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Executive Summary

Central Washington University has entered its fourth decade as a regional comprehensive university, a responsibility that it now discharges with maturity and confidence. CWU mounts excellent programs of study at the bachelor’s and master’s degree levels. The liberal arts and humanities and the natural and social sciences continue to prosper alongside thriving professional programs. A growing emphasis on interdisciplinary programs has evolved during the decade. Two new degree designations—the bachelor of applied sciences and the master of public accountancy—have been added. The large majority of CWU faculty members hold the terminal degree in their fields of study, and, as a group, the faculty has compiled an outstanding record of teaching, scholarship, and service. Students work with these faculty in moderately-sized classes; and a dedicated staff provides support and continuity of services. Faculty and staff scholarly activity has sharply increased during the decade, drawing resources from federal, state, and private entities. The university entered into faculty collective bargaining during the study period, and activities associated with that change led to a reexamination of shared governance of the university.

Relatively few leadership changes throughout most of the decade contributed to institutional stability. Jerilyn S. McIntyre became the first woman to lead the university when she was appointed its 13th president and took office on July 1, 2000. She remained in the position for the large part of the decade, retiring on December 31, 2008. Two of the five executive officers that she appointed early in her tenure remain part of the executive team and three others served for more than half the decade before leaving for other positions or retirement. During the decade, the institution reinvigorated relations with state and federal legislative delegations and committees. By all accounts those improved relationships have served the institution well in many arenas though not as much in resources as the university would have preferred.

During this period, the university continued to refine and define the role of its six university centers, divided equally among rural and densely populated areas of the state, and their relation to the residential campus in Ellensburg. Particularly in the last half of the decade, CWU balanced its long-standing interactive TV approach to distance education with the development of more fully online and hybrid courses. The asynchronous nature of web-based educational programs has improved access for place-bound and work-bound students.

State budget cuts throughout the decade have challenged the university. By the time President McIntyre arrived in the summer of 2000, it was clear that CWU would miss an overly optimistic enrollment target by nearly 600 full time equivalent students (FTES) for the 2000-2001 academic year. This was, unfortunately, also the year in which the legislature was making budget decisions for the 2001-2003 biennium. The result was that the university’s budgeted enrollment was rebased downward and the budget was cut accordingly. Further, a downturn in the state economy led to an additional two percent budget cut for CWU and for its sister public institutions. Additional cuts followed in the next two years and, even though CWU’s enrollment recovered and
flourished during that time, state support lagged enrollment by as much as 886 FTES in 2004-2005. It was not until the 2007-2009 biennium that state support once again caught up with and surpassed enrollment, in part because the legislature funded more FTES than the university had requested and in part because CWU undershot its own estimates during the biennium. This variance resulted from a combination of improved graduation rates for existing students and a downturn in the number of community college students completing transferrable associate’s degrees, a decreasing percentage of whom pursued baccalaureate degrees. The latter shift was particularly disadvantageous because, on average, 55 percent of new undergraduate students are transfer students, mostly from the state’s community colleges, and about 64 percent of our undergraduate degrees go to transfer students. This and the national economic downturn created the context for the state legislature’s 2009-2011 biennial budget discussions; the result was another significant cut in the university’s budget.

The budget crises of the decade make the university’s significant gains all the more impressive. They include, to name only a few, the reinstitution of and enhancements to new student and transfer student orientation, development of a nationally recognized “first year experience,” initiation and growth of living learning communities, strengthening of the already flourishing program of undergraduate research, increased scholarly productivity of the faculty, a major overhaul of the university’s academic program review and educational outcome assessment process, creation of the Center for the Teacher-Scholar, prize-winning renovations and restorations of historic buildings and construction of state-of-the-art facilities on the residential campus in Ellensburg and at each of the university centers, and completion of the institution’s first comprehensive gifts campaign which surpassed both an original ($18 million in five years) and revised ($21 million) goal by garnering $21.6 million in three and a half years.

Planning. These gains can be attributed in part to two consecutive cycles of strategic planning. Building on the mission statement and core values that had been established under the leadership of Interim President James (Dolph) Norton, President McIntyre commissioned a widely representative strategic planning committee in 2000 to establish a vision for the university’s future and to write goals and subsidiary goals that could move Central Washington University toward achieving it. While the goals were not set by the budget situation, they were surely informed by it. President McIntyre asked each of the five divisions of the university to plan in ways that would achieve important results in good times and bad. She established work groups to create interdivisional enrollment management, information technology, communication, and facilities plans. She required that all new proposals for support or funding be grounded in university, divisional, unit, or interdivisional plans. The university strategic plan was updated in 2006, and progress on goals established in the 2001–2006 plan was announced to the university community.

Centers. Through its six university centers, the university is able to extend its reach to meet the educational needs of place- and work-bound students in urban and rural parts of the state. The centers serve an increasing number of students. Meeting the needs of these students has given the university impetus to expand the diversity of campus
operations to include multiple means of course delivery—including interactive television, online programs, hybrid courses, and increased use of technology—to reach out to students.

University centers offer programs of upper-division and graduate instruction that lead to selected majors and minors appropriate to the needs of the locale and its students. Degree programs at the centers generally fall into four areas—business and accounting, teacher preparation, electronic and industrial technology, and law and justice. In addition to degree programs, the centers offer a variety of minors and certificate programs. The percent of total FTES university enrollment completing work at the centers ranged from 11.5% in 2001–2002 to 15% in 2008–2009.

The Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board reviews and approves all programs in major fields of study at all sites including the centers. The university expands its programs at the university centers when student demand and state need dictate and when funding is sufficient to support a high quality educational outcome. Faculty, staff, and administrators take care to ensure that courses, academic programs, support services, and facilities are comparable to those offered at the residential campus. New and well appointed facilities were constructed during the decade to house each of the six university centers, and are a matter of pride for Central and for the partner community colleges where the buildings are located. CWU expects the centers to play an increasingly significant role in the coming decade.

**Students.** Enrollment during the decade soared from 8,233 head count (HC) (7,805 FTES) in 1999–2000 to 10,188 HC (9,610 FTES) in 2008–2009. Of the 2008–2009 cohort, 8,399 HC (8,028.5 FTES) studied on the residential campus in Ellensburg and 1,789 HC (1,581.5 FTE) were enrolled at a university center. Although CWU’s residential campus is situated in Ellensburg—the geographic center of the state—its influence is statewide. Students come from every corner of the state, and the majority (65 %) is from western Washington.

During the decade, CWU witnessed a major growth in the percentage of students of color, from 12% in 1999 to 22% in 2008–2009. Applications from students of color have increased to 26%. For most of the decade, CWU enrolled the highest percentage of Hispanic students of any state public institution, about 8% of undergraduate students. CWU boasts the highest graduation rate for Hispanic students of any Washington public university. A large number of students—approximately 34%—are first generation college students. Students at the university centers are older and more ethnically and racially diverse, with more nontraditional students who are 22 or older, female, and Pell Grant recipients than those at the Ellensburg campus.

**Faculty.** Central Washington University long has considered the quality of its faculty as the most important predictor of program effectiveness. Since the last accreditation review, over 79 tenure-track faculty have retired, approximately 155 have left the university for other reasons, and 265 new tenure-track faculty have been hired. The university has vigorously recruited new faculty of high quality. These new faculty have brought with them abundant energy and talent and have contributed greatly to CWU’s
reputation as a student-centered university while enlarging CWU’s focus on scholarly and creative endeavors. Central takes pride in providing a student-centered, safe, and welcoming learning environment, guided by intellectually and pedagogically innovative teacher-scholars. The increased emphasis on scholarship evident in the past decade has resulted in steady increases in external grant applications and close to a three-fold increase in the amount of grant funding awarded to the university from a wide variety of agencies.

There have been dramatic changes between 1999 and 2009 in the policies and procedures related to faculty selection, evaluation, roles, welfare, and development. The most significant stimulus for change has been the successful engagement by the administration and faculty in collective bargaining, first sanctioned by the state legislature in 2002. The collective bargaining unit includes all faculty who teach at least 16% FTE, and governs compensation, working conditions, rights, and responsibilities. Clearly stated roles and evaluation standards are designed to strengthen each person’s contribution to the institutional whole. Programs that promote faculty welfare and professional development reflect the university’s investment in career-long faculty service.

The previous decade also saw significant focus on faculty compensation. In 2001, the Faculty Senate worked with the administration to establish the Salary Administration Board (SAB) to develop salary goals and procedures for implementing them. Between 2002 and 2005, the university pursued improvements in faculty salaries following SAB recommendations. However, the state entered a period of economic downturn in the middle part of the decade and fewer dollars were available to invest in this goal than had been anticipated. Even so, there has been visible progress toward achieving salaries that are closer to those of our state peer institutions. In fact, our assistant professor salaries are now equivalent to those of the other regional comprehensives in the state even though they continue to lag in CUPA comparisons.

The past ten years also witnessed a dramatic increase in the number of part-time and non-tenure track faculty compared to the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty. The increase is a concern to both faculty and administrators. There are numerous contributing factors to this increase, including the need to accommodate the large number of students for whom stable state support was not available. More stable state funding of the past two years has moderated this trend, resulting in significant gains in the tenured and tenure-track ranks.

**Governance.** The university has benefitted from a supportive and activist board of trustees (BOT) throughout the decade. Executive leaders have provided a number of venues for students, staff, and faculty to discuss matters of importance, to participate in decision-making, and to appeal decisions with which they take exception. All major constituent groups—students, faculty, staff, and administrators—are represented by organizations that play an active role in shared governance. The students are represented through the Associated Students of Central Washington University’s Board of Directors. A student sits on the BOT, and students sit on the large majority of university committees and many divisional and college level committees as well. The
Faculty Senate is the major representative of the faculty on matters related to shared governance. In 2004, the faculty voted to unionize and since 2006, the faculty has been represented by a collective bargaining agreement. Issues of wages and working conditions are negotiated between CWU and the United Faculty of Central, and the BOT ratifies the final contract. Since 2007, collective bargaining units have represented a portion of the university’s classified staff. Classified staff not covered by collective bargaining agreements have specific guidelines published regarding layoff procedures per Washington State Department of Personnel rules, and the Employee Council represents all classified staff in shared governance. The Exempt Employees Association participates in governance on behalf of exempt employees, and the Exempt Employees Code specifies conditions of employment for this group of employees.

Representatives of all constituents sit at the table during Board of Trustees meetings and are members of the President’s Advisory Council. While points of disharmony have appeared over the past decade, Central enjoys a relatively peaceful and smooth-running campus. Issues are addressed as they arise, and the institution is optimistic that solutions can be crafted that work to everyone’s advantage.

**Student Support Programs.** In the early part of the decade, student services saw a significant structural re-organization. Enrollment management services (Financial Aid, Admissions and Registrar Services) were separate from the main body of student services, and the separation did not serve the university well. The Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management was formed in 2001 to blend these two functions, and Auxiliary Services (Bookstore, Dining, Conference Services, and Housing) moved from its home in the Division of Student Affairs to the Division of Business and Financial Affairs. The re-organization streamlined student services and served as a springboard for major growth in student support programs that are federally, state, and locally supported.

A significant percentage of the growth in support programs has been at our university centers. Traditionally, student services were primarily located at the Ellensburg campus. However, as enrollment increased at the six university centers, staff were hired to provide appropriate services at those locations. Student services at the university centers have grown to include admission recruiters, financial aid, career services, disability support services, and academic advising. In summer 2008, University Center Interdivisional Committees (UCIC) were formed in order to improve service delivery to students and serve as a collaborative vehicle for center staff and staff at the Ellensburg campus to identify strategic goals specific to each university center.

The opening of the architecturally stunning Student Union and Recreation Center (SURC) in 2006 provided a heart for the campus and substantially improved facilities for student government and a wide variety of student life offerings. Students are actively and widely involved in university governance. In addition to their service on all university committees that affect them, they also hold a majority of seats on the Service and Activities Fee Committee, a student committee with faculty and staff
representation that recommends to the Board of Trustees the dispersal of over four million dollars annually in student funds.

CWU is committed to developing a positive academic and student life environment for its students, and its effective student support programs achieve that end. While challenges remain, the university is rightly proud of the programs offered to assist students in making their educational experience successful and productive.

**Library and Information Resources.** If the SURC is the heart of the campus, the library is its head. It continues to support the academic programs of the university as it has done throughout the institution’s history, but in recent years the nature of the support has changed with the times. Over this past decade, the library has sharply increased the integration of electronic resources into its collections, moving from reliance upon print periodicals indexes to electronic indexes and aggregator databases as the primary means of locating journal articles, many government documents, and financial data. All students have password-protected worldwide internet access to CWU’s electronic resources. A dramatic example of improved access is that in 1999 the library offered approximately 7,000 full-text e-resources and now offers over 25,000.

Library services at CWU’s centers have been enhanced through the development of agreements with community colleges hosting Central Washington University centers. In 2004, the library hired an instruction and outreach librarian to provide instruction and other professional services to support academic programs at all of the centers and to maintain communication with the community colleges where the university centers are located. All students have electronic access to CWU-provided resources at the residential campus, including the holdings of the Orbis/Cascade Alliance member libraries by means of the Summit catalog.

The explosion of internet resources and membership in the library consortium has mitigated the effect of limited funding and allowed the library to continue to support student learning and faculty scholarship in a manner in which the university is justifiably proud.

**Research Foundation.** In keeping with Goal 3 of each of the two strategic plans created under her leadership, President McIntyre worked closely with the CWU Board of Trustees to establish the CWU Research Foundation (CWURF), a separate 501c3 entity. Its mission is to encourage and assist Central Washington University's faculty, staff, and students to serve as an intellectual resource to enable central Washington, the state, and the region in solving human and environmental problems through economic development. The Central Washington University Research CWURF accomplishes this by supporting and encouraging the transformation of intellectual inquiry and exploration into applications that facilitate economic development.

**Staff and Administration.** During the last decade, the university witnessed an increase in the categories of employees labeled classified staff and administrative exempt. Although CWU continues to be under-administered compared to peer institutions in the state, the increases have been a source of concern among the faculty. A careful analysis of the additions suggests that the large majority of the new positions have been among professional and student support staff and particularly reflect efforts by President McIntyre to move critical student affairs and enrollment management staff to
state support. These have included positions in disability support, admissions, financial aid, and registrar’s officers, some of which were funded during the decade by special legislative appropriations for these purposes. In addition, a three-fold increase in externally-funded grants and contracts has created new positions that support the grant activities. Although the increased staff and administrative positions are justifiable, faculty see them as competing with academic and instructional needs, and it is a point of contention that has not been addressed to their satisfaction.

**Appraisal.** CWU has always been and continues to be a resilient institution. The university engages in continuous self-appraisal—formal and informal—that allows it to identify strengths and challenges and to chart new courses as necessary.

**Primary Strengths.**
- CWU is an engaged and engaging institution that is characterized by outstanding faculty and academic programs and by strong programs of student support.
- Employees, regardless of their classification, take an interest in and promote student success.
- During the decade, planning and evaluation have become increasingly institutionalized and cyclic.
- The university is financially solvent with multiple indicators of good stewardship including adequate reserves and awards for energy conservation.
- New physical structures on the main campus and at the centers have significantly enhanced the university’s ability to deliver a quality education.
- Educational program assessment and evaluation has improved markedly in the past few years.

**Primary Challenges.**
- Despite considerable investment in software and infrastructure, an integrated and fully operational data management and reporting system remains elusive.
- CWU’s status as a largely transfer institution has made it particularly difficult to develop a general education program and assessment of general education student learning that works for all students.
- The past biennial budget marked the first time that the university’s student tuition will make up a larger portion of the instructional budget than does state support. This creates a number of challenges for the university not the least of which is to develop additional forms of institutional support to reduce the burden on students who are already financially stripped.
- While the university actively engages in strategic planning, the integration of planning between organizational levels, data and assessment, budget allocation, and spending is not always clear nor are clear procedures in place that would facilitate such integration.
- Assessment, including educational program assessment, has undergone significant improvement, but it continues to be a work in progress.

**Next Steps:** President James Gaudino assumed office on January 5, 2009 and brings great energy and new ideas to lead the university into the next decade. He has already initiated a visioning exercise as the first step in another round of planning. He has also signaled to the university community his interest in a more entrepreneurial stance for the university. In a time of shrinking resources, he has called on each division of the university to discover efficiencies, eliminate waste, identify cost-cutting possibilities,
and create revenue-generating initiatives. His enthusiasm promises to lead the university with vigor and creativity into the second decade of the century. He has already taken stock of the university’s data management and reporting system and has established a committee to recommend steps toward improvement. He has embraced the Research Foundation as a fertile breeding ground for the entrepreneurial ideas that he believes will be required as we move into the future. Finally, he is anticipating the full integration of the new NWCCU accreditation standards into the everyday functioning of the university.

As an institution, we look forward with a sense of purpose and with renewed enthusiasm and curiosity, eager for what lies ahead.
Central Washington University
Eligibility Requirements

Central Washington University is authorized by the state of Washington to offer undergraduate and graduate education programs through the master’s degree (Chapter 28B.35.050 of the Revised Code of Washington). At the undergraduate level, Central Washington University offers the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Applied Science, Bachelor of Arts in Education, Bachelor of Fine Arts, and Bachelor of Music degrees. At the graduate level, the university offers the Master of Arts, Master of Arts in Teaching, Master of Education, Master of Fine Arts, Master of Music, Master of Professional Accountancy, and the Master of Science degrees (Eligibility Requirements 1; 8). The university was founded in 1891, and its principal educational programs have been in existence for several decades (18).

The university's Board of Trustees is made up of eight members, including one student member, who are appointed by the governor and who have no contractual, employment, or personal financial interest in the institution (4). The president, a full-time employee of the university, serves as its chief executive officer (5).

The university is guided by a statement of mission and goals that has been created by the university community and adopted formally by the Board of Trustees (2). The statement clarifies that the purposes of Central Washington University are appropriate to higher education and that the university exists to serve the interests of its students. The first two goals state that the university will maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life on the Ellensburg campus and at the university centers (8). The university has in place systematic planning, evaluation, and assessment procedures that analyze mission fulfillment and goal achievement. The data from these analyses are widely published and used to improve university and program effectiveness (17).

The university has a funding base from state support, tuition and fees, and private giving adequate to carry out its mission. It has a long history of financial solvency, and its debt burden is minimal and well-managed (15). Its financial records are audited annually by the state, and the audits carry an opinion on the financial statement. The university's audit record is exemplary (16). The university's income is directed to its educational mission through support of instruction, research, academic services, public service, student services, student aid, maintenance of the physical plant, and auxiliary services (6).

The university employs a highly qualified faculty adequate to its educational mission, and a core full-time faculty is employed in each area in which the university offers a degree (7). The mission statement asserts the importance of the relationship between faculty and students: “Qualified faculty and staff create a community that encourages and supports the emotional, personal, and professional growth of students from a variety of backgrounds.” This assertion is borne out in practice, and the strong relationship that the university builds between faculty and students is one of its major strengths (12).
The library and information resources of the university are well-developed with a highly regarded main library on the Ellensburg campus, service branch libraries at the university centers, cooperative library agreements with the other state colleges and universities, membership in the regional consortium of academic libraries, well-developed electronic patron access to services, access to comprehensive online suites of databases and full-text resources, courier and electronic transport services, and inter-library loan capabilities. Excellent library faculty and staff assist students and faculty in their use of these resources (10).

Student admission policies are clearly written, and they form the basis of admission practices. Students must meet specified entrance requirements to participate in degree programs at Central Washington University and must complete proficiency requirements prior to entering specified general education courses of the university (13). To earn a bachelor's degree at Central Washington University, students must complete a minimum of 180 quarter credits, of which 45 must be earned at the Ellensburg campus or at one of the university centers (8). The degree must include a general education component either completed at Central Washington University or transferred from another accredited institution (9). Students who earn bachelor's and master's degrees complete a university-endorsed major area of specialization (8). Each educational program of the university defines and publishes its educational objectives and, in the context of the university's curriculum review process, provides evidence that they are consistent with the level, quality, and standards expected in higher education (8). Programs of study encourage students to learn both the conceptual foundations of the field of study and their application. As students progress through their programs of study, there is an increasing expectation that they will work independently, engage in critical thinking, deal with abstract concepts, and understand and distinguish among values (12). Departments employ a variety of end-of-major assessment tools to determine the extent to which these expectations are met.

The university catalog is published annually in print and electronically, is widely distributed, and is available on the university's website. It and other publications of the university describe in detail the university's mission and goals; admission requirements and procedures; rules and regulations for conduct; academic regulations; degree-completion requirements; programs and courses with specific indications of when they are offered; tuition, fees, and other costs; refund policies; and other items relating to attending the university or withdrawing from it (14).

Students participate in institutional governance through the Associated Students of Central Washington University and through membership on university committees and the Board of Trustees. The Faculty Senate represents the faculty in the formulation of institutional policies, and faculty serve as members of policy-recommending university committees (7). The faculty's collective bargaining agent, the United Faculty of Central, represents the faculty in matters relating to personnel actions and workload. Administrative staff are represented in the formulation of institutional policy through the Exempt Employees Association, and classified staff are represented in institutional governance through the Employee Council. Representatives of these groups participate in open meetings of the Board of Trustees, and it is in this forum that general university policies are adopted (6).

The university upholds the value of free speech and encourages intellectual independence on
the part of both faculty and students. The faculty is granted academic freedom both by policy and in practice (3; 11). Faculty and students are free to examine and test the knowledge appropriate to their discipline, constrained only by ethical considerations. There are no limitations on freedom of inquiry or expression. Further, the university has clearly written policies of humane and non-discriminatory treatment of students, faculty, and staff. These are communicated in the University Policies Manual and form the basis for practice (3).

The university participates as a member of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities and accepts its policies and standards. The university agrees to abide by the Commission's policies and standards including modifications that occur in accordance with due process (20). It agrees to disclose information as requested by the Commission on Colleges as the Commission carries out its evaluation and accreditation functions (19). The university acknowledges that the Commission may make known the nature of any action it takes regarding the university including the university's status with the Commission (20).
Self-Study Process

Six individuals were selected in 2007 to attend the Self-Study Workshop, sponsored by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. Following the 2007 workshop, an executive committee was established to recommend the process for Central Washington University's self-study. The committee included six members—five administrators and one faculty member. The group recommended a process including the structure and makeup of an accreditation steering committee to the provost. Dr. Philip Backlund, a faculty member in the Department of Communication, was appointed executive director of the accreditation process. He was given partial release from teaching to support the effort. The accreditation executive committee was responsible for coordinating the collection of data and exhibits and for overseeing the development of the university's response to the standards.

The next step was to organize committees for each of the standards. The executive committee recruited nine individuals to serve as chairs of these committees. These chairs, in turn, worked with the executive committee to staff each committee with the appropriate individuals. Care was taken to ensure that each committee included administrator, faculty, and staff representatives. Representatives from relevant natural groups on campus that were part of the existing infrastructure also were included. Mr. Ron Baker provided initial training to the committee after which the group met as a whole at least once each quarter beginning in March 2007.

In addition to selecting members who were knowledgeable in the areas to which they were assigned, members of the steering committee and of the subcommittees were selected based on the following characteristics:

- Individuals who were interested and would commit to doing the necessary work.
- Individuals who listen actively to all elements within the university community.
- Individuals who have at least a moderate amount of institutional memory.
- Individuals who can get other people to participate.

The members of the university community who constitute the Accreditation Steering Committee are:

**Executive Director**
Phil Backlund

**Executive Committee**
Tom Henderson, Kevin Kimball, Mark Lundgren, Tracy Terrell, Tom Peischl

**Chairs of Individual Standards Committees**
- Standard One—Mission and Goals: Planning and Effectiveness: Libby Street:
- Standard Two—Educational Programs: Warren Street:
- Standard Three—Students: Leslie Webb (Initial Chair, left the University Winter Quarter 2009), Tracy Terrell and Richard DeShields (current Chairs)
- Standard Four—Faculty: Patsy Callaghan
- Standard Five—Library: Daniel CannCasciato
- Standard Six—Governance: Robert Brammer
- Standard Seven—Finance: Kevin Kimball and Kevin Conwell:
- Standard Eight—Physical Resources: Mickey Parker and Bob Tosch
- Standard Nine—Institutional Integrity: Judy Miller

**Administrative Support**
Shirley Sadler
In addition, the following individuals either served as members of sub-committees or contributed in some other major way to the completion of this self-study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adams, Michelle</th>
<th>Hall, Ellen</th>
<th>Peacock, Nick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badgley, Margaret</td>
<td>Heath, David</td>
<td>Pellett, Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, Dan</td>
<td>Hickey, Bob</td>
<td>Poe, Greg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergman, Ethan</td>
<td>Hodges, Barbara</td>
<td>Quitadamo, Ian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady, Dusty</td>
<td>Hoff, Linda</td>
<td>Quirk, Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britto, Marwin</td>
<td>Hogan, Gerard</td>
<td>Rahm, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman, Kelley</td>
<td>Holter, Sherer</td>
<td>Reynolds, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canedo, Agnes</td>
<td>Hoober, Sara</td>
<td>Richardson, Lynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton, Scott</td>
<td>Hyatt, Gary</td>
<td>Rittereiser, Steve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinn, Jane</td>
<td>Hyatt, Jena</td>
<td>Ryder, Doug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinn, Michael</td>
<td>Johnson, Kirk</td>
<td>Sadler, Shirley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colson, Sandy</td>
<td>Johnson, Jackie</td>
<td>Savoian, Roy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curran, Chris</td>
<td>Johnson, Shelly</td>
<td>Shorr, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, Ed</td>
<td>Kaufman, David</td>
<td>Sheldon, Kathleen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darda, David</td>
<td>Knoke, Carmen</td>
<td>Shields, Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defa, Dennis</td>
<td>Kramer, Teresa</td>
<td>Sleigh-Layman, Staci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denman, Anne</td>
<td>Kruckenberg, Jana</td>
<td>Smith, Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeShields, Richard</td>
<td>Lambert, Connie</td>
<td>Stanton, Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolge, Jennifer</td>
<td>Launius, Michael</td>
<td>Storla, Dave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebenal, John</td>
<td>Layman, Dan</td>
<td>Swiney, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faltus, Carol</td>
<td>Ledgard, Eric</td>
<td>Trumpy, Bob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkstad, William</td>
<td>Li, Chenyang</td>
<td>Tullos, Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foy, Geoff</td>
<td>Lupton, Natalie</td>
<td>Underwood, Katie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis-McWhite, Karen</td>
<td>McIntyre, Jerilyn</td>
<td>Vadnais, Teresa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouts, Roger</td>
<td>Milner, Laura</td>
<td>Vertrees, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaer Carlton, Kathy</td>
<td>Munson, Ron</td>
<td>Waldeck, Steve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia-Hanson, Lisa</td>
<td>Moug, Kara</td>
<td>Watson, Becky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelatt, Coleen</td>
<td>Navarette, Pedro</td>
<td>Weisel, Brent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gookin, Karen</td>
<td>Nemeth, Kevin</td>
<td>Wellock, Tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Jen</td>
<td>Nelson, Jesse</td>
<td>Wenger, Steve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grunden, Sheryl</td>
<td>Nixon, Don</td>
<td>Whitney, Katrina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubser, Becky</td>
<td>Oursland, Mark</td>
<td>Watson, Becky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guggino, Julie</td>
<td>Palmquist, Bruce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of the committee also was aided by the extraordinary efforts of many administrators, faculty, and staff that completed self studies and unit plans during the past two years to inform the university’s NWCCU self study. Academic deans, department chairs, and unit heads particularly were instrumental in providing the evidence the committee needed to complete its work.

Subsequent to the development of the first complete draft of the self-study, the steering committee invited Dr. Max Checkett and Dr. Don Habbe to the campus to review the document, interview members of the university community, and comment on the work the committee had done. Their feedback was extraordinarily valuable to the completion of this process, and we are in their debt. Also, we are indebted to Dr. Ron Baker, our liaison from the Commission on Colleges, for his valuable advice throughout the process.

This self-study was the work of the entire university community. In its final form, it only partially reflects the university’s continuous self assessment processes and the more focused self studies of these past two years. However, we believe it provides an accurate appraisal of the university as we found it at the end of the 2008-2009 academic year.
Response to 1999 and 2004 Recommendations

Central Washington University has responded to the recommendations of the 1999 NASC full-scale visitation team and the 2004 NWCCU interim visitation team with targeted programs of institutional reform. Many of the concerns expressed by the 1999 team formed the basis of a charge from the Board of Trustees to President McIntyre when she was hired in 2000. The recommendations, together with the actions and progress related to each, are summarized below. Each is addressed in greater detail in the body of the self study.

Institutional Mission. In 1999, the university was in the midst of developing a new mission and role statement. Through its first recommendation, the visiting team emphasized the importance of completing this work and a revision to the mission statement was finalized in 2000. Crafting the mission provided an occasion for the university to connect with its major internal and external campus constituents during months of meetings and written contributions. The statement was adopted by the CWU Board of Trustees on February 11, 2000. The university’s mission statement is constructed in two parts. The first paragraph describes its desired outcomes and the following two paragraphs describe its students, its collaboration with the state’s community college system, the role of teaching and the faculty, and the scope of its programs. The mission statement served as the foundation for CWU’s 2001-2006 strategic plan which was adopted by the Board of Trustees on December 6, 2001. It was left unchanged when the university crafted the 2006-2011 strategic plan, and the board endorsed it anew in the context of the new plan on June 9, 2006. By policy, board members are required to review the mission statement at least every ten years. The mission statement is widely published including in the strategic plan brochures and in the university catalog and appears on the walls of many administrative and academic offices. The first paragraph is frequently referenced as a rationale for a variety of actions of the university.

Governance. In 1999, the NASC evaluation team recommended that the “the Board, administration, faculty, staff, and students undertake a major commitment to revitalize and strengthen governance and administration at Central.” Since that finding, the Board of Trustees has invited additional constituent groups to participate during board meetings, the faculty has unionized, the number of vice-presidential divisions was reduced and constituent departments realigned, and the President’s Advisory Council membership has expanded. Additionally, channels of communication throughout the campus community have been strengthened through the use of intranet and email, electronic circulation of the University Bulletin, and non-tenure-track faculty representation on the Faculty Senate. The university’s web environment has expanded and is used extensively. Fireside chats for students with members of the President’s Cabinet have become a quarterly favorite. Building on successful governance mechanisms established prior to 1999 and modified since, the university’s governance structure has adjusted to additional pressures in the past ten years and remains vital. The 1999 NASC recommendation regarding governance was replaced by commendations for progress in the 2001 NWCCU focused visit and the 2004 regular interim visit. As the university moves further into the presidency of Dr. James Gaudino, who took office in January of 2009, the university expects that the governance structure and internal relationships will continue to improve.

Assessment. The 1999 review called for a reenergized assessment program. A new president and upper administration developed productive change initiatives in this critical area. The 2004 interim report to NWCCU documented the university’s progress toward the regular cycles of outcomes-oriented assessment that mark its current practices. Formulating a comprehensive educational assessment plan and reviving regular and informative cycles of program review have been the two principal lines of progress. In both of these efforts, standards were devised that stress functional goals, gathering relevant evidence, and modifying programs in response to assessments. Developmental work on a comprehensive educational assessment plan has been marked by a series of assessment matrixes reported to the NWCCU. They have evolved into the educational assessment plan that is described in Standard Two. Five-year comprehensive program review cycles began in 2002. In 2007-2008, the
university added yearly department and program assessment reports that focus on assessing progress toward student learning goals. In 2007, the University Assessment Committee was divided into an ad hoc University Assessment Committee, which focused on assessment of all university programs (e.g., business office, student affairs, facilities management) and the Academic Assessment Committee, a 17-member committee of faculty and administrators that advises the associate vice provost for undergraduate studies regarding educational program assessment. The current self study documents the university’s comprehensive program of educational assessment at the departmental, college, and division levels.

