**

**Exhibit 1.E: Synthesizing Committee Textbook**

**Exhibit 1.F: Report of the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Synthesizing Committee**

**Exhibit 1.G: Definitions of Terms**

**Exhibit 1.H: Goal Elements**

**Exhibit 1.I: Vision, Goals, Subgoals, and Objective Recommendations**

**Exhibit 1.J: Performance-based Budgeting Documents**

**Exhibit 1.K: Sample Data Sets**

**Exhibit 1.L: Data Dictionary**

## Recommendation Two: Governance

### HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The Central Washington University governance system operates under the policies identified in the University Policies and Procedures Manual (**Exhibit 2.A: Policies and Procedures Manual**). The self-study provided evidence that the university conforms to these policies and that the policies are consistent with NASC standards.

At the time of the 1999 review, the university was in the process of a national search for a new president. Dr. Dolph Norton was serving as interim president. The events that led to this search included a vote of no confidence by the faculty in the previous president, Dr. Ivory Nelson. In addition, the self-study reported on a 1998 referendum in which 74 percent of CWU faculty who voted indicated a desire to be represented by a collective bargaining unit through United Faculty of Central (**Exhibit 2.B: Ballot and Vote Results**). However, in October 1998, the Board of Trustees affirmed its commitment to work with the Faculty Senate as the official representative of the faculty and declined to support actively the collective bargaining initiative. The no-confidence vote and the collective bargaining referendum were indicative of some of the more pressing issues that the institution faced in the area of governance and administration.

A recurring theme in the self-study was the need for the different elements of university governance – staff, faculty, committees, administration, and trustees – to develop mechanisms for performing their functions with greater interdependence and collaboration. At the time, the various governance entities were described as operating instead in an independent, parallel manner. The self-study identified other related issues and concerns that had developed: increases in the number of vice presidents and in the number of exempt and professional employees (formerly known as administrative-exempt employees) relative to faculty and classified staff, differences in the manner of determining pay rates for faculty and exempt staff, and a lack of formal mechanisms for participation in governance by classified staff.

Finally, the self-study identified some newly implemented policies and practices whose impact on governance and administration could not yet be evaluated. These included the addition of a student member on the Board of Trustees, efforts by the Board of Trustees to involve the faculty and inform them of board actions, and the adoption of an exempt pay policy.

Based on the self-study and its findings, the recommendation of the NASC Evaluation Committee on the governance and administration read:

***We recommend that the Board, administration, faculty, staff, and students undertake a major commitment to revitalize and strengthen governance and***

*administration at Central. The troubles at Central should strengthen the resolve of all of the interested groups to learn individually and collectively from the recent breakdown. A successful search for a new chief executive is an immediate task. Reliable and open channels of communication must be constructed and faculty, students, and staff should be supported in their participatory role. At the same time, the governance system should enhance strong presidential leadership, a critical component in a healthy governance system.*

### RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION

The visiting team recommended revitalizing governance and administration, creating open and reliable channels of communication as a means to increase participation, and enhancing presidential leadership. The university community widely supported these recommendations and has made a concerted effort to respond to them. These responses are described below.

**Hiring a new president.** During the 1999-2000 academic year, the university completed a national search for a new president and hired Dr. Jerilyn S. McIntyre. She assumed the presidency on July 1, 2000 and immediately began to address the issues facing the university. The Board of Trustees delineated its expectations of the new president in her contract letter (**Exhibit 2.C: Presidential Search Documents**).

**Revising the administrative structure.** During the tenure of the interim president, a committee of five faculty members, one dean, and the five vice presidents reviewed the administrative structure of the university. They reviewed organizational charts of other universities of the same size, considered the functions the university must undertake, and brought their own understanding of appropriate alignments of functions to bear on their discussions. As the committee worked, they invited other members of the university community to submit alternative organizational structures and realignments. The committee's report said, in part:

*The primary conclusion is that Central's current structure does not emphasize, as much as it might, the priority of the academic mission of the university. The committee recommends that any realignment should highlight this priority and should clarify that the function of all units of the university is to support the academic mission. We fully recognize that the organization chart alone cannot assert this priority and that instead the shift in emphasis will require presidential leadership.*

Along with this primary conclusion, the committee submitted four alternative structures and indicated that they had not concluded that there were too many administrators or that any functions currently performed were unnecessary; however, at the same time they suggested that the university could operate with fewer than five divisions and corresponding vice presidents. Based on the recommendations of the

committee, Interim President Norton, with agreement of President-Elect McIntyre, made a number of changes in the upper organization of the university including reducing the number of divisions from five to four. This reorganization combined the Division of Student Affairs and the Division of Enrollment Management and Marketing into one -- the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. Most of these changes occurred by the beginning of the 2000-2001 academic year, although the recent shift of the budget analyst function and more recent revisions of the organizational charts within each division reveal that some additional refinements continue.

**Solidifying administrative leadership.** President McIntyre has established herself as a strong leader both within and outside the university. At the beginning of her administration, she recognized the importance of building a strong leadership team whose members were mutually supportive and whose personal and professional styles blended well with her own. She conducted an evaluation of the vice presidents and, in two cases, initiated and completed national searches for two of these top administrative positions-- provost and senior vice president for academic affairs and vice president for student affairs and enrollment management. The position of vice president of university relations was filled at that time by an interim appointment. A search for the position was delayed until the 2001-2002 academic year, and the interim appointee remained in the position. The fourth vice presidency -- of business and financial affairs -- was filled by an installed appointee who remained during the 2000-2001 academic year but has since accepted a position at another university. The position will be filled by an interim during the 2001-2002 academic year while a search for a permanent appointee is conducted.

President McIntyre has addressed pressing problems directly, communicated about them to the university community, and developed effective courses of action. A notable example is her response to the enrollment shortfall that became apparent shortly after her arrival and that required budget reductions in all areas of the university. President McIntyre stayed in touch with students and faculty in written communications and in meetings with constituent groups, assigned specific tasks to the vice presidents in an effort to diminish the impact of the shortfall, was active in negotiating a resolution with the state legislature, and explained the basis of her decisions to concerned parties.

**Strengthening the planning process.** As described in the response to NASC recommendation one, President McIntyre successfully conducted a university-wide process to develop a strategic plan. In addition, she began the development of a performance-based approach to budgeting that is informed by the goals and objectives developed in the strategic plan and specific performance indicators related to quality and productivity developed within the four divisions of the university (**Exhibit 2.D: Vision, Goals, Subgoals, and Objective Recommendations**).

**Increased involvement of the Board of Trustees.** Central Washington University has been fortunate to have an active and interested Board of Trustees for many years. Even so, the board recognized room for improvement and changed its operating procedures to increase members' knowledge of university operations and to improve communication with constituents. Three actions are particularly noteworthy.

First, the board established three subcommittees to address three broad areas of its responsibilities: academic affairs, resource development, and student affairs. Faculty, staff, and students are invited to participate in the subcommittees' study sessions as topics of importance are discussed. The study sessions also provide an opportunity to showcase exceptional talent of faculty, staff, or students. Second, the board vowed to improve its communication with the university community. Meetings have always been open to the public and minutes of meetings are widely available, but there was no formal mechanism through which board deliberations, concerns, or actions were communicated directly to the university community. During the past academic year, the board chair began the practice of sending a report to the university community by electronic mail following each meeting about the board's actions and activities. In addition, the board sets aside one meeting a year, the October board meeting, for discussion with faculty about faculty issues and concerns (**Exhibit 2.E: Sample Minutes, Electronic Mail, and Videotapes of BOT Meetings**). Last, the board responded to a concern of the classified staff that they alone of the staff were not formally represented at Board of Trustees meetings. Now, on a rotating basis, a representative of either the Exempt Employees Association, the Employee Council, or the collective bargaining unit that represents some classified staff is invited to the table during meetings of the Board of Trustees and has an opportunity to report to the board as appropriate. The staff representative joins the chairs of the Faculty Senate and of the Associated Students of Central Washington University.

**Increased effectiveness of the Faculty Senate.** The Faculty Senate leadership has improved its efforts to insure that its members clearly understand the role of the senate in university governance through a senate orientation at the beginning of the academic year. In addition, senate leaders encourage senators to make genuine and regular efforts to communicate with their department colleagues. To support this effort, the senate office provides notes of senate meetings to senators, in addition to official minutes, and posts information to the Faculty Senate web site at (<http://www.cwu.edu/~fsenate/>). The Faculty Senate Executive Committee is coordinating the work of its standing committees by appointing an executive committee liaison to each committee (**Exhibit 2.F: Faculty Senate Communications and Web Site**).

