

**REGULAR MEETING**  
**Wednesday, March 5, 2025, 3:10 p.m.**  
**AGENDA (draft)**

- I. **CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- II. **MOTION NO. 24-26: APPROVAL OF MINUTES** of February 5, 2024
- III. **PRESENTATIONS**
  - 1. **SHARED GOVERNANCE** – Mark Samples, Heidi Perez, Josh Welsh, Katy Williams *(20 minutes)*
- IV. **SENATE CHAIR REPORT**
- V. **FACULTY ISSUES**
- VI. **STUDENT REPORT**
- VII. **REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS**

**Executive Committee**

**Motion No. 24-27:** Ratify Matthew Altman, Philosophy and Comparative Religion, as the Faculty Legislative Representative beginning Fall 2025 through Spring 2028

**Academic Affairs Committee**

**Motion No. 24-28:** Amend CWUP 5-90-040(25), Academic Dishonesty, to add a section on generative AI use as outlined in Exhibit A.

**Bylaw and Faculty Code Committee**

**Motion No. 24-20 (third reading of three):** Modify Faculty Code Section IV, EC Members Complaint Process, as outlined in Exhibit B.

**Motion No. 24-08 (first reading of three):** Revise Faculty Code section IV to allow four NTT senators as outlined in Exhibit C.

**Motion No. 24-29 (first reading of two):** Modify Senate Bylaws Section I, Membership and Procedures for Election, to include a list of senator duties as outlined in Exhibit D.

**Curriculum Committee**

**Motion No. 24-30:** Approve the new Management Minor/Certificate as outlined in Exhibit E.

**Motion No. 24-31:** Approve the new Electrical Engineering Technology Major BS as outlined in Exhibit F.

**Motion No. 24-32:** Approve the new Data Science Minor as outlined in Exhibit G.

**Motion No. 24-33:** General Education Program

**General Education Committee**

**Motion No. 24-33:** Approve the proposed General Education Program Learner Outcomes as outlined in Exhibit H.

**Faculty Legislative Representative Report**

- VIII. **PRESIDENT**
- IX. **PROVOST**
- X. **CHAIR-ELECT**

XI. NEW BUSINESS

XII. ADJOURNMENT

***\*\*\*NEXT REGULAR SENATE MEETING: April 9, 2025***

**Shared Governance at Central Washington University**  
**An Ecosystem for Aligning Priorities to Advance the University’s Vision and Mission**  
**DRAFT – February 15, 2025**

**Preamble**

Shared governance is a cornerstone of a thriving university, founded on relationships, respect, responsibility, and transparency. Though sometimes misunderstood as requiring unanimous consensus, full access to all information, or full participation in all decisions, its true strength lies in honoring the expertise of others, joining in collaboration around important issues, and operating through trust.

In a healthy shared governance environment, constituents have opportunities to contribute to decision-making within their roles and expertise while recognizing that all decisions may not align with every perspective. Transparency builds trust, equity ensures fairness, and expertise drives sound decisions.

This document outlines Central Washington University’s aspirational vision for shared governance. By sharing information, fostering collaboration, and encouraging meaningful participation, we create an environment where constituencies contribute to the university’s success. Through the description of authority and responsibility and the commitments outlined below, we are dedicated to fostering a system that drives innovation and ensures a thriving and sustainable future.

**I. Shared Governance Definition**

Shared Governance is the system by which various groups participate in the decision-making processes at Central Washington University (CWU). Each group participates in different activities in various ways, depending on their roles, authority, expertise, and scope of responsibility; honoring those roles and authority is critical to healthy shared governance. Shared governance allows for all constituents to work together to address the opportunities and challenges the university faces. Ultimately, shared governance creates an environment that allows the university to align priorities, communicate transparently, and foster innovation in order to advance the university’s vision, mission, values, and strategic goals.

**II. Shared Governance Constituencies**

The Board of Trustees (Board), administration, faculty, staff, and students all contribute to the shared governance of the institution. Other than the Board and the President, participation by these constituents is typically facilitated through one or more of their representative bodies, depending on the nature of the governance activity. These bodies include:

- The Executive Leadership Team
- Deans’ Council
- The Academic Department Chairs Organization
- The Faculty Senate
- United Faculty of Central
- Exempt Employee Association
- Classified Employee Council
- Public School Employees (Classified Staff Union)
- Washington Federation of State Employees

- Teamsters
- Associated Students of Central Washington University Board of Directors

### III. Shared Governance Authority and Responsibilities

Each shared governance group plays a distinct role and has differing levels and kinds of authority, as determined by the role and responsibility of that group. Honoring the authority of other groups is essential to healthy shared governance.

Three different levels or kinds of authority exist in the shared governance decision-making process. These levels of authority derive from the responsibility that a shared governance group has over a particular area.

**Final Authority:** A group has the authority to make unilateral decisions in an area. At a minimum, other shared governance groups who are impacted by the decision should be informed of the action or consulted in a pro forma fashion.

**Preeminent Authority:** A group has primary authority for an area but other groups have an opportunity to participate meaningfully in the decision-making process. If there is disagreement between the groups, the group that has preeminent authority normally prevails.

**Joint Authority:** Two or more shared governance groups exercise equal influence in an area. These groups must collaborate closely in the decision-making process. If an area is subject to collective bargaining between a union and the administration or Board, the level of union participation should presumably be “joint authority.”

In all cases, including cases where the Board has final authority, shared governance at CWU includes an expectation of transparent communication and meaningful participation. Because of the unique expertise that faculty hold at a university, consultation with faculty in areas that relate to the educational and scholarly mission of the university is essential. The roles, responsibilities, and authority of the major groups of shared governance are outlined below.

#### **Board of Trustees**

The Board of Trustees for Central Washington University has the final authority over the university, and delegates authority to the President in the operations of the university. The Board has final authority for hiring and evaluating the President, as well as for approving the vision, mission, values, and strategic goals and new degree programs and academic majors. Additionally, the Board has final authority over the university’s budget. The Board will determine and communicate appropriate methods for participation of faculty, staff, and students in the areas of decision-making where they formally and directly exercise their authority, including especially the hiring and evaluation of the president.

#### **The President and Executive Level Administration**

The President of Central Washington University has preeminent authority over the operations of the university, delegated from the Board of Trustees. The President’s authority includes oversight

of facilities, finances, budgets, and information technology; the creation and implementation of vision, mission, values, and strategic goals; oversight of accreditation and adherence to state and federal policies; the hiring and evaluation of executive level leaders, including vice presidents and deans; guiding the composition of academic and non-academic programs to shape the institution's overall portfolio to align with its mission; fostering and initiating innovation and renovation of academic and other programs; oversight of student engagement and success, including admissions and financial aid policies; oversight of athletics and advancement; oversight of safety and security; and advancing the brand and marketing of the institution.

The President may delegate authority for these functions to other executive level leaders. The President or designee will determine and transparently communicate appropriate methods for participation of faculty, staff, and students in areas of decision-making where the President has preeminent authority.