Faculty Salaries. One of the recommendations of the 1999 NASC site visit highlighted the university’s struggle to provide “faculty salaries to attract and retain a competent faculty.” In 2001, the Faculty Senate established the Salary Administration Board to develop salary goals and procedures for implementing them. Between 2001 and 2004, the university pursued improvements in faculty salaries following the SAB recommendations. The process assumed that the state would continue to provide periodic cost of living adjustments, but the state entered a period of economic downturn; the end result was less progress than had been originally predicted. Nonetheless, there has been visible progress toward achieving salary gains that place CWU on par with peer institutions in the state. CWU benchmarks its faculty salaries against those reported by CUPA for public master’s institutions. In 2000, CWU average salaries were below CUPA benchmarks by $9320 for professors, $4,900 for associate professors, and $1,060 for assistant professors. By fall 2008, these deficits had been reduced to $4,890, $3,160 and $0 respectively. CWU average salaries for assistant professors had risen by 2007 to meet and exceed those of both Eastern Washington and Western Washington Universities; the full professor salary average exceeded that of EWU. The Academic Affairs 2006-2012 Strategic Plan lists the development of an effective reward structure and appropriate faculty compensation as a priority for action. Positive change is visible in the area of salary policies and procedures: the collective bargaining agreement has consolidated and clarified salary information to help ensure that policies on salaries and benefits are clearly stated, widely available, and administered equitably. While the effort to improve faculty salaries is not finished, the university has made substantial improvement.

Faculty Evaluation. At the time of the NWCCU 2001 focused interim visit, the university reported on three concerns regarding faculty evaluation and review that were raised by the 1999 evaluation team: uneven notification of faculty about the review process, evaluation criteria not fully understood by faculty, and lack of compliance with Policy 4.1, Faculty Evaluation. All three areas were addressed initially through academic policy changes and more recently in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Academic Code. While there are still opportunities to improve both the consistency and clarity of implementation, the university believes its revised processes and procedures for faculty evaluation bring it into compliance with the standards set by NWCCU. Through the University Faculty Performance Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review; college personnel policies; the University Policies Manual, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the institution provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities. Because faculty evaluation procedures are associated with working conditions, they are governed by the CBA. For the most part, however, these procedures were the norm for many years prior to the faculty contract negotiations. The CBA includes provisions for criteria, evaluation cycles, eligibility, personnel committees, general procedures, and personnel actions. There are three levels of evaluation: university, college (including the library), and department. Since the CBA was ratified, these criteria have been collaboratively revised for consistency and clarity.

Graduate Programs. At the time of the university’s last full-scale NASC review, reviewers observed that the university’s graduate degree programs have been created and are maintained by dedicated faculty members, and that graduate study is carried out within a framework of established policy standards, objectives, and policies. However, the reviewers directed the university to develop a clear statement of the role of graduate education at CWU, describe the alignment of the graduate program mission with
the mission of the university, develop a clear vision, promote the productivity of graduate faculty, assure the adequacy of resources, institute responsible graduate program review, and adopt a policy that clearly establishes higher expectations for graduate students in “layered” courses – courses that have different course numbers for undergraduate and graduate students taking the same course. By the time of the 2004 five-year interim review, NWCCU reviewers found satisfactory progress in most areas. The university described the steps it was taking to address these concerns in its 2007 progress report. In 2006-2007, the Graduate Council developed a white paper on the goals and mission of the CWU graduate program. In 2007-2008 the white paper evolved into a more comprehensive study of the graduate program. This document, which was adopted in March 2009, contains two subsidiary documents, one on policy statements of the role, mission, vision, goals, and relation to university goals and a second which provides an overview of the current status of graduate education at CWU. CWU’s revised policy on layered undergraduate/graduate courses was approved by the Faculty Senate in March 2008. The policy codifies the traditional understanding that graduate courses will consistently require greater depth of study and increased demands on student intellectual or creative capacities than undergraduate courses. These accomplishments are described in detail in Standard Two of the current self study.

**Commission Review Process.** Based on the recommendation of the 2001 interim site visit, the university has reviewed its procedures for consulting with the Commission staff on all pending and implemented changes. The appropriate review and notification processes required to permit action by the Commission are now in place.

**Summary**
The recommendations of the 1999 visitation team and the 2004 interim visit were taken seriously by the university. When President McIntyre was hired, she was charged by the Board of Trustees to address the problems that had been cited. As President Gaudino develops his priorities, the university will continue to be responsive to the philosophy and goals of accreditation and will continue to seek improvement through assessment of current practices, developing new initiatives, and by meeting challenges.
Standard 1 – Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness

Central Washington University (CWU) is one of six publicly supported baccalaureate institutions in Washington state and one of the state’s three regional comprehensive universities. Its role is prescribed by statute, and its mission is clearly outlined in a statement that was developed with broad constituent input and approved by the Board of Trustees (BOT). The mission statement is well publicized, often cited, and informs the university’s planning efforts. Planning at CWU is integrated across structural and functional units, and resources are aligned as plans emerge. The university has agreed to a set of metrics that track progress toward important goals and monitors them frequently. The Office of Institutional Research coordinates data analysis for the university. The President’s Cabinet and other executive officers and senior administrators review evidence about the university’s progress and make corrections as necessary. The sections that follow detail the ways in which CWU complies with the Commission’s requirements related to mission, goals, planning, and effectiveness.

Standard 1.A – Mission and Goals

Historical Background

CWU’s mission is constrained by the purposes set forth in Section 28B.35.050 of the Revised Code of Washington (Exhibit 1.E.1) which states:

*The primary purposes of the regional universities shall be to offer undergraduate and graduate education programs through the master's degree, including programs of a practical and applied nature, directed to the educational and professional needs of the residents of the regions they serve; to act as receiving institutions for transferring community college students; and to provide extended occupational and complementary studies programs that continue or are otherwise integrated with the educational services of the region's community colleges.*

The statutory context sets parameters, but it doesn’t fully define the mission of the institution. CWU’s mission has evolved with its transition from a normal school to a College of Education (1937) to a state college (1961) and, in 1977, to a comprehensive university. The mission statement has also evolved, and this evolution has involved input from the campus community. The most recent thorough revision to the mission statement was completed in 2000 partially in response to a recommendation by the 1999 NASC visiting team during its full scale review. The statement was crafted following input by major campus constituents and was adopted by the CWU Board of Trustees on February 11, 2000. (1.A.1; Exhibit 1.E.2)

Current Situation

Mission. The university’s mission statement is constructed in two parts. The first paragraph describes the university’s desired outcomes and the remaining two paragraphs describe its students, its collaboration with the state’s community college system, the role of teaching and the faculty, and the scope of its programs.

The mission statement served as the foundation for CWU’s 2001–2006 strategic plan (Exhibit 1.E.3) which was adopted by the Board of Trustees on December 6, 2001. It was left unchanged when the university crafted the 2006–2011 plan (Appendix 1.A.1), although the board took action (Exhibit 1.E.4) to endorse it anew in the context of the new strategic plan on June 9, 2006.
By policy (Exhibit GE.3, Part 1-1.6), board members are required to review the mission statement at least every ten years. The mission statement is widely published including in the strategic plan brochures and in the university catalog (Exhibit GE.2) and appears on the walls of many administrative and academic offices (1.A.2) (Exhibit 1.E.5). The first paragraph is frequently referenced as a rationale for a variety of actions of the university.

**Central Washington University**

**Mission Statement**

Central Washington University's mission is to prepare students for responsible citizenship, responsible stewardship of the earth, and enlightened and productive lives. Faculty, staff, students, and alumni serve as an intellectual resource to assist central Washington, the state, and the region in solving human and environmental problems.

Qualified faculty and staff create a community that encourages and supports the emotional, personal, and professional growth of students from a variety of backgrounds. The university works with community colleges to establish centers throughout the state and employs technology to extend the reach of its educational programs.

The university community values teaching as the vehicle to inspire intellectual depth and breadth, to encourage lifelong learning, and to enhance the opportunities of its students. The faculty develop and strengthen bachelor's and master's degree programs in the arts, sciences, and humanities; in teacher education; in business; in the social services; and in technological specializations. A strong liberal arts foundation; applied emphases; opportunities for undergraduate research, creative expression, and international study; and close working relationships between students and faculty are hallmarks of the undergraduate experience. Graduate programs develop partnerships between faculty and students to extend scholarship to important areas of research and practice.

**Goals.** Through inclusive community strategic planning processes in 2000–2001 (Exhibit 1.E.6) and more recently in 2005–2006 (Exhibit 1.E.7), the university established six core goals, each with a set of subsidiary goals, that guide activities within all divisions of the university. Institution-wide management objectives were crafted in 2001 based on each of the subsidiary goals, and progress in achieving them was tracked and made public in a variety of ways (1.A.3) including on the university’s website. The goals formed the basis for annual State of the University addresses during President McIntyre’s tenure (Exhibit 1.E.8) and framed discussions with the Board of Trustees, employee groups, government officials (Exhibit 1.E.9), service clubs, and editorial boards. University progress also has been the subject of guest editorials in local and regional newspapers, is reported internally to the campus in the monthly University Bulletin, and is detailed in university publications that are distributed to friends and alumni of the university and to government officials (Exhibit 1.E.10).

The goals and subsidiary goals are consistent with the institutional mission and resources (1.A.4) as evidenced by the remarkable progress and achievements of the five year period of the first plan (Exhibit 1.E.11). President McIntyre allocated resources of the university to ensure that goals could be achieved (1.A.5; Exhibit 1.E.12). Implementation of the 2006–2011 plan began with the 2006–2007 academic year and has formed the basis for revisions and extensions to plans of divisions, departments, and units of the university. Evidence that the university is making progress in achieving the goals of the 2006–2011 strategic plan is accumulating (Exhibit 1.E.13).

**Impact of Mission and Goals on Institutional Action.** To ensure that the university’s mission and goals underpin educational activities, admission policies, selection of faculty, allocation of resources, and planning, the president required division heads to tie budget requests and new initiatives to unit or

**Standard 1 – 21**
division goals which subsequently must align with institutional goals (1.A.4; also see discussion of integrated planning under 1.B). To reinforce this expectation, forms requesting resources (e.g., Exhibit 1.E.14) ask how the request is aligned with unit, college, and/or division goals and objectives. In requesting that vacant positions be filled or new positions created, division heads are required to show how the request is consistent with the university’s mission and goals.

As another example, President McIntyre's Spheres of Distinction initiative established a process by which members of the university community could submit proposals that were consistent with one or more of five "spheres." The president defined spheres as "innovative and resourceful approaches to academic, student, and campus life giving regional, national, or international prominence to Central Washington University." The five spheres, which are consistent with the university's mission and strategic goals, are: Interdisciplinary Programs and Research; Preparation of Professional Educators; Programs and Activities Nurturing the Development of Students as Individuals, Scholars, Artists, and Citizens; Activities Addressing Regional Needs and Enhancing Regional Resources; and University Centers. Priority was given to interdepartmental or interdivisional proposals, and winning proposals (Exhibit 2.E.5) were awarded presidential discretionary funds to accomplish their goals.

Public Service. Public service is fundamental to the university's mission (1.A.6). The mission statement asserts that “faculty, staff, students, and alumni serve as an intellectual resource to assist central Washington, the state, and the region in solving human and environmental problems." Strategic Goal 4 calls on the university to “build mutually beneficial partnerships with the public sector, industry, professional groups, institutions, and the communities surrounding our campuses.” Further, subsidiary Goal 1 under Goal 4—“increase involvement of students and employees in and with our multiple communities”—sets a clear expectation for public service. Examples of faculty public service (Exhibit 1.E.15) testify to the faculty’s historic commitment to service, now formalized in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Exhibit GE.7). Faculty evaluations include service to one’s discipline, the university, the community, and the region. Other employees of the university also are involved in public service and have the opportunity to report on these activities during their annual review. Sample activities are listed in Exhibit 1.E.16. Since 1977, the Board of Trustees has selected distinguished professors of the university; currently awards are given in four categories, one of which is service. See Exhibit 1.E.17 for a list of awardees.

Students are encouraged to engage in public service. The university's Don and Verna Duncan Civic Engagement Center coordinates opportunities for six levels of civic engagement (Exhibit 1.E.18), including projects related to students' majors. The Academic Service Learning Initiative engages students in course-related service projects that are mentored by a group of faculty fellows (Exhibit 1.E.19). The Board of Directors of the Associated Students of CWU and other student groups on campus take an active interest in public service and coordinate public service initiatives throughout the year (Exhibit 1.E.20).

Compliance with the Commission’s Substantive Change Reporting Requirements. The university routinely files reports and substantive changes in accordance with Policy A-2 Substantive Change (1.A.7). The most significant changes of the past decade have been a revision to the mission statement, adding the Bachelor of Applied Science and Master of Public Accountancy degree designations, adding and deleting several programs of study, and offering existing degree programs in new locations. See Appendix 2.A.3 for a complete list of changes under the purview of Policy A-2.
Appraisal of 1.A

The university’s mission statement arose from the extended university community. It is well understood and widely distributed. Members of the university community agree that the mission statement is an accurate description of the university; however, it receives mixed reviews on its length and level of detail. Some have suggested that the statement could be improved by focusing on only the first paragraph as the mission statement and using the remaining two paragraphs to further elucidate the mission. Others have asserted that paragraphs two and three do more to define us than the first paragraph does. Still, this mission statement has served us well and has been the foundation for our strategic goals and management objectives. It also has been a stable foundation for the mission statements of each of the five divisions of the university and their units (Exhibit 1.E.21).

The mission statement and strategic goals drive budget allocations. Funding requests are submitted to division heads for divisional funding and to the president for institutional funding. They are justified on the basis of their congruence with the university, division, or unit strategic goals. Some departments do a better job than others of aligning their budget requests with elements of the university strategic plan, and this variability forms a basis for discussion between division heads and their direct reports. The university's mission statement played a primary role in establishing the priorities of Transforming Lives (Exhibit 7.E.66, 7.E.67, and 7.E.68), the university's first comprehensive gifts campaign. In addition, a review of hiring patterns reveals that resources have been directed toward academic and student programs consistent with the mission (Appendix 2.A.5).

As a state institution, CWU must respond to legislative mandates or state coordinating board directives, and some high-priority goals may be postponed while we attend to these requirements. However, in recent years we've developed very cooperative relationships with state officials and have been able to reach agreement on most of our primary goals and initiatives. Although we make every effort to be proactive, sometimes emergencies arise that divert resources; for example, demolition of structurally weak residence halls in 2008. Most recently, the impact of the global recession on state budgets has generated discussions about how best to ensure that funds protect our mission and goals, access to students, long term sustainability, and quality of programs. Throughout the decade, careful planning and preemptive strikes have maintained forward momentum toward our common goals.

Employees and students alike support the community through public service, and the spirit of service is apparent in every corner of the university. The Don and Verna Duncan Civic Engagement Center and the Academic Service Learning Program bring coherence to student service activities. There is no similar venue through which employee opportunities are organized, even though the expectation for employees to serve the community is widely understood and plays a role in personnel evaluation, particularly for faculty.

The university has recently welcomed Dr. James Gaudino as its 14th president following the retirement on December 31, 2008 of Dr. Jerilyn McIntyre, who served in the position for much of this 10-year accreditation cycle. President Gaudino has been busy since his arrival. He has already engaged the university in a visioning exercise and will revisit the strategic plan in fall, 2009. He held a series of live and videostreamed public forums in winter and spring quarters of 2009 focused primarily on the implications of impending cuts in state support and has expressed an interest in continuing this mechanism for discussion of the university’s goals and progress toward achieving them as well as its challenges. He has also established an open door policy with the media as a way to respond to questions and to communicate the university's achievements. Last, he has asked the Division of University Relations to refresh the university’s brand and its marketing plan with a particular emphasis on improving navigation and transparency of the website (Exhibit 1.E.22).
Standard 1.B – Planning and Effectiveness

**Historical Background**

CWU has long engaged in strategic planning, though it has taken several forms over the years. Before his departure in 1999, President Nelson had established a strategic planning committee that annually updated an extensive plan which was then reflected in division and unit plans. Although these plans set general directions for the university, they were too cumbersome for easy recall and practical use. Still, the university planned and collected data to improve its operations.

Major accomplishments of the decade were reported in the 1999 self-study. President Nelson left the university in August 1999, and the Board of Trustees hired Dr. Dolph Norton to serve as interim president. President Norton was at the helm during the October 1999 NASC visit and, following feedback from the visiting team, he immediately engaged the university in a revision of its mission statement. He also directed the provost/senior vice president for academic affairs to reinstitute an academic program review process which eventually became a key planning opportunity for each academic department. Another accomplishment of Norton’s tenure was a study of the executive and top-level administrative structure of the university.

The new mission statement was adopted just months before the university welcomed its 13th president, Dr. Jerilyn McIntyre. Based on the study conducted during Norton’s tenure, President McIntyre restructured the upper-level administration, including reducing the number of vice presidents from five to four by combining student affairs and enrollment management functions in a single division.

President McIntyre immediately recognized the need for a new planning process that would yield a living strategic goals document, one that was memorable and that guided programmatic and resource allocation decisions. Starting with the newly crafted mission statement as a foundation, President McIntyre began working immediately with the Board of Trustees to identify six areas of strategic emphasis that would become the focus for visionary planning. Input was gathered from the results of BOT theme discussions, meetings with faculty and staff, recommendations from the existing Strategic Planning Committee, a CWU climate report commissioned by an earlier administration, the NASC evaluation team report, the NCATE evaluation team report, and appraisals in the institution’s 1999 NASC self-study. The resulting six strategic goals 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.

A day-long university forum in September, 2000 encouraged university-wide involvement in refining the goals and identifying a set of subsidiary goals. The president established an Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Synthesizing Committee to continue the productive discussions that emerged. The committee held 43 forums in December and January and also provided an online survey through which members of the university and wider community could provide input (Exhibit 1.E.6). From this work emerged a recommendation of a vision statement, core values, and six goals—each with a number of subsidiary goals—that was distributed to the university community and standing committees for review and comment. A final version (Exhibit 1.E.3) was forwarded to the Board of Trustees for its approval in December, 2001 (Exhibit 1.E.23).
Consistent with President McIntyre’s original charge, the final document lent itself to publication in a pocket-sized brochure. At least in part due to its portability, the document and its contents became well known to most members of the university community. Shortly after the plan was completed and adopted, the president engaged members of her cabinet in developing management objectives (Exhibit 1.E.24) that would identify the metrics through which the university would assess its progress in achieving the primary and subsidiary goals. Next, the president engaged the cabinet in identifying a set of diagnostic and performance indicators (Exhibit 1.E.25) that would, in essence, form the university’s dashboard report of progress.

To insure that planning was integrated across the university, she asked each division to create its own strategic plan that articulated with the university plan. By 2008, all divisions had developed strategic plans and units within the division had begun to align their plans with division and university plans. These plans are now in their second iteration (Exhibit 1.E.21). She also instituted a budget requesting and allocation process that was tied to goals and subsidiary goals and to management objectives.

Annual summer retreats of the cabinet provided an opportunity to review progress on each of the diagnostic and performance indicators and also to identify those where data integrity was questionable or measures needed to be redefined. The president reported the university’s progress on strategic goals at annual State of the University addresses (Exhibit 1.E.8), which she instituted in fall, 2001.

At the time of the last full-scale evaluation, the university was encouraged to develop and communicate an assessment plan which it had done by the time of the focused visit in 2001. This work was coordinated by the University Assessment Committee, which took into account university-wide and academic measures. The 2001 Assessment Plan (Exhibit 1.E.26) framed a set of questions which were answered by a variety of quantitative and qualitative measures. At the time of the 2001 visit, some of the measures had long histories of data and others were works in progress.

In addition to ongoing strategic planning, circumstances dictated from time to time that the university engage in targeted planning to address emerging or critical issues. For example, concurrent with President McIntyre’s arrival, the university experienced an unexpected shortfall in enrollment. The legislature’s rebasing of the university’s budget in response to the enrollment shortfall was accompanied by several years of lean state budgets for higher education in general which together resulted in a significant revenue downturn. To respond to the pressing enrollment and budget crises, the president commissioned an enrollment recovery plan and an integrated marketing and branding plan, two of several initiatives that set the stage for major renewal of the university as President McIntyre described in 2005 in a keynote address to the Snowmass Institute (Exhibit 1.E.27).

**Current Situation**

*The institution clearly defines its evaluation and planning processes (1.B.1) and plans for and evaluates its activities (1.B.2).* President McIntyre appointed a second Strategic Planning Synthesizing Committee in 2005 (Exhibit 1.E.7) to revisit the strategic plan and update goals and subsidiary goals for the next five year period. Like the committee that was assembled in 2000, *this participatory planning process involved faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community members (1.B.3)* (Exhibit 1.E.28). Ellensburg forums, university centers forums, and an online strategic planning survey (Exhibit 1.E.29) invited all who were interested to contribute ideas to the planning process. All goals were reviewed, three were substantially modified, and the subsidiary goals were extensively revised. The new plan was submitted to the campus community for review in winter 2005 and spring 2006 and was adopted by the Board of Trustees on June 9, 2006 (Exhibit 1.E.4). The plan included the mission statement that had been adopted in 2000 along with strategic goals and subsidiary goals, vision statement, and core values (Appendix 1.A.1).
As this process was initiated, several other planning processes were underway on campus. The Campus Site and Development and Master Planning Committee (CSDMPC) had initiated an overdue revision of the Campus Facilities Master Plan (CFMP). However, the CSDMPC’s work was stalled pending completion of the divisions’ strategic plans because the CFMP needed to be consistent with division goals and objectives. Divisions and units were also establishing their own participatory planning processes (1.B.3), which ultimately strengthened but initially slowed their planning. Further, since 2001, several other interdivisional work groups had been established to plan for initiatives that crossed divisional lines, such as housing, enrollment management, and information technology.

To improve integration of these various planning efforts, communicate with line staff and students, and assist the CSDMPC in validating its assumptions, the president convened a campus forum of administrators, department chairs, university standing committee chairs, and chairs of interdivisional work groups on May 21, 2005. Division heads provided an overview of their planning efforts, and chairs of interdivisional work groups summarized their emerging plans. The CSDMPC presented its planning assumptions for the assembled group’s comments (Exhibit 1.E.30). Several editorial and a few substantive changes to the assumptions emerged from the forum and provided the foundation for the CSDMPC to continue its work. The Campus Facilities Master Plan (Exhibit 8.E.37) was completed and adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 2, 2005.

Following the forum, Dr. McIntyre directed divisions and units to ensure that plans were completed and integrated with the now-completed university strategic plan. She also asked them to develop a graphic representation of that integration. At a second forum on October 16, 2006, a matrix of goals (Exhibit 1.E.31) was unveiled. It cross-referenced each element in each divisional plan with its related university goal and subsidiary goal. The plan was to post the table of goals on the website and provide live links to each plan to improve interdivisional understanding and communication. Further, each division was asked to build its own matrix of goals (Exhibit 1.E.32) to show relationships among its goals and those of units that report to it (Exhibit 1.E.21).

Two impediments slowed this work. First, broad participation in divisional planning took more time than expected. Second, units within divisions were waiting until the division plans were completed to either begin or, in most cases, conclude their own planning. In May, 2007, the president revised the job description for the executive assistant to the president to include oversight of university planning and renamed the position “chief planning officer.” By 2008, all divisions had developed strategic plans and units had begun to align their plans with those of their divisions.

The university also develops and implements procedures to evaluate the extent to which it achieves institutional goals (1.B.1). Each of the divisional and interdivisional plans of the university specifies metrics through which progress toward meeting its goals is tracked. Some of these metrics rise to the level of university metrics. As described earlier, President McIntyre worked with members of the President’s Cabinet early in her tenure to develop a set of diagnostic and performance measures that provide evidence of progress on important goals and initiatives (Exhibit 1.E.25). When they were developed, they stood apart from the strategic plan but were informed by it. They also were related to, but stood separate from, the 2001 University Assessment Plan (Exhibit 1.E.26).

These new indicators highlighted a problem that had been festering for some time. Although the University Assessment Committee was one of the standing committees of the university, its membership and oversight steered it toward academic assessment. Assessment activities of other divisions of the university were rarely included in discussions or reports. To correct the problem, the University Assessment Committee became the Academic Assessment Committee in December 2007 (Exhibit 1.E.33) and an ad hoc university assessment committee was established to firm up a university-wide plan expanded from the diagnostic and performance indicators. The ad hoc committee also was asked to inventory all the assessment and evaluation work of each division and look for a more integrated reporting structure. In conjunction with strategic planning that was taking place across campus, each division was already developing its own assessment plan, and these efforts fed
into the university-wide plan which was endorsed by the President’s Cabinet at its spring retreat on April 30, 2008, discussed with the President’s Advisory Council on August 6, 2008 (Exhibit 1.E.34), and disseminated to the larger campus community during fall of 2008.

The university-wide assessment plan (Exhibit 1.E.35) organizes quantitative measures around eight categories and twenty questions. The categories are:

- Budget and Student Support
- Condition and Use of Facilities
- Student Measures
- Academic and Student Life
- Partnerships
- External Funding and Support
- Diversity
- Staff Evaluation, Development, and Retention

Each question is “answered” with one or more measures. For example, four questions and eight measures are devoted to “Student Measures” and five questions and twelve measures inform the university about “Academic and Student Life.”

There are other important progress indicators that either do not lend themselves to quantitative measures or for which the university has had difficulty achieving reliable metrics. They are included as qualitative measures, and progress on each is reported annually on the Faculty, Staff, and Unit Accomplishments Performance Indicators Form I (Exhibit 1.E.36) or a variant of that form. Qualitative measures provide evidence (Exhibit 1.E.35) related to six questions:

- How does the university ensure civility and conflict resolution?
- How does the university divert resources to promising programs that meet institutional goals?
- What evidence is there of the excellence and recognition of the university’s faculty, staff, and programs?
- What evidence is there of the excellence and recognition of students?
- How involved are our students in co-curricular and extracurricular activities?
- What evidence is there that the university exercises care for the environment?

Qualitative and quantitative evidence includes enrollment, retention, and completion data; satisfaction surveys of alumni, students, and employees; status of student athletes; faculty salaries, and others. Appendix 1.A.2 includes briefing sheets that summarize and interpret trends in key diagnostic and performance indicators. One key indicator of the health of the institution is enrollment (Figure 1.1) which grew rapidly from 2001–2002 to 2006–2007 in response to measures put in place after an unexpected enrollment downturn in 2000–2001. The Divisions of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and of Academic Affairs convene quarterly for enrollment summits to ensure enrollment stability. However, recent slowing of enrollment despite continued aggressive measures has spawned a detailed analysis of pipeline and retention issues.

The academic program review process, which entered its second five-year cycle in 2007–2008, combined with an increasingly robust system of faculty evaluation, became the avenues through which the institution engages in systematic planning for, and evaluation of, teaching, research, and public service consistent with institutional mission and goals (1.B.2). Each academic department participates in a thorough program review during which it completes a self-study and invites to campus an external evaluator who provides input regarding the program’s viability, vitality, quality, and...

**Standard 1 – 27**
Faculty report their accomplishments in teaching, research, and service at the time of their regularly scheduled faculty evaluation. Details about faculty evaluation are reported in Standard 4 and Exhibit GE.7, the CWU-UFC Collective Bargaining Agreement. Further, all units of the university are asked to report the accomplishments of their faculty and staff to their division heads who summarize them for inclusion in the division’s budget request to the president. A generic form (Exhibit 1.E.36) prompts employees about contributions they might report. Faculty members report many of these activities in their annual workload agreements and workload reports.

Beginning in 2007–2008, academic departments began to submit annual reports of student learning goals and assessment data. At the beginning of the year, they submitted a plan that was reviewed and approved in the office of the associate vice president for undergraduate studies. At the end of the year, they provided evidence of students’ progress in achieving the outcomes. These processes and data are described more fully in Standard 2.

In addition to internally-driven assessment, the university responds to directives from governmental bodies which set performance goals. Beginning in 1997, the state established accountability measures for the public baccalaureate institutions and directed each institution to set benchmarks and report outcomes (Exhibit 1.E.37). More recently, Engrossed House Bill 2641 of 2008 directs each higher education institution to develop a performance agreement with the state that identifies institutional outcomes and state commitment (Exhibit 1.E.38). The fate of these agreements and their relation to accountability measures is still under discussion. The state also required each institution to participate in the Washington State Quality Award process, a derivative of the Baldrige Award process; CWU’s response is included as Exhibit 1.E.39.

The institution uses the results of its systematic evaluation activities and ongoing planning processes to influence resource allocation and to improve its instructional programs, institutional services, and activities (1.B.4). The annual resource allocation process is two-fold. First, the President’s Cabinet receives a revenue forecast from the state budget director that includes state support and tuition revenues based on projected enrollment. Because the state specifies how some of its allocation must be spent, the budget director identifies all externally constrained funds and funds available for internal allocation. Second, the cabinet discusses university-wide priorities for additional funding and sets aside funds for those purposes from expected revenues. The dollars that remain are placed in the president’s discretionary fund. This annual budget is distributed to the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), a university-wide committee made up of the vice presidents, the chief planning officer, the Faculty Senate chair, and the president of the Associated Students of Central Washington University. The committee meets in open session and approves or recommends modifications to the budget before it goes to the president for submission to the Board of Trustees (Exhibit 1.E.40).

Division heads request budget proposals from units that report to them. Unit heads submit information about faculty and staff accomplishments—a key performance indicator—and they also align their requests with unit, college, division, and university strategic goals. Division heads select those requests that align best with university goals and submit a division request to the president who allocates resources from the discretionary fund based on the likelihood that the request will advance unit, division, and university goals.

The president also evaluates “spheres of distinction” proposals (See discussion in Standard 1.A) on the bases of the quality of the program or staff that will house the project and on the degree to which the proposal advances the university’s progress on its strategic goals. Space modification and replacement requests (Exhibit 1.E.14) are similarly tied to strategic goals. The president also requires each member of the cabinet to submit an annual evaluation that ties progress to personal and unit goals.

Standard 1 – 28
As data related to the University Assessment Plan become available, or at least annually, the President’s Cabinet reviews them. When data reflect that a mid-course correction is needed, responsible administrators develop and implement a plan or resources are redirected to improve instructional programs or activities. A notable mid-course correction was begun when data revealed that improved time to graduation and a downturn in the pipeline of community college graduates with direct transfer agreements was eroding fall 2008 enrollment numbers. In response, the president worked with the cabinet to identify concrete actions to remedy the problem (Exhibit 1.E.41), each of which was assigned to a specific staff member who reported progress weekly.