**Improved faculty salaries.** Poor faculty salaries and salary inequities were cited by the 1999 NASC visiting team. Faculty dissatisfaction with salaries has been an issue at Central Washington University for a number of years, and decisions about how to improve them have been a major source of tension between the administration and the faculty. As we describe in greater detail in our response to recommendation four, the university has made significant progress in improving faculty salaries. The average faculty salary at CWU improved by 18 percent from fall 1997 (\$43,619) to fall 2000 (\$51,388). These improvements shifted Central's relative ranking among peer institutions from the 14<sup>th</sup> percentile (Fall 1997) to the 24<sup>th</sup> percentile (Fall 1999). A number of grievances continue to be filed by faculty members over perceived inequities among faculty.

Faculty and administrators have worked together to define the problem, establish procedures to address the problem, and revise university policy to improve the situation. Over time, the actions of the Faculty Senate, the Board of Trustees, and the administration are expected to reduce the tension surrounding this issue (**Exhibit 2.G: Salary Equity Process Documents**).

**Open channels of communication.** Communication is the keystone of participation and inclusion. For faculty and staff to participate effectively in the governance process, three conditions must be met: First, timely and accurate information must be readily available. Second, avenues of participation must be easily accessible. Third, the participants must believe that their participation will have an effect on the outcome. The university is making progress in all of these areas. Although minutes of university-wide and division meetings have been open to all members of the university community, the level of effort required to access them has frustrated many faculty.

In response to these concerns, President McIntyre revised the format of the University Bulletin (distributed every two weeks) so it could more easily serve as a conduit for information about decisions, concerns, celebrations, and other information of interest to the university community. These bulletins are posted to the university web page and distributed in paper copy to those who don't have easy access to the Internet. The use of electronic mail for the distribution of announcements and minutes has led to speedier transmission of information. Most important, the president has focused on achieving appropriate levels of contact with university groups. She meets regularly with the leaders of the Faculty Senate and, as requested, with leaders of the Employee Council, the Exempt Employees Association, employee unions, and the Associated Students of Central Washington University. She also provides a two-hour block twice monthly for drop-in visits by faculty, staff, and students who want to talk to her. All these efforts have provided university personnel with greater access to a much wider range of information. The collaborative process first used in developing the university's vision and goal statements has become the model for insuring participation and attacking difficult challenges. That process combined large-group meetings and focus groups with electronic mail and a website to give students, faculty, and staff an opportunity to participate at whatever level was comfortable.

Additional efforts to insure better communication between the faculty and staff and the administration include:

- Regular participation of the president, provost, deans, and other administrators in Faculty Senate deliberations
- Participation of the provost, associate vice presidents, and deans with Faculty Senate standing committees
- Participation of Faculty Senate representatives in Board of Trustees committee meetings
- Participation of the chair of the Faculty Senate on the Academic Affairs Council, which is the oversight council of the Division of Academic Affairs

- Five years of cooperative effort between the chair of the Faculty Senate and the provost in planning and conducting an annual fall faculty meeting
- Collaboration between faculty and administration on the Faculty Senate's Ad Hoc Salary Administration Board
- Regular communication between the provost and Faculty Senate chair throughout the year

### APPRAISAL

The university has made significant progress in addressing the recommendations of the NASC evaluation committee in the area of governance and administration. The search for a president was completed with the appointment of Dr. Jerilyn S. McIntyre during winter 2000. The search process was fair and open and inspired confidence within the university community. It established a collaborative approach that is proving useful in addressing other matters of importance to the university community including our responses to the recommendations of the NASC visiting team. The same spirit was applied to the search processes for the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs and the vice president for student affairs and enrollment management.

The Board of Trustees recognized the need for an improved and more positive system of governance and included this task among its charges to President McIntyre at the beginning of her tenure. They reflect on her success in the first year in her first year evaluation (**Exhibit 2.H: First Year Evaluation of President McIntyre**). The board found that President McIntyre met and exceeded their expectations in all regards. The board is particularly complimentary of President McIntyre's effectiveness in improving communication with constituents within and outside the university.

The administrative structure of the institution was reviewed and revised in an attempt to achieve greater efficiency and reinforce the academic mission of the university. At all levels, administrators and committee heads have stepped up efforts to listen carefully to and communicate effectively with their constituents. The Board of Trustees, administrators, and groups such as the Faculty Senate have attempted to improve channels of communication at all levels of the organization. Increased contact between parties and better distillation and distribution of information has resulted from these efforts.

The Board of Trustees' new committee structure has increased opportunities for participation by members of the Faculty Senate and staff organizations. This action has enhanced the participatory role of faculty in university governance. Likewise, a student member of the Board of Trustees has provided a stronger voice for students in university governance.

President McIntyre's effective efforts during the 2001 Washington legislative session provided evidence that the university is benefiting significantly from strong presidential leadership. An unexpected fall 2000 enrollment shortfall forecast a revenue

shortfall. President McIntyre's rapid response to revise the university's spending plan and her candor and open communication with the legislature, the state's Higher Education Coordinating Board, and the governor's Office of Financial Management softened the blow to the budget and to programmatic offerings.

President McIntyre lent visible support from her office to the strategic planning process. As a result, she was able to bring the university's mission, vision, and goal process successfully to closure. The appointment of administrative liaisons from the Division of Academic Affairs to senate committees and of Faculty Senate Executive Committee liaisons to the senate's standing committees has improved communication among committees and between faculty and academic administrators. Issues are openly raised and discussed and the fear of retaliation that once characterized faculty discussions seems to have abated.

From time to time, there is evidence of discontent, most notably in somewhat vitriolic electronic messages to the faculty list. Still, there is considerable evidence that faculty concerns can be raised directly with administrators and, likewise, that administrative concerns can be raised directly with faculty. A number of faculty grievances have been filed during the past two years, many in response to salary equity concerns. This upswing in the number of grievances suggests that efforts to address lagging salaries and salary equity have not been completely successful. A very positive approach to negotiating conflict among the classified staff has reduced the number of grievances among that staff group. However, some discontent surfaced among facilities management staff and resulted in a survey that assessed climate issues in the department and confidence in administrators. The matter has come before the CWU Joint Labor Relations Committee, and efforts to ease the conflict continue. **(Exhibit 2.I: Grievances and Other Disputes).**

A collective bargain initiative by faculty has not been resolved, and it is unclear how many faculty take an active interest in promoting this initiative. The Board of Trustees has taken no further action related to collective bargaining since the 1999 self-study. Members of the faculty collective bargaining unit, the United Faculty of Central, make overtures to the administration and the Board of Trustees. Their initiatives suggest a lack of trust in the ability of the administration, the Faculty Senate, and the Board of Trustees to address their concerns. However, in the absence of enabling legislation or action by the Board of Trustees, the faculty union continues to operate outside the channels of university governance.

The performance-based budgeting initiative is making the criteria by which judgments and decisions will be made more explicit **(Exhibit 2.J: Performance-Based Budgeting Documents)**. Successful searches for upper-level administrative positions have assured faculty, staff, and students that they have a very real role in university governance. The collaborative process that characterized the development of the strategic plan revealed the common aspirations of various constituents of the university and demonstrated the capacity of the university to govern itself in ways that are beneficial to its mission and to the well being of faculty, staff, and students. The initiatives that have

been undertaken have been particularly responsive to the needs identified in the self study for the different elements of the university governance structure – staff, faculty, committees, administration and trustees – to perform their functions in an interdependent, collaborative, and consensus-building manner. People are talking to each other openly and, for the most part, constructively. We believe we are moving in the right direction in our efforts to provide a more positive and effective system of governance at Central Washington University.

### *NEXT STEPS*

The initiatives undertaken represent significant attempts to strengthen the governance system of the university. Even so, there continues to be room for improvement. In the prior decade, the relationship between administrators and faculty often was corrupted by suspicion in both directions. A number of issues combined to create a condition of low morale within many groups. These historical trends are not reversed easily, and there continues to be some evidence of suspicion. Long term changes in patterns of interaction will require vigilance and continued development of more positive avenues for participation.

It is easy to list the strategies that have been employed to improve communication. It is quite another to assess the effectiveness of the efforts. Most important in the short term is to gather information from faculty and staff about the effectiveness of and their satisfaction with administrative efforts to improve communication and governance. At the beginning of the 2001-2002 academic year, the president will solicit feedback from the university community about the efforts of the past year and to determine areas in which further improvements are needed (**Exhibit 2.K: Feedback on Communication and Governance**). This information will provide insights to the administration about their leadership styles, the governance systems that are in place, and the effectiveness of the communication strategies that have been adopted.

Each constituent group of the university recognizes the need for better and more collaborative governance. The improvements of the past two years constitute a good beginning. The relative roles of collaboration and leadership within university governance are not fully resolved. Nor is it clear which issues require lengthy discussion and which require quick action by confident leaders. These will be matters for resolution in the years to come.