### **The Faculty**

Because of their expertise, the faculty of Central Washington University have preeminent authority over specific aspects including curriculum, research and creative activity, and faculty status and joint authority over the scholarly and educational mission of the university. Oversight of the curriculum is a primary responsibility of the faculty and includes determining the requirements for academic programs, the sequence of courses in an academic program, the subject matter or content of individual courses, the methods of instruction (e.g., lecture, lab, discussion), and the assessment of student learning. Faculty are instrumental in the advancement of new programs which should be developed jointly with the administration and in the decision to terminate existing programs.

Additionally, meaningful assessment for annual evaluation, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review is dependent on the expertise of faculty. While the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Deans determine the University and the College Criteria for evaluation, these criteria should be developed in consultation with the faculty. College and departmental criteria must originate from the University Criteria. Given their expertise, faculty within their departments and disciplines have preeminent authority to develop Department Criteria.

Given their role in curriculum, service, and scholarship, faculty should be consulted especially in the development and implementation of the educational component of the university budget. Early, ongoing and meaningful engagement in the overall university budget includes transparent sharing so that faculty can participate in decisions regarding expenditures, including especially those areas related to their expertise.

When the Board or the Administration disagrees with decisions that are within faculty expertise (curriculum and faculty status), they should exercise their authority with extreme caution and communicate the reasoning behind their difference of perspective.

### **Exempt and Classified Staff**

Exempt and classified staff play a critical role in supporting and engaging students to ensure their success as well as in the administrative and operational functioning of the university. As such,

they should be included in shared governance decisions and conversations that relate to their roles as they offer important perspectives.

### **Students**

At Central Washington University the student experience is the focus of our collective effort as we assist students in becoming “engaged professionals, active citizens, and lifelong learners.” As a result, the student voice is valuable in our governance environment and provides a perspective that is critical to our decision-making. Students should be invited to participate on task forces and committees when their perspective would strengthen the conversation and broaden the ideas being considered. Additionally, in the state of Washington, a student sits on the Board of Trustees providing another avenue for student participation in the governance of the university.

## **IV. Shared Governance Commitments**

The following commitments of shared governance have been developed through careful study of internal practices and policies, as well as key documents from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). These commitments are intended to guide the way in which the various shared governance groups interact with each other to align priorities, communicate transparently, and foster innovation, ultimately advancing the vision and mission of the university. Ultimately, shared governance at Central Washington University depends upon the creation of a culture of collaboration and consultation.

**1. Engagement and Institutional-Thinking** – We will commit to a culture of meaningful engagement that is based on understanding and honoring the various roles, authority, and responsibility of the shared governance groups at CWU, recognizing that respecting boundaries is essential to healthy shared governance. We will balance support for our own constituencies and areas with institutional thinking, adopting a shared governance mindset that advances the vision and mission of the university.

**2. Mutual Trust and Respect** – We will operate through an ethos of mutual trust and respect, recognizing that shared governance depends on collaboration rather than competition among faculty, staff, students, administrators, and trustees. We will engage each other believing in the good will and intentions of others, and we will ask questions and provide feedback when we sense that mutual trust and respect have not been a part of a decision-making process.

**3. Communication** – We will establish open and regular channels of communication so that decision-making processes are clear, with accessible documentation that ensures inclusivity and accountability. Transparent communication between shared governance groups and from shared governance leaders to their constituency is a key to the success of shared governance and should exist through formal and informal channels.

**4. Academic Freedom** – We will maintain a strong commitment to academic freedom as a cornerstone to the teaching and learning experience that faculty provide for students and to the scholarly endeavors of faculty as they seek to expand the boundaries of knowledge. Academic freedom exists within the disciplinary areas of faculty to support their expertise in teaching and

scholarship.

**5. Accountability** – We will take the assessment of shared governance seriously, recognizing that holding ourselves accountable to these principles and honoring the roles, authority, and responsibility of various groups is essential to healthy shared governance. We will regularly assess governance structures and processes to ensure effectiveness and adaptability to evolving institutional needs, with clear accountability for decisions and outcomes.

**6. Sustainability** – We will develop shared governance practices that are sustainable, and we will ensure continuity in leadership, institutional memory, and ongoing professional development for participants in governance roles. We will regularly review these commitments, along with university policies and procedures, to nurture a culture of institutional-thinking and a shared governance mindset.

Through the commitments outlined in this document, all constituents will work to include and honor appropriate voices in decision-making processes with formal and informal mechanisms to ensure decisions are made collaboratively and in the best interest of the institutional vision, mission, and values. To ensure equitable inclusion of input in these processes, we will engage in meaningful consultation early on and we will honor the roles, authority, and responsibility of various constituencies in the shared governance environment.

## V. Resources

- American Association of University Professors. (1994). On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom. In: *Policy Documents and Reports* (2015), 123-25. 11<sup>th</sup> Ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- . (1988). Statement on Academic Government for Institutions Engaged in Collective Bargaining. In: *Policy Documents and Reports* (2015), 325-26. 11<sup>th</sup> Ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- . (1966). Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. In: *Policy Documents and Reports* (2015), 117-22. 11<sup>th</sup> Ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- . (1972). The Role of the Faculty in Budgetary and Salary Matters. In: *Policy Documents and Reports* (2015), 289-91. 11<sup>th</sup> Ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Association of Governing Boards. (2017a). Shared Governance: Changing with the Times. Association of Governing Boards.
- . (2016). Shared Governance: Is OK Good Enough? Association of Governing Boards.
- . (2010). Statement on Board Responsibility for Institutional Governance. Association of Governing Boards.
- . (2017b). Statement on Shared Governance. Association of Governing Boards.

## Exhibit A

**Section:** CWUP 5-90-040(25)

**Title of Section:** Academic Dishonesty

New **Revision**

**Summary of changes:** Adds the following paragraph to existing policy dealing with Academic Dishonesty.

*(B) Absent a clear statement from a course instructor granting permission, the use of Generative AI tools to complete any assigned work is prohibited. The unauthorized use of AI shall be considered an instance of academic dishonesty.*

### **Rationale for changes:**

The goal of this policy revision is to unambiguously include the unauthorized use of generative AI as an instance of Academic Dishonesty, since it is not currently mentioned in WAC 106-125-20. At such time that the WAC is revised to include generative AI, it may be appropriate to revisit this section of policy.

AAC recognizes that some uses of generative AI tools may have pedagogical value, but that it is up to each instructor to communicate to students the ground rules for appropriate usage of AI in completing assigned work for a particular class. It should be noted that AAC is considering a separate charge for requiring a statement in the course syllabus about generative AI use.

Given the rapid development of artificial intelligence, we decided against mentioning specific examples of Generative AI tools or how they might be used by students in a way that constitutes academic dishonesty. Better to have a simple and concise policy that leaves to faculty the burden of specifying appropriate usage of AI in their classes.

### **CWUP 5-90-040 Academic and General Regulations**

(25) Academic Dishonesty

(A) Academic dishonesty is defined in the Washington Administrative Code ([WAC](#)) [106-125-20](#) Prohibited Student Conduct.

*(B) Absent a clear statement from a course instructor granting permission, the use of Generative AI tools to complete any assigned work is prohibited. The unauthorized use of AI*

shall be considered an instance of academic dishonesty.

~~(B)~~ (C) Faculty who suspect students of academic dishonesty must follow the procedure outlined in [CWU 2-90-040\(25\)](#).