During President McIntyre’s tenure, the university undertook the following major initiatives in response to evidence that improvements were needed:

- Developed a marketing plan to improve the university’s visibility (Exhibit 1.E.42).
- Created an enrollment plan for the residential campus and the university centers (Exhibit 1.E.43).
- Completed the institution’s first comprehensive campaign (See Standard 7).
- Developed new undergraduate majors and minors and new graduate programs (See Standard 2).
- Developed expanded programs and services for the university centers.
- Worked with government officials to secure funding for new facilities at each university center (See Standard 8).
- Developed a best-practices orientation program and first-year experience for incoming freshmen.
- Developed living-learning communities to strengthen academic and student life.
- Established a faculty scholarship and equipment pool to strengthen academic life.
- Converted 97 percent of classrooms to multi-media fully wired classrooms.
- Upgraded the information technology infrastructure including RESNET and wireless access.
- Completed 80 percent of a major consolidated utilities upgrade.
- Established the (internal) Diversity Council, the President’s External Diversity Council, and the Native American Indian Advisory Council to enhance our diversity efforts.
- Completed implementation of PeopleSoft relational database.
- Established the Performing Arts and Presidential Speaker Series to provide cultural opportunities for the university and larger community (Exhibit 1.E.44).
- Created a Research Foundation to stimulate faculty, staff, and student scholarship (Exhibit 1.E.45).
- Upgraded facilities on the residential campus to improve academic and student life (Standard 8).
- Strengthened SOURCE—the Symposium on University Research and Creative Expression—to improve academic and student life (Exhibit 1.E.46).
- Completed and published the university’s first economic impact study (Exhibit 1.E.47).
- Established an Ombuds Office to assist with mediation.
- Established a more robust professional development training program (Exhibit 1.E.48).
- Created the Climate Commitment Task Force to move the university toward carbon neutrality and appropriate stewardship of the earth in response to President McIntyre’s signing the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment (Exhibit 1.E.49).
- Established the Center for the Teacher-Scholar to provide centralized services for faculty development (Exhibit 1.E.50).

The institution has taken steps to integrate its evaluation and planning processes to identify institutional priorities for improvement (1.B.5). Institutional priorities are established through a reciprocal strategic planning process spanning all levels of the university. Goals of each division tie to the goals of the university, and the goals of each unit tie to the goals of the division and so on to the level of the individual student, staff, or faculty member.

The President’s Cabinet, which advises the president, reviews important assessment data from all sources. Areas for improvement become the focus of internal or external budget requests or set the
stage for reallocation or reorganization within the existing budget. New or expanded initiatives may also be proposed through the competitive spheres of distinction process.

The institution provides the necessary resources for effective evaluation and planning processes (1.B.6). A major step forward in effective evaluation and planning began prior to the last full-scale visit when the university committed to implementing PeopleSoft, a relational database program. Three modules—finance, student, and human resources—have undergone several upgrades since that time and are now fully operational. In the process of their implementation, edit checks improved data integrity. Reinvented business processes allowed for more web-based admission applications, class enrollment, and business transactions.

The Office of Institutional Research (IR) has primary responsibility, along with the budget officer, for providing data about the institution to the state and IPEDS and internally to the president and other office holders as needed. IR provides advice to the president and other members of cabinet on a range of matters including enrollment trends and faculty salaries, the latter benchmarked against peer institutions. IR was instrumental in developing the university’s lists of peers: one for internal academic comparisons and the other for state-mandated productivity-to-resources analyses (See Exhibit 1.E.51). IR is the primary and official source of institutional data for academic program review, grant submissions, specialized accreditation self-studies, accountability measures for the state legislature, and the requirements of the NCAA. IR staff work with offices throughout campus to identify and resolve problems of data integrity and discourage shadow data systems. The office assists users in clarifying their questions, develops and administers their surveys, and produces reports to meet their needs.

IR provides CWU’s data for guidebook surveys, including, among others, US New and World Report, Princeton Review, and College Board, and serves as a liaison to national surveys, for instance, the National Survey of Student Engagement. The office responds to external data requests from the media and the public. The IR director and staff members each serve on a number of university committees including the Ad Hoc University Assessment Committee, the Academic Assessment Committee, the Data Warehouse Committee, the EIS governance team, and the newly formed “query users group.”

The CWU Office of Testing and Assessment complements the work of Institutional Research. Through its testing function, the office is responsible for administering and aggregating data related to certain college entrance examinations (for example, ACT, SAT); placement exams, including COMPASS and math placement exams; certain major field tests; certification exams such as the Praxis exams for teacher education candidates, and graduate school examinations such as the GRE, MCAT, and LSAT. They also occasionally administer TOEFL and CLEP exams for students wishing to waive classes. They administer, score, and aggregate Student Evaluation of Instruction forms and provide Scantron facilities for scoring multiple-choice exams. Through its assessment function, the office works with departments and programs to conduct alumni surveys, provide feedback on assessment planning, and assist departments in developing program-level assessments. Staff from the Office of Testing and Assessment are significantly involved in the work of the Academic Assessment Committee.

The Academic Facilities Planning Office (AFPO) maintains a database of space resources by standardized use categories and monitors efficient utilization and distribution of classroom and laboratory space. The office recently received funding to implement a vendor-hosted space-analysis tool. The AFPO works directly with academic departments to identify and document space and facility needs. The planning officer also works closely with the Registrar, Facilities Management, and ITS to identify spaces that require infrastructure and general facilities upgrades. Utilization trends identified by the space analysis tool and compliance with Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) space utilization targets are communicated to the provost, deans, and associate deans. Based on data analysis, the AFPO may make recommendations to reassign, renovate, or replace existing space. AFPO planning takes into account existing and anticipated technological and pedagogical changes as well as
facilities conditions and sets a framework to provide academic facilities that meet the university’s educational, research, and public service missions (Exhibit 1.E.14).

Other offices have committed resources that support IR. For example, Enterprise Accounting staff and ITS staff implement upgrades to PeopleSoft. To maintain the integrity of faculty records, records-keeping has been centralized in the provost’s office, which employs a staff member responsible for data entry and validation. This effort has reduced, but not completely eliminated, shadow systems in departments and colleges. The budget office plays a key role in ensuring that funds are being spent as allocated. Each month, CWU’s books are reconciled with state appropriations for all budgeted operating and capital funds (See Standard 7). The Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management employs a data analyst to maintain student application cycle data. The division also conducts research on housing needs. The Office for Equal Opportunity aggregates and analyzes data on ethnicity. The Division of Business and Financial Affairs conducts research on auxiliary operations, and the Division of Academic Affairs conducts research on continuing education initiatives.

The Web Office assists university offices with design and development of web pages, and consistent branding has established a CWU “look” that extends from print publications to the web. The web serves as a resource for information for both the campus community and external constituents. Online bulletins and newsletters communicate the university's activities and successes to a variety of constituents and are a helpful supplement to print publications and other forms of communication.

The institution’s research is integrated with and supportive of institutional evaluation and planning (1.B.7) The director of institutional research reports through the chief planning officer in the president’s division, but serves the entire institution. He works closely with all division heads to provide timely data and to support units that are conducting research. In the very important area of enrollment management, an automated program distributes daily updates of enrollment trends during student registration to university officers to inform planning. Working together, the offices meet the compliance reporting requirements of state offices and of IPEDS. IR maintains a web-based “Facts at a Glance” (Exhibit 1.E.52) site that includes information of interest to internal and external constituents.

The institution systematically reviews its institutional research efforts, its evaluation processes, and its planning activities to document their effectiveness (1.B.8) The full implementation of PeopleSoft has improved business processes and provided the relational database functions that allow institutional research officers to ask and answer important questions. There are continuous efforts to improve data collection and integrity and the reliability and validity of evaluation processes. As new problems arise, new solutions are crafted. Recent efforts have focused on the early stages of creating a data warehouse that would simultaneously improve data integrity and free institutional research staff to devote more time to analysis and less time to programming. In a second initiative, IR is working with end users to establish a data dictionary—which PeopleSoft oddly does not provide—and common query protocols to be sure different units report data in the same way.

The university uses information from its planning and evaluation processes to communicate evidence of institutional effectiveness to its public (1.B.9) In addition to data that are provided on the Office of Institutional Research website, data from specific measures, for example, the Graduation Survey or Alumni Surveys, are aggregated to provide a picture of the entire institution and disaggregated to provide individual departmental reports. Data of interest to the public are also included in the State of the University Address and in addresses to constituent groups such as the CWU Foundation, the Alumni Association, service organizations, Ellensburg City Council, and other similar groups. Noteworthy data are also conveyed through a variety of university publications and, as appropriate, through the media.

**Appraisal of 1.B**

*Standard 1 – 31*
The university’s program of planning and evaluation has become increasingly systematic and integrated during this decade, although some inconsistency remains at the department and unit levels. Planning is driven by both external and internal contingencies. The biennial state funding process requires a systematic and integrated approach to goals, accomplishments, and resources. Further, the state requires institutions to report progress on accountability measures on an annual basis.

President McIntyre kept planning and responsiveness to plans front and center in campus conversations. She engaged the Board of Trustees in planning discussions, most typically at its annual summer retreat. Board members provided feedback on short-range plans, approved the five-year strategic plan, and participated in long-range planning that allows the university to set a trajectory for five years and beyond. Summer board retreats were productive events for the board but their results have not been circulated widely to the campus community. The academic program review process is systematic and cyclic and in this most recent year has been further strengthened with the addition of a requirement that each academic program submit an annual assessment plan and report.

At this writing, the university has learned that, in response to the global economic crisis, the legislature has imposed a significant reduction in state support for 2009–2011. In this light, the university is undertaking a thoroughgoing review of its strategic plans and initiatives. We continue to look forward to completing the circle of integrated planning, including ensuring that plans, assessment data, and analyses for each planning unit are updated regularly on the university’s website. This is a particularly important piece of an overall communication plan that will allow internal and external constituents to stay current about planning, initiatives, and outcomes.

The resource allocation process is well defined, tied to the strategic plan, and participatory. The board’s calendar for approving various budgetary proposals, for example, the state biennial operating and capital budget requests and the university’s annual operating budget, ensures a regular and systematic planning cycle.

Future planning will confront challenges we have identified. As a state-funded institution, the university is necessarily constrained by the biennial state budget process. This adds a layer of complexity to planning and somewhat impedes nimble responses to emerging needs. Because the university’s funding is tied to the state’s long-term plan and short-term legislative priorities, there is a continual yin and yang between maintaining fidelity to one’s strategic goals and responding opportunistically to the state’s newest initiatives. Despite best efforts, there is still some tendency to be reactive and to spend time figuring out how to recast the institution’s priorities to fit the state’s new contingencies. Further, state funding decisions, particularly in the first year of the biennium, often come so late that units and divisions are well into their fiscal year before they know how much money they have for operations and which of their goals they can adequately pursue.

State statutory mandates add another layer of oversight and divert the attention of staff toward complying with changing reporting requirements. For example, the state “priorities of government” initiative (Exhibit 1.E.53) asked state institutions to develop a performance agreement with the state that matches performance with resources and to apply for a Washington State Quality Award, the state’s version of the Baldrige Award (Exhibit 1.E.39). While each of these state initiatives is defensible, their summed effect calls for a substantial commitment of human and fiscal resources for external reporting that trumps internal governance and assessment projects. Their cycles are not well integrated with other state reporting or budgeting cycles. In other words, these multiple demands and requests mean that instead of digging deeper, we continue to assess and evaluate at the surfaces.

As the university develops a performance agreement with the state, it looks forward to more collaborative and strategic decision-making with the state, resulting in decreased incentives for opportunistic decision-making. The university is also mindful that responsiveness to changing

Standard 1 – 32
circumstances and to data on effectiveness is the hallmark of a successful organization. Thus the university hopes to arrive at a planning process that is integrative across all stakeholders and flexibly responsive to emerging needs and trends. President Gaudino is already taking the steps necessary to ensure these outcomes.

The goal of integrated planning has been to engage both top-down and bottom-up planning, and most divisions and units have made substantial progress. Still, some units have not completed their work and at least one of the functional area plans has not been finalized. Thus, the integration reflected by the matrix of strategic goals (Exhibit 1.E.32) is not yet complete. Divisions and units have been slow in moving their plans and assessment data to the web, although recent progress is encouraging. Exhibit 1.E.21 includes links to all divisional data that are now on line. University-wide assessment results and analyses are not systematically communicated, and some units do a better job than others of reviewing assessment results, being truly introspective about the data, and ensuring that the data inform action.

The university has increased the diversity of its students, particularly diversity of racial and ethnic origin, but its progress on diversifying faculty and staff has not been as robust. The Office for Equal Opportunity monitors these data carefully and recommends modifications in the hiring process and in retention policies that have helped other institutions recruit and retain a diverse workforce.

In the last decade, the university has made revolutionary progress in the area of data systems, data integrity, and data availability, all of which are integral to assessment and evaluation. The IR and IT functions are well defined, the units are staffed with qualified personnel, and their placement within the university’s organizational structure is effective. The university’s web presence has improved radically since our last full scale visit, and it serves both as a medium for communication and as a resource for assessment and evaluation. Many processes have been automated, and many forms are now online. A promising effort now underway will replace the university’s aging and inadequate but essential position control software.

Evolving technology presents its challenges. The university is at a critical point related to computing capacity, having grown considerably in number of users and functions. The time is close at hand when leaders will need to decide between building greater local capacity and outsourcing certain computing activities. Already a few functions have been outsourced to external servers and contracted providers.

The effectiveness of IR staff is slowed by the lack of data warehousing software, requiring that they serve as programmers and data extraction experts. The result is a backlog in requests to the office. Data integrity has improved, but contradictory reports from different units in answer to the same questions reveal the need for a more capable data dictionary and common query protocols. Increased web presence has improved communication on campus and with external constituents, but the number and preparation of web programmers is inadequate to meet current demand. IR has depended on student programmers to improve its website, but frequent turnover is a continual problem. This slows progress in developing a site that responds intuitively to user inquiries and that is easily and routinely updated. IR is hiring a temporary full time employee to complete the programming for such a site.

The university will continue to move forward on implementation of the data warehouse and complete other activities that will make it functional, including a data dictionary and common query protocols. The university must also take care to ensure that data collection is always accompanied by appropriate analyses and dissemination.

Although the university purchased the PeopleSoft Faculty Tracking Module to maintain complete records of faculty personnel actions and accomplishments, the software is not yet fully activated. This has slowed efforts for this self-study and for other important functions to compile abstracts of faculty activity. At least one college has purchased its own software—Sedona—to improve faculty tracking.
capability. Access to online forms is improving efficiency, but too frequently lost data or other malfunctions have frustrated both those who provide data and those who use it.

Data for most of the university’s diagnostic and performance indicators that populate the University Assessment Plan now are collected routinely and summaries are routinely accessible. There are, however, two areas where success has been elusive. First, data on graduates’ employment and continued educational pursuits are normally available for students completing degrees in professional fields but are very spotty in the liberal arts and sciences. The university has taken steps to keep students connected after graduation, but with only partial success. Most recently, student e-mail accounts were extended for a year following graduation to help maintain contact. The Division of University Relations is also capturing alumni employment data through personal contacts and through www.mycentral.cwu.edu. Results of these interventions are not yet known. Tracking student involvement in co-curricular and extra-curricular activities also continues to be elusive. The university is able to track fairly accurately how many students participate in individual events, but tracking involvement of individual students has been more challenging. A recent online tracking system developed by the Don and Verna Duncan Civic Engagement Center promises a solution. We look forward to finding creative solutions to problems with gathering data on important but elusive elements of our university assessment plan.

The university has also found it difficult to develop reliable data and effective formulas for enrollment projections. After several years of rapid growth in enrollment, a slight, unanticipated downturn emerged in 2008-2009. Many causal factors are outside of the university’s control, for example the supply of students completing in-state community college associate degrees with a direct transfer agreement. At the same time, successful efforts to reduce time to graduation resulted in a larger-than-expected graduating class. Thus, despite maintaining and growing the freshman class, enrollment dipped a bit. A more reliable predictive model would help the university take earlier action to ensure that enrollment is in line with local and state goals. The university looks forward to developing an enrollment projection model that allows us to plan ahead and make mid-course corrections as necessary.

Finally, communication about effectiveness could benefit from greater coherence. Too often, data are provided in fragmented ways and those who might be interested have trouble finding the big picture. Data are sometimes presented without interpretation, resulting in multiple perspectives on the same data. Current efforts to rebuild the Office of Institutional Research website promise some relief. The new website includes briefing sheets that summarize and interpret trends in key diagnostic and performance indicators (Appendix 1.A.2).

**Standard 1 Summary**

The university's mission is widely understood and was captured in a 2000 revision to the mission statement. As the university enters the new decade under the leadership of a new president, a changing state and national context for higher education portends further revision to both its understanding of the mission and the mission statement itself. Six strategic goals have guided university activities and resource allocation during the decade. Planning and evaluation have become increasingly integrated and requests for funding that are aligned with the university's goals receive priority for resource allocation. Assessment of university-wide goals is managed centrally, but departments and units also collect data for the purpose of determining the effectiveness of programmatic initiatives. Adoption of a relational database has improved availability and integrity of data related to financial, student, and human resources systems.

Responsiveness to the strategic goals has resulted in a decade of remarkable achievements including completion of the university's first comprehensive gifts campaign, improvements in the diversity of the student body, implementation of a climate commitment initiative, strengthening support for university
centers, and greater visibility for the institution. Still, there are challenges. Chief among them are the university's dependence on the winds of the state's fortunes for funding of its educational programs, limited computing capacity, and the pressing need for a data warehouse that will ease mounting pressures on staff in the Office of Institutional Research and allow them to respond to data requests with greater accuracy and speed.

The university benefitted enormously from the 8-year tenure of President Jerilyn McIntyre and, while her retirement was bittersweet, the arrival of President James Gaudino in January of 2009 has energized the campus in the way that new leadership invariably does. His new ideas and perspectives are stimulating the campus community and encouraging new ways of thinking about the university’s role, structure, and function. Despite significant budgetary constraints resulting from the global economic crisis, Central Washington University remains strong.
Standard 1 - Appendices and Exhibits

Appendices

1.A.1 CWU Strategic Plan 2006-2011
1.A.2 Evidence of Institutional Outcomes

Exhibits

GE.2 University Catalog 2009-2010
GE.3 University Policies Manual
GE.7 Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement
1.E.1 RCW Eligibility requirements for designation
1.E.2 BOT minutes February 11, 2000
1.E.3 CWU Strategic Plan 2001-2006
1.E.4 BOT Minutes June 8-9, 2006
1.E.5 Mission Statement Graphic Presentation
1.E.6 Strategic Planning Synthesizing Committee Reports
1.E.7 Strategic Planning Synthesizing Committee
1.E.8 State of the University Addresses 2005-2008
1.E.9 HECB Summer 2008
1.E.10 University Publications
1.E.11 Strategic Planning Accomplishments 2001-2006
1.E.12 Expenditures adjusted by HEPI 08
1.E.13 Progress on 2006-2011 Strategic Plan Goals
1.E.14 Long Term Space Request Form
1.E.15 Tenure Track Faculty Service
1.E.16 Staff Public Service Activities
1.E.17 Distinguished Professor Awardees
1.E.18 Civic Engagement Project Levels
1.E.19 Academic Service Learning
1.E.20 Public Service Activities Sponsored by Students
1.E.21 Division Strategic Plans
1.E.22 Visioning and Budget Planning under President Gaudino's Leadership
1.E.23 BOT minutes December 6, 2001
1.E.24 CWU Management Objectives
1.E.25 Performance Indicators Baseline Data
1.E.26 An Assessment Matrix for CWU
1.E.27 Enrollment and Budget Challenges and Responses 1999-2005
1.E.28 Strategic Planning Synthesizing Committee 2005
1.E.29 Strategic Planning Survey
1.E.30 CSDMPC Master Planning Forum May 31, 2005
1.E.31 Table of Goals 2006-2011
1.E.32 Divisional Tables of Goals
1.E.33 December 5, 2007 PAC Minutes
1.E.34 PAC Minutes August 6, 2008 Minutes
1.E.35 University Assessment Plan and Matrix
1.E.36 Faculty and Staff Accomplishments Report Form
1.E.37 CWU Accountability Results Summary 2006-2007
1.E.38 CWU Performance Agreement
1.E.39 Washington State Quality Award
1.E.40 BOT Final FY09 Annual Budget
1.E.41 Fall 2008 Enrollment Activities and Outcomes
1.E.42 Marketing and Branding Materials
1.E.43 Enrollment Plan
1.E.44 Performing Arts and Speaker Series
1.E.45  CWU Research Foundation MOU
1.E.46  SOURCE 2009 Web Site and Programs 2006-2009
1.E.47  Economic Impact Studies
1.E.48  Professional Development Training Program
1.E.49  Climate Commitment Task Force
1.E.50  Center for the Teacher Scholar
1.E.51  Peer Institution Lists
1.E.52  Facts at a Glance Website
1.E.53  Priorities of Government Initiative
Standard 2 – Educational Programs and Their Effectiveness

Central Washington University’s educational programs are the principal means by which the university enriches the intellectual, cultural, and professional lives of its students and, through them, the well-being of the state, region, and nation. The highest priority of the university’s human, physical, and financial resources is the success of its educational programs, offered by highly qualified faculty members. Faculty members collaborate with each other and with colleagues from other divisions of the university to maximize the student’s educational experience. Because the university understands the fundamental importance of its educational programs, it has developed deliberate methods for creating, maintaining, reviewing, and discontinuing undergraduate and graduate programs and courses. Assessment and improvement of the university’s educational programs has been increasingly integrated into its routine processes.

The university ensures responsible levels of support for its programs, including faculty resources, appropriate student capabilities, adequate technology and equipment, contemporary library information services, and a dedicated support staff.

Central Washington University’s undergraduate program seeks to open the student to the intellectual, professional, and civic world of educated men and women through its general education program, academic majors, and elective offerings. The university’s graduate programs emphasize student-faculty scholarly partnerships that prepare students for their chosen professions or further advanced study. All four of the university’s colleges are actively engaged in undergraduate and graduate educational programs. The four academic colleges collaborate with specialized units of the university that provide continuing education opportunities for the broader community, sponsor international study opportunities for CWU and foreign students and faculty and effectively implement the expanding technology for electronically-mediated instruction.

Standard 2.A – General Requirements

Overview of Educational Programs

Historical Perspective

When Central Washington University was founded in 1890, its educational programs were solely dedicated to preparing teachers for the new state’s common schools. Almost a century later, CWU and its sister institutions in Bellingham (Western Washington University) and Cheney (Eastern Washington University) were designated as regional universities by the state legislature. The Revised Code of Washington, adopted in 1977, requires that “the primary purposes of the regional universities shall be to offer undergraduate and graduate education programs through the master's degree, including programs of a practical and applied nature, directed to the educational and professional needs of the residents of the regions they serve; to act as receiving institutions for transferring community college students; and to provide
extended occupational and complementary studies programs that continue or are otherwise integrated with the educational services of the region's community colleges.”

Special strengths and traditions at Central Washington University have created the institution’s distinctive interpretation of the legislature’s charge. CWU values small classes and direct daily teaching contact between full-time faculty and students at all levels. In scholarly activities, the university values mentoring partnerships between students and faculty that generate professional-level accomplishments. It maintains a lively program of artistic and cultural events that complements the formal educational mission of the university and enriches the community. The university has been a leader in the state in providing access to first-generation students and students who might not otherwise be able to pursue a college degree. It has provided opportunities for underprepared students to build the skills necessary for collegiate learning and has provided educational programs elsewhere in the state when and where they are needed.

---

**Current Situation**

**Degree Programs.** The Division of Academic Affairs, headed by the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, is one of four vice-presidential divisions of the university. Credit-bearing educational programs are aligned under four colleges in the division: The College of Arts and Humanities (CAH), the College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS), the College of the Sciences (COTS), and the College of Business (CB). Interdisciplinary programs are aligned under the college that administers the majority of courses in the program. In this standard, elements that are common to all undergraduate and graduate programs of the university are addressed first, followed by self studies of each college. Organization charts for these academic units may be found in Appendix 2.A.1. Table 2.1 shows the major academic program realignments and name changes that have occurred in the study period. A prospective division of the College of Education and Professional Studies into two colleges, one for education programs and one for professional studies, is under consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>School of Business and Economics Became the College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Department of Curriculum and Supervision and Department of Teacher Education Programs Combined to become the Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Dietetics Program Moved from Department of Family and Consumer Sciences to the Department of Health, Human Performance, and Recreation, which changed its name to the Department of Health, Human Performance, and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Recreation and Tourism Program Moved from Department of Health, Human Performance, and Recreation to the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Department of Business Administration Divided and became the Department of Management and the Department of Finance and Operations &amp; Supply Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Flight Technology Program Split from the Department of Industrial and Engineering Technology and became the Department of Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Department of Philosophy Became the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central Washington University’s educational programs advance through many channels. *The core of its educational program is represented in courses of study that lead to an undergraduate or graduate degree, its program of general education, and a body of elective courses that enrich the experience the student takes away from the university (2.C)*.

Central Washington University is authorized to grant six undergraduate degrees and seven master’s-level graduate degrees (Table 2.2). The Master of Professional Accountancy (added in 2000-2001) and Bachelor of Applied Science (added in 2005–2006) degree designations have been added since the last full NWCCU review. No degree designations have been removed from the curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Degrees</th>
<th>Graduate Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in</td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>for Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Fine Arts</td>
<td>Master of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Music</td>
<td>Master of Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Master of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science</td>
<td>Master of Professional Accountancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within each degree designation, the university offers undergraduate or graduate major programs of study, some of which have multiple specializations. The CWU Catalog (Exhibit GE.2) lists all approved major programs of the university. Appendix 2.A.2 lists programs and the number of majors and degrees granted for the past five years. During the study period, 16 new major programs have been added to the university’s offerings at the bachelor’s level and five new programs have been added at the master’s level; 18 undergraduate programs and three graduate programs were discontinued. These new and removed programs are listed in Appendix 2.A.3. Parts 5-10.3 and 5-10.4 of the University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3) describe the processes of internal and external review and approval that govern the addition and removal of programs.

**Equivalent Policies and Programs at All CWU Sites.** Central Washington University has been a leader in reaching under-served populations since 1909. In the early years, programs were provided by locally-contracted faculty members or faculty members commuting from Ellensburg. The first university centers were established in 1975, with on-site courses, admissions, registration, financial aid, and library resources for place-bound students. Educational programs currently are offered on the residential campus in Ellensburg and the six CWU centers located on community college campuses throughout the state (also see Standard 8.A):

- **CWU-Lynnwood**, at Edmonds Community College, Lynnwood, WA
- **CWU-Yakima**, at Yakima Valley Community College, Yakima, WA
- **CWU-Pierce County**, at Pierce College, Ft. Steilacoom, WA
- **CWU-Des Moines**, at Highline Community College, Des Moines, WA
- **CWU-Wenatchee**, at Wenatchee Valley College, Wenatchee, WA
- **CWU-Moses Lake**, at Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake, WA
Limited selections of courses and programs are offered at three additional “teaching sites:”
CWU at Kent, at Green River Community College, Kent Station Campus, Kent, WA
CWU at Everett, at Everett Community College, Everett, WA
CWU at Mt. Vernon, at Skagit Valley College, Mt. Vernon, WA

In this self-study, these sites are collectively referred to as “university centers.” University centers offer programs of upper-division and graduate instruction that lead to selected majors and minors appropriate to the needs of the locale and its students. Electronically mediated distance education further expands the educational opportunities for non-resident students. Appendix 2.A.4 lists the programs that the HECB has pre-approved or approved by site and the current offerings at each site. During the period 2000 to 2008, the percent of total FTE university enrollment completing its work at the centers ranged from 11.5% in 2001–2002 to 15% in 2007–2008. The actual FTE counts at the university centers steadily grew from 856.4 in 2000-2001 to 1345.2 in 2007–2008 (Exhibit 2.E.1).

The university expands its programs at the university centers when student demand and state need dictate and when funding is sufficient to support a high quality educational outcome. The HECB reviews and approves programs in major fields of study based on a number of criteria, including documentation of state need, the quality of the assessment plan for both the program and students, the quality of a diversity plan, the viability of the budget, assurance of program quality, and the use of technology.

When the university offers courses and programs at a center, the courses are the same as those on the Ellensburg campus. They conform to the same curriculum policies and typically have the same basic syllabi. Tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty members at the centers meet the same qualification and review standards as those on the Ellensburg campus. In fact, academic departments are sometimes chaired by a faculty member at a center. Support services and facilities at the centers meet the same commitment to appropriate services and facilities found on the Ellensburg campus. In short, the university strives for seamless inclusion of the centers in the educational programs of the university. Unless otherwise noted, the narrative of Standard 2 applies to the all sites of the university and the university centers will not be described separately (2.A.1, 2.B.2, 2.E.1, 2.G.7, Policy 2.6).

Certificates and Endorsements. In addition to major and minor fields of study, Central Washington University offers bachelor’s and master’s degree programs leading to recommendations for state-level certification of school personnel. Preparing educators was the university’s founding role and still occupies a central position in its mission. CWU's teacher preparation program is the ninth largest in the U.S. and provides about 20 percent of Washington's public school personnel. In 2007–2008, 510 CWU students earned their initial (residency-level) school personnel certificates.

Undergraduate teacher education programs are interdisciplinary, combining a disciplinary major with a sequence of professional courses. Graduate programs focus on advanced skills leading to specialized professions in the schools. The Certification Office of the CWU College of Education and Professional Studies serves as the liaison to the state Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. CWU programs lead to recommendations for state certificates for school personnel in the following areas:
• Education Department: Teaching, Principal, Program Administrator (Instructional Leadership and Special Education)
• Psychology Department: Educational Staff Associate (School Counselor and School Psychologist)

Rigorous assessment of student learning and program goals is required in all of these programs. Washington State certification requirements for school personnel were thoroughly revised in 2000 and CWU’s programs for school professionals were altered to comply with the state’s new standards. In July 2007 each program was reviewed by the State Board of Education and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). NCATE reaccredited all programs. The state’s Professional Education Standards Board (PESB) withheld approval of CWU’s Teacher and Administrator programs and the university responded with program changes and improved documentation. After a focused site visit in April 2008, the PESB approved CWU’s programs for the normal 5-year period.

Exhibit 2.E.2 summarizes the number of certificates awarded, placement of graduates, and minority student representation for each of the state’s colleges and universities. In 2007–2008, CWU issued more first-issue teacher certificates than any of the other 19 authorized institutions in the state, 120 more than the second most prolific institution, Washington State University. City University was the most productive private institution. Table 2.3 shows the number of first-issue professional education certificates awarded by CWU since 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administrator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWU placed 67% of its 2006–2007 teacher education graduates in teaching positions by 2007–2008, close to the state average of 69%. This pattern has been relatively stable since 2000. CWU’s proportion of minority group certificate candidates has risen from 6% in 2004 to 18% in 2007–2008, the first year in which CWU exceeded the state average (15.8%). The university has focused on improving minority recruitment. Details of these certification data are available in Exhibit 2.E.2.

Some university programs do not lead directly to a professional certificate but prepare students to succeed in a qualifying examination administered by a state or a professional organization. Examples from 2007–2008 are the Nationally Certified School Psychologist (100% pass rate), Registered Dietitian examination (85% pass rate), and National Actuarial Examinations (69% pass rate on probability, 25% on financial mathematics) and the National Counseling Examination (CWU average at 99th percentile). These data provide valuable assessment data for their programs.

**University Certificates.** The university offers a number of programs leading to internally-defined certificates awarded by academic departments or the Office of Continuing Education. The University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-10.8) defines three types of internally-
awarded certificates. Exhibit 2.E.3 gives the policy definition and lists the current programs of each type.