### *EXHIBITS*

**Exhibit 2.A: Policies and Procedures Manual**

**Exhibit 2.B: Ballot and Vote Results**

**Exhibit 2.C: Presidential Search Documents**

**Exhibit 2.D: Vision, Goals, Subgoals, and Objective Recommendations**

**Exhibit 2.E: Sample Minutes, Electronic Mail, and Videotapes of BOT meetings**

**Exhibit 2.F: Faculty Senate Communications and Web Site**

- Exhibit 2.G: Salary Equity Process Documents**
- Exhibit 2.H: First Year Evaluation of President McIntyre**
- Exhibit 2.I: Grievances and Other Disputes**
- Exhibit 2.J: Performance-Based Budgeting Documents**
- Exhibit 2.K: Feedback on Communication and Governance**

## Recommendation Three: Assessment

### HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

At the time of the full-scale evaluation, Central Washington University had been involved for nearly 10 years in a progressively more rigorous program of major program assessment initiative. Nearly all academic programs had developed student learning outcomes and some form of end-of-major assessment of student learning. However, the work was uneven, and not all programs could provide evidence that the results of assessment articulated back through the curriculum.

In addition, assessment of general education outcomes had stalled. The general education program had been revised, and student learning outcomes for the program had been established. The measure of student success in meeting general education requirements was completion of required and elective courses. Additional measures to affirm that students were achieving the stated outcomes had not been developed.

A systematic plan for program review had been in place in the previous decade, but the schedule of program reviews had been interrupted awaiting the development of a statewide process by the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Therefore, program review through much of the 1990s was limited to specialized accreditation and a process of internal review of all graduate programs.

As the institutional self-study was written in 1999, academic departments were asked to conduct a self-study in which they were to reflect on the coherence and currency of program design, identify the role of faculty in curriculum development and review, describe the relation of degree and certificate programs to the university's mission, and describe the department's program assessment plan and its outcomes. Departments reported on student recruitment and retention efforts and success, their program of student advisement, and the quality of their faculty. The departmental self-studies were thorough in their descriptions of department assessment efforts.

Based on its review of the supporting materials related to assessment, the 1999 NASC full-scale evaluation visiting team included the following recommendation:

***The institution is recognized for its assessment work at the program level. However, as the Self-Study says, there is more work to do. Steps need to be taken to assure that there are quality outcome measures in place in all programs, including general education. Also, the information from the assessment process should be used to influence decision-making and planning to continuously improve individual programs and the total University's educational program. To fully meet the Commission on Colleges' expectations regarding educational assessment, the University needs to place prime***

*consideration on the achievement of institutional goals through assessment of programs. (Standard 2.B., Policy 2.2)*

**RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION**

Central Washington University had been operating under an assessment plan developed and approved in 1992. In the intervening years, the situation had markedly changed in terms of assessment tasks and university personnel assigned to these tasks. Thus, the first task facing the university assessment committee following the October 1999 evaluation visit was to stabilize oversight of the assessment process and to review and revise the university assessment plan. Assessment oversight was moved to the office of the associate vice president for academic affairs who also had oversight of the curriculum approval and program review processes.

In an attempt to document and describe university-wide and program level assessment activities, a sub-committee of the assessment committee developed an "Assessment Matrix" during the academic year 2000-2001 (**Appendix 3:A – Assessment Matrix**). This matrix was intended to provide an organizational framework within which to describe the university's assessment efforts. The subcommittee developed a set of 10 assessment questions that were relevant to program assessment at Central Washington University and then identified current or prospective assessment techniques that could be useful in answering the questions.

This matrix replaced the previous organizational scheme, which organized assessment according to entry, intermediate, and end-of-program assessment. This comprehensive outline of assessment activities helps the committee identify assessment areas to be reviewed and strengthened and directs assessment activities at the university level. Both the Faculty Senate General Education Committee and the university Academic Program Assessment Committee reviewed the matrix and forwarded it to the Academic Affairs Council, which recommended its approval as the university's revised assessment plan. The provost approved the matrix on June 5, 2001.

For each assessment question in the matrix, five procedural characteristics are described: (a) the assessment instrument or strategy, (b) the time assessment is administered (for example, baseline, intermediate, end-of-program) (c) the individual or office responsible for administering the assessment; (d) to whom the assessment is administered (for example, all students, a random sample of students, students in particular majors); and (e) how the results are used. More than one assessment strategy is used to answer some questions, and the assessment strategies vary across measures of review of transcripts, performance, opinion, and external evaluation.

The 10 assessment questions and comments about the status of assessment related to each are summarized in the paragraphs that follow.

**1. Do students possess "basic skills" on entry into Central Washington University?**

Two assessment strategies are used to answer this question. First, students' transcripts are reviewed to ensure that they have completed prerequisite coursework or a GED equivalency. Second, students are required to submit ACT, SAT, or COMPASS scores. These tests are used to determine student eligibility for basic college-level English and mathematics courses. Central offers three remediation choices for students who do not qualify for the 101 level classes based on their CPT or COMPASS scores: (1) complete a remedial course (2) complete remedial work through the Academic Skills Center; or (3) self-remediation. In all cases, the students must demonstrate adequately improved performance before proceeding to classes for which the skills are prerequisite. The Academic Skills Center provides support to students whose test scores reveal deficits or to students who self-identify or are referred by the faculty for additional support. The Academic Program Assessment Committee is discussing a plan to verify success of these remediation techniques by tracking whether students are successfully completing English 101 or Math 101 following remediation.

**2. Do students exhibit improved competency and exit with appropriate levels of competency in certain generic skills, specifically (a) writing, (b) critical thinking, (c) quantitative-symbolic reasoning, and (d) information literacy?**

Reflecting the current statewide assessment efforts, the assessment matrix identifies four generic general education competencies: writing, information/technology literacy, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning for which student work products will be assessed. The plan calls for each of the four skills to be assessed in the context of classroom work products using independent judges. Students also are asked to evaluate their own competencies in these areas at the time they graduate, at one year following graduation, and at five years following graduation.

A method for the independent evaluation of work products is being developed as part of a collaborative project with the five other public baccalaureate institutions in Washington state. Central Washington University has participated from the beginning in the development of these assessment instruments. Of the four areas identified in the statewide initiatives, the writing instrument is the most refined. The following paragraphs describe the initiatives in greater detail.

**Writing.** The university had previously assessed junior-level writing competency of students and found that many did not meet faculty expectations. These data were presented in the 1999 self-study. Following the somewhat discouraging results, the university encouraged a "writing across the curriculum" approach and reformed the English composition curriculum. These efforts now have been underway for a long enough period of time for entire classes of students to benefit from them.

Now in its fourth year, the statewide Senior Writing Study evaluates the writing of seniors in five disciplines at the public baccalaureate institutions of higher education.

The study currently is using a rubric that evaluates student writing in the following five areas: content, reasoning, organization, rhetoric of the discipline, and conventions/presentation. The university writing assessment coordinator is responsible for collecting papers to be used in the assessment process at the state level. In summer 2000, a total of 225 papers were evaluated, including papers from Central Washington University (**Exhibit 3.A: Statewide Senior Writing Assessment, 2000**). A second set of papers was gathered during the winter and spring quarters of 2001. These papers were evaluated at a statewide conference in August 2001. Results will be tabulated for each of the areas specified above and for the overall evaluation. These results will be distributed to each state institution and to relevant legislative committees. At a local level, in order to improve student learning outcomes, the coordinator provides feedback and recommendations to the English faculty and the university's academic departments.

**Information Literacy.** Information literacy assessment is moving into its second year of assessment of student learning at the state level. The statewide group responsible for this assessment is in the process of developing a feasibility study for implementing statewide assessment beginning in fall 2001. Examples of papers and projects at the senior level will be gathered during the year and analyzed at a conference in summer 2002 using an agreed-upon evaluation rubric.

In addition, in order to improve information literacy and technology skills of incoming students, librarians at CWU have developed an instructional program that reaches over 1,000 freshmen students as part of their general education requirements. This program is delivered through Central Washington University's required freshman orientation course, University 101. The program includes an instruction session in the library, a web-based instructional tutorial, and an online interactive assessment that provides a way to measure student success in using information technology. Revisions to the program will be implemented in fall 2001 to respond to feedback and improve student learning.

**Critical Thinking and Quantitative-Symbolic Reasoning.** Both of these areas are developing at a slower pace at the state level than the other two skill areas. Definition, objectives, and assessment strategies have not been finalized and await further statewide conversations. Statewide leaders have been identified for these two areas by the Interinstitutional Committee of Academic Officers (ICAO), a statewide committee of provosts of the six public baccalaureate institutions. In addition, progress reports have been presented to the Higher Education Coordinating Board during this past year.