~~(G)~~ (D) Students found responsible of academic dishonesty violations in a course will be prohibited from completing an SEOI for the course.

~~(D)~~ (E) Withdrawing from a course does not excuse academic dishonesty. In circumstances when academic dishonesty is confirmed, a W can be replaced by a letter grade ([see CWUP 5-90-040\(13\)](#)).

## Exhibit B

**Section:** Faculty Code IV.G.d

**Title of Section:** Section IV. (Faculty Senate), G. (External Senate Procedures for the Protection of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities), d. (Complaint Process), vi. (NEW)

**New**      **Revision**

### Summary of addition:

The BFCC proposes the addition of language to require the recusal of EC members from the complaint process when an issue or grievance is brought forward from their department.

### Rationale for additions:

Recusal is necessary to avoid potential conflicts of interest for the involved parties.

**Proposed Code addition:** (addition appears in red font)

### Section IV. Faculty Senate

G. External Senate Procedures for the Protection of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities,

d. Complaint Process

- i. Prior to submitting a formal complaint to the Senate, complainant(s) are strongly encouraged to make a good faith effort to discuss the complaint with the dean or member of CWU administration having direct responsibility for the area of concern. It is acknowledged that the nature of some complaints precludes such a step. If no mutually acceptable resolution of the complaint can be reached, complainant(s) may file a formal written complaint with the Senate for review.
- ii. A complainant(s) filing a complaint should first consult Section IV.G.1 Complaint Policy and Procedures and meet with the Senate Chair. The Chairperson will advise the complainant(s) about the Senate's jurisdiction and the complaint process.

- iii. To initiate a formal complaint, complainant(s) must complete, sign, and submit the Complaint Form located on the Senate website, which includes the following mandatory elements.
  - a) Concise statement identifying the complainant(s) with contact information.
  - b) Concise statement identifying the respondent(s) with contact information.
  - c) Basis for seeking a review by the Senate.
  - d) Each and every specific section of the Code, policies, and/or standards that was allegedly violated.
  - e) Supporting documentation pertinent or referred to in the complaint to substantiate the alleged code, policies, and/or standards violations.
  - f) Summary of the complaint with a description of the issue giving rise to the complaint.
  - g) Concise statement on how the alleged conduct of the respondent(s) violated the Code, policies, and/or standards.
  - h) Concise statement of the negative effect that the alleged violation has had on complainant(s).
  - i) Reasonable outcomes that would resolve this situation.
  - j) Summary of efforts to resolve this complaint.
- iv. The complainant(s) shall submit the completed Complaint Form and supporting documents in both electronic and hard copy forms to the Senate Office addressed to the EC.
- v. Complaints are not confidential. Elements of this complaint may be released as needed at the discretion of the EC.
- vi. The complaint will be delivered to all members of the EC at the next scheduled EC meeting. Due to potential conflicts of interest, EC members will be required to recuse themselves when issues or grievances are brought forward from their respective academic departments, or, in the case of the library senator, the library.
- vii. [The EC has the primary responsibility to ensure and to arrange an appropriate review by applicable committees. The EC will conduct an initial review of the complaint within 10 business days during the academic year to determine:
  - a) Whether the complaint falls within the Senate's purview. If not, the EC will return the complaint to the complainant(s) with recommendations as to the appropriate avenue for resolution to the complaint.
  - b) Whether the complaint package is complete. If incomplete, the EC may request the complainant(s)

to revise and resubmit the complaint.

## Exhibit C

**Section:** Faculty Code IV

**Title of Section:** Faculty Code IV. Faculty Senate, B. Membership, 1. a. iii and iv  
Faculty Code IV. Faculty Senate, B. Membership, 2. Terms of Service, b.

**New** and **Revision**

### Summary of changes:

Section removed: Section IV. Faculty Senate, B. Membership, 1. iii. concerns CWU center senators.

Sections revised: Section IV. Faculty Senate, B. Membership, 1. iv. concerns NTT senators. New language regarding the designation of NTT senators for CAH, CEPS, COTS, and one senator-at-large elected to represent all colleges and entities not from CAH, CEPS, or COTS (CB, Library, etc.).

Section revised: Section IV. Faculty Senate, B. Membership, 2. Terms of Service, b. concerns the NTT senator terms.

### Rationale for changes:

As of October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024, CEPS has 141 NTT faculty (73.55 FTE), CAH has 71 NTT (55.95 FTE), COTS has 58 NTT faculty (42.84 FTE), and CB has 21 NTT faculty (14.42 FTE). Additionally, there are NTT 20 faculty in Library and other areas (23.96 FTE) - not CAH, CB, CEPS, and COTS.

Removal of iii. CWU centers no longer have senators representing the individual centers. Departments and programs at the centers are represented by their respective department senators. NTT senators at the CWU centers will be represented by their respective CAH, CEPS, COTS and NTT senator-at-large. The NTT senator at large will be elected by those NTT faculty who are not in the CAH, CEPS, and COTS colleges.

Revision of iv. NTT senators will now be elected to represent CAH, CEPS, and COTS. An additional senator-at-large will be elected to represent divisions **outside** of CAH, CEPS, and COTS such as the Library and other areas. Senator representation is based on the NTT FTE for each area with CAH, CEPS, and COTS having the most NTT FTE, and other divisions lower have FTE.

Revision of terms of service. NTT senator terms of service will be for one year with maximum of three terms. Currently the Faculty Code does not identify a term limit for NTT senators. This term limit provides more opportunities for NTT faculty to serve as Faculty Senate.

### Proposed Code revision:

#### Faculty Code Section IV. Faculty Senate

##### B. Membership

##### 1. The Senate shall include:

##### a. Voting members

The following voting members are selected from faculty who hold no concurrent exempt appointment.

- i. One senator and an alternate are elected by and from TT/T faculty from each academic department and the library.
- ii. Additional senators, elected as directed in paragraph 1.i above, allocated to departments as specified in the Senate Bylaws (Bylaws).
- ~~iii. One senator at large and an alternate from each of the CWU centers that have at least five full-time faculty. Also one senator at large and an alternate for the remaining centers with fewer than five full-time faculty. Senators at large and alternates may be full-time NTT, and are elected by the faculty at the respective center(s).~~
- iii. CAH, CEPS, and COTS will each have two (2) one (1) NTT senator and two (2) one (1) NTT faculty members senator and two (2) alternates, elected by and from the NTT faculty in those colleges. Additionally, one (1) NTT senator-at-large and one (1) NTT alternate will be elected by and from NTT faculty who are not in CAH, CEPS, or COTS. NTT senators and alternates will be elected during in the spring quarter for the following year by those NTT faculty under contract in the preceding winter quarter. Eligible NTT faculty will have a minimum of twelve (12) WLUs for the year they serve. The senators and alternates shall serve for one academic year contingent on continued employment as NTT faculty at CWU. The EC shall oversee the election.
  - a. If the elected senator's workload drops below the 12 minimum WLUs, the alternate will serve as senator. If the alternate's workload drops below 12 WLUs or they are unable to serve, the unit will hold an election as

soon as is practical.