**High-Demand Programs.** In mid-decade the Washington State Legislature called for competitive funding proposals to boost enrollment in areas where student demand or employer demand exceeded the state’s instructional capacity. CWU won support for four programs in the 2003–2005 biennium, three programs in the 2004–2005 academic year, and two programs in the 2006–2007 academic year. Exhibit 2.E.4 provides brief descriptions and enrollment histories of these high demand programs.

**Spheres of Distinction.** The university’s self studies and external reviews have recommended that the university sharpen its definition of its unique qualities—its academic niche. In response to these assessments, President McIntyre inaugurated a “Spheres of Distinction” program in 2004. Members of the university community proposed themes that express CWU’s unique or characteristic aspects and the Board of Trustees approved five Spheres of Distinction: interdisciplinary programs and research; preparation of professional educators; programs and activities that nurture the development of students; activities addressing regional needs and enhancing regional resources, and university centers.

For 2006–2007, the university funded nine program development proposals that heightened expression of one or more of these themes. For 2007–2008, 11 new proposals were funded and nine more were funded in 2008–2009 (Table 2.4). Exhibit 2.E.5 provides descriptions of all programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.4 Spheres of Distinction Proposals Funded for 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development of Online Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Pacific Islander Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Partnership for Preparing Career &amp; Technical Education Teachers &amp; Administrators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Human, Physical, and Financial Resources

_Historical Perspective_

During the current decade the university has been confronted with a series of budgetary and enrollment challenges, beginning with an emergency in 2000-2001, when state funding based on optimistic enrollment projections combined with a moderate downturn in actual enrollments to produce an enrollment shortfall of 575 FTE students and the loss of $3.8M in state funding. At the same time, a downturn in the state economy led to an additional 2 per cent budget cut for the state’s public institutions and additional cuts followed in the next two years. The university negotiated a successful enrollment recovery program with the legislature and, under President McIntyre’s leadership, developed a strategy to improve the systemic strength of the institution, increasing its ability to cope with the known challenges of the day and heightening its immunity to the unknown challenges of the future. The plan consisted of the following key elements:

- Stabilize the budget
- Stabilize and grow the enrollment
- Integrate planning
- Build a strong and collaborative leadership team
- Focus on excellence
- Improve partnerships and external relationships
- Improve the visibility and reputation of the university

The details of this comprehensive plan and the enrollment recovery plan of 2001 may be reviewed in Exhibit 1.E.43.

The current international financial crisis is beginning to affect the university (See Standard 7), but the extent of its full impact is unknown at this writing. State funding is heavily dependent on sales tax revenues, making it very vulnerable to consumer sentiment. Four other trends have affected human, physical, and financial resource circumstances:

- Population dynamics have influenced student enrollment variability and the age and experience profile of the faculty. A more brisk pace of faculty retirements has reduced the average age of the faculty and has tilted faculty teaching and scholarship toward more contemporary topics.
- The university has built upon very productive alliances with community college partners where CWU now offers an increasing number of majors and minors.
- There has been a historic trend of decreased public support and increased reliance on tuition and other local funds. Annual revenue from student tuition exceeded revenue from state funds for the first time in 2004 and this gap has continued to widen. In 2009–2010, tuition will rise by 14%, partially to offset state cutbacks caused by the global recession.
- In October 2002, the legislature permitted faculty collective bargaining at the state’s public four-year institutions. CWU’s faculty chose The United Faculty of Central to be its collective bargaining agent. The university appointed its first faculty affairs professional administrator in 2005 to negotiate the first contract and administer the newly formed Office of Faculty Relations. The CWU Board of Trustees voted in March 2006 to accept the resulting contract. The faculty union and the administration both seek to strengthen the quality of the university’s academic programs. The effect of unionization is discussed more completely in Standard 4 and Standard 6.
**Current Situation**

Central Washington University demonstrates its commitment to high standards of teaching and learning by providing sufficient human, physical, and financial resources to support its educational programs and to facilitate student achievement of program objectives whenever and however they are offered (2.A.1). Summary descriptions of how the university’s current human, physical, and financial assets support its academic mission follow, with supportive evidence. The other standards of this self-study provide detailed analyses of these resources.

**Human Resources.** During the past decade, CWU has maintained more than an adequate staff to support its academic programs. The number and qualifications of the faculty are described in greater detail in Standard 4 and in Standard 2.C, below. This decade was one in which many faculty hired during the rapid expansion of the 1960s reached retirement age and others near retirement age responded to early retirement incentives. In fall 2008, 42% of the faculty with professorial rank had 10 or fewer years of service and 29% had been appointed in the previous 5 years.

In general, increases in enrollment, inaugurating new programs and new sites, and changes in disciplinary emphasis have been accommodated in an orderly way. Appendix 2.A.5 summarizes the FTE for each staffing category of the university from 1999 to 2009. The total university staff rose 40% (381 FTE) during this period. Total faculty FTE rose 21% (82 FTE). Tenure-track faculty FTE rose 3% (7 FTE), full-time non-tenure track appointees rose 222% (62 FTE) and part-time appointees rose by 13% (12 FTE). Some tenure-track faculty hiring was deferred during this decade because the proportion of student enrollments supported only by tuition revenues increased. Enrollment-based revenues do not provide the sound financial foundation required for the commitment to a tenure-track faculty member. Table 2.5 reports the proportion of the faculty with full time assignments.

At the time of the last full review, the self-study reported that the FTES/FTEF ratio rose from 17.0 in 1990 to 18.6 in 1999. This generally upward trend has continued through the current study period, with a decline in the most recent year, as shown in Table 2.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Faculty Full-Time (Headcount)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Faculty Full-Time (FTE*)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CWU Common Data Set   * Estimate. Full-time + 1/3 part time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTES*</td>
<td>7,510</td>
<td>7,357</td>
<td>7,961</td>
<td>8,332</td>
<td>8,958</td>
<td>9,021</td>
<td>9,289</td>
<td>9,673</td>
<td>9,464</td>
<td>9,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF*</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CWU Common Data Set   * Estimate. Full-time + 1/3 part time.

**Physical Resources.** Physical facilities that support the academic mission of the university are fully described in Standard 8. The importance of the university’s academic goals is evident in the 2005 Campus Master Plan (Exhibit B.E.37, p. 30). Some noteworthy recent academic facilities improvements include:

**Standard 2 – 45**
• A $29 million, 70,000 square foot music performance center and music education facility that opened in 2004.
• Twenty-five million dollars was invested in renovations to Dean Hall to accommodate the Anthropology Department, Museum of Culture and Environment, the COTS Dean Suite, the Department of Geography and Land Studies, the GIS Laboratory and the interdisciplinary Resource Management Program. Dean Hall was remodeled to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) silver standards and reopened in winter 2009.

CWU’s physical facilities at each of its six university centers have been newly constructed since the last full-scale accreditation review. Each of these facilities is located on the campus of a public community college. Standard 8 summarizes these new academic facilities. The academic programs at each site may be found in Appendix 2.A.4.

Computers now provide access to a wide range of tools for teaching, scholarship, and learning. Standard 5 provides extensive information about electronic resources. New faculty members specify a computer package when they are hired. Replacement upgrades are now on a three-year cycle. University resources are available via wired connections in faculty offices and student labs, wireless access in academic buildings and dormitories, and password-protected Internet access worldwide.

Student computer resources at CWU have grown from 206 older computers in seven labs in 1997 to several hundred PC and Mac computers in nearly 30 labs on the Ellensburg campus and each center site. Ninety-three percent of student computer lab equipment is now less than three years old. Loaner laptops are available for student use in the library and the student union building.

The Student Technology Fee Committee, a student majority committee, advises Information Technology Services about student labs. This committee has been instrumental in expanding the technology efforts and resources available to students. For example, with new equipment the Writing Center has been able to expand its services to the library, the SURC and the Brooklane housing area.
Classroom technology has kept pace with faculty and student computer use. During the study period, computer-assisted class presentations have become commonplace. On the Ellensburg campus, 197 classrooms out of 204 are equipped with computers, ceiling mounted projectors, and Internet connections. Portable equipment is available for the remaining seven classrooms. All classrooms at centers are similarly equipped with “smart technology” (also see Standard 8.B).

Financial Resources. Standard 7 describes institutional funding in detail. The university tracks financial revenues in dollars adjusted for annual changes in the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI). HEPI-adjusted total revenues per FTES have remained relatively constant at least since 1989 (Figure 2.1), but the source of those revenues has steadily shifted from state appropriations to tuition and fees and, to a lesser extent, to grant and contract revenue (Figure 2.2. Also see Figure 7.1). State appropriations now constitute 29% of the total revenues; tuition and fees make up 32% of the total. Grant, contract, and gift revenue has remained relatively constant in recent years, at about 17% of the total. Detailed annual data is available in Exhibit 2.E.6. The emerging global recession will constrain the university’s operations.

Since 1999, the legislature and governor have allowed state university boards of trustees to set tuition and fees. Like other public institutions, CWU almost always has increased its tuitions to the fullest extent permitted by the legislature, 5% in 2008–2009. Increases of 14% per year have been authorized for 2009–2011 in the wake of the global budget crisis. Course fees to cover consumable materials, while small, have increased over the decade as well. Exhibit 2.E.7 shows the course fees now in effect. Course fees are reviewed and approved by the university Board of Trustees.

All tuition revenues are retained by the university, so enrollments above the state support level generate marginal additional revenues. Enrollment is somewhat unpredictable, however, so the university avoids making lasting tenure-track hiring commitments that rely on enrollment-based revenues. An underenrollment produced the emergency of 2000-2001 described above. In the years since then, enrollments have ranged from 99.76% of the budgeted enrollment (2007–2008) to 111.07% (2004–2005), with an average of 106.8%. This has provided an adequate budgetary platform for the university’s academic programs. A

1 These data are for the entire year’s university revenues, including summer quarter. The state supports about 97% of the student FTE enrollments during the 9-month regular session but there is no state support based on summer enrollment. Thus, the proportion the state contributes to revenues is lower for the entire year’s program than for the 9-month regular session.

Tuition and fees became the largest source of the entire year’s revenue in 2004. State support is now approximately 60% of the 9-month regular session revenue. The university projects that tuition and fees will overtake state support of the 9-month revenue in 2010.

Standard 2 – 47
trend back to more tenure-track faculty hiring occurred when the legislature fully funded enrollment in the 2007–2009 biennial budget.

State appropriations to institutions of higher education as a percentage of the state budget (Exhibit 2.E.8) declined from 16.2% to 11.4% early in the 1990s and have stayed in that vicinity to the present. Higher education appropriations now account for 11% of state general fund appropriations. However, the state general fund budget grew by over 22% in the current biennium, returning total funding to 1987–1989 levels. The current global recession will reduce those gains.

From 1997 to 1999, the state legislature defined the accountability goals of public universities. Since 1999, institutions have defined their own performance goals, with the approval of the HECB. This helped to strengthen a culture of assessment and to thoughtfully develop local indices especially relevant to CWU's mission. For example, among its initial indicators, CWU chose to report the percentage of faculty mentoring students, since scholarly partnerships are especially important to CWU's institutional culture. In the 2008–2010 biennium, these goals are

- Increase the number of baccalaureate degrees per year to 2,050 (2007–2008 = 2,485)
- Increase the number of high-demand baccalaureate degrees per year to 49 (2005–2006 = 206)
- Increase the number of advanced degrees per year at all campuses to 196 (2007–2008 = 197)
- Improve the six-year graduation rate for baccalaureate students to 51.1 percent (2007–2008 = 55.5%)
- Improve the three-year graduation rate for AA transfer students to 72.3 percent (2008–2009 = 78.9%)
- Improve the freshman retention rate to 78.2 percent (2007–2008 = 77%)
- Improve time to degree for baccalaureate students to 86.6 percent (2005–2006 = 87.6%) and
- Provide a report on Pell grant recipients' performance within each of these measures.

The university's recent performance is already close to, or exceeds, these realistic target goals.

As state support has receded, the alumni and friends of the university have stepped forward to support the academic mission of the university through conventional gifts to the CWU Foundation and through extraordinary gifts to the university's first capital campaign, Transforming Lives. Standard 7.D describes these fundraising efforts in greater detail.

- Total revenue from conventional CWU Foundation giving improved from $1.40 million in 1998–99 to $2.15 million in 2007–2008, but slumped with the worldwide recession in 2008–2009 to $1.29 million (Exhibit 2.E.9). Across the decade, 34% of the CWU Foundation’s annual university support was used for student scholarships and 68% was used to recognize and support faculty teaching, academic projects, and other programs.
- The Transforming Lives capital campaign set a goal of an $18 million endowment, later raised to $21 million, primarily for student scholarships. The campaign reached its goal in May 2008, and completed the campaign in June 2008, with a total of $21.7 million. See Standard 7.D for details.

At the same time, external grant funding has increased from $3.27 million in 1997–98 to $9.5 million in 2007–2008 (See also Standard 4.B). External funding impacts the academic program through direct support of faculty scholarship, matching funds for faculty endowments, graduate research assistantships, and indirect fund grants that support summer research, undergraduate student research, and instructional equipment. Annual reports of grant activity from 2001 are available on the web. Exhibit 2.E.10 is the 2007–2008 report, presenting highlights and details of each of the 87 proposals funded that year.
Program Development, Curriculum Design, Review, and Approval

**Historical Perspective**

The academic program at CWU represents a dynamic balance of many influences. Faculty expertise, student interest, societal needs, legislative directions, and the milieu created by the higher education community are a few examples. Since these influences are always changing, the CWU academic program also is always in a state of flux. The university’s program development and curriculum design, review, and approval processes are designed to facilitate open and orderly curriculum change. While many factors influence curriculum change, the curriculum is the unquestioned province of the faculty.

In 1998 the Faculty Senate’s handbook of curriculum policies was merged into a comprehensive manual of university policies (Exhibit GE.3). Section 5-10 is the section on curriculum policies. Since 2000, the CWU Policies Manual has been available on the web. In 2008–2009, portions of the policy manual that described procedures were extracted and collected into a separate CWU Procedures Manual (Exhibit GE.4). A new Academic Code (Exhibit GE.3, Part 4) was adopted after the university collective bargaining agreement was reached in 2006. It asserts that the faculty has principal responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, and research. The Academic Code reinforces the primacy of the faculty in curriculum processes in several additional sections.

An electronic version of the catalog was begun in 1996, and it is now the official description of the university’s curriculum. Past electronic catalogs, the current catalog (Exhibit GE.2), and the draft version of the next catalog are available online. The electronic draft catalog incorporates all changes as soon as they are approved by the appropriate bodies. New degree programs become effective when they have been approved by the Faculty Senate, Board of Trustees, HECB, and the NWCCU. Program and general education requirement changes become effective in the fall quarter following publication in the official electronic catalog. Course changes become effective when they have been approved by the FSCC and are implemented by Registrar Services. New specializations, minors, and certificates become effective when approved by the Faculty Senate (See Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-10.4.8.5).

CWU encourages the development of interdisciplinary programs. In 2002, work began on developing interdisciplinary program charters to identify, for example, mission and goals, departmental or college program residence, line of authority, governance structure, and budget. The 2006–2012 Academic Affairs Strategic Plan (Exhibit 2.E.11) called for all programs to have a charter by 2007. The current form of the interdisciplinary program charter policy is Section 5-10.9 of the CWU Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3). Two sample charters may be found in Exhibit 2.E.12 and full descriptions of all programs and their charters are available on the interdisciplinary programs web site and the CWU-NWCCU interdisciplinary programs binder.

**Current Situation**

*The goals of the university's educational programs, whenever and however offered, including instructional policies, methods, and delivery systems, are compatible with its mission. They are developed, approved, and periodically evaluated under established institutional policies*
and procedures thorough a clearly defined process (2.A.2). In the program review process (See Standard 2.B), each program relates its existing program goals to its department, college, and university missions. Goals of newly proposed programs must similarly align with the unit and institutional missions. These alignments, along with evidence sources and performance targets for each, are summarized in each program's current Department/Program Assessment Plan, available online and in CWU-NWCCU department binders.

Curriculum policies and procedures of the university apply to all programs regardless of the site or means of delivery. Internal program approval is contingent on assurances that appropriate resources are available to ensure the program's success. External program approval is contingent on the quality of the program proposal, the resources available to deliver it, and projected need. CWU procedures comply with all HECB program approval policies (Exhibit 2.E.13).

The university’s educational programs are faculty-driven and student-centered. All departments participate in the common processes of program planning, review, and assessment, academic policy development, and curriculum approval. At least three mechanisms exist for review of educational programs: the curriculum approval process (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-10), cyclical program review (Exhibit 2.E.14) and, for some programs, specialized accreditation (See Standard 2.C and Exhibit 2.E.15).

Forms for the curriculum approval process (Exhibit 2.E.16) are all available electronically. Curriculum proposals are reviewed at the department, college, and Faculty Senate levels, with additional review by the Graduate Council, General Education (GE) Committee, or Center for Teaching and Learning, when appropriate. Proposals for new degrees and new degree programs are distributed by the HECB to the other four-year public institutions in the state for review and comment. All public institutions are notified of significant curricular changes, such as delivery of an existing program to a new site.

Appendix 2.A.6 provides a graphic characterization of the university's curriculum and program approval process. Three standing committees of the Faculty Senate (Exhibit GE.3, Part 4) and three standing committees of the university serve as the clearinghouses for academic policy and curriculum.

- The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee reviews academic standards, policies, and organizational structures and recommends policy revisions to the Senate.
- The Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee reviews all proposed curriculum changes, considers changes to curriculum policies, and recommends action to the Senate.
- The Faculty Senate General Education Committee reviews and recommends changes to policies, structure, and curriculum for the university's GE requirements. This committee changed from a university standing committee to a Faculty Senate standing committee during the current study period.
- The Graduate Council (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-10.1.6) reviews and approves academic policies and procedures related to graduate programs.
- The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and Graduate Programs Committee of the Center for Teaching and Learning develop policy and approve curriculum changes for all programs designed to prepare school professionals (Exhibit 2.E.17).
Currently, designees of the provost serve as administrative liaisons to the Faculty Senate committees. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research serves as the administrative liaison to the Graduate Council, and the Dean of Education and Professional Studies serves as the administrative liaison to the Center for Teaching and Learning committees. Specimen minutes of these committees may be reviewed in Exhibit 2.E.18. These structures form a channel for responsive curriculum change that preserves the integrity, interdisciplinary collaboration, and accountability of all academic programs.

The University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3) describes the policies, regulations, and procedures for additions and deletions of courses or programs, and these policies are systematically and periodically reviewed (2.A.11). This document clarifies that responsibility for design, approval, and implementation of the curriculum is vested in designated institutional bodies with clearly established channels of communication and control. It also asserts that “the teaching faculty collectively is the major force governing the curriculum of the university” (2.A.7). Jurisdiction for all matters of curriculum clearly is specified in the manual, and procedures are implemented as described virtually without exception. Responsible compliance with curriculum policies is encouraged by forms for every common kind of curriculum action (Exhibit 2.E.16).

At least two weeks before Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee approval of curriculum changes, curriculum summary logs (Exhibit 2.E.19) are distributed electronically to all faculty members, staff, and academic administrators. Items automatically come before the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee unless someone receiving the log raises a concern.

The Board of Trustees approves new programs before consideration by either the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) or the NWCCU. In the event of program elimination or significant change in requirements, CWU curriculum forms and HECB policies explicitly require that appropriate arrangements are made for enrolled students to complete their program in a timely manner and with a minimum of disruption (2.A.12).

Degree and certificate programs demonstrate a coherent design; are characterized by appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, synthesis of learning, and the assessment of learning outcomes; and require the use of library and other information sources (2.A.3). In their program review self studies and in the program self-studies prepared for part of this self-study, departments report the coherence, breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, learning goals, and assessment strategies for each program. In 2008, the Assessment Committee compared all program student learning assessment matrices to an evaluative rubric. Results are discussed in Standard 2.B and documented in Exhibit 2.E.20.

The university uses degree designators consistent with program content (2.A.4). CWU is approved by the state to offer bachelor’s and master’s degrees. As a regional university in the state of Washington, CWU awards neither the associate’s degree nor the doctoral degree. The University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-10.6) fully describes the degree designations and their appropriate use. These policies are consistent with national practice.

Several years ago, the university began to balance the emphasis of its educational programs between teaching and learning, between inputs and outcomes. Many workshops and presentations have been offered during each quarter’s Faculty Development Day to encourage and assist in this process. The results have been encouraging. Virtually every
course syllabus includes learner outcome objectives and assessments for each. Course syllabi are available in departmental offices. Departments have developed goals, target criteria, and assessment data for each degree program. Departments include this information in their program reviews (Exhibit 2.E.14) and the self studies prepared for this NWCCU review. Current learner assessment plans for each program are available online.

These data frame departmental discussions about program change. A “culture of assessment” is gaining broad acceptance as academic departments find that assessment cycles are a productive structure for programmatic change. Progress toward this reformation is steady (See Standard 2.B.), and the university is well past the point where degree objectives, including the content to be covered, the intellectual skills, the creative capabilities, and the methods of inquiry to be acquired; and, if applicable, the specific career-preparation competencies to be mastered are defined for most fields of study or technical programs (2.A.4).

Although Central Washington University does not provide programs in concentrated or abbreviated timeframes (2.A.5), some programs have a non-traditional delivery or scheduling format. The university offers two summers-only master’s degree programs (Master of Arts in Teaching: Mathematics and Master of Arts in Theatre Production), and one online master’s degree program (Master of Science in Health and Physical Education). Some programs operate with cohort groups which complete a course sequence en masse, for example, the Bachelor of Arts in Education: Elementary Education at CWU-Pierce County.

Central Washington University operates on a quarter system using practices common to institutions of higher education (2.A.6). Each quarter lasts approximately 10 weeks. Summer classes follow either a 6-week or 9-week schedule. Course credits are determined by teaching format (e.g., lecture, lab). The NWCCU definition of a unit of credit is cited as the university’s standard in the University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-10.5.7) and repeated in the university catalog (Exhibit GE.2).

Programs are of comparable length to similar programs found in regionally accredited institutions of higher education. Degree requirements are laid out in the University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3) and repeated in the university catalog (Exhibit GE.2). They are consistent with those of other accredited universities. A minimum of 180 credits is required for the bachelor’s degree, of which 60 credits must be upper-division classes. At least 60 credits of concentrated study in a major, dual major, or major-minor combination is required. The number of credits required in undergraduate majors varies from 45 to 149 credits, with Music (138–149), Construction Management (138) and Mechanical Engineering Technology (135–137) requiring the most credits.

Tuition is calculated on a per-credit-hour basis from 2 to 9 credits and for credits in excess of 18. A single fee is charged for 10-18 credits. Tuition and fees are set each year by the Board of Trustees and are published online at the registrar’s website (Exhibit 2.E.21), and in the university catalog. Master's candidates pay a higher fee than bachelor's candidates, and out-of-state residents pay more than in-state residents. However, tuition does not vary across programs (2.A.6). Summer session instruction is not supported with state funds, so the tuition structure for summer session varies somewhat from the academic year schedule.
The institution’s curriculum (program and courses) is planned both for optimal learning and accessible scheduling. (2.A.9) General academic advising, major advising, course scheduling, and course prerequisite requirements all are designed to optimize student learning and progress toward his or her degree. Many GE courses are offered every quarter, and all departments of the university offer required courses at least once in each two-year cycle. CWU’s federal IPEDS 6-year graduation rate (3-year graduation rate for transfer students) is one of the university’s performance indicators reviewed by the HECB. Thus, there is institution-wide awareness of and commitment to effective student learning and course scheduling that is efficient and accessible.

Library and Information Resources for Educational Programs

**Historical Perspective**

CWU library system has evolved both physically and conceptually from a circulating collection of print volumes to becoming an access point to the world’s information resources. There is a history of excellent relations between faculty and library staff, several of whom hold faculty rank. The library has assertively expanded into electronic resources and full partnership in regional consortia. Standard 5 describes library information services in detail.

**Current Situation**

Faculty, in partnership with library and information resources personnel, ensure that the use of library and information resources is integrated into the learning process (2.A.8). Faculty members and library information specialists collaborate to expand undergraduate and graduate learning resources in the local library collection, the university centers, and the academic libraries of the Northwest. Students are introduced to the library and other information resources in their University 101 curriculum by using a library orientation module designed by the library faculty. Students use library and information resources throughout the GE curriculum, and the requirements intensify in their major programs of study.

The Library Advisory Committee and departmental faculty representatives (Exhibit 2.E.22) work collaboratively with the library staff and departmental liaisons to ensure that the holdings and policies of the library are consistent with the needs of educational programs. Recent surveys of the faculty (See Standard 5) inform the library about the adequacy of its services.

Routine purchases are made through a purchasing service guided by CWU’s institutional profile. For more targeted collection development, the faculty representatives and academic department liaisons in the library staff (Exhibit 2.E.22) keep informed about program needs. Individual faculty members routinely submit requests for acquisitions via their department library representative.

The university’s Brooks Library has very respectable monograph, journal, map, federal and state documents, and music collections for an institution of CWU’s size and mission. Beginning in 2003, the Orbis Cascade Alliance has provided CWU students and faculty with access to the holdings of most academic libraries in Washington and Oregon. Currently, 35 public and private universities, colleges, and community colleges in Oregon and Washington pool their resources in the Alliance’s Summit union catalog. For items not available via
Summit, a knowledgeable interlibrary loan staff has a good record of finding and ordering items from libraries around the United States.

The availability of electronic full-text journal databases has greatly expanded access to online journal publications at CWU, relieving some of the restrictions imposed by limited journal budgets. Through Blackboard (See Standard 2.G and 2.H) and Docutek, instructors are able to make electronic articles and PDF versions of print articles available to their students. The library staff has investigated plagiarism detection tools and the university now subscribes to SafeAssign. The Summit Alliance, full-text databases, Blackboard, and SafeAssign capabilities all have more closely integrated library information resources with the academic curriculum. The Archives at CWU (See Standard 5) was established in 2004 to act as the repository for official and unofficial records that document the history of the university. The Archives also serves as a regional repository to house, preserve, and promote the unique cultural history of Central Washington. It may be used as a resource for scholars and a resource for classes in local history.

**Appraisal of 2.A**

Central Washington University is a well-established and stable institution, now in its 121st year. It successfully transitioned from a normal school to its current status as a comprehensive regional university. For the last five years, U.S. News and World Report has ranked CWU in the upper 40% of master’s degree granting institutions in the 11 western states. From 2001 to 2006, CWU’s enrollments grew at a higher rate than any other state public university. Still, small classes and close relationships between faculty and students provide a learning environment less like a public university and more like a small private university. This desire for an intimate learning environment is played out in classroom capacity. At the Ellensburg site, the median classroom capacity is 41.5 students, and 80 percent hold fewer than 60 students. At the three largest university centers – Des Moines, Lynnwood, and Yakima – the median capacities are 36.5, 41, and 34.5 respectively (Exhibit 2.E.23).

The university has highly stable and excellent programs of study at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and at centers throughout the state. The development of academic programs throughout the university historically has been based largely on individual or departmental initiatives rather than on a focused institutional mission. It has been difficult to promote focused program growth when state funding incentives and new scholarship inspire creative program proposals. The Spheres of Distinction initiative shaped more focused program growth. In 2008, the provost called for a strategic plan for the university centers to determine a rationale for focused growth and marketing. In the past, faculty and staff at university centers have felt that the revenue their work produces has not been matched by services and working environment. Newly constructed teaching facilities at the centers have eased these concerns.

Human resources are more than ample to carry out the university’s mission. Well-prepared faculty members interact with students in moderately-sized classes. A dedicated staff provides support and continuity of services. As the university grows into a mature union-administration dialogue, all parties seek harmonious outcomes. The university’s physical environment is very well suited to its mission at all sites and the university’s fiscal resources have been adequate, although the emerging global financial crisis has injected a note of
uncertainty about funding. The university's library and other information services are well integrated into educational programs at all sites.

The university community has become more aware of the mission of the university and its special strengths. In the future, the university needs to regularly re-examine its vision, mission, and goals to develop a coherent and more focused view, agree upon changes in emphasis, and share its orientation with new members of the community. The presidential initiative to recognize and fund programs in a few “spheres of distinction” gave tangible emphasis to the university’s unique strengths.

Curriculum development procedures are all products of the faculty and thoroughly institutionalized in administrative processes. These procedures have been transferred to electronic formats and are available on the web. Past accrediting reviews have noted that CWU has a relatively large number of academic majors and specializations. In the last decade, the number of new majors has roughly equaled the number of deleted majors. This trend or one of selective pruning of programs should be pursued in the future. There are occasional faculty complaints about the timing of curriculum deadlines but they accommodate an orderly curriculum review and catalog production process. The review process is sufficiently labor intensive to make ill-considered change difficult. Three additional factors will alter Central’s degree programs in the near future: a new president will bring initiatives for improvement, the global economic recession will compel changes in ways that are difficult to predict at this time, and enrollment growth probably will present a new level of needs for academic programs, faculty size, physical resources, and academic administrative support.

**Standard 2.B – Educational Program Planning and Assessment**

**Historical Perspective**

Central Washington University has a fundamental commitment to the effectiveness of its educational programs. Prior to the 1980s, deans and the university Program Review and Evaluation Committee reviewed educational programs to confirm their quality. These reviews focused primarily on program inputs and varied in content, style, and rigor. By the late 1980s, the university, legislature, and accrediting bodies began to promote outcomes-based assessment. The HECB began to monitor the quality of public undergraduate programs in 1985. In 1987 the first HECB master plan required each institution to submit an assessment report. The current HECB master plan, *Moving the Blue Arrow* (Exhibit 2.E.24) continues to focus on assessing progress toward master plan goals.

In 1989, the university adopted its first explicit assessment plan and appointed an administrator to oversee the assessment program. The title, job description, and supervision of the position have changed several times since then. The Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies (AVPUS) now is responsible for coordinating the academic assessment program of the university.
In the mid-1990s, the university paused in its assessment efforts while the state legislature and HECB reconsidered their assessment standards. The 1999 NASC (now NWCCU) review rightly pointed out that the university’s assessment efforts were in the doldrums and called for a reenergized assessment program. There was a pause as the university digested NASC’s recommendations and a new president and upper administration contemplated productive change in many areas, including assessment. In 2007, the University Assessment Committee narrowed its focus and became the Academic Assessment Committee, a 17-member committee of faculty and administrators that advises the AVPUS regarding educational assessment. Its mission, values, goals, and membership may be found in Exhibit 2.E.25. Assessment of other university programs (e.g., business office, student affairs, facilities management, etc.) passed into the hands of an ad hoc University Assessment Committee and is currently overseen by the President’s Cabinet.

The 2004 interim report to NWCCU documented the university’s progress toward the regular cycles of outcomes-oriented assessment that mark its current practices. Formulating a comprehensive educational assessment plan and establishing regular and informative cycles of program review have been two principal lines of progress. In both of these efforts, standards were devised that stress functional goals, gathering relevant evidence, and modifying programs in response to assessments.

Developmental work on a comprehensive educational assessment plan was marked by a series of assessment matrices reported to the NWCCU. The most recent version was the 2005 Assessment Matrix (Exhibit 2.E.26). The matrices have been superseded by a comprehensive Educational Assessment Plan (2009; Exhibit 2.E.27), described below. Five-year comprehensive program review cycles began in 2002. In 2007–2008, the university added yearly department and program assessment reports that focus on assessing progress toward student learning goals. College-level academic assessment goals were developed in 2008–2009.