**3. Do students exhibit (a) adequate content knowledge in areas of study related to general education at the completion of their general education curriculum and (b) improved content knowledge and skills in areas of study related to general education from entry to the completion of their general education curriculum?**

As reported in the university's self study, a statement of mission, a rationale, and desired student outcomes direct Central's general education program (**Exhibit 3.B:**

**General Education Program Outcomes**). These outcome statements guide assessment efforts in the program.

The approved assessment plan details the manner in which adequate and improved content knowledge in general education will be assessed. The plan calls for transcript review to determine the GPA for general education and GPAs in segments of the general education program. While GPA analysis alone is not an adequate assessment tool, analysis of GPAs allows identification of classes outside the normal range of grade distribution for which special analyses may be warranted. In spring, 2001, the University Academic Program Assessment Committee approved a recommendation to use the COMPASS test as a pre- and post-test measure of content knowledge. One reason for adopting this test is that it is commonly used by the state's community colleges and allows comparisons of native and transfer students.

#### **4. Do students exhibit readiness to enter their chosen major field of study?**

A range of entry-to-major assessment processes are used by a limited number of academic departments, and these measures reflect both thresholds for admission to a major as well as diagnostic measures to indicate readiness for major components of study (**Appendix 3.B: Entry to and End-of-Major Assessment by Department**). The University Academic Program Assessment Committee has only recently turned its attention from end-of-major assessment to admission-to-major assessment practices. As commonalities are noted among department requirements, systematic data collection and benchmarking for intermediate assessment will begin.

The statewide senior writing study has been duplicated for students entering their junior year. The study had two purposes: gauge how well students can write academic texts and determine how well general education courses have prepared students to write these texts (**Exhibit 3.C: Junior Level Writing Project**).

#### **5. Do students exhibit appropriate levels of content knowledge at exit related to their major field of study?**

Each department has submitted and publishes a set of student learning outcomes describing expected outcomes of the major course of study (See individual department websites, departmental handbooks, and departmental self-studies from the 1999 full-scale evaluation). Each department also develops its own strategies to determine if students exhibit appropriate levels of content knowledge after completion of their major field of study. The end-of-program assessment strategies vary by department (**Appendix 3.B: Entry to and End-of-Major Assessment by Department; Exhibit 3.D: End-of-Major Assessment Documents**).

To update the extensive review in this area that was conducted for the 1999 self-study, the Academic Program Assessment Committee surveyed the academic departments for end-of-major assessment practices. Department chairs reflected on the current and past year's assessment along with a description of their plans to improve the

areas of weakness. Responses indicated that some departments are exceptionally skilled in assessing the outcomes of their education programs and using those results for the improvement of curriculum. It also is clear that technical and professional majors lend themselves more directly and easily to end-of-major assessment. Some programs embed end-of-major assessment in the terminal field-based internship. Some have commonly accepted national tests or certification and licensing examinations that provide criterion- or norm-referenced placement of students. Other departments are less satisfied with the strategies they employ and need further development and support. Assessment is more common among major fields of study than in disciplinary minors.

**6. What is the personal and demographic profile of our students?**

The assessment plan calls for the analysis of data from student admissions information. The information will be used to plan the development of appropriate services for students, provide for comparison to other schools, and provide a basis for prediction of student success when combined with performance on other measures. The data have been gathered and updated regularly. It is stored in the data warehouse and distributed to administrators and faculty as needed.

**7. How satisfied are students with aspects of their programs, specifically (a) individual classes, (b) their majors, (c) student support services, and (d) knowledge acquired?**

The assessment plan calls for a combination of student rating of instruction, the Noel-Levitz survey, department-generated surveys, and the graduating senior questionnaire. Data would primarily consist of student self-report information and would be used to provide evidence of student satisfaction, evidence of program content and delivery, and to determine areas of strength and weakness related to student support services (**Exhibit 3.E: Sample Student Satisfaction Surveys**).

**8. How well do targeted courses include and assess for certain general education competencies?**

The General Education Committee developed a survey (**Exhibit 3.F: General Education Course Survey**) designed to audit the course content of general education courses for alignment with the objectives of the general education program. The survey first was developed and administered in 1999. A fall 2001 readministration of the survey will update the data from the first administration. The committee also collected course syllabi from the most recent academic-year general education courses (**Exhibit 3.G: General Education Course Syllabi**). These syllabi also will be analyzed in fall 2001. The committee is developing a set of guidelines for new course approval for general education to ensure that any new courses address prescribed student learning objectives.

**9. How do our students compare with other students who complete similar programs of study?**

The assessment plan calls for the analysis of job placement rates, graduate school entry, survey of employers, and formal assessments such as the GRE, CPA, LSAT, MCAT, and other professional certification exams. Some departments conduct detailed analyses of these indicators; others are only beginning to identify comparative indicators and collect data. For those departments that have developed a system of assessing their students' comparative placement in their disciplines, the results of these investigations lead directly to curriculum revisions (**Exhibit 3.D: End-of-Major Assessment Documents**).

#### **10. How do individual academic programs compare with state and national standards?**

Each academic program prepared an extensive self-study for the October 1999 full-scale visit. The evaluation team commented favorably on these departmental self-studies, though it did note that some were stronger on analysis than others. The self-study process led to extensive self-evaluation on the part of every academic department.

Academic departments at Central Washington University participate in a number of specialized accreditation processes (**Exhibit 3.H: Specialized Accreditation List and Reports**) that require extensive internal and external review. In spring, 2001, the university underwent its full scale National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) evaluation which required program folios from all the disciplines and departments through which endorsement for teacher education is available as well as the graduate programs that prepare professional educators in school psychology, school counseling, and school administration. An official finding by NCATE is expected in October, 2001; however, the visiting team's report was strongly complimentary recommending that Central Washington University had passed all standards and was cited for two weaknesses in only one of those standards.

In addition, the accreditation plan of the College of Business was approved by the AACSB/The International Association for Management Education, and the college is now in the candidacy phase for accreditation. In this process, each of the three departments and all programs (with the exception of the newly developed master's program that is in its pilot year) in the College of Business are undergoing extensive review. The bachelor's degree in paramedics received full accreditation following a February, 2001 submission. The B.S. in chemistry is under review by the American Chemical Society's Committee on Professional Training. The master's degree in school psychology was nationally approved by the National Association of School Psychologists in spring 2000. The Department of Music will sit for its next review by the National Association of Schools of Music in 2002 and already is in preparation for this effort. Construction management and food sciences and nutrition, nutrition and dietetics specialization, also will submit for review in 2002.

The university has made less progress in obtaining formal internal and external review of programs that don't have specialized accreditation bodies. For many years, the university operated under a plan that required program review at least once a decade and,

later, twice a decade for all programs of the university on a rotating basis. Even then, programs that submitted to specialized accreditation review were exempt from additional review. This effort was directed by the university Program Review Committee. In the early 1990s, the state's Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) announced its intention to develop a statewide program-review process. Central decided to revise its system to match the process developed by the HECB. However, the HECB experienced one delay after another in developing a process that was acceptable to everyone. By the end of the decade, the HECB abandoned this effort. At about the same time, CWU had called for extensive internal self-study by each department in the process of preparing for the full-scale NASC evaluation and administrators decided not to put in place any other external review at that time. Immediately following the 1999 full-scale review, the major specialized accreditation processes were proceeding.

The result today is that the university is just now reviewing recommendations for a systematic review process for all programs of the university. Ideally, the university is interested in integrating program review, assessment, and performance based budgeting into an elegant review process that is cost-effective and non-duplicative. One proposal has had particularly strong support and pilot tests of its process, using one department from each college, are scheduled for 2001.

### APPRAISAL

The assessment matrix identifies 10 important program outcome questions and describes methods the university has adopted or is considering to answer the questions. Academic departments, the university Academic Program Assessment Committee, and key administrators have clarified the university's assessment mission and goals, discussed the philosophy and process of assessment, and implemented assessment protocols.

Still, the university has made more progress in some areas than others. In the past half-decade, the university has made considerable progress toward wider acceptance of the learning model. Academic departments have identified student learning outcomes and assessment strategies. When departments present new programs to the university curriculum committee, they must identify the following three levels of assessment in their proposal: entry, intermediate and end-of-program assessment strategies. Even so, some faculty worry that the emphasis on specific objectives limits the overall goals of higher education. There is some resistance. All programs have program-level objectives in place and most also have course-level objectives as well.