- b. NTT faculty who work in two or more units are eligible to vote and be nominated for senator or alternate in the unit in which they work the most WLUs during the winter quarter of the election year. If faculty work an equal number of WLUs in two or more units, they may vote and be nominated for only one senate position.

b. Nonvoting members There shall also be the following ex officio, nonvoting members:

- i. the President;
- ii. the Provost;
- iii. three student representatives selected by the Associated Students of CWU (ASCWU) – Board of Directors.

2. Terms of service for voting senators:

- a. Term appointments for TT/T senators and alternates shall run three (3) academic years. No TT/T senator shall serve more than three (3) consecutive terms. A partial term of two (2) academic years or more shall be treated as a full term, while a partial term of less than two (2) academic years shall not be counted.
- b. Term appointments for NTT senators and alternates shall run one (1) term academic year. A partial term shall be treated as a full term. No NTT senator shall serve more than three (3) consecutive terms. A partial term shall be treated as a full term of two (2) or more academic quarters shall be treated as a full term, while a partial term of less than two (2) quarters shall not be counted.
- c. All terms begin June 16<sup>th</sup>.

# Exhibit D

**Section:** Senate Bylaws I

**Title of Section:** I. Membership and Procedures for Election

**New**      **Revision**

**Summary of additions:**

The BFCC proposes the addition of language that includes the removal of a senator from their duties (Section I.E.2.) as well as a list of senator duties to the Senate Bylaws.

**Rationale for additions:**

The Senate Bylaws outline the duties of the officers of the Executive Committee but not senators. The list of duties proposed is based on a survey sent to all senators requesting feedback on the importance of attending Senate meetings, providing reports of Senate meetings to departments/units, attending open EC meetings, etc. The addition of language to E.2. relates to the process for removal of a senator who does not fulfill their duties.

**Proposed Bylaws addition:**

Membership and Procedures for Election

A. Membership

Membership of the Senate is prescribed in the Code, Section IV.B.

B. Nomination and election

1. Senators and alternates (except non-tenure track faculty senators; see B.2 below) shall be nominated and elected during winter quarter and the Senate office informed of results by January 31.
2. Non-tenure track senators and alternates shall be nominated and elected during spring quarter (see Code IV.B.1.a.iv).
3. Only faculty members consenting to nomination shall be candidates.
4. Elections shall be conducted by secret ballot.

C. Senate representation for departments/library

1. Each academic department/library shall have Senate representation according to the following full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty:

1 – 14 FTE	1 senator
15 – 29 FTE	2 senators
30 – 44 FTE	3 senators
45 or more FTE	4 senators
2. In the event that a department/library falls below 15/30/45 FTE, senators will serve out the remainder of their terms. At the first

regularly scheduled election of senators, the department/library which experienced a decrease of faculty below the prescribed FTE will elect the appropriate number of senators for the subsequent term, unless, by the time of the election, the department/library has returned to the prescribed FTE or more.

#### D. Alternates

When it is necessary for a senator to be absent from a Senate meeting, such senator shall notify his/her alternate of his/her intended absence. Senate alternates, when acting in the capacity of senator, shall have all the powers and responsibilities of senators.

#### E. Replacements

1. If a departmental senator is to be gone for a quarter or less, his/her alternate will serve in his/her absence. If a senator or alternate is to be absent from the Senate for more than a quarter, he/she shall resign his/her Senate seat.
2. If a senator resigns permanently from the Senate, or is removed by a majority vote of their department, the position shall become vacant and a replacement shall promptly be nominated and elected.

Replacements, elected to a position vacated by a regularly elected senator, shall serve for the unexpired term of the senator. Such a replacement for a tenured or tenure-track senator, who serves an unexpired term, is not disqualified from thereafter serving three full consecutive terms, unless the unexpired term is two years or more in length (see Code IV.B.2.a regarding partial terms).

#### F. Duties

1. The primary role of senators is to represent their department or unit which includes the following:
  - a. Review Senate agenda before Senate meetings
  - b. Attend Senate meetings
  - c. Relay department faculty's (or constituents') issues/questions/concerns to Faculty Senate
  - d. Vote on motions during Senate meetings
  - e. Provide reports (orally or written) from the Senate meetings to department or constituents within two weeks after Senate meetings. Senators should remember to abide by the principles of responsible speech outlined in the CBA Article 6.2, which apply just as much to internal as to external communications.
  - f. Participate in Senate forums, special meetings, and Senate-related surveys.
2. Senators who fail to fulfill these duties may be subject to removal as per Bylaws I.E.2.



# Exhibit E

## Management Minor or Certificate

### 1. Required Course Credits: 15

1. MGT 386 Principles of Organizational Behavior
2. MGT 395 Leadership in Business Organizations
3. MGT 380 Organizational Management **OR** MGT 382 Principles of Management

### 2. Department-Approved Electives Credits: 5

1. BUS 411 Emotional Intelligence for Professionals
2. HRM 381 Management of Human Resources
3. MGT 200 Tactical Skills for Professionals
4. MGT 389 Business and Society

### 3. Total Credits: 20

# Exhibit F

## Electrical Engineering Technology Major, BS

### 1. Core Requirements Credits: 73

1. EET 221 Basic Electricity
2. EET 221LAB Basic Electricity Laboratory
3. EET 271 Digital Circuits
4. EET 312 Basic Electronics
5. EET 312LAB Basic Electronics Laboratory
6. EET 323 Active Linear Circuits
7. EET 325 Electrical Networks
8. EET 372 Advanced Digital Circuits
9. EET 373 Introduction to Embedded Programming
10. EET 374 Microprocessors
11. EET 376 Advanced Microprocessors
12. EET 426 Advanced Electrical Network
13. EET 427 Process Control
14. ETSC 242 Instrumentation
15. ETSC 301 Engineering Project Cost Analysis
16. ETSC 343 Programmable Logic Controller Applications
17. ETSC 443 Programmable Logic Controller Applications II
18. ENG 111 Writing in the Sciences
19. CS 112 Introduction to Data Science in Python
20. COM 302 Intercultural Communication

### 2. Pre-Approved Elective Sequences Credits: 16

Select two of the following sequences.

1. CS 110 Programming Fundamentals I **AND** CS 111 Programming Fundamentals II  
**OR**
2. EET 332 Electrical Machines **AND** EET 433 Transmission and Distribution of Electrical Power  
**OR**
3. EET 377 Advanced Robotics and Automation **AND** EET 477 Industrial Robotics and Automation  
**OR**
4. ETSC 490 Cooperative Education *(Must be taken for 8 credits.)*

### 3. Mathematics Requirement Credits: 14-15

1. MATH 172 Calculus I
2. MATH 173 Calculus II

**Select one from the following:**

3. BUS 221 Introductory Business Statistics
4. MATH 211 Statistical Concepts and Methods
5. MATH 260 Sets and Logic
6. MATH 265 Linear Algebra I
7. MATH 272 Multivariable Calculus I

**4. Physics Requirement Credits: 15**

1. PHYS 111 Introductory Physics I with Laboratory
2. PHYS 112 Introductory Physics II with Laboratory
3. PHYS 113 Introductory Physics III with Laboratory

**OR**

4. PHYS 181 General Physics I with Laboratory
5. PHYS 182 General Physics II with Laboratory
6. PHYS 183 General Physics III with Laboratory