**Current Situation**

The encompassing rationale for all university assessment plans, including its educational assessment plan, is to provide a basis for continuous improvement of academic programs. The most prominent component of the academic assessment regimen is how student learning goals are set and accomplished. The 2007–2008 Student Learning Academic Assessment Report (Exhibit 2.E.20) is a very inclusive summary of recent learning assessment results. Departmental program review documents, college self-studies, divisional reports, and the following topical discussions provide substantial evidence that the university’s assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning (2.B.3). The assessment report website provides a gateway to much of the university’s educational assessment evidence.

The university has focused its recent assessment efforts at the department, college, and university levels. The CWU Educational Assessment Plan (Exhibit 2.E.27), completed in 2009, provides a general overview of measures of educational assessment and their relations to the university and academic affairs strategic plans. Assessment of student learning outcomes provides the central focus of the plan. Measures are grouped into the following categories:

- Measures Related to Admission, Placement, and Mentoring
- Review of Program, Department, College, Division, and Institutional Goals
- Assessment of Student Learning

**Standard 2 – 56**
• Persistence, Graduation, and Follow Up
• Perceptions of Students, Alumni, and Employers

Brief discussions of these and selected other academic assessments at the department, college, and university levels follow.

Department Level Assessment. The successes of a comprehensive assessment regimen demonstrate a robust commitment to continuous improvement at the department level. Systematic assessment of student learning goals and other academic program goals take the form of course-based assessment, program outcome assessment, entry-to-program and end-of-program assessments, and comprehensive program review self studies on five-year and one-year cycles. Each of these efforts is described below.

Courses. Learning goals and assessments for every course in the CWU curriculum are available in the provost’s office and in course syllabi. New or revised goals are submitted when courses are created or changed. Curriculum forms (Exhibit 2.E.16) give guidance about writing effective goals and assessments. Course grades reflect student performance and guide future content and pedagogy.

Program Outcomes. The faculty plays a central role in designing the manner in which their programs would be evaluated (2.B.1). All programs publish their program goals and student learning outcomes, preferably in the form of a student handbook, either in print or online (2.B.2). The faculty of each program creates its own program and student performance objectives and reports them in a matrix format its cyclical program review, in its yearly assessment report, and in its NWCCU self-study. Program mission statements are published in the university catalog and are augmented with learner outcomes, assessment requirements, and essential advising information on department websites, in department offices, on syllabi, and in student handbooks. Traditional printed student handbooks are rapidly being replaced by online resources. These materials are included in departmental binders in the exhibit room.

The university has funded many program assessment development activities, including faculty development consultants, participation in regional and national assessment conferences, training grants, and department assessment retreats. The theme of the 2007 Faculty Development Day was “Assessment and Continuous Improvement: Information You Can Use.” Faculty attended a general orientation session and attended small group work sessions on program assessment.

In 2007–2008 departments and interdisciplinary programs began to submit yearly reports of program learning goals, assessment methods, and recent data in their Assessment of Student Learning Department and Program Report. Exhibit 2.E.28 provides the template for the report, the 2007–2008 executive summary of findings, and completed undergraduate and graduate examples from the Psychology Department. Each report is reviewed by the program’s faculty and the dean.

In 2007–2008, 86 of 115 programs submitted reports, submitting data on 308 program outcomes. The AVPUS and members of the Academic Assessment Committee rated elements of each report from 0 to 4 using a performance rubric with indicators ranging from unacceptable to research-supported “best practices” in assessment. A target score of 2 was
used for this first year of implementation, with the intention of increasing target scores as departments and programs improve their understanding and application of assessment practices. University-wide results of outcomes assessed (mean rating = 2.64 out of 4), assessment methods (2.20 out of 4), assessment results (2.78 out of 4), and how the department plans to improve (1.09 out of 2) or has improved (1.73 out of 2) its program indicate proficiency in identifying learning targets, appropriate use of methods to measure achievement of learning outcomes, and analysis of results. Even though 85% of the reports provided documentation of pedagogical and/or curricular change as a result of their assessment findings, more work is needed to help programs learn to make programmatic decisions based on collected data. Exhibit 2.E.20 shows these ratings by program and college.

Entry-to-Program and End-of-Program Assessment. All programs carry out assessments of entering and exiting students. These measures are independent of course grades. Exhibit 2.E.29 and Exhibit 2.E.30 show the entry-to-program assessment methods of each undergraduate and graduate program. Exhibit 2.E.31 and Exhibit 2.E.32 show the end-of-major assessment methods of each undergraduate and graduate program. Table 2.7 shows the number of programs using various entry-to-major and end-of-major assessment methods.

All programs use an entry assessment to guide student advising. Some departments also use these data to plan course offerings or reflect upon program goals. Some programs use entry assessments to judge whether a student has the skills to succeed in the major. For example, the WEST-B examination is required before admission to the teacher education program. Few programs use entry assessments of knowledge and skills for later comparison to exiting abilities.

The Mathematics, Communication, Theatre Arts, and Family and Consumer Science departments have entry orientation courses to help the student begin an assessment portfolio, give preliminary career orientation, and assess entering skills for guidance and comparison to exiting skills. Some graduate programs have formal entry assessment and professional orientation classes, for example, PSY 503, Proseminar in School Counseling, or a survey course that establishes a mentoring relationship for assessment and guidance.

In 1993 the university mandated end-of-program assessment and formal reports. Departments have adopted assessments most appropriate to their goals and disciplines. An increasing number of departments conduct end-of-program assessments in a capstone course for majors. A list of 43 of these courses and representative syllabi are presented in Exhibit 2.E.33. End-of-program assessment results and consequent program changes are reported in each department's yearly assessment report and 5-year program review self-study.
Table 2.7 Frequency of Use of Entry-to-Major and End-of-Major Assessment Methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry-to-Program Assessment, 2008-2009</th>
<th>Undergrad Programs</th>
<th>Grad Programs</th>
<th>End-of-Program Assessment, 2008-2009</th>
<th>Undergrad Programs</th>
<th>Grad Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Portfolio Review</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Statement</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Test Scores</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Standardized or Competency Exit Exam</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in entry-level classes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Department Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency test in entry-level class</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Licensing or Certification Examination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA at time of application</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Self Evaluation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with advisor</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Senior Thesis or Project</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Master’s Thesis or Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway courses or transcripts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Senior Performance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Exam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Master’s Performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio or Performance Audition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Exit Interview, Focus Group, or Essay</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement: Test Scores</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement: Entry-level classes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Professional Board Interview</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Capstone Course</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Programs</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>GPA Requirement</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Survey</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni Survey</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Placement Record</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer Feedback</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Review.** Program review is an opportunity for departmental conversations and reflection on progress toward goals. *Individual program reviews provide evidence that assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning and this evidence is reported in the college self-studies that accompany this standard (2.B.3).* The completed review is evaluated by the dean, provost, and an external examiner, usually the chair of a comparable program at a peer institution. Program reviews have been an effective means of establishing a culture of assessment at the university and connecting department, college, and institutional processes for planning, assessment, and budgeting.

The HECB requires a review of each educational program of the university at least every ten years, including departmental reflection and justification, a review of outcome data, and external review by a disciplinary expert. The university’s program review process includes these elements and operates on a five-year cycle. Department goals include but extend beyond student learning to include faculty and staff hiring, equipment purchases, diversity, scholarship, specialized accreditation, and the like. The 2006–2012 Academic Affairs Strategic Plan (Exhibit 2.E.11) endorses the program review regimen and calls for its results to be used for planning purposes. In their program review self-studies and in the program self-studies prepared for part of this self-study, departments report the educational goals and assessment strategies for each program, and reflect on the coherence and currency of the program and achievement of program goals. These documents are posted online and are available for inspection in the departmental binders in the exhibit room.

Beginning with four departments in 2002–2003, all departments completed program reviews by 2007–2008 and a second cycle began. Interdisciplinary programs were added to the process in 2005–2006. The entire review schedule appears in Exhibit 2.E.34. Each program completes a self-study guided by a program review self-study form (Exhibit 2.E.14) that
requires evidence and reflection on a number of attributes. The five-year self-studies, external reviews, dean’s summaries, executive summaries, and reports of actions taken for all past program reviews may be found, by college, on the assessment report website and in the departmental binders. In 2007–2008, the university inaugurated additional yearly department/program assessment reports of progress toward student learning goals.

**College Level Assessment.** Because department and program learning goals link to college and university goals, each college has prepared an academic assessment matrix that complements the assessment matrixes of its departments. At the college level, academic goals are more general and express aspirations for accomplishment summed over departments. Exhibit 2.E.35 presents the four college academic assessment matrixes and their assessment reports for 2008-2009.

**University Level Assessment.** In concert with the faculty, department chairs, and deans, the Division of Academic Affairs creates the reporting structures for department and college level assessment programs and compiles, evaluates, and disseminates their findings. These assessments are linked to elements of the 2006–2012 Academic Affairs Strategic Plan and the 2009 assessment of progress toward its goals (Exhibit 2.E.11). The strategic plan and outcomes assessment include elements related directly to student learning and extends to include areas indirectly related, such as faculty and staff hiring and professional development, curriculum and program development, diversity, scholarship, enrollment management, and specialized accreditation goals.

In addition to department and college academic assessment routines, the university collects, analyzes, and distributes data from the following assessments, linked to university-level strategic goals:

**Assessment of Entering Students.** The admissions index, COMPASS, and College Student Inventory help to determine the academic path and advising services of entering freshman students. These assessments are linked to the academic affairs strategic goals for a student-centered learning environment, to address student diversity, and enhance academic student support services. See Standard 2.C for further description of academic student support services.

The Admissions Index (AI) is a combination of SAT or ACT scores and high school grade point average (GPA) used by all Washington state public institutions. The AI assesses skill levels of first-time entering students and directs them to regular or remedial English and mathematics classes. An AI of 28 predicts an 80% likelihood of a university GPA of 2.0 or higher. The average AI of CWU’s entering freshman class is about 40. CWU’s typical pattern of SAT and ACT scores (Exhibit 2.E.36) places its incoming students close to national averages, below the average for Washington state high school graduates, and below that of the other four-year public institutions in the state.

The university understands the challenges posed by its student ability profile and takes pride in serving students from backgrounds lacking a strong college-bound orientation. The university devoted the 2002 Fall Faculty Conference to teaching, advising, and counseling strategies for students. See Exhibit 2.E.37 for the conference agenda and data packet.
The ACT COMPASS test is used to place entering students with intermediate SAT scores into appropriate English and mathematics courses. In 2007–2008, 41 percent of the entering class took the COMPASS test for English placement; 40 percent took the COMPASS tests for math. Of those, the COMPASS scores of 48 percent resulted in remedial English placement and 56 percent resulted in remedial math placement. A 2006 study of three years of COMPASS evidence (Exhibit 2.E.38) concluded that the COMPASS is an effective placement tool, resulting in improved student learning.

The CSI is administered to the university’s first-year students. This survey yields 20 predictive indicators such as dropout proneness and poor study habits. These data primarily are used as flags for early intervention by the Student Engagement Retention Team (SERT). SERT’s membership and intervention strategies are described in greater detail in Standard 3.

CSI data summaries for 2003–2008 may be found in Exhibit 2.E.39. The 1147 students taking the 2008 CSI were close to national averages on most items. CWU female students reported somewhat less anticipated academic difficulty and male students reported somewhat lower study habits, much lower desire to finish college, and somewhat higher receptivity to financial guidance.

General Education (GE) Assessment. The GE assessment program is described in Standard 2.C, below. It is linked to the strategic plan objective to “advance challenging and innovative academic programs that prepare students for their personal and professional lives and for lifelong learning” by strengthening general education.

Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI). Student evaluation of instruction promotes the strategic goal that advances scholarship and creative activity and the goal to support and reward the professional growth of the faculty. CWU’s first campus-wide Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) form was adopted in the 1970s. The current format was created in 1994 by a faculty committee that reviewed the scholarly literature and peer institution practices. Ad hoc committees have modified the SEOI in succeeding years. Exhibit 2.E.40 presents the 2005 and 2009 committee reports, including a proposed new form that was pilot tested in spring 2009. The current SEOI consists of 29 five-point Likert-format instructor ratings, two open-ended ratings, and four informational items about the student. Exhibit 2.E.41 presents the SEOI forms for five different types of instruction: lecture/discussion, seminar, skill acquisition, lab, and visual/performing arts. A new form for online courses is being created.

Students anonymously complete an SEOI in nearly every course. Results are returned to the instructor and department chair the following quarter unless the class is too small to assure student anonymity. Aggregated 2004–2008 SEOI data is reported in Exhibit 2.E.42 and by college in Exhibit 2.E.43. Figure 2.3 shows the consistently high ratings of “the course as a whole” and “the instructor’s teaching effectiveness,” averaged over more than 20,000 SEOIs per quarter. The primary use of the SEOI is to inform instructors and their mentors about their teaching effectiveness. Departments and colleges use aggregated SEOIs to track student response to programs. Faculty are required to submit SEOI data with their annual workload reports. In
2008 a faculty committee proposed that a self-evaluation of instruction (Exhibit 2.E.44) accompany workload reports.

**Freshman, Senior, and Alumni Opinion Surveys.** Student, alumni, and employer attitude surveys are linked to the academic affairs strategic goals to improve advising, to improve the quality of data about graduates, and to retain students who will benefit from the CWU experience.

Until 2000, first-year students and graduating seniors completed the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) survey. In 2000, the university moved with prevailing national practices to adopt the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) as its measure of student satisfaction. The principal dimensions of the NSSE are level of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, enriching educational experiences, student-faculty interaction, and supportive campus environment. Exhibit 2.E.45 summarizes the results of the freshman and senior NSSE surveys since 2001. CWU’s freshman and senior NSSE ratings are very close to, but usually slightly below, national peer norms on nearly every measure. Measures of effect size show that none of these differences approach a level of practical significance. There has been very little change in this pattern over the years.

CWU also conducts its own survey of graduating seniors every year. The return rate of the 2008 survey was a respectable 48% (n=1,114) and the overall results reflect a very positive appraisal of the university. The more important an area was deemed to be, the higher were its positive ratings. Parking is an exception to this picture, despite a higher ratio of parking spaces to students than any other state four-year institution. Eighty-two percent rated their overall education at CWU as excellent or good and 75 percent said they would attend CWU if they had it to do over again. Exhibit 2.E.46 presents the results of senior surveys from 1999–2008, including a report of general education program ratings.

Every two years, CWU conducts a survey of alumni who graduated one year previously and five years previously. The most recent survey was completed in 2006. Table 2.8 shows the percentage of alumni rating selected items in the most favorable two (of five) categories. Detailed ratings for several recent alumni surveys are in Exhibit 2.E.47, including alumni ratings of the general education program. In 2008 the offices of Institutional Research and Career Services collaborated to replace two alumni surveys with a single instrument to be continuously administered via the Internet. In alumni mailings, one-year and five-year graduates will be urged to respond to the survey. The first administration is scheduled for summer 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.8 2006 Alumni Survey: Selected Means</th>
<th>2001 Graduates</th>
<th>2005 Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall education</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs for intellectual growth</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs for personal growth</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs for career training</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2008 an alumni survey was created for each department undergoing program review. It consists of a core of common items related to university-level goals and items contributed by each alumnus’s major department. Alumni of the most recent 5 years are contacted by email and regular mail. An example of one of these surveys (Psychology Department) and 2008 university-level item results may be seen in Exhibit 2.E.48. The overall results are very positive (Figure 2.4)
but there are two issues that the university could discuss. First, alumni place a high value on communications skills but this area is not part of the current general education program. Second, when asked how well the university accomplished its general education and university mission goals, cultivating "stewardship of the earth" was rated noticeably lower than the other eight areas.

Standard 3.D.11 of this self-study describes placement evidence and university surveys of employers who hire CWU’s graduates. Placement information for professional education graduates is reported in Standard 2.A, above. Many departments and programs, especially those that lead to specific professions or those with state licensure or professional association accreditation requirements, maintain close ties with employers and conduct surveys of student qualities. The college self-studies that follow and each department’s program review and NWCCU self-study, found in the department binders, cite relevant employer surveys.

Specialized Accreditation. Several programs are independently reviewed by professional organizations in very thorough assessments. Because they usually are very comprehensive reviews, specialized accreditation assessments are linked to many academic affairs strategic plan goals for program improvement. A full list of programs, accreditation dates, and other details is provided in Exhibit 2.E.15.

CWU's teacher preparation program is fundamental to the university's traditional mission. Its specialized accreditation process is described in Standard 2.A, above. In addition, CWU has applied for Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business – The International Association for Management Education (AACSB) initial accreditation in 1994, 1998, and 2004. Each effort highlighted areas of strength and those needing improvement. CWU currently participates in an AACSB developmental program to move its program forward in critical areas of faculty salary, faculty qualifications, and faculty scholarship. A complete self-study will be completed in December 2009 and a site visit is anticipated in spring 2010.

**Appraisal of 2.B**

The university has developed many strong academic assessment routines and is making steady progress on others. The five-year cyclical program reviews and the new yearly departmental assessment reports all testify to these accomplishments. Procedures for course-level and department-level assessment plans, results, and applications are well developed and reflect a growing commitment to regular assessment and reflection. They follow uniform reporting templates, as did the 2008 self-studies completed for this accreditation review (Exhibit 2.E.49). The Assessment Committee, the AVPUS, the Director of General Education, and Director of Testing and Assessment have built an annual assessment report from many sources of evidence. Assessments at each level, beginning with student learning goals of individual courses, are linked to the academic goals of each higher level. All college self-studies include assessment summaries, sometimes with reflective analyses that match goals, assessments, and program actions.

The departmental program review regimen is in its second cycle and is yielding some of its anticipated benefits: There is greater awareness and acceptance of assessment routines, and program improvements are emerging. Including an external examiner has enhanced the validity of these reviews. Input from faculty members and department chairs will continue to
shape the process. For example, some department chairs have expressed an interest in being included in the exit interview with the external reviewer.

The university has been implementing elements of educational program assessment spelled out in the Educational Assessment Plan (Exhibit 2.E.27). Plans for the near future are to conduct a thoughtful analysis of each element of the plan to ensure that, as a group, they achieve the institution’s assessment goals and that results articulate more evenly across academic programs and procedures. The university will continue to develop college-level and university-level evidence to reflect on goals and assessments at those levels, and make assessment evidence more readily available by embedding academic data-gathering routines into the everyday academic business of the university. The Information Technology Services department is working closely with several groups on campus, including the AVPUS, to identify and review academic assessment software packages that could reduce duplication of data reporting, increase access to data, and increase the ability to quickly aggregate results and make timely decisions.

More limited paths for future consideration include:

• Comparison of entry-to-major and end-of-major assessment routines could be explored for opportunities to demonstrate “value added” evidence of increased student knowledge and skills.

• Course-level and department-level regimens for undergraduate majors are the best developed levels of academic assessment in the university. As the program review process matures, graduate program reporting will become as thorough as that of undergraduate programs.

• Different assessment measures are employed by different departments, so their findings do not easily lend themselves to college-wide or university-wide summaries. Some common criteria could be helpful. The Assessment of Student Learning Department and Program Report (Exhibit 2.E.28) is an example of a university-wide core of assessment criteria that still permits departments to choose their own assessment methods.

**Standard 2.C – Undergraduate Program**

**General Education**

**Historical Perspective**

For the last four decades, the structure and rationale of the CWU GE program have been remarkably stable. Beneath this calm exterior faculty groups have been actively seeking better ways to express the ideals of a university GE program, consistent with the 2006–2012 Academic Affairs Strategic Plan (Exhibit 2.E.11) and NWCCU Policy 2.1. Their efforts resulted in a new GE framework (Exhibit 2.E.50), still evolving but accepted in principle by the Faculty Senate in May 2008. Exhibit 2.E.51 describes in detail six stages of GE program development over the past eight years. Each stage was accompanied by assessments that guided the next stage. The university community sought to increase the program’s coherence, to build faculty ownership and accountability, to respond to changes in community college curricula, and to incorporate recent scholarship on effective programs.
The first stage of change involved collecting evidence through a faculty survey to acknowledge its assumptions about students, their abilities, and their needs. The 2002 Faculty Survey results, comments, and actions taken appear in Exhibit 2.E.52.

The second stage began with a faculty GE survey and SWOT analysis of CWU’s values and environment (Exhibit 2.E.53), leading to a 2004 Faculty Institute on General Education. Attendees recognized that CWU is home to an intellectually lively and well prepared faculty with diverse cultural and vocational backgrounds, and that GE faculty development opportunities are valuable. They noted that GE improvements were needed and that the current administration supported GE change. Participants agreed that GE reform faced several challenges: Not all faculty members agree with the need for GE revision, GE courses and GE faculty receive too little respect, and increases in GE enrollment may not be accompanied by increases in space and funding. In 2005 these findings were described in a comprehensive white paper entitled State of the Program: General Education at CWU (Exhibit 2.E.54).

Integrative learning, an existing component of the university mission, emerged as an effective core strategy for GE reform. A campus representative attended an Association of American Colleges and Universities colloquium to learn how integrative learning can support and assess GE goals such as critical thinking, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, writing, and diversity awareness. The attendee’s report (Exhibit 2.E.55) endorsed an integrative learning approach to GE reform and noted aspects of the CWU environment that may facilitate or hamper the expansion of integrative learning.

In the third stage of reform, the Faculty Senate General Education Committee and the Academic Assessment Committee related GE to the campus mission and vision, identified student skills levels and primary needs, and examined models from peer institutions. The General Education Committee worked on a proposal that incorporated student assessment data to strengthen elements of learning strategies, cultural competence, and multidisciplinary problem-solving. The Assessment Committee refined rubrics for critical thinking, written expression, and quantitative and information literacy. Both committees consulted student perceptions of the GE program (Exhibit 2.E.54, Section VII). GE proposals in 2006 and 2007 reflected the same cross-disciplinary, integrated decision-making that they were advocating for students.

The fourth stage was marked by hiring a half-time Coordinator of General Education in October 2007. The coordinator works with the Faculty Senate’s General Education Committee, the Assessment Committee, and the AVPUS. The GE committee created a framework that promotes coherence, clarity, and strategic planning. It articulated a rationale for each breadth area. The coordinator identified remaining barriers to reform and reviewed all GE course syllabi to relate courses to the new framework.

The resulting 2008 GE Program Reform Proposal (Exhibit 2.E.50) presented a revised mission and established learning outcomes that align with specific course requirements. It established authority for continuous planning and assessment. Among its new features was a course requirement that focuses on the interrelationships between major fields of study (2.C.3). The fifth stage of GE reform, articulating and adopting outcomes, occurred progressively over the 2008–2009 academic year. Stage six—framing and approving an institutional plan for transitioning to the new framework—is in progress. A plan articulated by
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the General Education Committee and based on data related to past enrollments has been posted publically on an internet Wiki for discussion by all members of the campus community (Exhibit 2.E.56). A final version of the implementation plan is expected by December 2010. The evolution of the GE reform proposal testifies to the influence of reflective assessment on the core curriculum at CWU.

**Current Situation**

**Program Description.** The current GE program and the evolving reform proposal both reflect a fundamental commitment to the development of basic skills and a comprehensive introduction to the liberal arts and sciences. The university requires a component of general education for all its degree programs. The requirements are published in the university catalog (Exhibit GE.2) in clear and complete terms (2.C.1). GE requirements can be completed by taking CWU GE courses, transferring approved degrees or courses from other institutions, or completing the CWU Douglas Honors College curriculum. In any year, about half of the university’s graduating seniors (51.3% in 2008) completed its GE requirements by transferring an approved associate of arts degree from a community college.

The current GE program at Central Washington University (Exhibit 2.E.57) is divided into two structural and functional units: a basic skills unit and a breadth unit. The basic skills unit stresses competence in (a) written and oral communication, (b) quantitative reasoning, (c) critical analysis and logical thinking, and (d) literacy in the discourse or technology appropriate to the program of study (2.C). Over the years, the concept of basic skills has expanded from writing and mathematics to include speaking, critical thinking, and information technology literacy.

The breadth unit includes the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, mathematics, and the social sciences (2.C.3). Students are required to take three courses each from arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and natural sciences. Each of those groups is divided into three thematic subgroups from which students are required to take one course. Subgroups within the arts and humanities and social and behavioral sciences foster an awareness of cultural diversity. Other goals for the program emphasize that “students will become thoughtful and responsible members of society and stewards of the Earth,” and that students “will respect diversity of background, experience, and belief, and will value the different perspectives that this diversity brings.” These latter two goals, in particular, have resisted clear expression in the course options.

In a move to strengthen writing skills, since 2003–2004 students have been required to take at least four breadth courses in which at least 7 pages of assigned writing is assessed for content and mechanics (grammar, spelling, punctuation, and organization).

For several years, the curriculum forms for GE courses (Exhibit 2.E.16) have ensured that new or changed courses are linked to GE program goals and that essential GE learning strategies will be practiced and assessed. College strategic plans and the university’s graduation policies include references to GE expectations, demonstrating that a substantial core of general education instruction is regarded as an essential component of all baccalaureate degree programs (2.C).
The general education program is based on a rationale that is clearly articulated and is published in clear and complete terms in the catalog (2.C.2). This rationale is subject to periodic reconsideration in the light of desirable student learning outcomes and contemporary scholarship. A comparison of the goals of the current (2003–2009) GE program and the newly adopted GE proposal illustrate this point.

### 2003-2009 General Education Program Goals

1. Students will become thoughtful and responsible members of society and stewards of the Earth.
2. Students will respect diversity of background, experience and belief, and will value the different perspectives that this diversity brings.
3. Students will achieve fluency in reading, writing, oral communication and information technology.
4. Students will master the basic principles of logical, mathematical and scientific reasoning.
5. Students will develop an appreciation of the breadth and depth of scientific and humanistic knowledge.
6. Students will develop a sense of the interconnectedness of knowledge.
7. Students will integrate knowledge from diverse fields of study in order to solve real-world problems.
8. Students will become aware of the manifold ways that knowledge evolves.
9. Students will develop a disposition to ask incisive and insightful questions.

### Newly Adopted General Education Program Goals

1. to practice and apply the essential skills required to lead enlightened and productive lives;
2. to observe and reason scientifically about the natural world;
3. to understand and apply principles of social and behavioral dynamics;
4. to appreciate and give expression to beauty and truth through the arts;
5. to analyze and critique historical and contemporary accounts of human experience;
6. to develop knowledge and skills necessary to be reflective, active participants in a changing, multicultural, intercultural world;
7. to observe the interconnectedness of knowledge by employing multiple modes of inquiry across disciplines to address issues and solve problems.

Discussions of the GE program are open to the university community and available on the web in the form of committee minutes and reports posted on the Faculty Senate site and the General Education site. When discussions of the GE program result in changes in degree requirements, the university publishes new criteria by which the relevance of each course to the general education component is evaluated and each goal is accompanied by a clear, short statement of rationale which will become a required component of all GE syllabi (2.C.2).

**Governance.** Consistent with NWCCU Policy 2.1, the faculty, the administration, and the Board of Trustees collaborate to plan and execute the GE program. The Board of Trustees affirms the importance of GE in the mission and goals statements of the university (Exhibit GE.1). It appropriately delegates the conceptualization and specific content of the program to the faculty. Administrators provide oversight and resources to ensure that the curriculum is implemented as designed.

Some other universities have created a separate administrative unit, sometimes named the “University College,” to deliver the GE curriculum or have narrowed their GE program to the essential learning skills, without breadth content. Central’s preference, better suited to its mission and vision, is to engage cross-disciplinary planning because it affirms the connection between GE and the disciplinary skills of academic majors. The multi-disciplinary General Education Committee is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate and is described in Standard 2.A, above. The committee reviews and recommends GE programs and policies in close cooperation with the AVPUS and the college deans, primarily the deans of the College of Arts and Humanities and the College of the Sciences.

The Office of the Registrar ensures that students meet the GE requirements for graduation. It maintains transfer agreements that meet CWU’s GE requirements (See “Transfer Credits,” below) and it works with academic departments to establish course equivalencies (Exhibit
Electronic degree audits have streamlined this effort.

In the GE proposal of 2008, the faculty sought to create stronger program coherence without losing the potential for serendipitous discovery in the wide variety of current GE courses. For the next three years, the university will make as smooth a transition as is possible from a course-based program to the new outcomes-based framework.

Other GE Initiatives. The work of the General Education Committee has been augmented by two types of other noteworthy initiatives:

Faculty Research Initiatives. Over time, faculty research has focused on teaching methods applicable to the GE program. The presentations, publications, and faculty development workshops credited to CWU faculty (Exhibit 2.E.59) are evidence of its commitment to the Boyer Model of the Teacher-Scholar.

Administration-Supported Initiatives. Spheres of Distinction grants have funded the development of integrative courses such as “Black Performative Culture” which ties studies in African and American history, diasporic perspectives, and literature with writing. In 2008–2009, the university created the Center for the Teacher-Scholar to support and enhance faculty development in scholarship, teaching, and service (Exhibit 2.E.60). In 2008, the College of Arts and Humanities and the Office of Student Affairs funded a faculty institute on integrated learning. Finally, CWU faculty have created new GE options at the 300 level that can be offered as distance education, online, or multimodal courses, primarily for students at CWU centers. Examples include ENG 347, “Global Perspectives in Literature,” PHIL 306, “Environmental Ethics,” and COM 302, “Intercultural Communication.”

Innovations and Alternate Avenues to Achieving General Education Expectations. Several programs pursue the university’s general education goals in alternate or innovative ways. Each is briefly described here, with more complete details available in Exhibit 2.E.61 and the discussion of the First Year Experience program in Standard 3.B.

Living/Learning Communities (LLC). Students in LLCs share a living space, take a common set of courses—usually a combination of GE courses aligned with the theme of the LLC—and benefit from living-site advising and extracurricular activities. Among the current LLC themes are Aviation, Casa Latina, Education, International House, Music, and the Douglas Honors College. Also see Standard 3.D.

One Book, One Campus. The One Book, One Campus program encourages students, faculty, staff, and administrators to read the same book and to discuss its meaning throughout the year, especially in GE classes. It is a required reading for all first-year students during freshman orientation. The 2008–2009 selection was This I Believe, a collection of essays on personal values.

Transferring a Degree. Students may transfer coursework from other accredited institutions to meet all or part of the university’s GE requirements. Direct Transfer Agreements (DTA) with state community colleges assure transfer students that their Associate of Arts degrees satisfy CWU’s GE requirements.
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The William O. Douglas Honors College. The Douglas Honors College (DHC) is CWU's enriched general studies program for talented students. The mission statement of the Douglas Honors College and senior thesis titles (Exhibit 2.E.62) impart the flavor of this program. For its first 30 years the DHC curriculum was centered on a four-year course of reading, discussing, and writing about the world’s great books. In 2008 a new interdisciplinary DHC curriculum with lower-division and upper-division tiers was adopted to make it accessible to more students. The new DHC curriculum was presented to the campus in an online webinar (See Exhibit 2.E.63). The lower division interdisciplinary courses were created in 2008–2009 and the new curriculum will be phased in, beginning in fall 2009.

The Science Honors Program. The Science Honors program is a two-year program that provides talented undergraduate science students an opportunity to conduct meaningful research in collaboration with CWU faculty. The Science Honors experience culminates in a written honors thesis and an oral presentation to the CWU community at SOURCE, Central’s annual celebration of research and creative accomplishments. Exhibit 2.E.64 includes the program’s web site, a summary of the initial program proposal and subsequent grant reports, and the student investigators, faculty mentors, and titles of all honors projects since program inception.