Central Washington University, like many other institutions, struggles to find an assessment plan that is both thorough and parsimonious. Most difficult has been the search for an acceptable way to assess general education competencies. The university has been actively involved in Washington state-level efforts to develop assessment in the areas of writing, information literacy, quantitative-symbolic reasoning, and critical thinking. The writing assessment has been field-tested and, at Central, has been piloted

not only as a senior level assessment but also as a junior-level assessment. Progress on the other four areas has been slower. There also has been very little progress toward developing a system to assess the general education competencies in the arts, sciences, and humanities content areas.

End-of-major assessment has not changed radically since the 1999 self-study. Some departments are doing a better job than others of using the results of assessment to revise their program or remedy specific student deficits. However, all departments have some form of end-of-major skill assessment, and a number of departments have made significant program changes on the basis of the results. Administrative oversight is important to ensure that these efforts continue in a systematic way.

Currently, the university does not have a systematic process for program review outside of that which is embedded in specialized accreditation. Because a large number of the university's programs are involved in specialized accreditation, many departments' programs have been reviewed. The university looks forward to the leadership of the new provost in developing a valid, parsimonious, informative, and prescriptive system of program review.

### *NEXT STEPS*

A major task of the incoming provost is to stabilize the administrative oversight of university program assessment. Assessment oversight is a responsibility of the associate vice president for undergraduate studies, a position that currently is vacant and will be filled with an interim appointee during the coming year. The person who is appointed to this position will need to be knowledgeable about and a strong proponent of a coherent system of program assessment.

There continues to be both healthy skepticism among faculty and departments about the role and function of major program assessment in an institution of higher education. The questions raised by faculty require thoughtful discussion and resolution.

Difficult questions remain about the best ways to assess the effectiveness of the general education program. The university will continue to work at the state level to develop assessment instruments in the four generic competencies of writing, quantitative-symbolic reasoning, critical thinking, and information literacy. Collection of dissemination of data from the COMPASS exam will reveal the adequacy and appropriateness of the examination for assessing content knowledge in general education disciplines and will allow comparison of native and transfer students.

Another task will be to step up efforts to develop diagnostic/prescriptive assessment strategies to ensure that a student's course of study is designed for maximum success. This is true for first year students and for students who are transferring as juniors. Currently, only a few programs have entry-to-major requirements and do not

have a means to identify students who may need supplemental instruction or special coursework to meet their educational goals.

The university will need to move quickly in affirming and implementing a schedule and process for program review of programs that don't complete specialized accreditation processes. This will be the first item on the agenda for the university Academic Program Assessment Committee in fall, 2001.

Last, the provost and associate vice president will need to develop a tracking and feedback system to ensure that all aspects of the assessment matrix are in place and results are used to improve programs.

### APPENDIX

**Appendix 3.A: Assessment Matrix**

**Appendix 3.B: Entry to and End-of-Major Assessment by Department**

### EXHIBITS

**Exhibit 3.A: Statewide Senior Writing Assessment, 2000**

**Exhibit 3.B: General Education Program Outcomes**

**Exhibit 3.C: Junior Level Writing Project**

**Exhibit 3.D: End of Major Assessment Documents**

**Exhibit 3.E: Sample Student Satisfaction Surveys**

**Exhibit 3.F: General Education Course Survey**

**Exhibit 3.G: General Education Course Syllabi**

**Exhibit 3.H: Specialized Accreditation List and Reports**

## Recommendation Four: Faculty Salaries

### HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

At the time of our 1999-2000 full-scale evaluation, faculty salaries and benefits at Central Washington University lagged far behind peer institutions within and outside the state and challenged the university's ability to attract and retain competent faculty to achieve its mission, particularly in highly technological and scientific fields. Department chairs and personnel committees spoke often and with regret about the low faculty salaries available to new hires and replacement positions. Some chairs, notably in the sciences and highly specialized fields, reported that they were unable to attract adequate pools of qualified applicants and that many applicants lost interest when they learned that published salary ranges were not negotiable.

The October 1999 self-study described in detail the dimensions of the salary issue. Specifically, the self-study identified salary inequities, salary lag as compared to peer institutions, inconsistent application of salary adjustment policies, and salary compression as issues requiring attention. Both salary inequities and the unfortunate position of Central Washington University faculty salaries compared to peer institutions have led to a number of actions by the university over the past several years to address salary concerns.

Even so, the self-study noted and the evaluation team confirmed the absence of a systematic process whereby inequities could be addressed. Through the 1990s, some individual claims of inequity were settled under threat of legal action, in response to a bona fide offer from another institution, or at the time of a promotion. While these actions improved equity for some faculty, they did not address all equity issues, and in some cases, created greater inequities.

In response to the concerns about inequity and in the face of conflicting data from several formal and informal committees of the faculty, President Nelson allocated \$50,000 to the Faculty Senate to fund an external consultant to review faculty salaries and salary policies. The senate established a Salary Equity Committee in 1997-98 to draft a request for proposal and select an external consultant to conduct a salary equity study. The consultant's findings were reported to the university community on May 5, 1999. She recommended options available to the university to correct inequities (**Exhibit 4.A: Consultant's Report**). Following the study, the Faculty Senate Budget and Faculty Senate Code Committees worked with academic administrators to develop a plan that followed the recommendations of the consultant for consideration by the Board of Trustees.

At its June 11, 1999 meeting, the Board of Trustees approved a \$1,553,597 addition to the faculty salary base to provide an across the board increase for all faculty

and to make significant progress toward correcting salary inequities and salary compression. In addition, the board approved proposed changes to the Faculty Code. Sections of the code were revised to include language that would provide for regular salary equity review (**Exhibit 4.B: Faculty Code; Section 8.46**) and monitoring of the salary base (**Section 8.30**). These steps were important for two reasons. First, they were directly related to the salary issue, and second, they reaffirmed publicly the board's resolve to correct sagging faculty salaries. The policy changes outlined the basis for determining the presence of an inequity, required the Faculty Senate to conduct a biennial faculty salary equity study as part of the preparation for the university's biennial budget request to the state legislature, and described the university's commitment to achieving both salary equity and increasing average salaries to make them equal to the average of the top quartile in peer institutions.

Based on its evaluation of the material related to faculty salaries, the full-scale evaluation committee report made the following recommendation:

*The university continues to struggle with providing faculty salaries to attract and retain a competent faculty. While policies on salaries and benefits are clearly stated and widely available, internal equity problems have evolved. The institution responded with a significant salary package comprised of both individual equity adjustments and an across-the-board increase. A process of equity review (to be conducted by faculty senate), and a target for average salaries have been established. Those are important steps. But progress will only be made if additional steps are taken. The Committee recommends that the University and faculty senate pursue the procedures in the Faculty Code section 8.46, Correcting Salary Inequities, and resolve the salary equity matter. (Standard 4.A.4)*

#### REPOSE TO RECOMMENDATION

Central Washington University welcomed the visiting team's findings and actively addressed this recommendation. University administrators, the Board of Trustees, and the Faculty Senate have been diligent in their efforts to improve faculty salaries and increase the salary base. Efforts have emphasized five approaches:

- appeals to the state legislature
- internal reallocation
- changes in policy
- changes in practice
- clarification of legal limitations

Central Washington University continues to work externally with other public higher institutions in the state to bring the salary issue to the attention of state legislators. Salaries at all state schools in Washington lag behind those of peer institutions in other

states. None rise to the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. Legislators have been responsive, though not to the extent desired. The state budget is stretched, operating as it does under spending limit controls and increased demand for state-supported services. Salary increase percentages for the past ten years are included in Table 1.

**Table 1.**  
**State-Mandated Increases by Year to the Faculty Salary Base**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Percent Increase</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Percent Increase</b>
90-91	6.4%	96-97	0
91-92	3.9%	97-98	3.0%
92-93	3.9%	98-99	2.0%
93-94	0	99-00	2.0%
94-95	4.0%	00-01	3.7%
95-96	0		

The university is not relying solely on the state legislature to fix this problem. Internal reallocation processes and changes to policy and practice also have been employed. Following approval by the Board of Trustees in Spring 2000, the FY 2001 budget included \$1,240,919 for application to faculty-salary items in the FY 2001 budget including \$265,463 local funding for merit and \$81,636 for equity adjustments. In fact, during the year just past, the actual increase to the base for tenure track faculty including internal reallocation was 4.64 percent compared to the state increase of 3.7 percent. Specific actions to improve salaries and correct inequities are detailed below.

**Faculty Salary Study Applied In Fall 1999.** In fall 1999, as a result of the faculty salary equity study, equity adjustments were awarded to 111 professors for compression within the rank of professor, 13 associate professors for compression between the ranks of associate and assistant professor, 3 assistant professors for compression, and 112 tenured and tenure-track faculty members in federally protected classes. In spring 2000 equity adjustments were made to 24 full-time-non-tenure-track faculty in federally protected classes.