(CHEM 181/181LAB may be substituted for PHYS 112 or PHYS 182)

**5. Capstone Sequence Credits: 10**

1. EET 487 Senior Project Management
2. EET 487LAB Senior Project Management Laboratory
3. EET 488 Senior Project Quality
4. EET 488LAB Senior Project Quality Laboratory
5. EET 489 Senior Technical Presentations

**6. Total Credits: 128-129**

# Exhibit G

## Data Science Minor

### 1. Required courses - Credits: 29

1. MATH 172 Calculus I
2. MATH 173 Calculus II
3. MATH 265 Linear Algebra I
4. MATH 309 Mathematical Computing
5. MATH 410A Advanced Statistical Methods I
6. MATH 410B Advanced Statistical Methods II
7. MATH 410C Advanced Statistical Methods III

### 2. Select one of the following statistics courses - Credits: 5

1. MATH 211 Statistical Concepts and Methods
2. MATH 314 Probability and Statistics

## **Exhibit H**

When the current Gen Ed Program was created, it was created with Program Goals rather than Program Learner Outcomes (PLOs). However, our current accreditation process requires a Gen Ed program assessment, which has led to the formation of these proposed PLOs.

The PLOs are distinct from the Knowledge Area outcomes. While the Knowledge Area outcomes are specifically tailored to the focus of each Knowledge Area and its associated classes, the PLOs must provide a general, overarching set of outcomes that align with the overall Gen Ed Program goals. Additionally, the number of PLOs should be limited and manageable to assess, while suggesting assessment artifacts that are relatively straightforward to produce.

The proposed PLOs were discussed by the Gen Ed Committee during Spring 2024 and presented to the June 2024 Faculty Senate meeting for discussion and feedback where they were well-received.

### **Proposed General Education Program Learner Outcomes**

3. Apply quantitative and qualitative methods to describe, analyze, and solve problems.
4. Recognize when information is needed and be able to locate, evaluate, and effectively use it situationally, effectively, responsibly, and ethically.
5. Assess the relevance and strength of claims in written texts, visual media and/or other forms of discourse.
6. Communicate well-reasoned ideas effectively using a variety of methods and genres appropriate to purpose, audience, and context.
7. Extend knowledge and skills in a practical context and/or environment.

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Faculty Senate

**FROM:** Bernadette M.E. Jungblut, Ph.D., Faculty Legislative Representative

**DATE:** 3 March 2025

**RE:** 2025 Washington Legislative Session Update

The legislature has just completed the seventh week of the session and is on to the eighth. Two key dates have passed – Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup>, the Policy Committee Cutoff and Friday, the 28<sup>th</sup>, the Fiscal Committee Cutoff. Bills that were not passed out of their respective policy committees died on the 21<sup>st</sup>; bills that were not passed out of the House Appropriations Committee or the Senate Ways and Means Committee died on the 28<sup>th</sup>. Below, please find a summary of the bills that died.

Along with bills that did not have fiscal impacts (and thus, did not need to pass through Appropriations or Ways and Means), bills that survived the policy committee and fiscal committee process are now moving through their respective chambers. These bills now have until March 12<sup>th</sup> to be passed by the House of Representatives (HB bills) or the Senate (SB bills). Bills that survive this process will then have until April 2<sup>nd</sup>, Opposite Chamber Policy Cutoff, to make their way out of the policy committees in the other chamber.

As usual, this legislative update provides a summary of bills of particular relevance to Central Washington University faculty introduced in the House of Representatives Postsecondary and Workforce Committee (HPEW), Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee (SHEWD), or other committees to date.

As always, if there are questions about any of the bills summarized below, I hope you will not hesitate to contact me via email or cell: 407.754.4458.

### **Bills No Longer Being Considered This Session**

#### **[HB 1035: Creating policies and resources to address secondary traumatic stress in the higher education workforce](#)**

- Secondary traumatic stress occurs when a person experiences psychological trauma after encountering the trauma of another person. For example, a faculty member who talks with a student about a traumatic event the student experienced may, in turn, experience secondary traumatic stress. Other terms for secondary traumatic stress include vicarious trauma and

compassion fatigue.

- This bill would have required that CWU (and the other two public regional universities, Western Washington University and Eastern Washington University, and all Community and Technical Colleges) create a website space with links to resources about secondary traumatic stress. These resources might include self-assessments and best practices to prevent or at least ameliorate secondary traumatic stress.
- This bill would also have required CWU to develop a Model Policy and Procedure to prevent or address secondary traumatic stress. According to the [Bill Analysis](#), this model must include the following:
  - “A commitment to support mental health in the workplace
  - Promotion of a positive workplace climate with a focus on diversity and inclusion
  - Regular assessment of campus-wide implementation of the Model Policy and Procedure that includes input from the workforce
  - Provision of appropriate resources and training to trustees, administrators, and staff for continuous improvement
  - Establishment of a campus-wide Workforce Mental Health Committee.”
- In turn, each Workforce Mental Health Committee would be required to:
  - “Share secondary traumatic stress, stress management, and other mental health resources and supports available through the Public Employees' Benefits Board, as well as through the College Board
  - Share links to a secondary traumatic stress self-assessment tool and any associated resources
  - Report to each board of trustees and regional universities at least once per year with a summary of the committee's activities”
- On January 17<sup>th</sup>, the House Postsecondary Education and Workforce Committee (HPEW) held a public hearing on HB 1035.
- HPEW was scheduled to vote on this bill on January 21<sup>st</sup>; however, no action was taken.
- This bill was not voted on in the HPEW and has died.

[HB 1136: Providing student navigational supports to increase postsecondary enrollment](#) and [SB 5164: Providing student navigational supports to increase postsecondary enrollment](#)

- These companion bills would have provided support for prospective students when completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and the Washington Application for State Financial Aid (WASFA).
- These bills had the potential to increase student enrollment at CWU.
- I provided written testimony to both policy committees for this bill as follows:
  - “HB 1136/SB 5164 Student Navigational Support will enable more Washington State residents to apply for federal and state financial aid by completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and the Washington Application for State Financial Aid (WASFA). When surveyed, prospective students consistently say the primary barrier to going to college or university or seeking an apprenticeship or workforce development opportunity is the fear they cannot afford the cost of tuition. The Washington College Grant – available to many Washingtonians via the WASFA – helps with tuition costs. Moreover, Washington State’s low FAFSA completion rate (consistently less than 50%) for college-going students means our state leaves millions of federal dollars (approximately \$55 to 60 million per year) on the table. Supporting the completion of the WASFA and the FAFSA will mean more prospective students can become actual

students – increasing enrollment that supports our public colleges and universities and moving us closer to the goal of 70% of Washingtonians with a post-secondary degree or credential.”