General Education Assessment. CWU offers numerous routes to completing the general education program and serves a large number of transfer students. To yield the most effective course of study, the timing and selection of GE courses can vary by academic major. These factors are common to institutions such as Central and complicate GE assessment.

CWU is committed to two basic approaches to general education assessment. The first occurs as a component of department program reviews. Departments are responsible for aligning the content and student assessment standards of their GE courses with the GE framework, including its mission, goals, and outcomes. They are also responsible for gauging student GE basic skills at exit as a part of their senior assessments.

The second approach occurs at the institutional level. CWU is committed to identifying and implementing standard measures that provide not only pre-post data on basic skills but also comparison data with peer institutions. The following measures help to converge on a global assessment of the GE program.

Senior Surveys. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE; Exhibit 2.E.45) and CWU’s senior and alumni surveys (Exhibits 2.E.46 and 2.E.47) have informed changes to the GE program. NSSE items related to the GE experience between 2001 and 2007 suggest that the GE program is marginally, though consistently, less favorably rated than those of peer institutions. Figure 2.5 shows two examples that illustrate this trend.

Significant gains have been evident in responses regarding “analyzing quantitative problems,” and “using computing and information technology.” However, student ratings of “understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds” actually decreased over the survey period. These data have influenced the specifics of the new GE framework.

NSSE data and the senior survey agree on the need for increased attention to “speaking clearly and effectively.” Alumni surveys have found similar results. Alumni report being well prepared in thinking critically, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, and communication; however, students rate preparation in communication below its “critical”
importance in the workplace. The 2007–2008 Student Learning Academic Assessment Report (Exhibit 2.E.20) also notes this gap in the GE program.
Faculty Survey of GE Goals in GE Classes. A 2008 study (Exhibit 2.E.65) gauged the extent to which GE goals and essential skills are represented across the curriculum. The survey showed there are multiple opportunities for students to experience the methods and learn the matter of various disciplines; it also showed that faculty perceive greater attention to GE goals than those goals appear in their syllabi. This suggests a need for greater alignment of syllabi with GE goals and expectations.

Annual program reviews report how GE goals are integrated into major programs. For example, Psychology assesses logical reasoning, diverse perspectives, and communication. Computer Science lists analytical writing, oral communication, and information technology. Chemistry expectations include quantitative reasoning, and English specifies critical thinking, writing, and research methods.

Achievement Tests. The Washington Educator Skills Test–Basic (WEST-B) is required for admission to the teacher preparation programs in Washington state. The WEST-B is taken after students have finished most or all of their GE programs, so the WEST-B basic skills tests could be taken as GE assessments. More than 20% of all CWU graduates are education majors and their specialties span all colleges. CWU students pass the state criteria for reading (91 percent passing), writing (83 percent) and mathematics (91 percent) at very high rates, however, these rates all fall marginally below the averages of state public universities (96, 94, and 95 percent, respectively). These institutional differences in basic skills exist among entering students (Exhibit 2.E.36), so one could conclude that gains in basic skills are comparable across all public institutions.

Two other general skills examinations may be cited here. The Construction Management department administers a national certification exam to all seniors. CWU seniors traditionally exceed national averages on this exam, but were slightly below average in writing skills in 2007–2008. Finally, case study reports by students in MGT 489, Strategic Management were evaluated as part of a study funded by the Academic Assessment Committee. Two faculty members rated organization, style, depth/accuracy, and language. Average ratings fell in the middle of a four-point scale.

Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). The CLA is a nationally standardized test created and maintained by the Council on Assessment in Education and designed to measure critical
thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving, and written communication skills. In 2008–09, CWU utilized the Collegiate Learning Assessment, testing a sample group of 87 entering freshmen through their UNIV 101 course and a sample group of exiting seniors through their senior seminars. The scores of the freshman students (Exhibit 2.E.66) showed that their overall achievement level placed them at the 54th percentile of comparable institutions, but at the 85th percentile when each student’s CLA scores were adjusted for his or her academic aptitude, as measured by the SAT or ACT. A report on the senior performance is expected from CLA in August of 2009.

In addition, CWU sought and attained a participatory role in the National Science Foundation-supported Critical Thinking Assessment Test. In 2009–10, a pilot project utilizing this test will be conducted at CWU. Data from the CLA and the CAT will be combined with data from senior surveys, the National Survey of Student Engagement, and discipline-specific achievement tests to inform decisions related to General Education programming.

Transfer Credits

**Historical Perspective**

In the last ten years, manual evaluation of transfer credits has been replaced by automated processes that are monitored and updated by transfer articulation personnel in Registrar Services. Transfer evaluations are posted to each student’s degree progress report and made available online to the student and his or her advisor. The online degree progress report was inaugurated in 2003 and is commonly referred to as a CAPS (Central’s Academic Progress Report) report. Exhibit 2.E.67 presents a typical CAPS report for a student transferring with an AA-DTA degree. If a transfer student does not have an AA-DTA, CAPS will identify which GE, major/minor, and elective courses have been completed and which requirements still need to be fulfilled. DTA students are given priority admission status.

Three policy changes since 1999 have had the effect of liberalizing the award of transfer credits. First, in 2000, the university began a policy of accepting AA degrees from NWCCU-accredited institutions in lieu of CWU GE requirements. The list of qualifying institutions appears on the web and in Exhibit 2.E.68.

Second, CWU had a long-standing policy that prohibited applying community college transfer credits to CWU’s upper-division course requirements. In 2004, however, the state legislature mandated that students transferring lower-division credit from public community colleges must be treated the same as students transferring from public four-year institutions. In response, CWU now allows community college courses to satisfy upper-division CWU course requirements. This policy change may have misinterpreted the legislature’s intent and the university is now reviewing this decision. In May 2005, the legislature increased the number of transfer credits that may be applied to a bachelor’s degree from 90 to 105. These policy changes have opened access to advanced topics to the community colleges and reduced upper-division FTE enrollment.

Third, many science majors begin with extensive lower division course sequences, so AA transfer science majors can find themselves behind their peers when they arrive on a four-year campus. In 1999, the state authorized the Associate in Science (AS) degree to address this problem. Compared to the typical AA-DTA degree, the AS degree requires fewer credits in
communication, humanities, social sciences, foreign language, or cultural diversity. Thus, the
typical AS degree only partly satisfies CWU GE requirements. CWU has programmed all
Washington AS degrees into CAPS, so an AS transfer student can determine which GE and
major requirements remain to be completed.

**Current Situation**

Central Washington University has extensive, well-practiced, and successful experience with
students who transfer credits from other institutions. In 2007, 2,264 transfer students
applied for admission, 1,883 were admitted, and 1,124 enrolled. Historically, about two-thirds
of the university’s bachelor’s degrees (63.5% in 2008) are awarded to students who
transferred from another institution. In any year, about half of the university’s graduating
seniors (51.3% in 2008) completed an AA-DTA degree.

CWU accepts credits from regionally accredited colleges and universities provided the courses
are not remedial, developmental, or sectarian in nature. Undergraduate students may
transfer a maximum of 135 credits of which 105 may be earned from a community college;
graduate students may transfer up to nine credits toward a master’s degree. Some
transferable courses may apply only as elective credits. Thus, some students may exceed 180
credits in completing all graduation requirements.

Central Washington University complies with the best practices standards established in the
Transfer Credit Practices of Designated Educational Institutions 2006 (Exhibit 2.E.69),
compiled by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. CWU
is a member of the Washington Council for High School–College Relations and its Inter-
College Relations Commission, the statewide Inter-institutional Committee of Registrars and
Admissions Officers, and the Joint Access Oversight Group, formed in 2003 to consider
statewide transfer policies. CWU subscribes to the "Policy on Inter-College Transfer and
Articulation among Washington Public Colleges and Universities," published by the HECB.

*Central Washington University has transfer agreements with each Washington state
community college (2.C.4; Exhibit 2.E.70).* Admission policies, forms, and procedures for
transfer students are fully described on a system of web pages. General advice to transfer
applicants is noted in the CWU catalog and the reader is referred to the web for detailed
information. Personnel in the Admissions Office, Registrar Services, and Academic
Advisement Office specialize in evaluating transfer records and orienting transfer students to
CWU. The Admissions Policy Manual (Exhibit 2.E.71) guides admissions counselors when they
field questions from transfer students.

*The university's policies for the transfer and acceptance of credit are clearly articulated
(2.C.4).* The university's transfer policies and practices (Exhibit 2.E.72) are described in the
catalog, registration handbook, admission publications, the Course Equivalency Guide for
Washington Community and Technical College Transfer Students (Exhibit 2.E.58), and course
equivalency tables for public two-year and four-year institutions in Washington. This
information is made available in written publications and on the university’s transfer policy
web site. Transfer policies and equivalency sheets list the DTA degrees and courses that
routinely transfer for credit (Exhibit 2.E.70). Comprehensive sets are bound and distributed to
department offices, community colleges, and advisors. Finally, these lists are complemented
by a list of community college courses that will not transfer to CWU (Exhibit 2.E.73).
Consistent with NWCCU Policy 2.5, transfer credits are accepted on the basis of the quality of the originating institution, particularly its accreditation status, the comparability of the course to CWU’s offerings, and the relevance of the course to the receiving program. *Department chairs in coordination with Registrar Services ensure that the credits that are accepted are comparable to native credits* (2.C.4). Department chairs, usually in consultation with faculty specialists, can grant credit to individual students who document their work at an accredited institution.

CWU admissions advisors assist transfer students at an early stage in their academic programs. Admissions advisors are available at the residential campus and the university centers. They visit each state community college at least once a year to discuss transfer policies and demonstrate web resources. The CWU Transfer Guide (Exhibit 2.E.74) is available at these events.

In four of the most recent six years, CWU’s three-year graduation rate of AA-DTA students was higher than or equal to any other public university in the state. In 2007–2008, the rate was 78.9 percent, second only to the University of Washington. Recent state incentives to decrease the time to graduation have resulted in earlier outreach to community college students. The Transfer Academic Program Plan (TAPP, Exhibit 2.E.75) has been established to guide community college students into DTA degree paths that mate with CWU major programs, beginning with the majors offered at the university centers. The program will be expanded to link other community colleges to majors offered at the Ellensburg campus. Some departments at CWU have formal TAPP agreements; most are informal. TAPP plans will be particularly helpful for majors that exceed 90 credits, for example, industrial and engineering technology and teacher education.

Central Washington University provides an appeal process for students seeking an exception to transfer policies. Only a few students file appeals but the implementation of the BAS seems to have increased that number. CWU is in the process of studying these data. CWU does not give credit for experiential learning, but a credit by examination may be pursued for specific courses. Between 2005 and 2008, an average of 160 students earned credit by examination in 82 separate courses per year.

Credit is accepted from foreign institutions with which CWU has a bilateral or consortium agreement or when the institution has been reviewed and approved by the CWU OISP. Academic departments are consulted when appropriate. Foreign transcripts are reviewed by an international accrediting agency, and then articulated into CAPS. Beginning in 2006, Central has been accepting both grades and credits from foreign institutions.

**Student Advising**

**Historical Perspective**

Faculty, staff, and administration at Central Washington University recognize that effective academic advising is essential to a high quality academic program. Historically, faculty members have been the primary source of student advising, especially for their majors and minors. In recent decades, GE advising has shifted to a corps of professional advisors. In a reorganization of the university in 2000, the Academic Advising Center (AAC), with its GE
advising functions, moved from the Division of Enrollment Management to the Division of Academic Affairs, reporting to the provost.

The charges of the AAC have been to coordinate the academic advising and orientation course required of all beginning students (University 101), stage other orientation activities for beginning students, and advise students on a walk-in basis. UNIV 101 was taught by regular faculty members and staff members. These instructors provided GE advice for the students in their sections of UNIV 101. This arrangement was in place until 2008.

For about ten years before 2004, new freshmen were advised to take GE courses in prearranged “blocks.” Block registration paused in 2004 to adapt to on-line registration, then permanently discontinued when it was found that students preferred selecting individual courses.

Over the last decade, migration from paper records to electronic records and online resources has greatly facilitated the advising process. CAPS shows the student’s progress toward his or her declared major and allows the student and advisor to see the effects of a hypothetical change in major or minor. Diagnostic test scores, transfer evaluations, grades, catalog requirements, information from graduate schools and professional associations, and other advising materials are available online.
Current Situation

Central Washington University maintains effective academic advising programs to meet student needs for information and advice (2.C.5). The university’s primary advising services are organized under the provost’s office, with some special-needs advising administered by the division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. The Academic Advising Committee was established in 1999 to recommend advising policies and procedures. It has recently revised the university’s advising vision, mission, and goals (Exhibit 2.E.76). The committee also is responsible for the course content of UNIV 101, recommends activities and policies of the Academic Advising Center, and recommends guidelines for faculty academic advisors. The advising program is frequently revised to meet current needs and to incorporate advances in student personnel services scholarship and technology.

Pre-Major and General Education Advising. The AAC staff consists of eight year-long advisors, one 9-month advisor, and the director. This staff provides all the GE advising for the Seattle area centers, coordinates the UNIV 101 course, coordinates the Achiever Scholar and Running Start programs, helps coordinate new student orientations, teaches the college survival skills course (UNIV 102), and advises special needs students. The number of students served by the AAC has risen from 1248 in 2000 to 5827 in 2007. A 2007–2008 survey of advising center clients (Exhibit 2.E.77) showed that most (58%) student requests were for GE advising and removing an advising hold on registration. This pattern is consistent with the AAC’s mission. The overall quality of the advising center was rated “excellent” by 81% of those surveyed.

In fall 2008 the professional advisors of the AAC took over pre-major advising from UNIV 101 instructors. Assessment of the earlier model showed that those who taught UNIV 101 had very large advising loads, making faculty reluctant to teach UNIV 101, and not all UNIV 101 instructors stayed current with GE requirements. The new model is designed to make the advising of beginning students more consistent, to help students clarify their major and career goals earlier, to better prepare students for their major, and to connect freshmen to other services on campus.

Faculty members will continue to advise majors, and the UNIV 101 class will continue its university orientation curriculum (Exhibit 2.E.78). Student advising at the centers will remain primarily faculty-based with the support of onsite professional advisors in western Washington and a professional advisor based in Ellensburg for eastern Washington.

The new advising model was presented at a campus meeting and an interactive webinar in June 2008. The new model requires contacts with an advisor three to five times in an undergraduate career. A full description of the new structure may be found in Exhibit 2.E.79. An annual CWU Advising Handbook (Exhibit 2.E.80) was published until 2008–2009, when the UNIV 101 textbook, Academic Advising website, orientation meetings, and the AAC office became the sources for up-to-date materials.

Designated AAC staff members are trained to advise students with disabilities, non-traditional students, minority students, and academically at-risk students. Transfer students advised by faculty and staff at an orientation day every July and at shorter events during winter and spring breaks. Other offices provide advice for first-generation students (McNair Scholars), foreign students (OISP, UESL), students from migrant families (CAMP), disabled, first
generation, or low income students (SSS, WaTEP) and underprepared students (STAR). These programs are described below.

**Major Advising.** Academic departments and programs are responsible for advising their majors and minors. Students consult with advisors as soon as they are fairly confident of their choice of major or by the time they have completed 115 credits. Most transfer students begin working with major advisors immediately. Nearly all departments use their websites to supplement personal contact with documents, forms, links to professional associations, student association websites, and the like. Web support is especially helpful to time-bound and place-bound students.

Each department has described its system of departmental assistance and advising in Section 3A of its NWCCU self-study (Exhibit 2.E.49) and its student handbook or web site. Departments differ on how students are assigned to an advisor, how advising loads are distributed, and whether and how often advising is required. All departments require students to see an advisor before they are admitted to the major. Some departments have an advisement committee that proposes standards and prepares advising forms and documents. Formal major advisor training is rare and there is no university-wide orientation for faculty advisors. Department secretaries often handle routine student questions. The College of Business and the teacher training programs have professional pre-major advisors. After admission to the major, their students are assigned to a faculty advisor.

Major advising extends beyond course selection and meeting degree requirements. Advisors also assess student strengths and interests, guide and assess student portfolios, and provide information about careers and graduate study. Many departments incorporate these topics in a capstone course required of majors. Exhibit 2.E.33 lists the 43 current capstone courses, with representative syllabi.

**Programs of Developmental, Remedial, and Academic Support**

**Historical Perspective**

Many of the finest university students in the state of Washington attend Central Washington University. These highly accomplished students come from a wide range of personal histories and CWU is proud of its commitment to access for all qualified students. Since 2000, about 34% of the university's students have been first-generation college students. Regardless of background, some students require assistance to meet the intellectual and social challenges of university life. All CWU students are required to meet the same degree requirements and the university is committed to the success of students who enter with academic weaknesses. This section describes the university’s services for those who will succeed when missing or weak skills are strengthened.

At the time of the last full NWCCU review, academic skill development programs were conducted by the Academic Skills Program (ASP). ASP was replaced by the University Writing Center and University Math Center in 2002, providing a broader array of diagnostic and instructional services. ASP also provided an orientation to the university and college survival skills, now carried out by the University 101 and 102 courses described in the preceding section.
**Current Situation**

The need for academic skills development is diagnosed early in the CWU student’s career. All students must demonstrate proficiency in writing, reading, and computation prior to or during the first quarter of study at CWU. Developmental or remedial work is not required for admission, but students must correct deficits in reading or writing before enrolling in English composition and basic mathematics courses required in the GE program. Thus, **students are required to participate in assessment activities through which their levels of proficiency are determined** (2.C.6). These requirements are found the university catalog (Exhibit GE.2) and in the University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-9.4.40.1). Students with skill deficits are directed to appropriate developmental courses.

**Clear policies govern the procedures that are followed in the granting of credit for remedial and developmental work (2.C.6).** Remedial and developmental courses do not apply to a student’s grade point average or to the 180 credits required for the baccalaureate degree. The courses do apply toward financial aid eligibility and full-time status. These policies are explained in the university catalog.

Since 1997 the university has sought to prevent many academic problems by requiring all students with less than 45 credits to take University 101. The UNIV 101 curriculum covers study and exam skills, student rights and responsibilities, faculty expectations, CWU advising resources, the university’s GE, major, and graduation requirements, creating an academic plan, computing resources, library information resources, and opportunities for leadership. See Exhibit 2.E.78 for the UNIV 101 topic outline and textbook, including special CWU content. UNIV 101 does not treat specific skill deficits but orients the student to the culture and resources of a university.

Some of the university’s academic support services are administered by the Division of Academic Affairs, headed by the provost; some are administered by the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. Both groups of programs are briefly described below.

**Academic Support Programs Administered by the division of Academic Affairs.** More complete descriptions may be found in Exhibit 2.E.81. Evidence demonstrating the positive impact of these programs on grades and retention may found on the assessment report website. The positive effects of the Math Center, TRiO-SSS, AAP-Supplemental Instruction, and AAP-Tutoring programs are noteworthy.

- The University Writing Center makes classroom presentations about writing skills, consults with instructors, and provides one-on-one consultations with students at three locations on the Ellensburg campus (Exhibit 2.E.82) and all the university centers (Exhibit 2.E.83). In April 2009, CWU hosted the Pacific Northwest Writing Centers Annual Conference.
- In the words of its mission statement, the University Math Center is designed to “help a diverse population of learners build the academic and practical mathematics skills they need to graduate on time. The staff members of the Math Center teach developmental math classes, offer individualized tutoring for these courses, and extend tutoring services to all general education students at our drop-in lab” (Exhibit 2.E.84).
- The McNair Scholars Program is a federally funded program designed to prepare up to 25 promising low-income, first-generation students and eligible minority students for doctoral study.
The University English as a Second Language program brings students from around the world to CWU for intensive English instruction and academic preparation as well as for orientation to American culture and university life. UESL is discussed in greater detail in Section 2.G.

CWU’s Academic Achievement Programs (AAP) provides three routes to understanding course content and developing effective study techniques: the Supplemental Instruction Program, the Tutoring Program, and the Smarthinking online tutoring program.

CWU’s federally-funded TRiO Student Support Services program helps low income, first generation college students and students with disabilities earn a bachelor’s degree. The state’s Washington Trio Expansion Program (WaTEP) allows CWU to assist additional TRiO-eligible students.

Discipline-specific learning assistance programs include graduate students with teaching assistantships, the Accounting Help Lab, the Computer Science Club tutoring service, and Foreign Language tutoring. A list of these services is available on the university web site.

**Academic Support Programs Administered by the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management.** The division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management provides several support services for underrepresented student populations. Of these, CAMP, STAR, and CDS most clearly provide academic skills development. Please refer to Standard 3.D for other support programs. More complete descriptions of CAMP, STAR, and CDS may be found in Exhibit 2.E.85.

- The College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) CAMP provides tutoring, academic skills assessment, study skills training, and technology training to migrant students in their first year of college. CAMP also provides assistance with university paperwork requirements, career planning, and cultural enrichment events.
- Student Transitions and Academic Resources (STAR) provides academic advising, career and financial aid counseling, tutoring, peer mentoring, study skill guidance, advocacy, and appropriate referrals for nontraditional and academically-at-risk students.
- Center for Disability Services for (CDS) ensures that individuals with disabilities are provided equal access to programs, services, and facilities, promotes a positive university climate for persons with disabilities, and promotes full inclusion of CWU students, employees, and visitors with disabilities. CDS services include Adaptive Technology Services, Alternative Testing Resource Center, State Audio Services, and Time Management Mobile Assistive Technology.

**Qualifications of the Faculty to Deliver the Educational Programs**

**Historical Perspective**

A summary of the size of the faculty may be found in Standard 2.A, above. Standard 4 provides an extensive analysis of the faculty. The qualifications of the CWU faculty have historically been very strong, changing over time with the changing mission of the university. When the mission of the university was primarily teacher preparation, experts in pedagogy and school subjects made up the faculty. The current faculty is made up of teacher-scholars in the humanities, arts, sciences, business, education, and professional studies, appropriate to the comprehensive university that is CWU today.

*Standard 2 – 79*
Current Situation

The faculty of the university is well qualified to deliver the educational programs at the levels offered. (2.C.7). Appropriate terminal degrees are held by 87% of CWU’s full-time faculty members and 99% of its tenured or tenure-track faculty. Virtually all hold at least the master's degree (See Table 2.9 and Exhibit 2.E.86). When faculty vacancies occur, departments establish job descriptions that attract individuals who bring high levels of expertise, and most searches are successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Degrees of Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Terminal Degrees</th>
<th>Non-terminal Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure Track</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central’s faculty members bring their expertise to the classroom: By far the largest proportion of courses is taught by full-time faculty, although the percentage is lower for GE courses. Full-time non-tenure track faculty teach 30% of all general education courses; part-time non-tenure track faculty teach 40% of all general education courses. The tenure track proportions are commensurately higher for upper division major courses and graduate courses. Part-time instructors averaging just over 60 FTE per quarter support the educational program, and they are a highly qualified group. The master’s degree is the conventional threshold for part-time instructors, but the university is benefited by the occasional contributions of highly qualified experts in specific skill areas who may not have earned a master’s degree.

Full-time faculty represent each field in which major work is offered. (2.C.7) All programs of the university operate with full-time faculty, sometimes exclusively and sometimes in partnership with part-time or adjunct instructors (See Standard 4 and Exhibit 2.E.87).

Appraisal of 2.C

This substandard has reported evidence regarding the undergraduate program with special attention to GE, transfer credits, advising, developmental, remedial, and academic support programs, and faculty qualifications. Undergraduate majors are extensively described and evaluated in the college self-studies that follow and in the departmental self-studies created for this review (Exhibit 2.E.49). Evaluations of strengths and challenges follow:

Undergraduate Majors. Strong undergraduate majors are supported by dedicated faculty who strive to initiate students to their disciplines. Interdisciplinary programs have received recent emphasis. Detailed reports of undergraduate majors are reported in five-year and annual program reviews and college self-studies. The proliferation of majors of some earlier decades has moderated. This provides an opportunity for further sharpening of CWU’s institutional persona by combining some majors, pruning back others, and creating a few that visibly promote the key qualities of the university.

General Education. CWU’s GE program has been adequate to its mission but has not generated the full potential of its intellectual appeal. GE classes are smaller than at most
universities, resulting in closer faculty-student interactions. A strong core of faculty is open to new ideas and pedagogy.

A history of assessments has driven positive change in the GE program. The new GE curriculum framework needs to achieve its own identity among the faculty and be fleshed out with course offerings. Some hurdles remain while others have been surmounted. For example, the Safari information system has eased infrastructure complications of multidisciplinary courses and colleges have taken a more prominent role in administering interdisciplinary courses. The long term goals for this initiative include:

- A coherent, research-supported program that nurtures the development of students as scholars, artists, and citizens.
- The invigoration of faculty-student-staff conversations that promote the transition from a course-based program to an outcomes-based and assessable curriculum.
- A culture of GE assessment that generates, analyzes, and applies evidence to maximize student success and engagement.
- Faculty development support sufficient to cover developmental workshops, Integrative Learning conference attendance, annual Learning Initiative grants, the CLA at the freshman and senior levels, and student-directed electronic and print materials.

Data from several tangential assessments of the GE program have been reported above, but there is no coherent GE assessment program as such. A renewed assessment effort should accompany the revised GE program. One may infer from the measures that do exist that written and oral communication seem to be matters for concern. Beginning in fall 2008, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) has been administered to first year and senior students to determine growth in critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving, and written communication skills.

Transfer Credits. CWU’s stable transfer policies and procedures have resulted in a long history of generally smooth, predictable, routine transfer of credit. Transfer agreements with the state’s community colleges carry out the state’s two-plus-two philosophy and provide an easy transition for students. TAPP agreements further smooth the transition of community college students at CWU’s co-located centers.

The addition of electronic transfer evaluations, CAPS reports, and increased staffing, transfer orientation events, and online access to transfer information have been the major improvements of the decade. For selected majors, transfer students can continue to attend CWU classes on their community college campus or one nearby. Transfer students who have not completed their GE requirements can find it difficult to satisfy both GE and major requirements. The availability of online GE courses is alleviating this problem somewhat.

The university has had less success with credit evaluations for students who are transferring from out-of-state, foreign, and private institutions, especially for applicants who apply late in a cycle. Without an accurate credit evaluation, students may lose time in their program of study. Even for routine transfers, scheduling problems may arise if continuing students fill classes before transfer students register.

The university works to improve communication between the university, transfer institutions, and students. Advances in online information have greatly improved the communication
process and provide advice well in advance, but students still occasionally feel that they have been treated poorly.

Future developments include integrating measures of performance-based assessment of student work into the university’s transfer evaluation regimen. Universities across the country are embracing performance-based education because it is consistent with a focus on learning rather than teaching. A performance-based paradigm is similar to providing credit for prior experiential learning but CWU has historically avoided that route to academic credit, except via credit by examination.

The implications of legislation allowing lower division community college credits to transfer as upper division CWU credits remain to be worked out. Although the legislation was intended to facilitate transfer from community colleges to four-year institutions, the number of courses being accepted from community colleges as upper division courses has increased dramatically. CWU will need to review each of these courses and their requirements over the next few years to determine the appropriate transfer level.

**Academic Advising.** The program of advising at CWU is well-developed and continues to improve by responding to feedback. A new advising model will combine professional advisors who guide students before they choose a major and faculty advisors who help students complete their major and move into careers or advanced study. Students can access academic advice through several different channels of personal contact, printed information, and online content. Transfer students at the university centers away from Ellensburg have the same advising opportunities as those on the Ellensburg campus, but it may prove difficult to establish services at community colleges that promote smooth transition for their students without intruding on their advisor-advisee relationships.

Objective measures of advising effectiveness, such as time-to-degree statistics, admission to graduate study, frequent changes of program, and placement in inappropriate classes all seem satisfactory. Nevertheless, surveys of student opinion of advising have chronically returned ratings that are lower than seem justified. Possible explanations include misperceptions of the advising role, inconsistent faculty training, the historically minor role of professional advisors, and relying on peer advice. Survey data will be tracked to see if the new advising model will be more favorably received.

The AAC will be assigning a professional advisor to liaison with each of the colleges to ensure better information exchange and provide more accurate information to freshmen and transfer students on each major program. A training program for faculty advisors is also desirable. The remaining challenge related to advising is matching student demand with course availability, especially for first-quarter transfer students and in gateway courses of growing majors. The university should explore the best way to use registration data to create new sections of high-demand classes.

**Developmental, Remedial, and Academic Support.** CWU’s student support programs have a very good record of preventing dropout and keeping students on their degree path. CWU’s academic support services could begin to work with potential students well in advance of admission to build college-level skills through new learning technology. For many students, though, the guidance of understanding mentors and successful peers will remain an essential part of university achievement.
Qualifications of the Faculty. The large majority of CWU faculty members hold the terminal degree in their fields of study, and, as a group, the faculty has compiled an outstanding record of teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty involve themselves with students outside of the classroom. The principal challenges to maintaining a qualified faculty may be offering competitive salaries and establishing a realistic balance of teaching, service, and scholarship expectations. In addition to the challenges noted above, the global economic recession may call for reductions in faculty positions. Natural attrition is a humane way to reduce staff size but it may not maintain proper balance across specialties. The university will need policies to maintain its integrity while coping with this budget constriction.

Standard 2.D – Graduate Program

Historical Perspective

Central Washington University was authorized to grant the master’s degree in 1947. Its early graduate programs prepared school personnel with advanced conceptual, research, and practical skills. Graduate offerings expanded to the arts and sciences in the 1970s. In 2000-2001, the first program in a business specialty, the Master of Professional Accountancy, was added to the curriculum. An inventory of current master’s degree programs is found in the university catalog, on the university web site, and in Exhibit 2.E.88.

At the time of the university’s last full NWCCU review, reviewers observed that the university’s graduate degree programs have been created and are maintained by faculty members dedicated to their disciplines and professional communities. Master’s degree graduates were found to have an excellent placement rate in professional settings and in doctoral programs. They confirmed that graduate study is carried out within a framework of established policy standards, objectives, and policies.

The reviewers directed the university to develop a clear statement of the role of graduate education at CWU, to describe the alignment of the graduate program mission with the mission of the university, to come to a clear vision for the future direction of graduate education, to promote the research expectations and productivity of graduate faculty, to assure the adequacy of resources to maintain quality programs, and to institute responsible graduate program review.

By the time of the 2004 five-year interim review, NWCCU reviewers found satisfactory progress in most areas. They noted remaining needs for a clear definition of the role of graduate education and aligning the goals of the graduate program with the goals of the university. Reviewers also directed the university to adopt a policy that clearly establishes higher expectations for graduate students in “layered” courses – courses that have different course numbers for undergraduate and graduate students taking the same course. The university described the steps it was taking to address these concerns in its 2007 progress report.

The following section presents a comprehensive review of graduate education at Central Washington University with special attention to the final disposition of the recommendations from the 2004 review.
__Current Situation__

The Office of Graduate Studies and Research (OGSR) administers graduate education policies with the guidance of the Graduate Council and in cooperation with graduate program directors, department chairs, and college deans. It promotes and manages grants and contracts, administers faculty development funds, coordinates undergraduate research activities, and oversees the Chimpanzee and Human Communication Institute, the Center for Spatial Information, Kittitas County Retired and Senior Volunteer Program, and three grant-funded U.S. Department of Education programs.