**Faculty Salary Equity Process During AY 2000-01.** In November 2000, 88 faculty requested over \$600,000 in equity adjustments through a formal faculty salary equity review process. Tenured and tenure-track faculty in each college and in the library elected salary equity review committees of tenured faculty who had not requested adjustment. These elections took place in accordance with procedures developed by the provost and deans and reviewed with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (**Exhibit 4.C: Salary Equity Procedures**). The committees reviewed applications and recommended to their respective deans whether an adjustment appeared warranted. Deans made award decisions following the recommendations of the elected equity committees. In March of 2001, the university distributed \$81,505 plus approximately 16 percent in benefits, totaling approximately \$94,500, to 40 faculty members. The awards

ranged from one step (1 percent) to three grades (9 percent) on the current salary scale (**Exhibit 4.D: Faculty Salary Scale**).

**Part-Time Faculty Salaries.** A four-year process to raise the pay scale for part-time faculty was completed in fall 2000. From 1997-98 to 2000-01, the minimum rate per faculty contact hour increased 38.5 percent. The minimum rate increased from \$500 to \$691 per credit for part-time faculty with terminal degrees and from \$400 to \$553 per credit for part-time faculty without terminal degrees. The minimum part-time rate is now tied to grade 1 of the faculty salary scale to ensure that improvements for part-time faculty will keep pace with improvements for full-time faculty.

**Grievances.** The faculty grievance process continued to be used by faculty in an attempt to achieve salary equity. During the academic year 1999-2000, salary grievance awards totaled \$26,267. Faculty continued to use this process during the academic year 2000-2001. However, faculty who filed grievances related to salary equity during AY 2000-01 were referred to the formal faculty salary equity process conducted during that year.

**Ongoing Efforts.** The faculty salary consultant's report and the salary equity study pointed to the need for a better understanding of market conditions related to faculty salaries. To that end, the Faculty Senate created the Ad Hoc Market Definition Committee. The committee analyzed market conditions in higher education and prepared a report for the senate that subsequently was presented to the administration and the Board of Trustees (**Exhibit 4.E: Market Definition Committee Report**). The ad hoc committee also suggested a study of university salary policy and a second ad hoc committee, the Salary Administration Board (SAB), was created to undertake the task. The SAB met through the spring 2001, and its report was adopted by the Faculty Senate in May 2001 (**Exhibit 4.F: Salary Administration Board Report**) and presented to the president and the Board of Trustees in June 2001. The report outlines a plan to move Central's faculty salary base to a position consistent with the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA) scale.

### APPRAISAL

Lagging faculty salaries and real or perceived salary inequities have emerged over decades, and the necessary procedures and resources to correct the problem will require focused and sustained effort. Current additions from the legislature and internal reallocations have positioned Central more favorably in relation to peer institutions, but salaries continue to be well below the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. The salary equity processes of the past several years have corrected some inequities, but it would be fair to say that not all faculty are satisfied with the outcome. Some faculty members have been disappointed that they did not receive an equity adjustment, others have been disappointed with the amount devoted to correcting inequities. Some faculty found the application process unwieldy or uncomfortable. Nonetheless, the process itself was generally perceived as fair and faculty-driven, and the university can point to substantial progress both in

recognizing the problems associated with salaries and in taking action to correct them. Further, a mechanism now is in place to continue the process.

Different means of adjusting salaries are met by different levels of faculty acceptance. Changes to the base are generally viewed as equitable even though faculty may object to the amount of the increase. On the other hand, procedures to restore or establish equity that require judgments of individual records and histories may result in a sense of even greater inequity by a given individual, even though the process is generally viewed as fair.

Internal reallocation as a strategy to improve salaries is unacceptable if the reallocations threaten other aspects of the university's program, and the university has nearly reached this limit. Further, it is inappropriate to use one-time funds currently in specific initiative reserves for salary adjustments that require permanent increases in the salary base. Thus, Central's ability to correct inequities and achieve its goal of the average faculty salary in the top quartile of peer institutions is very much affected by the financial health of the state. The Washington state legislature operates with a voter-imposed spending limit on state budgets. Constitutionally mandated expenditures in the areas of public school education, social services, and corrections place heavy demands on a limited budget. Despite the clear desire of many legislators to support higher education and to remain competitive in hiring qualified faculty to educate the state's citizens, legislatively granted faculty salary increases have been small and may continue to be small. Still, Central's president is working collaboratively and aggressively with presidents of the state's other four-year schools, which have similarly lagging salaries, to keep this matter in front of the legislature.

Salaries relative to peers have improved since the 1999 full-scale evaluation. No one at the university would judge the improvements as adequate, yet most people recognize the efforts of university administrators and the Board of Trustees to address the problem. Clearly, the level of commitment of the institution to correcting inequities and improving the average salary is significant even if the result is not fully satisfactory to everyone. New policies are in place, the Board of Trustees has placed a high priority on improving faculty salaries, and both faculty and administration are committed to working together to solve the problem.

### *NEXT STEPS*

The university now has mechanisms in place that will ensure attention to faculty salary issues. Based on these mechanisms and the reports developed by the consultant and market definition committee, the Ad Hoc Salary Administration Board was formed. The charge from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was to:

- Develop a mechanism to disburse available funds for faculty salaries to the CUPA mean,
- Develop a salary administration policy,

- Develop a hiring policy that is consistent with the recommendations from the market definition report.

The committee operated under the following considerations and assumptions on what a salary policy should contain:

- Equitable pay based on experience, performance and contribution;
- Salaries competitive with those of peers at comparable institutions;
- Opportunity to advance on the salary scale throughout a career at the university;
- A clear and open salary system which is evidently applied consistently and rationally;
- Faculty salary requirements and expectations.

The report recommended two broad actions. The first is a process to move faculty salaries to the CUPA mean; the second is a process for long-term maintenance of salary improvements. There has not been a cost analysis of the plan because the CUPA data needed for the analysis are not yet available. The Faculty Senate approved a motion at its May 16, 2001 meeting supporting the principles expressed in the salary administration board's report as the basis for a new salary regime at Central Washington University.

In fall 2001, the administration will begin its work to develop a multi-year plan to implement the Salary Administration Board plan. Everyone recognizes the significant challenge that awaits, but achieving competitive salaries is a high priority for the faculty, for administrators, and for the Board of Trustees.

#### EXHIBITS.

**Exhibit 4.A: Consultant's Report**

**Exhibit 4.B: Faculty Code**

**Exhibit 4.C: Salary Equity Procedures**

**Exhibit 4.D: Faculty Salary Scale**

**Exhibit 4.E: Marketing Definition Committee Report**

**Exhibit 4.F: Salary Administration Board Report**

## Recommendation Five: Faculty Evaluation and Development

### HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

University policies governing faculty evaluation are detailed in the Faculty Code (**Exhibit 5.A: Faculty Code**) and are extended through college and departmental policies (**Exhibit 5.B: Sample College and Department Faculty Evaluation Policies**). The Faculty Code provides overall guidance for faculty evaluation, identifying general policies, procedures, and criteria for appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, merit, and post-tenure review. The development of specific procedures and department- and discipline-based criteria has traditionally been delegated to academic departments without any university-level review. Through the 1990s, CWU developed a larger role for its four academic colleges in a number of areas, including faculty evaluation. Encouraged by sitting provosts of the past decade, the deans have worked with department chairs and faculty to develop greater consistency in the expectations for faculty performance among the colleges and departments.

Departments long have had procedures in place to evaluate faculty performance. However, many of the procedures were informal, there was considerable variation in the type of evaluation that was conducted, and there was some inconsistency in application. For example, some departments required elaborate goal setting and justification of performance while others required nothing more than the presentation of a file designed to convey how the faculty member had met the requirements of the university as expressed in the Faculty Code. Each faculty member is responsible to maintain such a file and update it on an annual basis, but there was inconsistency in the manner in which departments and colleges reviewed the files and on the type and level of feedback given to faculty about their performance. Some departments systematically reviewed files and provided detailed feedback. Others rank-ordered faculty for consideration for a salary adjustment, but gave no other form of feedback about faculty performance.

Under Faculty Code policy, probationary faculty are evaluated annually until tenure is granted or they leave the university. In the past, once tenure was granted, faculty were evaluated only when they were eligible for promotion or merit. During periods when state resources or internal distribution of salary adjustment funds made merit increments unavailable, review of professional record files of tenured faculty did not occur systematically except for those being considered for promotion.