- On January 16<sup>th</sup>, the Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee (SHEWD) held a public hearing on SB 5164.
- On January 17<sup>th</sup>, the House Postsecondary Education and Workforce Committee (HPEW) held a public hearing on HB 1136.
- On January 28<sup>th</sup>, HPEW passed a substitute bill, [HB 1136-S](#).
- This substitute bill clarified how CTC and four-year institutions would be selected to participate in this program and also clarified the responsibilities of the outreach and enrollment specialists who will work with high school students to increase FAFSA and WASFA completion rates.
- On January 31<sup>st</sup>, HB 1136-S was referred to the House Appropriations Committee.
- On January 30<sup>th</sup>, SHEWD passed a companion substitute bill, [SB 5164-S](#).
- This substitute bill likewise clarified how CTC and four-year institutions would be selected to participate in this program and also clarified the responsibilities of the outreach and enrollment specialists who will work with high school students to increase FAFSA and WASFA completion rates.
- On January 31<sup>st</sup>, SB 5164-S was referred to the Senate Ways and Means Committee.
- HB 1136-S sat in the House Appropriations Committee for nearly two weeks, never received a hearing in that committee, and died.
- SB 5164-S had a public hearing in the Senate Ways and Means Committee on February 17<sup>th</sup> and was scheduled for a vote on February 28<sup>th</sup>; however, no action was taken, and this bill also died.
- The fiscal notes for both these bills were more than \$27 million over the 2025-27 biennium. Given the projected budget shortfall over the next four years, it was highly unlikely these bills would have made it through their respective fiscal committees.

[HB 1143: Concerning Washington college grant award amounts](#) and [SB 5205: Concerning Washington college grant award amounts](#)

- These companion bills proposed that higher education institutions wishing to obtain the maximum [Washington College Grant \(WCG\)](#) must sign an affidavit attesting they do not discriminate against students or employees on the basis of “age, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, race, creed, color, national origin, citizenship or immigration status, honorably discharged veteran or military status, or the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability” (as per the Washington Law Against Discrimination).
- For public institutions of higher education, the maximum WCG college grant is calculated by taking the established 2019-20 base grant and adding the tuition growth factor which, for public institutions, is defined as “an increase of no more than the average annual percentage growth rate of the median hourly wage for Washington for the previous 14 years as that wage is determined by the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics.” For CWU, the growth factor has typically been just over 2%. Put another way, tuition growth for public institutions is pre-determined whereas private institutions can set their tuition without this governmental restraint.
- At the January 20<sup>th</sup> Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee (SHEWD) and the January 21<sup>st</sup> House Postsecondary Education and Workforce Committee (HPEW) meeting, the Council of Faculty (i.e., the group of faculty legislative representatives) offered collective testimony citing the higher tuition at private institutions compared to public institutions and the fact that private institutions often are allotted higher maximum WCG

amounts than public regional universities like CWU. We prefer any increases to the maximum WCG go to public institutions rather than private institutions. We are requesting data on what dollar amount and percentage of the WCG goes to private institutions annually. We also plan to find out the average debt accrued by public college students compared to private college students.

- While HB 1143 received a hearing, it was never scheduled for a vote in the HPEW, and died.
- The Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee passed SB 5205 on February 6<sup>th</sup>, and this bill was referred to Ways and Means on February 10<sup>th</sup>.
- The Washington Student Achievement Council estimated the total net cost of SB 5205 could be as high as \$1.4 million per year but was not able to provide a definitive number.
- SB 5205 did not receive a hearing in Senate Ways and Means and died.

#### HB 1492: Providing early registration for students with dependents

- This bill would have mandated that institutions with early or priority registration provide new students with dependents early registration. Continuing students with dependents would also have been provided with early registration among students with the same level of class standing or credit.
- This bill defined dependents as: “Children 18 years of age or younger who are under the registering student's care; and persons who, because of physical or mental disability or because of extreme advanced age, is dependent upon the registering student to provide the basic necessities of life.”
- This bill was a [Washington Student Association](#) priority this session.
- This bill had a public hearing in the House Postsecondary Education and Workforce Committee on January 29<sup>th</sup>.
- This bill was scheduled for a vote on February 4<sup>th</sup>; however, no action was taken, and this bill has died.

#### HB 1949: Exempting certain scholarly communications from disclosure under the public records act

- For the past three legislative sessions, the Council of Faculty has been working with the [Washington Coalition for Open Government](#) to craft this bill.
- This bill would have exempted the following from public records requests:
  - The identity of a human subject if the informed consent protocol for the research study had guaranteed confidentiality of records identifying that subject
  - Materials provided to reviewers for the purpose of peer reviews of scholarly manuscripts and research proposals including evaluations by peer reviewers, and correspondence between the reviewer and the review requester to the extent such correspondence would reveal the reviewer's identity
  - Data, computer code, or draft manuscripts created in the conduct of research studies until such data, code, or draft manuscripts have been publicly disseminated, published, copyrighted, or patented
- The State Government and Tribal Relations Committee heard this bill on February 19<sup>th</sup>. The Council of Faculty took a collective position of “pro” and testified in committee.
- This bill never received a vote and has died. The committee chair encouraged the Council of Faculty to bring back this bill next session.

#### SB 5275: Passport to careers

- This bill would have taken the existing Passport to Careers Program, which serves youth in foster

care without housing, and made it an entitlement (i.e., guaranteed). This has traditionally been a \$5,000 addition to the Washington College Grant, guaranteed for up to six years. Money ran short for it last year, and since it was not an entitlement, eligible students received only \$2,800.

- This bill received a public hearing in the Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee on January 23<sup>rd</sup>.
- I signed in “pro” in favor of this proposed legislation. In addition, the Council of Faculty collectively took a “pro” position on this bill and we testified in committee on January 23<sup>rd</sup>, in favor of this bill.
- On February 10<sup>th</sup>, the Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee passed a substitute bill, [SB 5275-S](#) which included language to specify this bill pertained to the “Passport to Careers Program.” This bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee on February 11<sup>th</sup>.
- This [fiscal note for this bill](#) was listed as “non-zero but indeterminate;” however, the Washington Student Achievement Council estimated that, “...if 2,000 eligible students were enrolled for FY26 and 2,200 eligible students for FY27 and received \$5,000 per student based on this bill and student’s financial need, the program would require an additional \$7.3 million dollars for FY26 and \$8.6 million dollars for FY27...”
- The Senate Ways and Means Committee did not give this bill a hearing, and it has died.

#### [SB 5308: Guaranteed admissions](#)

- This bill would have expanded the [Washington Guaranteed Admissions Program \(WAGAP\)](#) to all WA school districts. At present, not all school districts participate in WAGAP.
- Currently, if students have a 3.0 cumulative GPA, meet (or are on track to meet) all [College Academic Distribution Requirements \(CADRS\)](#), and their school district has an agreement with the public, four-year colleges and universities (the Evergreen State College, Eastern Washington University, Central Washington University, Western Washington University, Washington State University, and the University of Washington-Tacoma), students are guaranteed admission to these institutions.
- This bill would have required all school districts to participate in WAGAP by creating data-sharing agreements to provide 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade student WAGAP eligibility data.
- This could have been a good bill for CWU. It would have provided access to contact information for more high school students who meet the WAGAP criteria. This could potentially have helped CWU recruit and admit more Washington State students – increasing our enrollment.
- This bill was heard on January 23<sup>rd</sup> in the Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee.
- I signed in “pro” in favor of this proposed legislation. In addition, the Council of Faculty collectively took a “pro” position on this bill and testified in committee on January 23<sup>rd</sup> in favor of this bill.
- This bill did not receive a vote in the Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee and has died.
- A companion bill, [HB 1557: Establishing the Washington guaranteed admissions program and requiring student notifications](#) dropped in the House on January 23<sup>rd</sup> and had a public hearing in the House Postsecondary Education and Workforce Committee on February 5<sup>th</sup>. I signed in “pro” on this bill. In addition, the Council of Faculty collectively took a “pro” position on this bill, and testified in committee on February 5<sup>th</sup> in favor of this bill.
- On February 18<sup>th</sup>, the House Postsecondary Education and Workforce Committee passed a substitute bill, [HB 1557-S](#), that reduced the cost of this bill.