The graduate faculty is the primary source of policies regarding admission, transfer credit, graduation, and standards of scholarship required in graduate coursework. Graduate programs and their departments set goals that are consistent with the missions of their colleges and the university. Accomplishment of those goals is assessed at least every five years in the program review cycle. Curriculum and policy changes evolve from evidence from each program’s assessment regimen.

The graduate curriculum provides advanced study in selected fields, leading to the student’s demonstrated ability to execute independent work of professional quality. Curriculum development conforms to university policies that require statements of student learning objectives, assessment methods, and goals consistent with program, department, college, and university goals. Graduate curriculum approval differs from undergraduate only in that the dean of graduate studies and research and the Graduate Council review proposals for compliance with graduate program regulations.

**Mission and Goals of the Graduate Program and Articulation with University Goals.** In 2006–2007, the Graduate Council developed a white paper on the goals and mission of the CWU graduate program. In 2007–2008 the white paper evolved into a more comprehensive study of the graduate program. After campus-wide input, two documents were adopted in March 2009 (Exhibit 2.E.89): one is a policy statement of the role, mission, vision, goals, and relation to university goals; the second is an overview of the current status of graduate education at CWU. Some key elements of the role of graduate study at Central Washington University are to:

- provide opportunities for students to earn master’s degrees prior to pursuing doctoral studies, in professions where the master’s degree is the terminal degree, and in disciplinary or interdisciplinary programs that reflect the cultural, physical, and historic qualities of the region, or that respond to the needs of the fields of education and business;
- establish scholarly collaborations between students and faculty members that also engage undergraduate students, and
- fuel the economic, social, and educational development of the region.

The role and mission document describes five main ways in which the level and nature of graduate-degree programs are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution (2.D.1):

- They maintain and strengthen academic life on the Ellensburg campus and at the university centers by modeling the context for the discovery and dissemination of knowledge in which undergraduate students also participate;
- They strengthen funding and infrastructure by building partnerships with various constituencies (public sector, industry, professional groups, institutions and communities)
which will enhance the programs themselves through graduate research and practice as well as bring benefits through the work of the university’s graduates in the state and region;

- They increase state and national prominence of the university through recognition of the quality of its graduate programs and the accomplishments of its degree recipients;
- They build inclusive, respectful, cooperative and diverse communities which involve faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students in shared intellectual and applied endeavors, and
- They maintain and strengthen academic life on the Ellensburg campus and at the university centers through periodic review and subsequent improvement of graduate programs;

In concert with university curriculum policies and regular program review, the 2009 mission and goals report confirms that programs of study at the graduate level are guided by well-defined and appropriate educational objectives and differ from undergraduate programs in requiring greater depth of study and increased demands on student intellectual or creative capacities (2.D.2). Graduate degree programs must extend the student’s ability to achieve a fluent grasp of fundamentals, mastery of specialized knowledge and skills, and the ability to independently produce a work product that is typical of the student’s discipline.

New graduate programs at CWU arise from a combination of departmental strengths, faculty qualifications, availability, and interest, student interests, and employment demands. HECB and NWCCU standards for program approval set rigorous criteria to ensure that programs are well-crafted, will be well-supported with appropriate faculty, space, equipment, laboratory, and information resources, that they will meet societal needs within the state, and will avoid unnecessary duplication with other state universities’ programs. The process requires careful consideration of proposals on-campus as well as at the state level, and ensures successful integration with existing programs.

**Graduate Program Review and Assessment.** Courses and programs of study at the graduate level are guided by well-defined and appropriate educational objectives (2.D.2). Graduate program objectives are assessed in the normal five-year cycle of departmental program reviews with annual reports of student learning goals and, in some cases, through specialized accreditation processes and state or national certification examinations. Graduate programs in History, Geology, Education, Psychology, Health and Physical Education, and Exercise Science were reviewed in 2008–2009. Biology and Family and Consumer Sciences were reviewed in 2007–2008, Resource Management in 2006–2007, and Art, Mathematics, and Music in 2005–2006. More about the program review process and yearly assessment reports may be found in Standard 2.B. A more global assessment of the entire graduate education enterprise is available in Exhibit 2.E.89.

Alumni perceptions of their graduate experiences are currently assessed by a survey administered by the Office of Graduate Studies and Research every four years. This schedule is designed so that one- through four-year perspectives will be reflected in the degree to which the CWU program prepared the graduate for employment, for job advancement, or for further study. Results of the most recent survey conducted in 2004 (Exhibit 2.E.90) indicate that:

- Overall, CWU master’s degree graduates rated their program of study good to excellent.
• CWU’s geographic location emerged as the most important factor influencing respondents’ decisions to earn their degrees at CWU.
• Course work in their subject fields and oral examinations were rated very positively by the majority of respondents.
• Career advising emerged as an area needing improvement.
• For the majority of this group of graduates, the impact that committee chairs, other committee members, other faculty, and other students had on their graduate experience at CWU was very positive.
• More than three-quarters of the respondents finished their master’s degrees within three years.

The survey instrument was recently converted to an online format. The 2008 survey is scheduled to be administered online in summer 2009.

Programs and Enrollment. Central Washington University offers 29 graduate degrees in 16 departments and through two interdisciplinary programs. Each college offers at least one graduate program. The university offers two types of master’s programs. Discipline-specific, research-oriented programs are intended to prepare students either for doctoral study or for a career in a research-oriented field. Professional or applied programs prepare students to enter professions in which the masters is the professional degree. In the current study period, four new graduate programs have been added to the curriculum: Master of Professional Accountancy, M.S. in Engineering Technology, M.S. in Food and Nutrition, and M.S. in Primate Behavior. New specializations have been added to some existing graduate degrees, such as the interdisciplinary Applied Behavior Analysis specialization added to the M.S. program in Experimental Psychology. Three program options were discontinued during the current study period: M.S. in Organization Development, M.A. in English Language Learning, and M.A. in English: Teaching Option.

About 75% of the respondents to the 2004 graduate alumni survey reported that their graduate degrees were directly related to their current employment. In several fields, graduate students often are teachers seeking an advanced degree in their major teaching area: Over half of the respondents reported they were employed in K-12 systems as teachers, administrators or professionals. Over a quarter reported they were employed as professionals or managers outside of education. Approximately 7–10% of CWU master’s degree graduates pursue doctoral studies, most commonly in English, history, biology, chemistry, geology, psychology, and resource management.

Exhibit 2.E.91 reports the spring quarter graduate student headcount from 2005 to 2008 by program. Reliable enrollments in resource management, geology, theatre production, school psychology, mental health counseling, history, English, and master teacher buoy the graduate program. Enrollments in professional accountancy, biology, coaching, nutrition, engineering technology, and exercise science have risen recently, while reading specialist and special education enrollments have declined. Declines in education degrees are perhaps due to the added requirement of one year of teaching experience before admission to the MAT degree, and possibly also related to temporary difficulties in state accreditation of CWU’s education programs (See Standard 2.B).

Since 1998, graduate student enrollment has averaged 430 students during the academic year and 325 students during summer quarter. Summer enrollment in graduate courses
began a steady decline in 2003–2004, possibly due to changes in state law that allow alternate routes to Professional-Level Certification for school personnel. Academic year enrollment grew appreciably between 2001 and 2003, and has remained relatively stable since then. Figure 2.6 summarizes academic year and summer quarter enrollments by year.

Figure 2.6 Graduate Enrollment Trends

Graduate enrollment represents about 4.3 percent of the university’s student population. There is no university definition of the optimum graduate enrollment, although there is a general consensus that growth is desirable. At the department level, however, most programs cap enrollment at a level deemed optimal by the faculty. Most graduate faculty members also teach undergraduate courses and there is no reduction in teaching load or higher workload credit for teaching graduate classes. The 2009 Graduate Mission and Goals report calls for a study of program size and graduate faculty compensation and loads (See Exhibit 2.E.89, Goals 3 and 5).

Most graduate programs are offered primarily during the academic year when students may receive tuition waivers and graduate assistantship support. Through assistantships, many graduate students work with undergraduates as teachers of record, teaching assistants, or lab supervisors.

Traditional-schedule programs accounted for about 56% of the degrees granted in 2007. Some graduate coursework for nontraditional students follows nontraditional schedules (e.g. three or four weeks in the summer and one night a week through the academic year). In 2007 44% of graduate degree recipients participated in programs that had some alternative-format scheduling. Programs offered primarily during the summer (Mathematics, Theatre Arts Production, Education, Health, Human Performance and Nutrition) are designed for teachers. These are usually offered in three-week or six-week formats. For the online M.Ed. in Family and Consumer Sciences Education to be offered by the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance, CWU faculty will provide two of the eight core courses required. Students who enroll through CWU will take the balance of their graduate credits locally. Online programs have excellent future potential for place-bound students, especially in connection with intensive short-term classes at centers or on the Ellensburg campus.

Exhibit 2.E.92 reports the graduate degrees that were conferred from 2005 to 2008 by program and specialty. In 2007–2008, the university awarded 197 master’s degrees. Of these, 36 percent were granted in programs for school personnel, 39 percent prepared graduates for specific professional fields such as accounting, nutrition, and engineering technology, 15 percent were in liberal arts programs such as English, history, art, and music.
and 10 percent were in science programs such as biology, chemistry, geology, and experimental psychology.

**Characteristics of the Graduate Student Population.** Between 2004 and 2008 women represented about 60% of graduate student enrollments. The overall percentage of U.S. non-White enrollment has increased from 11% to 18%, due largely to increases in Black and Hispanic enrollment (See Exhibit 2.E.93). Still, there is a large discrepancy between the Black and Hispanic population in Washington (4.5% and 9%, respectively) and their representation in CWU’s graduate student population (less than 2% and less than 5% in fall 2008). Partly due to a fellowship program in the Resource Management Program, American Indians constituted about 6% of the graduate student headcount, compared to 2.6% of the state’s population.

Table 2.10 shows graduate students by the primary site of their enrollment. The majority of graduate programs are offered at the Ellensburg campus. Programs offered at university centers are listed in Appendix 2.A.4 and Exhibit 2.E.94. Centers programs combine electronically-mediated distance delivery and instruction from commuting Ellensburg instructors and on-site faculty. Targeted graduate programs at the centers, evening offerings, and distance delivery have been successful in attracting nontraditional students. In 2008, 22% of graduate students were enrolled at university centers, primarily at CWU-Des Moines and CWU-Lynnwood.

The cost of graduate education is a significant hurdle to many students. Many graduate students enrolled during the academic year receive graduate assistantships, which provide in-state tuition waivers, and increasingly, out-of-state tuition waivers. The number of graduate assistantships increased from 93 in 2003 to 178 in 2008–2009.
Graduate tuition waivers amounted to approximately $1.1 million in 2007–2008 and exceeded $1.4 million in 2008–2009. Related sources of support include university fellowships and scholarships, research grants and scholarships, graduate work-study, and other need-based grants or loans. Since 2003 the Graduate Office has offered competitive Summer Research Fellowships to graduate students. Ten summer fellowships of $2800 were awarded in summer 2008 and seven were awarded in summer 2009. Graduate financial support makes graduate education possible for many students and it provides supervised professional teaching, research, and performance opportunities. Participation in the multidisciplinary Yakima WATERS (Watershed Activities To Enhance Research in Schools) grant is an example: It benefits CWU graduate students and K-12 teachers and students who conduct joint research projects in the Yakima River watershed.

In addition to their research contributions, graduate students have become essential to instructional delivery. Graduate assistants teach more than 100 introductory classes a year, principally in Art, English, and Health, Human Performance, and Nutrition. They assist in laboratory sessions in the sciences and assist undergraduates in the University Writing Center, Student Recreation and Fitness Center, and Athletics. Other assistantship opportunities are available through agreements with organizations such as the Thorp Mill Historical Preservation Society, the Chimpanzee and Human Communication Institute, and the CWU Research Foundation.

**Layered Courses.** CWU’s policy on layered undergraduate/graduate courses was approved by the Faculty Senate in May 2008 (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-10.2.8; Part 5-10.5.3). The policy codifies the traditional understanding that *graduate courses will consistently require greater depth of study and increased demands on student intellectual or creative capacities than undergraduate courses* (2.D.2). Examples of increased demands include additional readings or additional writing expectations, additional laboratory, field, performance, or studio work, and more rigorous assessment standards. Eight graduate programs have at least one layered course. Exhibit 2.E.95 presents the policy, a list of all layered courses, and the additional requirements imposed on graduate students for each.

**Appraisal of 2.D**

The relation of graduate programs to the university's mission has been studied and reported in a 2008 document (Exhibit 2.E.89). Graduate programs are an integral element of the CWU academic mission. The document concludes with a call for more active engagement by the Graduate Office and Graduate Council in pursuit of further progress in program review, new program creation, program deletion, faculty loads, student support, and enrollment management. OGSR is gathering information in summer 2009 for Graduate Council, so that the Council may undertake a more thorough review of these issues during the next academic year.
Enrollment in graduate programs peaked and is now subsiding somewhat. Some possible reasons were discussed above. In addition,

- The number of international students is affected by on-campus financial support, U.S. visa requirements, and the appeal of programs in other English-speaking countries. International enrollment declined from 19 in 2005 to 5 in 2007 and rebounded to 19 in 2008–2009. CWU may experience another downturn due to the emerging global recession and the H1N1 flu pandemic.
- OGSR is actively encouraging student recruitment in all programs by subsidizing recruitment materials and travel. The most successful recruitment strategies seem to involve personal contact with undergraduates and promotion of a path to better careers. To encourage more personal contact with students by faculty, the graduate office sends incomplete applications to departments for faculty follow-up.

There are plans for the development of post-masters degree programs to meet the needs of special constituencies. The psychology faculty have drafted an initial proposal for Educational Specialist degrees in school counseling and school psychology; in Education, doctoral programs in specific areas such as special education or curriculum and instruction have been discussed in general terms. In both cases, such programs would be built on significant strengths in existing graduate programming.

Graduate programs currently comprise about 4.3% of the university’s student population. Based on graduate enrollments at comparable institutions and on the size and scope of the region served by the university, the university has decided that graduate enrollments should grow to about 6 percent of CWU’s total. Several departments feel that they have not exhausted the potential interest in their graduate offerings. Some of the most attractive however, such as mental health counseling, require very intensive student mentoring so faculty resources would need to be increased. In other cases, the need for specialized laboratory equipment or facilities poses barriers to program expansion.

As demonstrated by the success of the Master of Professional Accountancy degree, there is good potential for graduate programs offered at university centers, which serve primarily place-bound students and offer courses later in the day or during weekends. The Graduate Office has received many inquiries about a Masters of Business Administration and the university centers have expressed interest in being able to offer a M.S. in Law and Justice.

Central has the potential for substantial graduate growth in non-resident students, through WEST and WICHE exchange programs, and international students. Since graduate students prefer and expect fully functional web-based enrollment services, the Office of Graduate Studies and Research is revising its website, and has joined with undergraduate admissions in adopting recently purchased Customer Relations Management (CRM) technology. To level the competitive playing field and to increase non-resident enrollment, the university should consider increasing waivers of the non-resident portion of tuition to attract out-of-state students into programs with capacity.

In the recent past, recruiting has been more traditional, using brochures and magazine advertisement. Graduate Office personnel met with program chairs and coordinators in 2008–2009 to assess recruiting needs and to undertake a more targeted program of
recruitment. A new system of customized electronic brochures will be ready in 2009–2010 to augment this more vigorous recruitment effort.

Financial support is an important student recruitment tool. The number of graduate assistantships increased from 93 in 2003 to 178 in 2008–2009. Graduate Office proposals to enhance graduate financial support include funding graduate stipends and health insurance from base budget funds instead of college and one-time allocations and increasing graduate student participation in externally funded projects. Externally funded research increased from $3.2 million to $9 million during the same time period, 2003 to 2007–2008. Funded research results in increased direct employment of graduate assistants as grant project assistants and replacement instructors.

Considering the relatively small number of annual graduates in most programs, the alumni survey will be made more effective by sending a survey to every graduate the first year after graduation. OGSR will continue with the quadrennial survey for longer-term perspectives.

The Graduate Council ensures that requirements for 500-level courses, including layered courses, are appropriate to graduate status (Exhibit 2.E.95) and that 400-level courses counted toward graduate degrees were completed after admission to the graduate program. In the past, it was difficult to confirm that policies requiring higher-level performance and additional requirements were followed in the case of 400-level courses. Addressing this, Graduate Council now requires that the syllabus for all 400-level courses that can be used for graduate credit must specify the additional work and expectations for graduate students taking the course for graduate credit.

Standard 2.E – Graduate Faculty and Related Resources

**Historical Perspective**

The qualifications and duties of the graduate faculty are described in the CWU Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-2.7.1.2). In order to direct master's theses or serve on graduate student committees, a faculty member must be a member of the graduate faculty. Nominations for appointment to the graduate faculty or for special appointments originate in the academic departments and are reviewed and approved by the dean, Graduate Council and the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research.

The graduate faculty designation is used only to express an individual's qualification to serve in certain roles, not to identify individuals who teach only in the graduate program. At CWU, faculty members are rarely assigned exclusively to graduate education. Graduate faculty members supervise only the work of master’s degree candidates because Central Washington University is not authorized to offer the doctoral degree. Nevertheless, CWU has a core of full-time faculty active in graduate education at its main campus and at each location where graduate programs are offered, in accordance with NWCCU Standard 2.E.6.

**Current Situation**
Graduate Faculty. Central Washington University’s graduate faculty are adequate in number and sufficiently diversified within disciplines so as to provide effective teaching, advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, as well as to participate appropriately in curriculum development, policy development, evaluation, institutional planning, and development (2.E.4). Graduate programs in large departments are typically overseen by a program committee of core faculty with the scholarship and teaching background appropriate to the program. In many cases, the committee is headed by a program director whose professorial assignment includes time for administrative duties. Small graduate programs often engage the participation of the department’s entire full-time faculty whose responsibilities include a commitment to graduate education (2.E.4). Even in small departments, a faculty member other than the chair may have graduate program administration duties as part of his or her load.

The quality of graduate faculty members is assured by required qualifications for membership in the graduate faculty. Graduate faculty members must apply for reappointment every five years. A terminal degree is one of several requirements for membership in the graduate faculty. In 2007, 98 percent of the university’s full-time faculty had terminal degrees (Exhibit 2.E.86). Thus, virtually all full-time tenure-track faculty members are eligible to be nominated for graduate faculty status.

Graduate faculty members work regularly with graduate students in coursework, advising, graduate committee chair or member roles, research, scholarship and professional mentoring. Faculty-student collaborations have resulted in substantive contributions to knowledge in both practical and theoretical areas. In the majority of departments which offer graduate programs, all faculty work to varying degrees with both graduates and undergraduates.

Four grades of graduate faculty status—Regular, Associate, Special, and Retired—reflect different levels of credentials and experience teaching graduate courses, supervising theses and projects, and chairing graduate committees. Requirements for each grade are listed on the graduate faculty recommendation form (Exhibit 2.E.96). Conscientious application of appointment standards and recruitment of qualified new faculty members ensures that programs offering graduate degrees have appropriate full-time faculty in areas appropriate to the degree offered and whose main activity lies with the institution. CWU’s graduate faculty are qualified by training and research to serve in the disciplines in which they teach and supervise research (2.E.3). Table 2.11 shows the numbers of graduate faculty in 2008–2009. A list of graduate faculty members is presented in Exhibit 2.E.97. Faculty in departments that do not offer graduate degrees, such as Sociology and Philosophy, are often members of the graduate faculty. These faculty members offer graduate courses that support degree programs, serve on graduate committees, and occasionally work with Individualized Studies graduate students.

A thriving graduate faculty is maintained by including graduate teaching and supervision among the position requirements of new faculty appointees. In fall 2008, for example, there were seven faculty openings in departments that offer graduate programs and all of them included graduate teaching and supervision in their job descriptions. Four of them had graduate teaching and supervision as the primary responsibility.
When graduate programs are delivered at a site other than the Ellensburg campus, full-time faculty are involved in the program, are physically present at the site for student advisement, and participate fully in the planning, delivery, and assessment of the program (2.E.5). All graduate programs are staffed by full-time faculty of the university, regardless of where the program is offered, and program directors are readily available to all students. Graduate programs are offered at the university centers (Exhibit 2.E.94) dependent on need, adequate resources, and HECB/NWCCU approval.

**Graduate Council.** The Graduate Council represents the faculty and students in matters which affect graduate education at CWU. It reports to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. The Council reviews and approves graduate policies and procedures, proposals for new degree programs, all graduate curriculum and program changes, and graduate faculty nominations. For example, the Graduate Council recently reviewed all departmental layered courses to confirm that expectations of 500-level students were appropriate to graduate credit (2007–2008) and made recommendations to ensure higher quality of graduate theses and to expedite final review of theses (2006–2007). Current membership of the graduate council and recent minutes of its meetings are available on the OGSR website.

**Support for Programs.** Central Washington University demonstrates a continuing commitment of resources to initiate graduate programs and to ensure that graduate programs maintain pace with the expansion of knowledge and technology (2.E.2). In addition to ensuring the high quality of graduate faculty members, the university maintains a much more generous student-to-faculty ratio at the graduate level than at the undergraduate level. In 2007–2008, the average undergraduate class size was 25.5 and the average graduate class size was 7.1. These data are for regular classes and do not include individual instruction, such as thesis or directed research.

Annual budget and equipment plans take into account the special support needed to maintain graduate programs. For example, the College of the Sciences has funded new digital recording and playback equipment for the counseling practicum sessions in its psychology programs, a new computer science imaging research laboratory, and sophisticated geodetic survey equipment in geology. New course proposals must be accompanied by the proposer’s assessment of library resources, faculty staffing, special facilities, and equipment needed to support the course. Standard 8 discusses teaching and research equipment in greater detail.

Library services appropriate to graduate education have undergone radical improvement during the current study period, due primarily to comprehensive electronic access to full-text articles from hundreds of scholarly journals, participation in the Cascade/Orbis Alliance, and an electronically-enhanced interlibrary loan system. The adequacy of library and information resources is covered in more detail in Standards 2.A, 2.H, and 5.

The physical facilities required to deliver instruction offered at the graduate level are commensurate with expectations of master’s level work and are consistent with the institution’s goals. *The university makes available for graduate programs the required resources for faculty, facilities, equipment, laboratories, library, and information resources wherever the graduate programs are offered and however delivered* (2.E.1). Most recently, the Science Facility and Music Education Building and the remodeled Black Hall and Dean Hall have provided modern facilities and equipment for the graduate programs in Music, Biology, Chemistry, Education, and Resource Management. The Chimpanzee and Human Communication Institute supports the recently-approved Primate Behavior M. S. program.
Finally, the excellent new buildings on the campuses of CWU’s community college partners (See Standard 2.A and Standard 8) and technologically enhanced classrooms on the Ellensburg campus provide advanced facilities for the Professional Accountancy degree.

In the past, there was some concern that new equipment came mainly with new buildings and was not updated over time. Now, new equipment needs increasingly are met by cyclical replacement of computer equipment, including media presentation equipment in all classrooms, and equipment award competitions. In the most recent competition, funds from the President’s office, the Provost’s office, and Graduate Studies supported eight faculty applications for a total of $235,000.

**Appraisal of 2.E**

The university maintains a high level of faculty qualifications and support in its graduate programs by requiring thesis committee experience and evidence of established scholarly activity. The 2008 study of graduate program mission and goals concludes with a recommendation to identify differences between the roles of faculty in undergraduate and graduate instruction, especially with regard to loads. The Graduate Council will be evaluating the work loads of graduate faculty during its evaluation of graduate programs during the 2009–2010 academic year. Newly hired faculty are typically granted associate graduate faculty status to ensure that they become familiar with CWU’s processes. Faculty without prior thesis or dissertation supervision experience are required to serve on a thesis committee to its completion before they can chair one, or they may serve as a co-chair with a regular member of graduate faculty. Associate graduate faculty are encouraged to seek nomination to regular status before their 5-year appointment expires once they meet the criteria for regular status.

New programs should build on faculty expertise in existing departments to meet emerging needs for professional expertise and employment in the state, region, and nation and should also consider programs that are unique to the state and region. The Office of Graduate Studies and Research, together with the Graduate Council as a whole, is beginning to evaluate possible areas for new program development.

New programs under discussion include allied health sciences, gerontology, energy studies, sustainability, student leadership, human resources administration, arts administration, MFA in creative writing, and a potential revival of the MS in Organization Development, perhaps with an online component. Faculty in departments that do not support a graduate program may find opportunities to collaborate with related disciplines. For example, the Resource Management Program currently involves faculty from Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, and Political Science. Individual Studies master’s students from 2005 to 2008 have pursued specializations as varied as comparative philosophy and religion, geropsychology, cellular and molecular pharmacology, athletic coaching, higher education and student affairs, and gender and organization change.

**Standard 2.F - Graduate Records and Academic Credit**

*Standard 2 – 95*
Historical Perspective

During the study period, a growing number of record administration duties for graduate students have migrated from the Admissions Office, Financial Aid, and Registrar Services to the Graduate Office. The Graduate Office now manages graduate admissions records, student recruitment, coordinating transfer credit evaluation with departments, financial aid advising, tracking academic progress, thesis committees and editorial review of theses, degree checkout, and diplomas.

For most of the study period, an Associate Vice-President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Continuing Education administered graduate education and was assisted by a Director of University Research and a Director of Continuing Education. In 2008, the Associate Vice-President’s position was eliminated and an interim Dean of Graduate Studies and Research was appointed. The dean is assisted by an Associate Director of Research and Sponsored Programs. Continuing Education now reports directly to the provost. While there have been administrative changes, there have been no changes in basic policies concerning admissions, student performance standards, academic credit, or graduation requirements. These policies are published in the graduate studies section of the university catalog.

Current Situation

Admission Procedures. Central Washington University has a graduate admissions policy and student recruitment program that provides prospective students with complete information about its graduate programs and options. Graduate faculty, through their departments and the Graduate Council, are responsible for setting graduate admission criteria, transfer of credit policies, and graduation requirements. Program faculty members review applicant files, make admission recommendations, and recommend students for graduate assistantships. All current policies and procedures are published in a separate section of the print and online university catalogs. Some programs list admission policies in department handbooks or on department web sites and some submit their program descriptions and admissions criteria for publication in professional organization guides. Graduate program information and forms are available by mail and on line. The graduate school brochure and graduate application materials specify the general requirements for graduate study and the specific requirements of individual programs (Exhibit 2.E.98).

Graduate program admission policies are consistent with and supportive of the character of the graduate programs offered by the institution (2.F.1). Alignmentments of the goals of graduate programs with the goals of their departments, colleges, and the university are described in each department’s cyclical program review documents and in their 2007–2008 departmental self studies (Exhibit 2.E.49). Further evidence on this point is presented in Standard 2.D, above.

The university’s graduate admission policies are designed to give all applicants a fair and equitable review and admit only those applicants with an excellent chance of succeeding in the university's graduate programs. These policies and regulations are published and made available to prospective and enrolled students (2.F.1). All policies regarding student admission and progress toward a degree are published in the print and electronic versions of the annual university catalog. There is a uniform set of minimum application requirements for all university graduate programs, with additional requirements set by some specific programs.
Program faculty committees review graduate applications and recommend students for admission and assistantship awards.

Consistent treatment of applicants is ensured by a standard set of application materials that includes a completed and signed application; a minimum of three letters of recommendation, preferably prepared by people capable of assessing the applicant’s ability to succeed in graduate school; a personal statement of professional and educational objectives; transcripts from all institutions of higher education attended; payment of a $50 application fee, and submission of Graduate Record Examination scores when required or, for the Master of Professional Accountancy, Graduate Management Admission Test scores (2.F.2). Decisions are based on the information provided by the applicant and by referees. CWU actively seeks graduate applications from members of underserved populations. In addition, graduates from the nation’s McNair Scholars programs receive letters inviting them to apply and offering to waive the application fee. Consistent with the Revised Code of the State of Washington, applicants are expected to have earned a grade point average of 3.0 in the most recent 90 quarter credits (60 semester credits) of undergraduate study, although exceptions can be made.

Faculty within the graduate departments establish internal admissions criteria which may exceed those enforced by the OGSR, however, they may not be less than those required by the OGSR (2.F.3). For example, students applying for the M.F.A. in Art, the M.A. degree in English, or the Master of Music also submit appropriate samples of their work.

Admission decisions are made by the graduate dean, based on recommendations of the department to which the applicant applied (2.F.2). CWU faculty weigh an applicant’s background, professional development, academic record, letters of recommendation, test scores, and statement of educational objectives to ensure a good match between the student and the program. The graduate dean reviews each recommendation and makes the final decision to admit students into the program. The graduate dean’s review also ensures that candidates who are not recommended for admission are denied admission for good cause.

The volume of graduate applications has varied over the study period. Figure 2.7 shows the pattern of applications accepted for admission, denied, and withdrawn or incomplete during the last 11 years. The maximum number of applications received in this period was 519 in 1998–99; the minimum was 409 in 1999–2000, and the average number is 474. The average number of applications accepted for admission is 310. The average number of applications withdrawn or incomplete is 103.

The rate at which applicants are accepted into graduate programs varies from 72% to 88% in the last 11 years. See Figure 2.8.

The rate at which applications were never completed or were withdrawn for not attending after being admitted has risen markedly since 2004–2005 (Figure 2.9). Perhaps the new electronic application system has resulted in a higher number of applications being initiated but not completed. In 2008–2009 OGSR staff members separated the applications never completed from those that were withdrawn for non-attendance and found that about half fell in each category.
Degree Requirements. Graduation requirements are determined by program faculty and meet or exceed the requirements listed in Standard 2.F.4. Minimum graduation requirements are set by the graduate dean in consultation with the graduate council and the graduate departments. To be eligible to earn a master’s degree from CWU, each student must satisfy all department course and other requirements and

- must earn a grade point average of at least 3.0 overall,
- must earn at least the minimum number of credits required for the specific degree (no fewer than 45 credits),
- may transfer no more than 9 graduate credits from other universities, must include at least 25 credits of courses numbered 501 or above (graduate level) and may include senior (400) level undergraduate courses,
- must include at least 30 credits of graded courses,
- must apply for the degree within six years of date of the oldest course on their approved course of study,
- must satisfy all other requirements, including successful completion of a thesis or project and a culminating examination and/or thesis or project defense where applicable.

Other end-of-program assessments are listed in Exhibit 2.E.32. Additional rules are described in the university catalog and include special requirements of certain programs, such as a background check and liability insurance requirement for students in the mental health counseling program.

Each master’s thesis defense is open to the public. The OGSR announces thesis defense meetings in the Campus Bulletin, and many departments publicize the time and place of their oral examinations. During the academic year, a member of the graduate faculty is recruited to represent the Graduate Council at each thesis or project defense.

Academic Credit Policies. Central Washington University permits graduate students to transfer a maximum of nine quarter hours of graduate-level credit from accredited institutions which offer graduate degrees, provided that the courses in question are approved in advance as part of the graduate student’s official Course of Study with the Graduate School (2.F.5). Members of the department in which a degree is being earned decide if credits completed at other institutions can apply to the graduate program. Transfer credits may not have been applied toward another degree and must be offered as part of the graduate program of the originating institution. Typically, only credits from accredited institutions are accepted. It is the student’s responsibility to provide evidence of the comparable nature, content, and level of credit earned at another institution to the course requirement at CWU. Central Washington University does not accept transfer credit for conferences, short courses, brokered courses, or pass/fail courses. Only courses in which a grade of “B” or better was earned are eligible for transfer. Credits that were earned more than
six years before the time sought for transfer are ineligible. CWU's internal policies on transfer and award of academic credit are wholly consistent with NWCCU Policy 2.5.