NASC Policy 4.1.d states “ . . . *the faculty member is responsible for remediating the deficiencies, and the institution is expected to assist through development opportunities.*” Consistent with this policy, individual faculty development plans have been left largely to the discretion of the faculty member. Opportunities designed specifically to address developmental issues related to teaching, scholarly or creative activity, or service are available through academic departments; colleges; the associate vice president for graduate studies, research, and faculty; and the provost. The provision

of these opportunities is decentralized, sometimes causing faculty to seek multiple sources for support. This was the situation found by the full-scale evaluation team during its visit in October 1999 and led them to recommend:

*The Committee recommends that the University take immediate action to fully implement the recently-approved policy regarding faculty evaluation to insure campus-wide compliance with the requirements of Standard IV and Policy 4.1. Policy 4.1 requires that every faculty member at every institution be subject to some type of substantive performance evaluation at least every third year. The Committee urges the University to carefully monitor the implementation of the new faculty evaluation policy to insure that both tenured and non-tenured faculty are evaluated in accordance with Policy 4.1. (Standard 4.A.5, Policy 4.1)*

---

#### RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation and accompanying evaluation narrative addressed three areas: uneven notification of faculty related to the review process, evaluation criteria not fully understood by faculty, and compliance with Policy 4.1.

**Notification** The issue of faculty knowledge of the evaluation policy has been addressed in two ways: changes to the Faculty Code and changes to academic policy.

Effective September 1, 1998, Faculty Code section 8.80 specified the timing of faculty evaluation for tenured faculty and for phased retirees. The policy also described the role of the department chair in such evaluations. These changes require post-tenure review at least once every three years.

The office of the provost/senior vice president for academic affairs has developed and maintained a database that tracks reviews for each faculty member. This record lists the dates of each faculty member's last performance review and most recent performance review discussion with his or her supervisor (**Exhibit 5.C: Faculty Review Database**).

Effective January 2001, each dean notifies in writing each tenured faculty member in his or her college of the last time he or she was evaluated for tenure, promotion, merit, or post-tenure review and identifies the specific date by which a subsequent post-tenure review process must take place if no other evaluations occur. This process was added to the academic calendar, a document that guides faculty personnel actions. (**Exhibit 5.D: Faculty Notification Letters**).

**Evaluation Criteria**. The provost and deans have addressed concerns about evaluation criteria through a variety of methods. Each college has published evaluation procedures and criteria in college policy manuals and through individual college websites (**Exhibit 5.B: Sample College and Department Faculty Evaluation Policies**). When

they do exist, departmental policies and procedures are described in each department's policy manual. The published procedures and criteria address review of probationary faculty, part-time faculty, and tenured faculty. The procedures and criteria are applied to review for tenure, promotion, merit, and post-tenure review.

Because a thorough evaluation of effective teaching requires more than student evaluation, departments increasingly are considering multiple measures. These measures may include peer review; class visitations; mentoring systems; review of syllabi, activities, and assessment strategies; and student outcome data to strengthen the evaluation of teaching. Each of these measures is described in college and department policy manuals.

**Policy 4.1.** The narrative of the NASC evaluation report included the statement that the university was out of compliance with Policy 4.1 regarding faculty evaluation. In 1997-98, the provost worked with the Faculty Senate to develop a post-tenure review policy requiring all faculty members to be evaluated at least every third year (**Exhibit 5.A: Faculty Code**). Reviews for status or salary adjustment could serve as the post-tenure review, but in the absence of either, the policy required each faculty member to submit a file for evaluation at least every three years. Part-time and adjunct faculty are evaluated following each quarter or year of service. Thus, the university's policies, regulations, and procedures have become more stringent with respect to providing for the evaluation of all faculty on a continuing basis consistent with Policy 4.1 -- Faculty Evaluation.

In 1994, the university revised its merit distribution procedure from one of ranking to one of criterion-based rating. University minimum criteria were established in teaching, scholarship, and service. Two sets of criteria by which faculty would be evaluated were established at the university level, one set describing expected minimum performance for one incremental increase on the salary schedule, the other describing minimum performance to receive two increments (**Exhibit 5.E: University Merit Criteria**). Departments were invited to establish additional criteria. In this approach, all faculty who met the criteria at each level shared in the resources that were available for merit awards. This procedure was adopted by the Faculty Senate in May 1994 and applied for the first time in a performance-based salary adjustment during Fall 1997.

Another improvement in the faculty evaluation process during the past two years has been a more explicit provision for feedback accompanying the evaluation process. Department chairs and deans have been required for quite some time to inform faculty of their recommendations related to status and salary adjustments and to inform the next administrative level of the reason for recommending improvements in salary and status. Individual faculty members are to receive copies of each formal recommendation forwarded within these processes.

Consistent with Standard 4.1.d, when deficiencies are noted during the evaluation process, faculty members are responsible for seeking means to improve their performance, and the institution is responsible for assisting in this process through

development opportunities. Chairs and deans provide developmental opportunities to faculty to enable them to become more effective in teaching, scholarship, or service. This aspect of faculty development typically involves individual arrangements between an administrator and the faculty member. A large number of faculty development opportunities are available to individual faculty members through academic departments, individual colleges, the library, academic computing services, the Office of Graduate Studies and Research, and the provost's office. The university provides up to 4 percent of its full-time-equivalent faculty with professional leaves each year, and retraining leaves may also be proposed and granted (**Exhibit 5.F: College and Departmental Development Plans**).

### APPRAISAL

The university has improved the consistency of faculty evaluation, faculty notification, and the feedback mechanism that is associated with the review process. Faculty are evaluated on a periodic basis, every three years at minimum, regardless of their tenure status or the availability of status or salary adjustment. Administrators are expected to provide feedback to faculty about the quality of their work. Administrators at all levels are much more aware of their responsibility to serve as mentors, supervisors, and evaluators, and they attempt to combine these roles. However, there is room for improvement in the process.

There continues to be some inconsistency across departments and colleges in implementation of faculty evaluation processes. Further, department chairs receive little training in their supervisory roles, particularly in their roles as faculty mentors and evaluators. The tie between faculty evaluation and the component of faculty development that is intended to improve the performance of faculty whose work is below par could be stronger. The university has developed and maintained a decentralized approach for this type of faculty development. Because support is shared among the departments, deans, and other academic-support units, some faculty may benefit more than others. Faculty members do not have consistent access to a place or person with whom to discuss concerns about their effectiveness as a faculty member.

### NEXT STEPS

Faculty evaluation at Central Washington University is a well-established process. Still, there is room for improvement. The university recently has hired a new provost who will work with the deans and the faculty to achieve improvements in four areas. First, some deans and department chairs come to their positions with minimal training to serve in their roles as mentors, supervisors, and evaluators, yet the burden of this responsibility falls to them. This fall, the provost will work with the deans to identify training opportunities for deans and chairs that will enable them to serve more effectively in these roles. Second, the provost, deans, and faculty will continue to refine the criteria that form the basis of faculty evaluation to ensure they are properly rigorous and that they are applied consistently across the departments and colleges of the university. Third, the

deans and chairs will step up efforts to communicate about the expectations that surround faculty evaluation, particularly with new faculty. Fourth, the provost and deans will review those performance areas where deficiencies most often are noted and consider how university-wide developmental opportunities might be made available to achieve improved performance.

**EXHIBITS**

**Exhibit 5.A: Faculty Code**

**Exhibit 5.B: Sample College and Department Faculty Evaluation Policies**

**Exhibit 5.C: Faculty Review Database**

**Exhibit 5.D: Faculty Notification Letters**

**Exhibit 5.E: Merit Review Criteria**

**Exhibit 5.F: College and Departmental Development Plans**

## Recommendation Six: Graduate Programs

### HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Central Washington University offers graduate degrees in 16 departments and through one interdisciplinary program. The degree programs are distributed across the College of Arts and Humanities, the College of Education and Professional Studies, and the College of the Sciences. The College of Business received university and state approval to begin offering its first graduate program, the master's in professional accountancy, beginning fall 2001. The College of Business also participates in the interdisciplinary master's degree programs in resource management and in organization development.

The university offers two kinds of master's degrees. Discipline-specific, research-oriented degrees are intended to prepare students to either continue their education at the doctoral level or to begin or continue a career in a research-oriented field. Professional or applied degrees prepare students to enter various professions with a body of knowledge and experience essential to career paths in professional areas. Statistically, since 1994, graduate student enrollment has averaged 600 active graduate students per year, representing approximately 8 percent of the university's student population of just over 7,000 students, and a three-year average of 178 graduates annually.

**Program Development.** Central Washington University first received permission from the state in 1947 to provide graduate education. Since that time, 29 master's programs have been added to the curriculum. To date, master's degree programs have been limited in number and field to ensure the university's primary focus on the undergraduate level. Graduate programs have also been developed to meet regional needs. Development of graduate programs flowed logically from the university's original mission as a normal school, and the largest graduate programs have been those designed for practicing teachers and other school professionals. In other areas, faculty interests and expertise together with market demand have driven the creation and maintenance of master's degree programs.