- This bill was referred to the House Appropriations Committee, received a hearing on February 26<sup>th</sup>, was not voted on, and has died.

#### [SB 5397: Establishing limits on the percentage of courses taught by faculty without tenure track status at community and technical colleges.](#)

- The key text of this bill was as follows: “No later than July 1, 2026, the community and technical colleges shall each adopt a policy concerning the percentage of courses that may be taught at each respective college by faculty without tenure track status. At minimum, the policy must require that no more than 45 percent of courses offered annually may be taught by faculty without tenure track status on and after July 1, 2030.”
- The [Washington Education Association \(WEA\)](#) asked the Council of Faculty to support this bill and testify in favor of it. We discussed this bill in our weekly faculty legislative representative meeting on February 5<sup>th</sup>.
- Our online and in-person discussions focused on two aspects of this bill: 1) our strong preference to support tenure-track faculty teaching classes, and, by extension, increase the number of tenure-track colleagues; and 2) our priority this legislative session to convince senators and representatives not to reduce the fund split – and to emphasize the need to make our four-year institutions whole again. Unfortunately, SB 5397 had the potential to be a distraction from our efforts to increase funding for public four-year institutions.
- The Council of Faculty reached out to WEA to discuss how we can collectively support community and technical colleges and four-year public universities in the future.
- The Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee held a public hearing on this bill on February 6<sup>th</sup>; however, this bill was not voted on in that policy committee and has died.

#### [SB 5400: Supporting local news journalism](#)

- This bill would have created a “Journalism Corps Program” to fund civic reporting in underserved communities.
- The funding for this program would have come from the [Workforce Education Investment Account \(WEIA\)](#).
- [RCW 43.79.195](#) states: “Expenditures from the account may be used only for higher education programs, higher education operations, higher education compensation, state-funded student aid programs, and workforce development including career connected learning as defined by RCW [28C.30.020](#).”
- This bill had a public hearing on January 28<sup>th</sup> in the Senate Committee on Labor and Commerce.
- This bill was problematic because, while the Journalism Corps Program may be a worthwhile endeavor, the funding for this program would have been taken out of the WEIA – which is supposed to be used only for higher education. The [fiscal note for this bill](#) was \$40 million for the 2025-27 biennium. Due to this, I signed in “other” on this bill.
- This bill was scheduled for a vote on February 7<sup>th</sup> in the Senate Labor and Commerce Committee; however, no action was taken. This committee passed a substitute bill, [SB 5400-S](#), on February 14<sup>th</sup> and that bill was referred to the Senate Ways and Means Committee.
- The substitute bill did not receive a hearing in that fiscal committee and has died.

#### [SB 5402: Modifying financial aid eligibility](#)

- This bill would have changed the award amounts of the [Washington College Grant \(WCG\)](#). WCG amounts are based on family income in comparison to the state median family income, adjusted

for family size. The new amounts would have been as follows:

- Zero to 70% of state median family income = maximum WCG
- 71% to 80% of state median family income = 50% of the maximum
- 81% to 90% of state median family income = 25% of the maximum
- 91% to 100% of state median family income = 10% of the maximum
- The original WCG statute provided the maximum amount to students with family incomes between zero and 55% of the state median family income, adjusted for family size.
- This was subsequently changed to provide the maximum WCG to students with family incomes between zero and 65% of the state median family income, adjusted for family size. That change is due to expire, and the maximum WCG amount would revert back to students with family incomes between zero and 55% of the state median family income, adjusted for family size.
- This bill would also have awarded a bridge grant of \$500 to all full-time students receiving the maximum WCG as long as they are not recipients of the college-bound scholarship program. Bridge grants could be used for non-tuition and non-fee college expenses such as books, lab fees, supplies, technology, transportation, housing, and child care.
- This bill was the [Washington Student Association's](#) top priority this session.
- A public hearing was held on this bill on January 30<sup>th</sup>, in the Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee. The Faculty Legislative Representatives (FLR) from Eastern Washington University (EWU), the University of Washington (UW), and I testified in favor of this bill.
- The EWU FLR focused on how this bill would increase enrollment; the UW FLR focused on the need to “smooth the cliff” of the Washington College Grant. Unlike federal Pell grants, which gradually decline as a student’s (or student’s family’s) income increases, the WCG does not gradually decline. This means that when a student or a student’s family earns a little more income from one year to the next, the student’s WCG can be cut in half – or more.
- My testimony focused on how increasing WCG eligibility would increase enrollment of traditionally under-represented students:
  - “Chair Nobles, Ranking Member Warnick, and members of the committee, for the record, I am Bernadette Jungblut, Faculty Legislative Representative for Central Washington University and a member of the Council of Faculty here today testifying in support of Senate Bill 5402. This bill would enable more students to be eligible to receive the Washington College Grant and would increase enrollment in postsecondary education. In addition, more students who have been traditionally under-represented in higher education would be able to go to college. Surveys suggest that nearly 90% of Washington State graduating high school students **\*say\*** they want to go to college; however, only about 50% of them do. Many students in the 50% who do not enroll are students of color, students who are the first in their family to go to college, and students from lower income backgrounds. Enabling more of our prospective students to become **\*actual\*** students would diversify our campuses and programs and ultimately, diversify the Washington State workforce. I thank you for this opportunity to testify and urge you to support SB 5402.”
- The Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee passed a substitute bill, [SB 5402-S](#) on February 6<sup>th</sup>, and the bill was referred to the Senate Ways and Means Committee on February 7<sup>th</sup>. (The substitute bill removed some redundant language).
- The [fiscal note for this bill](#) was listed as “non-zero but indeterminate;” however, the Washington Student Achievement Council estimates this bill could cost \$48.2 million in FY26 and \$50.6 million in FY27. This made it the most costly bill I am tracking this session.
- The Senate Ways and Means Committee did not give SB 5402-S a hearing and, as such, this bill has died.
- The companion bill, [HB 1568: Modifying Financial Aid Eligibility](#) dropped in the House on

January 24<sup>th</sup> and had a public hearing in the House Postsecondary and Workforce Committee on February 5<sup>th</sup>. I signed in “pro” on this bill. In addition, the Council of Faculty collectively took a “pro” position on this bill.

- This bill did not receive a vote in the House Postsecondary Education and Workforce Committee and, as such, has died.

#### SB 5658: Concerning the workforce education investment account

- This bill would have made the same changes to the eligibility criteria for the [Washington College Grant \(WCG\)](#) and college bridge grants as SB 5402 (please see below).
- This bill would also have mandated that the “surcharge imposed under [RCW 82.04.299](#) must be used exclusively for higher education programs that lead to a credential in advanced computing, as defined in RCW 82.04.299, and related science, technology, engineering, and math computing fields to increase access and equity, especially for students from traditionally underserved communities.”
- This bill would also have mandated that “(w)hen the number of qualified Washington state applicants exceeds the available enrollments at the University of Washington Paul G. Allen School of Computer Science by 100, then additional enrollments must be automatically added and funded from the surcharge imposed under RCW 82.04.299 to accommodate the additional demand.”
- The “surcharge” referenced here is the workforce education investment surcharge imposed on certain advanced computing businesses. This surcharge is calculated by taking the gross income of the business subject to the tax under [RCW 82.04.290](#)(2), multiplied by the rate of 1.22 percent.
- In short, this bill would have given preference in some WCG funding to STEM disciplines and the UW School of Computing.
- The Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee held a public hearing on this bill on February 10<sup>th</sup>; however, this committee did not vote on this bill and, as such, this bill has died.

### **Bills Still Being Considered This Session**

#### HB 1036: Adding labor trustees to college boards

- This bill would add a trustee to CWU’s Board of Trustees (BOT) from “labor.” It is unclear whether this trustee would be staff member or a faculty member.
- Potential advantages include having a wider diversity of representation on CWU’s BOT.
- There are concerns, however, that a currently employed CWU staff or faculty member might experience a conflict of interest by serving on the board.
- On January 15<sup>th</sup>, the House Postsecondary Education and Workforce Committee (HPEW) held a public hearing on this bill.
- On January 28<sup>th</sup>, HPEW passed a substitute bill, [HB 1036-S](#).
- The substitute bill added the following language: “No trustee may be an employee of the higher education system, a member of the board of directors of any institution of higher education, or a member of the governing board of any public or private educational institution.” This includes a representative from labor.
- On January 31<sup>st</sup>, HB 1036-S was referred to the House Rules Committee for review.
- This bill has been sitting in the House Rules Committee for more than a month. The Rules

Committee could still move it to the House floor for a vote; however, they would have to do so no later than March 12<sup>th</sup>, the Chamber of Origin Cutoff.

#### [HB 1337: Concerning the appointment of presidents of institutions of higher education](#)

- This bill proposes that when conducting a search for a university president, the governing board must publicly announce up to four finalists for the position 30 days prior to a board meeting that involves making a hiring decision. Within that 30-day period, the governing board must provide a public university forum to which students, staff, faculty, and media are invited.
- Potential advantages to this bill include increased transparency in presidential hiring processes.
- Potential disadvantages may include potential candidates' hesitancy to apply given these provisions.
- This bill was scheduled for a public hearing in the House Postsecondary Education and Workforce Committee on February 18<sup>th</sup> and scheduled for a vote in this committee on February 19<sup>th</sup>.
- HB 1337 has been in the news – with an article in the *Spokane Spokesman-Review* on January 28<sup>th</sup>, [“WSU, UW Presidential Searches Enter Final Stages without Identifying Candidates; Bipartisan Coalition Seeks Transparency,”](#) and a more recent editorial in *The Seattle Times*, [“Grant Hearing for Bill to Make Hiring of University Presidents Transparent.”](#)
- The Council of Faculty took a collective position on this issue and testified “pro” on HB 1337-S on February 18<sup>th</sup>. The gist of our testimony was that more transparency in searches is to be valued, and numerous institutions across the country have hired excellent presidents with open and transparent hiring processes.
- HPEW passed that substitute bill, [HB 1337-S](#), on February 19<sup>th</sup>. As expected, this substitute bill included the requirement that student and faculty trustees/regents be involved in the all aspects of the process surrounding presidential searches – including votes from which they are currently excluded. The other provisions listed above were removed.
- HB 1337-S is now in the House Rules Committee and will need to be moved to the House floor for a hearing and vote before March 21<sup>st</sup>, the Chamber of Origin Cut-Off, to remain alive.

#### [SB 5355: Improving safety at institutions of higher education while supporting student survivors of sexual assault](#)

- This is a fairly complex bill with numerous requirements.
- At a minimum, higher education institutions would be required to “provide survivors at postsecondary institutions with certain protections, resources, and accommodations to help them navigate the aftermath of traumatic sex-based and gender-based violence and harassment.”
- In addition, students would be guaranteed the following rights:
  - “Engage with employees who have been trained in trauma-informed care.
  - A quick and timely institutional investigation process not to exceed six months from the date an investigation is initiated, unless extenuating circumstances exist.
  - Mental health or counseling services, on campus or off-site, regardless of whether the student chooses to make a formal report through the campus Title IX office or to law enforcement.
  - Access to confidential support services, which may include peer advocates, campus-affiliated advocates, and gender-based violence support groups.
  - Request supportive measures including but not limited to:
    - Counseling and other medical assistance

- Extensions of deadlines or other academic adjustments
  - Modifications of on-campus work or class schedules
  - Leaves of absence
  - Increased security or monitoring of certain areas of campus
  - Directives prohibiting the parties from contacting one another in housing or work situations
  - Have court-issued no-contact and restraining orders honored and reported to university police and security services by a trained employee, such as a campus-affiliated advocate when requested to do so by the survivor
  - Be made aware by a campus-based employee if the employee is a Title IX required reporter and to which office the employee will share the information provided by the survivor
  - Access to a no-fee attorney through an organization that serves the entire state and is focused on sexual assault.”
- Institutions would also be required to:
  - “Establish or expand an existing student health and safety committee that includes representatives from various groups.”
  - Collaborate with a community-based organization focused on survivors of sexual assault, sexual harassment, and sex-based violence to provide training for employees and students.
  - Include the phone number of a regional community-based organization focused on survivors of sexual assault, sexual harassment, and sex-based and gender-based violence that provides 24/7 support on the back of each student's identification card.”
- This bill also:
  - Prohibits nondisclosure agreements.
  - Establishes timelines for Title IX investigations and mandates an online option for reporting Title IX violations.
  - Mandates campus climate assessments every five years. Results of these assessments must be reported to the Council of Presidents, and institutions must also post assessment results on a public-facing website.
- The Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee held a public hearing on this bill on February 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- This committee passed a substitute bill, [SB 5355-S](#) on February 17<sup>th</sup>, and this substitute bill was referred to the Senate Ways and Means Committee on February 18<sup>th</sup>.
- Ways and Means heard this bill on February 24<sup>th</sup> and passed a second substitute bill on February 28<sup>th</sup>, [SB 5355-S2](#). This second substitute bill was also moved to the Senate Rules Committee on the 28<sup>th</sup>.
- The new version of this bill removes almost all of the language above – and reduces this proposed legislation to requiring that the following information be printed on new or replaced student, faculty, and staff ID cards:
  - “(a) The contact information for a national suicide prevention organization;
  - (b) The contact information for one or more campus, local, state, or national organizations specializing in suicide prevention, crisis 5 intervention, or counseling, if available;
  - (c) The phone number of a regional community-based organization focused on survivors of sexual assault, sexual harassment, and sex based and gender-based violence that provides 24/7 support.”