**Program Quality and Review.** The quality of the programs and their reputations can be attributed to the efforts of committed faculty. Graduates of the master's degree programs have an excellent placement rate in professional settings and in doctoral programs. Several graduate programs of the university have achieved regional and national prominence. Most programs have been developed on the basis of faculty interest, resulting in outstanding faculty dedication to the programs.

Graduate study is carried out within a framework of established standards, objectives, and policies approved by the Graduate Council, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, and other appropriate university groups to ensure that graduate students receive a high-quality learning experience. Curriculum development follows the

prescribed university curriculum approval process that includes review and approval by the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board. Graduate curriculum approval differs from undergraduate only in that the associate vice president for graduate studies, research, and faculty and the Graduate Council review curriculum proposals for compliance with graduate program regulations.

Program review is pivotal to the maintenance and improvement of graduate studies. The university recognizes that program review and rational decision-making about the development, expansion, suspension, or deletion of graduate programs is particularly appropriate at a time when the university is experiencing significant changes in leadership and tightening budgets. As noted in the university self-study produced for the October 1999 visit, the graduate school and members of the Graduate Council conducted a series of program review interviews with chairs and directors of each graduate program in 1996. In 1998, a survey of graduate alumni provided useful information regarding the quality of graduate programs.

Finally, the 1999 self-study noted that the role of graduate education and the manner in which it fulfills the mission of the university was not fully settled. At the time of the evaluation team's visit in 1999, it noted uncertainty about the future direction of graduate education, including intentions to reorganize the Office of Graduate Studies and Research, limited research expectations and productivity of faculty, and questions about adequacy of resources to maintain quality programs. Based on their review, the team recommended:

*The University is strongly urged to take the steps necessary to determine a role and goals for the graduate program that are compatible with the institution's mission and goals. (Standard 2.D., 2.E., and 2.F.)*

#### **RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION**

The university agreed with the recommendation of the evaluation team and has responded to the charge in a number of ways. The president has directed the CWU community in a process designed to review the university mission and to develop a vision statement, goals, and objectives (described in our response to recommendation 1). The outcome of this process in spring, 2001 has set the stage to consider the role of graduate studies at the university.

Preliminary to the mission development process, the interim associate vice president for graduate studies, research, and faculty and the Graduate Council held a series of interactive focus groups during 1999-2000 designed to provide a grassroots determination of the current and future roles of graduate studies. Four sessions were held, one each for the four primary constituent groups: Academic Affairs Council and the President's Advisory Council, graduate students, department chairs, and faculty. The conversations were productive and the associate vice president synthesized the information from these sessions in a draft report (**Exhibit 6.A: The Role of Graduate**

**Programs at Central Washington University**). This draft was presented to the Academic Affairs Council for consideration.

Based on feedback to the draft report, the interim associate vice president for graduate studies, research, and faculty drafted two further statements which outline specific directions for the future development of graduate programs at Central Washington University. The documents describe the process by which existing and new programs are to be reviewed (**Exhibit 6.B: The Role of Graduate Programs at Central Washington University, Draft #2; Exhibit 6.C: Current and Future Roles of Graduate Programs at Central Washington University**). The proposal details suggestions for:

- increased number of faculty allocated to graduate programs,
- increased state-funded graduate assistantships,
- increased in-state and out-of-state tuition waivers,
- new graduate web-based application process,
- a reward structure for faculty who serve on graduate committees,
- increased offerings of graduate programs at our centers,
- development of post-baccalaureate certification programs, and
- a larger cadre of graduate teaching assistantships for general education and upper division courses.

The proposal also calls for increased dialogue internally and externally regarding review and expansion of graduate programs. The Academic Affairs Council will consider the proposal in fall 2001. These documents, together with the university goals and objectives, form the decision-making criteria used as the university clarifies the role of graduate studies, considers new program proposals, and evaluates current efforts.

Since the October 1999 visit, four new graduate programs have been initiated. The master's of science in engineering technology began enrolling students in Fall 2000 and will be offered at both Ellensburg and westside locations. As noted earlier, the master's in professional accountancy was approved for Fall 2001 implementation. A master of science in law and justice was approved by the Faculty Senate in May 2001 and now is under review by the State Higher Education Coordinating Board. A fourth program, a master of science in addictionology, was provisionally approved and operated for one year, after which the program was put on hold until concerns about the curriculum and resources could be addressed (**Exhibit 6.D: Report of the External Evaluators**).

### APPRAISAL

The university has undertaken a serious review of the role of graduate studies, involved constituents in discussion, and now has before the president and provost a recommendation.

The proposal describes the value of the graduate program to the undergraduate effort, makes specific recommendations for changing the balance between graduate programs and undergraduate programs, recommends strategies for reviewing current programs and adding others, and specifies the hiring and fiscal requirements to implement the plan. Even without these changes, the university has stated principles for approving graduate programs that are consistent with the state's Higher Education Coordinating Board's guidelines. These principles include such elements as demonstrated and enduring societal need for masters level graduates, faculty expertise, infrastructure support, reasonable prospects for a pool of highly qualified students, consistency with successful undergraduate programs at CWU, and consistency with programs at sister universities.

Provost Soltz will begin working with college deans and department chairs in fall 2001 to come to closure on the role of graduate education in relation to the university's mission, to consider the recommendations outlined in the draft reports, to undertake the program reviews that are suggested, and to identify graduate programs that might be initiated, maintained, and deleted.

Within this process, the provost and deans will work with departments to set parameters about the ratio (measured in FTE students) of undergraduate to graduate programs at Central Washington University. Implications for staffing also will be identified and considered. In this process, they will develop a more rigorous checklist of elements to be included in reviewing existing and proposed programs; for example, relation to mission, vision, and goals; cost; and practicality for an institution of our size.

The narrative portion of the NASC evaluation report described the process of graduate program review at Central Washington University as inadequate. Inherent in the plan that has been put forward is a more rigorous and systematic procedure for program review. Most graduate programs at Central Washington University have been the subject of some form of internal or external review over the past five years, and feedback from these reviews has been used to make significant program changes. However, the processes have been somewhat sporadic and have not taken place on a systematic basis. The proposal would correct these weaknesses.

Still, the current proposal does not address fully the role: the way in which graduate education articulates with the larger mission of the university. It has proved extraordinarily easy to be drawn off course by emerging opportunities to provide specific programs independent of an intentional plan. A number of conversations reveal that faculty and administrators have ideas about the role of graduate programs at an institution such as Central, and these ideas are well articulated in **Exhibit 6.A**. Even so, many of the conversations have skirted the issue, focusing instead on resource allocation and ideal size of the graduate program compared to the undergraduate one.

This diffusion of focus was noted by the visiting team in 1999 and, very frankly, clarity has not emerged on this question. However, the question is very much on the

agenda as the three draft reports reveal, and the academic affairs council has placed a high priority on resolution of this matter.

### *NEXT STEPS*

The provost and Academic Affairs Council are positioned to take the following steps beginning in fall, 2001:

- Analyze the proposal presented by the interim associate vice president for graduate studies, research, and faculty in light of the new university mission, vision, and goals.
- Clarify the relationship between the graduate office and the four colleges in establishing the methods and standards for graduate program review.
- Consider the impact of university-wide performance measures in program review of graduate programs.
- Improve the integration of the mission statements of the university, the academic colleges, and the graduate office.
- Develop a manageable cycle for graduate program review that parallels the undergraduate program review cycle.

As is the case with the university's response to other recommendations, the role of graduate studies will hinge on the adoption, clarification, and implementation of the newly developed university mission, vision, goal, and objective statements in fall 2001. Determining the role of graduate studies cannot happen absent this implementation.

### *EXHIBITS*

**Exhibit 6.A: The Role of Graduate Programs at Central Washington University**

**Exhibit 6.B: The Role of Graduate Programs at Central Washington University,  
Draft #2**

**Exhibit 6.C: Current and Future Roles of Graduate Programs at Central  
Washington University**

**Exhibit 6.D: Report of the External Evaluators**

## **Appendix 1.A: Central Washington University Strategic Plan 2001 - 2006**

(The content only of a graphically produced full color four-fold version of the strategic plan is included here. The full color version will be available with the exhibits in the Office of the Provost.)







## **Appendix 1.B: Surveys and Reports Regularly Produced by Institutional Research**







**Appendix 3.A: Assessment Matrix**



















### **Appendix 3.B: Entry-to- and End-of-Major Assessment by Department**