Graduate students may receive graduate degree credit for selected internships and other field-based experience that is an integral part of the program of study in which they are enrolled. A member of the university faculty supervises every field-based learning experience, usually in consultation with a site supervisor at the internship setting (2.F.6). Eleven graduate programs, including eight certification programs, require internships that are integral to the program of study. Another eleven programs offer internship, practicum, cooperative education, or other practical skills experiences as electives (Exhibit 2.E.99). Other field-based experiences may be embedded in didactic course requirements in programs such as resource management, history, music, biological sciences, and chemistry. CWU does not grant credit for prior experiential learning (Policy 2.3; 2.A.10; 2.F.6).

**Appraisal of 2.F**

Central Washington University’s graduate records management procedures support the wishes of the faculty and administration to recruit talented graduate students and guide them with clear directions through an advanced educational program. The university’s admissions and graduate transfer credit policies follow accepted standards. Many of its programs are separately accredited by professional organizations and state boards.

The OGSR reviews all theses for conformity to editorial form and English language usage. During the study period, a thesis review backlog developed. In order to facilitate the process the Graduate Council and OGSR have recently instituted changes. OGSR staff now sample portions of each thesis and if it requires minimal changes it is returned to the student for corrections. If more substantive changes are required then it is returned to the whole thesis committee to ensure corrections are made. OGSR has taken preventive action to improve the quality of initial thesis drafts by offering instructive courses before the students begin writing their theses. These changes have made the review process more efficient and have improved the initial quality of theses.

**Standard 2.G - Continuing Education and Special Learning Activities and Standard 2.H - Non-Credit Programs and Courses**

The responsibility for the administration of continuing education and special learning activities is clearly defined and an integral organizational component of the university’s organization (2.G.4). Units of the university collaborate with the four academic colleges to pursue the goals of continuing education and special learning activities. The Office of Continuing Education (CE) identifies educational needs of special groups in the region, coordinates educational outreach programs, administers the summer session, and manages most non-credit offerings of the university. The Office of International Studies and Programs (OISP) coordinates CWU’s international educational efforts, including exchange programs and international opportunities for students and faculty, advising and support for international students, sponsoring an international presence in surrounding communities, and advocacy for internationalizing the curriculum. The burgeoning technological capacity for electronically-
mediated instruction is effectively managed for students and faculty by the Department of Multimedia Technology and Instructional Support (MTIS) and the Educational Technology Center (ETC).

**Continuing Education**

*Historical Perspective*

In 1989, continuing education and special learning activities, including most instruction at the university centers, was housed in the Office of Extended University Programs. An affiliated office, the Center for Learning Technology, managed the technology of electronically-mediated delivery systems to and among the university centers. By 1999, administration of the university centers programs was transferred to the academic colleges, reflecting equal standing among all academic programs, regardless of site and means of delivery. The Office of Extended University Programs was renamed the Office of Continuing Education.

In 2000, a comprehensive reorganization of the administration was undertaken to give greater prominence to the academic affairs of the university. From 2002 to 2008, CE reported to the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Continuing Education. In 2008, that associate vice president became a dean and Continuing Education was separated from his supervision. CE now reports to the provost. The Center for Learning Technology was made a division of Libraries and Information Technology and renamed Academic Computing. In 2004 it adopted its present name, Multimedia Technology and Instructional Support. It now reports to the provost.

Under new directorship, the Office of Continuing Education took on a more entrepreneurial role for the university, identifying unmet program needs, piloting potentially attractive courses and programs, and providing non-degree options for state residents. Degree programs and credit-bearing courses have always been administered by college deans but CE serves as an incubator for fledgling programs, nurturing their early development in a self-support funding environment until proven enrollments can justify state funding. Seven academic programs, such as the Career Switcher program for mathematics teachers, an M.S. in Engineering Technology at CWU-Des Moines, the Wine Trade Professional Certificate program, and the Wine Trade and Tourism Minor have begun under the aegis of CE.

The university has a long history of offering non-credit learning opportunities in support of the university's mission to meet the lifelong learning needs of its constituents. In the last ten years, CE has established five series of non-credit courses, all developed with funding by federal and private foundation or corporate sources. The Open Spaces Technology Center (with the U.S. Dept of Education and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation) and CD-ROM-based in-service teacher training (with Virtual Education Software, Inc.) are examples.

CE has attracted over $3.59 million in external funding over the last seven years to develop and implement its programs. Revenues in excess of operating costs have been shared with many university programs. Between 2003 and 2007, over $688,557 was distributed to programs such as the university Math Center and Writing Center, Safety and Health Management program scholarships, cultural resource inventory projects, web-based course development grants, and revenue sharing with academic departments.
Finally, since the CWU summer session is not supported by state funds, CE has administered the university’s summer session classes since the 2006 summer session. CE has restructured the summer session format, manages the summer budget, and vigorously publicizes summer classes.

Current Situation

The continuing education and special learning programs of Central Washington University, including non-credit programs and courses, are compatible with the institution’s mission and goals (2.G.1). The current mission and goals statements of the university explicitly describe the university’s intent “to serve as an intellectual resource to assist ... in solving human and environmental problems,” “to encourage lifelong learning,” and to “build mutually beneficial partnerships” throughout the region. The CE mission (Exhibit 2.E.100) is consistent with the university’s objectives in four ways: It enables the university to meet the lifelong learning needs of its constituency. It extends the reach of the university through program offerings that are not dependent on state resources. It coordinates market testing of degree courses or programs in new locations. Finally, it provides an environment for developing special interest programs to the point that they can become part of the university’s regular academic offerings. The breadth and level of the university’s CE offerings are reflected in the 2009–2010 CE marketing and press kits in the NWCCU exhibit room.

CE encourages and facilitates alternative delivery styles and sites. For example, it administers the Cornerstone Program, providing college level classes to high school students in areas where Running Start classes are not available. In summer 2004, CE partnered with Gatlin Educational Services to offer a series of non-credit web-based courses ranging from medical transcription to test preparation for commercial certificates such as Microsoft Certified Systems Administrator.

The continuing education and special programs of Central Washington University are designed, approved, administered, and periodically evaluated by appropriate university committees under clearly established curriculum procedures. Full-time faculty representing the appropriate disciplines and fields of work are involved in the planning and evaluation of the university’s continuing education and special learning activities (2.G.1, 2.G.3, 2.G.8). Credit-bearing academic programs of the university, regardless of delivery medium, site, or funding source, are subject to the same university requirements for curriculum design and approval. Instructors of all credit courses taught through CE are evaluated via the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI). The faculty retains primary authority for the design and approval of the curriculum. All courses are developed and offered in accordance with CWU Policies 5-10.5.13 (Credit Offerings) and 5-10.5.14 (Non-Credit Offerings) (Exhibit GE.3). Non-credit offerings are developed in support of the university mission with assistance from appropriate faculty as needed. CWU does not grant credit for prior experiential learning (2.A.10; 2.G.9). The university does not grant external degrees, special degrees, or offer degree completion programs (2.G.10).

Granting credits for continuing education courses and special learning activities is based upon university policy, consistent throughout the university, and applied wherever located and however delivered. The standard of one quarter hour of credit for 30 hours of student involvement is maintained for all credit-generating instructional programs and courses (2.G.7). The standards that establish appropriate student time commitment expectations and student academic background requirements for course credits and level are based upon institutional policy, applied regardless of site.
and means of delivery. The university conforms to the quarter-system standard of 30 hours of student involvement per week for one credit. Credit for all CE and OISP credit-generating courses is posted on transcripts in the same manner as all other classes.

Non-credit programs also are guided by university policies, regulations, and procedures. They are characterized by high quality instruction with qualified instructors. Faculty are involved, as appropriate, in planning and evaluating non-credit programs (2.H.1). “Prior to scheduling a noncredit offering, an appropriate academic department or faculty member [is] consulted for input on appropriateness of the offering, credentials of instructor (if not CWU faculty), suggestions on evaluation and other recommendations to insure overall quality” (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-10.5.14.3).

Non-credit programs include non-credit certificate programs, life-enrichment programs, continuing education units for professionals, and clock hours for teachers. Non-credit certificate programs target non-matriculating students and offer instruction reviewed, delivered, and administered by CE independent of but in consultation with CWU's colleges. These programs are not subject to the standard curriculum review process but CE seeks input from appropriate colleges or departments and programs. Non-credit certificate programs are available for review for two weeks in the provost's office. Currently, CE, the College of Arts and Humanities, and staff from the State Board of Community and Technical Colleges have developed a non-credit Community College Instructor Certificate program that will accept its first students in summer 2009. The Wine Trade Professional Certificate is another recent example that began as a non-credit certificate program and evolved into a credit-bearing certificate program.

Life-enrichment programs meet the non-credit learning needs of diverse groups. Programs are developed and administered under specific internal and external policies and procedures. Faculty are involved in program development or instruction as appropriate. For example, interested individuals can participate in the Mammoth Field School, an eastern Washington paleontology excavation of a mammoth skeleton (Exhibit 4.E.25) or they can learn more about wine by taking consumer short courses on wine offered by the World Wine Program (Exhibit 2.E.101).

CE works with specific organizations to develop special group training programs. Examples include paramedic training programs for professionals from Taiwan, test preparation courses for the WEST-B examination, mathematics and science teacher training in the Quincy School District, and an aviation maintenance management program for Vietnamese students, in collaboration with Seattle Central Community College. The latter two examples are credit-bearing programs.

When offering courses that award Continuing Education Units (CEU), the institution follows national guidelines for awarding and recording such units. Each CEU is equivalent to 10 hours of instruction and appropriate to the objectives of the course (2.H.3). CWU rarely offers CEUs but when they are offered, written operational procedures and documentation ensure that national guidelines are followed. Exhibit 2.E.102 presents the university’s CEU policy and the forms for CEU proposals. CEU procedures are also available online.

Central Washington University is authorized by the state’s Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to award clock hours for educational learning activities. One clock hour equals one hour of seat time or participation. CWU complies with Washington Administrative
Code policies and procedures for the award of clock hours, including approval and evaluation standards. Students earning clock hours do not earn CEUs or academic credit at the same time. Faculty members are routinely involved in the evaluation of clock hour educational activities. A committee of two CE staff and one faculty member reviews program proposals and instructor qualifications in compliance with the Washington Administrative Code. Exhibit 2.E.103 provides examples of educational activities that were approved for clock hours during the past academic year. Exhibit 2.E.104 presents the office’s form for clock hour activity proposals.

The university takes sole responsibility for the academic and fiscal elements of all instructional programs it offers and conforms to the requirements of Policy A-6, Contractual Relationships with Organizations Not Regionally Accredited (2.G.2). CWU’s continuing education and special learning activities conform to the same academic and fiscal policies as all other programs of the university. The university invites various advisory bodies to assist in strengthening its programs; however, these groups do not assume the university’s responsibility for the integrity of its programs.

CE offers several instructional opportunities with organizations that are not regionally accredited. These include the Cornerstone Program, in-service professional development courses for schools and professional organizations, and CD-ROM-based professional development courses with a commercial partner. All programs conform to Policy A-6, which ensures compliance with university academic and fiscal policies, clear contractual arrangements, and responsible student recruitment standards.

The Cornerstone Program was reported to NWCCU (Exhibit 2.E.105) prior to its inception in fall 2001. Cornerstone offers lower-division courses to advanced students in high schools and complies with CWU Policy 5-9.2.15 (Exhibit GE.3). Cornerstone has grown every year and now enrolls over 700 students per year. Thorough program assessment reviews in 2004 (Exhibit 2.E.106) resulted in program improvements. The program received full accreditation by the National Association of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships in spring 2007. Cornerstone teachers have faculty contacts in CWU academic departments and CWU conducts annual Cornerstone teacher training sessions. The Cornerstone NACEP Self-study (Exhibit 2.E.107) includes a sample school district annual agreement, a teacher portfolio evaluation, CWU and Cornerstone syllabi for the same courses, Cornerstone teachers and their qualifications, Cornerstone teacher training agendas, data comparing Cornerstone students later admitted to CWU with other CWU students, and the Cornerstone student handbook.

Many university departments offer courses numbered 500 with the title Professional Development. These are special topics courses for practicing professionals. They are not applicable to degrees nor to requirements for endorsements or teaching certificates. The Professional Development Credit Program Agreement (Exhibit 2.E.108) spells out the conditions required of the university and the school districts and professional organizations that partner it to offer professional development credits.

Currently CE has partnered with Virtual Education Services Inc. to offer CD-ROM based professional development courses for educators and with Gatlin Education Services to offer non-credit web-based course and career enhancement programs. All courses have been reviewed by appropriate academic departments and colleges and CE was authorized to offer the courses. The CD-ROM classes have a CWU Department of Education-approved adjunct
faculty member available for assistance and students have a one-year time frame to complete the course before a failing grade is issued (Exhibit 2.E.109).

The continuing education fee structure and refund policies are equitable and published for student review (2.G.6). As a self-support unit, CE has authority from the CWU Board of Trustees to set tuition based on the costs of delivery. While tuition may vary from program to program, most tuition rates are equal to those for state-supported courses. All participants within a given program are charged the same rate and are subject to a standard refund policy. Fees for academic credit courses are submitted annually for university approval. Fees and refund policies are established through well-documented procedures and communicated to students in appropriate promotional and registration materials.

When credit is measured by outcomes alone or other nontraditional means, student learning and achievement are demonstrated to be at least comparable in breadth, depth, and quality to the results of traditional instructional practice (2.G.11). CWU allows students to challenge selected courses by examination. Academic departments determine which, if any, courses may be challenged and set standards for the award of course credit (Exhibit GE.2, CWU Catalog). The privilege is offered only to matriculated full-time students, so this option is not often exercised by continuing education students.

The institution maintains records for audit purposes, which describe the nature, level, and quantity of service provided through non-credit instruction (2.H.2). CE and, in the case of extensive language and cultural activities, the OISP, maintain financial, student, and program records of all non-credit offerings for external review. Files are maintained for seven years and typically contain a program brochure or program description, payroll information, copies of purchasing requisitions, copies of contracts or agreements if the program was developed with a partner, and a list of participants and their evaluation. Non-credit offerings do not appear on university transcripts. Continuing Education programs were most recently financially audited in 2003 and found to comply with accepted standards (Exhibit 2.E.110).

International Studies and Programs

Historical Perspective

Since the 1999 NASC accreditation visit, the university has rededicated itself to the task of preparing students for the emerging global community, consistent with the mission statement of the university. As a result, the OISP has grown from an office dedicated to advising a limited number of international students to an office that supports a comprehensive array of international education opportunities at CWU. Recent program development landmarks are described in Exhibit 2.E.111.

Current Situation

The primary mission of the OISP is to develop and implement a comprehensive plan and concomitant program for the growth of international education at CWU and the communities it serves. OISP’s programs are compatible with the university’s core value of “excellence achieved through a diversity of ideas and people” and its mission to provide “opportunities for . . . international study” (2.G.1). OISP fulfills its institutional mission by offering a diverse set of international education opportunities including international exchange, study and teaching
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abroad, intercultural activities, support for internationalizing the curriculum, contracted language and cultural programs, promoting student and faculty diversity, and an open-enrollment ESL program. The Passages newsletter (Exhibit 2.E.112), informs the university community about international programs.

The influence of OISP at CWU has made steady progress in this reporting period, although the global recession has rolled back some earlier gains. CWU student enrollment in overseas programs remained steady, at about 250-300 per year. Since the 1991–1992 academic year, OISP has hosted 301 U.S. State Department J-1 foreign exchange students, including students that participated in National Student Exchange programs. Many other international students enroll in CWU’s courses: In each quarter of the 2008–2009 academic year, an average of 354 international students from 35 countries enrolled for CWU courses, including an average of 44 students at the CWU-Des Moines or CWU-Lynnwood centers (Exhibit 2.E.113).

During the last decade, five to six CWU faculty members participated in the university’s faculty teaching abroad and exchange programs each year, although this number has dropped to two in 2007–2008 and 2008–2009. In 2008–2009, nine exchange faculty/scholars from foreign universities taught classes on the CWU campus or continued their research at CWU. There were six such scholars in the 2007–2008 academic year. CWU has sponsored exchange scholars from China, Japan, Colombia, France, Belarus, Korea, Russia, Uruguay, the Czech Republic, and several other nations in the last decade. Exhibit 2.E.114 presents detailed lists of the CWU and foreign exchange faculty members.

At CWU, all credit-bearing international programs are self-supporting through fees paid by students or through revenues from other international programs. Fees for programs offered through the Office of International Studies and Programs are equitable and set to cover direct and indirect costs with the approval of the Board of Trustees (2.G.6). All financial arrangements for international programs at CWU are consistent with university policies, including employment practices, travel, printing, contracting, purchasing, and payment policies.

The International Studies and Programs Advisory Committee (ISPAC; Exhibit 2.E.115) consists of faculty from all the of the university’s colleges and area study programs. ISPAC reviews all changes or additions to policies and procedures, and advises the executive director on all OISP academic activities. Since 1991, OISP has made about $5,000 annually available to faculty members presenting papers to scholarly conferences abroad through the ISPAC Small Grant Awards (Exhibit 2.E.116).

There are three divisions within OISP: Asia University America Program (AUAP), University English as a Second Language (UESL) and Study Abroad and Exchange Programs (SAEP). OISP complies with NWCCU Policy 2.5 and all state and university policies. Each division also has developed its own policies and procedures. Credit transfers from foreign institutions are discussed in Standard 2.C.

The university takes sole responsibility for the academic and fiscal elements of all instructional programs it offers and conforms to the requirements of Policy A-6, Contractual Relationships with Organizations Not Regionally Accredited. OISP seeks the advice of interested groups as appropriate but CWU is solely responsible for the integrity of its
programs. CWU’s international studies programs conform to the same academic and fiscal policies as all other programs of the university. AUAP administrative staff maintains the financial, academic and inventory records for the AUAP program and UESL program accounts are administered through the university’s business and accounting office. The programs of OISP were most recently financially audited in 2003 and were found to be in compliance with all responsible practices (Exhibit 2.E.117).

OISP support services include academic, immigration, and general advising for about 200 matriculated international students each quarter. OISP ensures that CWU complies with the mandates of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security’s Student Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) of 2003. The CWU Office of Information Technology Services and OISP created a SEVIS menu within Safari that has been certified by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. In 2008, OISP assumed responsibility for directly registering international students on the SEVIS system.

Asia University America Program (AUAP). AUAP is a study-abroad program for sophomores from Asia University in Tokyo, Japan. AUAP has had over 2,500 participants since it began at CWU in 1989. The program offers students the opportunity to improve their English skills, learn about American culture, and earn one semester of Asia University credit in their majors of law, business, economics, and international relations during the five-month program. Central, Western, and Eastern Washington Universities participate in this program. Exhibit 2.E.118 presents a set of AUAP program materials.

Significant recent developments in the AUAP curriculum include a Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) preparation course and the Student for a Day program. The TOEIC course meets Asia University’s desire for increasing students’ TOEIC scores. The Student for a Day program began in 2002 at the request of Asia University. AUAP students experience the schedule and the classes of regular students by shadowing CWU students for a day.

CWU students are frequently invited to AUAP classes for cross-cultural discussions, classroom activities, and to act as teaching assistants. AUAP, University Housing, and New Student Programs have teamed up to train the Residence Hall Assistants and the International Peer Advisors who work for AUAP. Orientation sessions have been developed for freshmen who will live with international roommates. AUAP has increased local outreach by having Japanese students visit elementary schools, preschools, retirement centers, and assist in civic projects such as Habitat for Humanity.

Since much of the recruiting of AUAP students is done through word of mouth, student satisfaction is a significant part of the assessment of AUAP. Each cycle, AUAP students fill out a comprehensive program evaluation. Internal evaluations are done twice during the cycle for each instructor, each course taught, and all of the activities that are organized through AUAP. Each International Peer Advisor is evaluated by the students three times during the cycle. Finally, at the end of each cycle, the AUAP staff interviews a focus group about all aspects of the program. The AUAP staff evaluates the all of these data and makes changes before the next cycle begins. These assessment tools have been instrumental in helping the AUAP at CWU continue to have highly satisfied students as well as to become leaders in developing curriculum and programming for the entire consortium.
University English as a Second Language (UESL). In 1989, the UESL Program became an intensive English program and the pilot program for the AUAP. In 1990, UESL separated from the AUAP and matured dramatically. Today, UESL offers a year-round, intensive English program and several short-term summer programs. The year-round program is open to students from all language backgrounds and at all levels of English proficiency. It provides language instruction, academic preparation, and orientation to American culture for 70 to 90 students per quarter. Currently, the majority of international undergraduates at CWU studied in the UESL Program before beginning their undergraduate work. Nearly all of the international marketing and recruiting for CWU is done by UESL and funded by its self-support budget.

UESL faculty members (Exhibit 2.E.119) hold at least master's degrees in Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), and average more than 10 years of teaching experience. A student handbook (Exhibit 2.E.120), program materials (Exhibit 2.E.121) and meetings with UESL faculty and staff orient new students to the UESL program and to campus life. Students are tested and placed in one of the program's five language levels, designed to develop all language skills and academic tools such as computer use and research writing. Each quarter, course evaluations and exit interviews provide the basis for program refinements.

In addition to its language and culture classes, UESL sponsors the Conversation Partner Program, which matches UESL students with U.S. students, typically as a required or optional component of courses in anthropology, education, communication, foreign languages, geography, TESL, and TESOL. UESL enriches CWU's partner institutional relationships by offering short-term summer programs for and by providing opportunities for visiting faculty members and spouses to take English classes.

UESL enrollment fluctuations are affected by many external factors, particularly global political and economic events. The Asian economic crisis of 1997 reduced enrollments from about 90 to an average of 65–72 students a year. Enrollment was recovering when the attack on the World Trade Center and restrictions on student visas cut enrollment by nearly 50%. Since 2006 the average quarterly enrollment has been about 76, with 88 enrolled in fall 2008. The high was 94 in fall 2007, which included students from 13 countries. In 2007–2008, most participants in the program were Japanese, Chinese, Korean and Taiwanese students. In the two previous years, Saudi Arabian was the dominant nationality, as CWU was selected as a target school for the Saudi government's scholarship program. Most of these students have passed through UESL and are now CWU undergraduates.

Study-Abroad & Exchange Programs (SAEP). In 1999, study-abroad activity was administered by the director of the OISP and enrolled 250 students in overseas programs and 45 students in U.S. exchange through the National Student Exchange (NSE) program. In 2003, SAEP was created as a separate unit of the OISP due to significant growth in this area. In 2008–2009, this unit enrolled 242 students in international programs, eight students in NSE, 16 international exchange students, and two inbound NSE participants.

Central Washington University's study-abroad programs meet the same academic standards, award similar credit, and are subject to the same institutional control as other courses and programs offered by the university. Credit is not awarded for travel alone. The operation of these programs is consistent with Policy 2.4 Study Abroad Programs (See Exhibit 2.E.122),
and Policy A-6 Contractual Relationships with Organizations Not Regionally Accredited (2.G.12). Beginning in fall 2006, all courses taken in approved CWU study-abroad and exchange programs are recorded on the CWU transcript as INTL, FNST or MFST (International, Foreign Studies, or Music Foreign Studies) classes, indicating that coursework was completed overseas. Short-term programs led by CWU faculty and international internships are recorded as credit in the appropriate department. Students enrolled in approved CWU study-abroad/exchange programs are guaranteed to receive credit at CWU for coursework they complete abroad. Students are strongly encouraged to complete the credit transfer agreement process to substitute overseas coursework into their program of study prior to departure, although this process may also be completed upon return to the institution. All international courses that bear CWU academic credit are reviewed and approved by the academic department that grants the credit. Academic credit is not granted by OISP.

CWU offers a wide variety of overseas opportunities in an effort to serve the broadest section of students at the university. Program offerings range from short-term programs led by CWU faculty, to narrowly-focused “island” programs, to direct enrollment at universities abroad.

Faculty-led programs range from 10-day spring break trips to quarter-length programs. These programs offer a high level of support for students and compatibility with majors. Since 1999, CWU has offered 53 faculty-led programs sponsored by 13 academic departments, including some programs running multiple times. During 2008–2009, seven programs were offered by 13 CWU faculty members and enrolled 72 students, 26% of the total overseas enrollment for that year. Exhibit 2.E.123 lists the faculty-led programs conducted since 1997–1998. These programs have includes such diverse locations as Cambodia and Vietnam (2004), Zambia (2005, 2006) and South Africa (2008). Each program was developed consistent with OISP policies for developing regular (Exhibit 2.E.124) and short-term (Exhibit 2.E.125) programs.

Island programs, in which an American university creates an educational outpost in a foreign city, were once the norm in study-abroad programs but are assuming a smaller role as student interests change. These programs may be independent of a foreign university or housed on a university campus, and typically offer a limited selection of liberal arts courses taught in English and complemented by language classes, as appropriate. Direct enrollment at universities abroad has become more common as institutions abroad expand their language programs. Academic opportunities range from intensive language instruction to enrollment in courses with regular students.

In 1999, CWU supported a portfolio of over 200 programs in 45 different countries. Today, 500 programs are available in 75 countries (Exhibit 2.E.126). International internships are a relatively new offering of SAEP, beginning in winter 2006. Following on-campus collaboration, SAEP began to offer study-abroad services and benefits to students who intern abroad, joining several sister institutions in the IE3 Global Internships Program. Students receive SAEP assistance in identifying internship sites abroad, increased financial aid for internship expenses, and an orientation prior to departure. In 2008–2009, seven students completed international internships in seven countries, compared to only two international interns in 2005.

Central Washington University currently operates four nationally-marketed study-abroad programs. Programs in Buenos Aires, Argentina; Valdivia, Chile; Guadalajara, Mexico, and Lugano, Switzerland are approved and sponsored by the College Consortium for International
Studies (CCIS), a consortium of over 130 U.S. universities and colleges. The Mexico and Argentina programs completed the CCIS program review process in 2005 and 2006, respectively, and were commended for their quality and unconditionally approved for continued sponsorship. These four programs enrolled 105 students in 2008–2009. The Lugano and Valdivia programs will have a site review in 2010. 

Consistent with the recommendations in the concluding paragraphs of Policy 2.4, Central Washington University relies heavily on consortium programs. To some extent, consortium arrangements remove the university from direct confirmation that every program satisfies the guidelines of Policy 2.4. However, all of the university’s consortium partners are well respected at the regional, national, and/or international levels. The university takes care to choose membership only in consortia that develop programs consistent with the guidelines in Policy 2.4. In addition, both CCIS and NCSA, CWU’s two main consortium partners, have each developed program review processes and procedures to ensure that programs continue to meet the quality standards of the consortia after initial approval.

OISP has been granted contract authority by the CWU Board of Trustees. OISP issues contracts for programs with international educational institutions and U.S. government granting agencies. The CWU Contracts Office reviews all contracts before they are signed. Either the president or provost signs contracts in excess of $2,500. Most contracts are for educational services, most commonly language and cultural programs. In these cases, CWU does not extend the prestige of its accreditation. Central Washington University also enters into inter-institutional agreements (Exhibit 2.E.126) covering student and faculty exchange and other forms of cooperation.

**Electronically Mediated Distance Education**

**Historical Perspective**

Electronically-mediated distance education (DE) is widely implemented to deliver educational programs at all locations. The number of DE classrooms on the Ellensburg campus has grown from six in 1999 to eight in 2008, but the greatest growth has occurred at the university centers, where 11 DE classrooms at five centers in 1999 has expanded to 26 DE classrooms at six centers (Exhibit 2.E.23; Exhibit 2.E.127). The display medium in these classrooms has improved from 36-inch television monitors to large-format projected images. An average of 12 courses per quarter was delivered through interactive TV in 1999. In 2008–2009 the average was 48 courses per quarter. A summary of some of the media engineering projects that established these capabilities is provided in Exhibit 2.E.128.

In 1999 the university’s concept of distance education was limited to synchronous interactive televised classes carried on a statewide educational network. Now a wide variety of digital formats, described below, have expanded the university’s distance outreach. New capabilities emerge every year as information industries innovate to exploit the higher education market. Expert instructional technology support for faculty and students for the last decade has been provided by the Department of Multimedia Technology and Instructional Support (MTIS) and the Educational Technology Center (ETC).

**Current Situation**

*Standard 2 - 109*
MTIS provides distance education services for all university sites, including support for faculty and student users. The ETC is open to all faculty and students but is oriented primarily toward media production and training for applications in the K-12 schools. MTIS has increased its staff during the study period to one full-time operator at three university centers (Lynnwood, Des Moines, and Wenatchee). CWU-Yakima is a special case with at least 12 operators for ten classrooms. CWU shares the Yakima facility with several institutions, and pays for about four or five of these technicians. MTIS administers incentives for faculty and students to redesign the curriculum, collaborate with other institutions, and create partnerships with the community, government agencies, and corporations to pursue the university mission. Standard 5.A further discusses MTIS and ETC services.

Synchronous interactive television is still a mainstay medium for distance education courses, utilized by about 150 courses per year. Courses originate at one site and are transmitted to students at an average of two more sites at the same time. DE courses are transmitted about 2500 hours per year, with less than 1% interruption in service due to technical problems. The opportunity for real-time interaction with the instructor and other students makes this format attractive. However, different sites accommodate local student preferences for daytime, afternoon, or evening classes, creating some difficulties in finding mutually convenient times for synchronous delivery.

Hundreds of courses take advantage of asynchronous distance delivery systems, allowing professors and students to access learning materials at different times. Blackboard, a widely-used commercial product, was installed at CWU in 2000. Exhibit 2.E.129 summarizes Blackboard’s growing utilization since its inception. In spring 2009, for example, 737 course sections, 29% of all courses, used the CWU Blackboard system in some way. Lower division courses make up about a third of the Blackboard-assisted courses. Many textbook publishers offer Blackboard integration of their text and ancillary materials, enhancing the value of Blackboard to faculty and students.

In 2008, 102 instructors responded to a campus-wide survey about Blackboard use. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents said they had used Blackboard more than six quarters, reflecting some measure of satisfaction and widespread use. Ninety-five percent said their students found Blackboard easy and convenient to use. A summary of all results may be found in Exhibit 2.E.130. Survey respondents offered many comments to guide future developments.

CWU is an iTunes U university, allowing faculty members and students to upload audio and video streams and play them on computers, iPods, iPhones, or similar products. Instructors are beginning to combine traditional classroom lectures and labs with streamed content that includes multimedia presentations, discussion groups, and electronic assignments. In its first few months, iTunes U included 41 presentations from the Natural Science Seminar Series, a series on best pedagogical practices for elementary school, and an advanced trumpet

Figure 2.10. Blackboard Courses per Quarter, 2000-2009
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CWU is an iTunes U university, allowing faculty members and students to upload audio and video streams and play them on computers, iPods, iPhones, or similar products. Instructors are beginning to combine traditional classroom lectures and labs with streamed content that includes multimedia presentations, discussion groups, and electronic assignments. In its first few months, iTunes U included 41 presentations from the Natural Science Seminar Series, a series on best pedagogical practices for elementary school, and an advanced trumpet
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workshop. In addition to asynchronous delivery via Blackboard, iTunes U, and homegrown web-based presentations, several instructors now are using desktop video to meet with students during office hours. Finally, students can now subscribe to RSS feeds of Blackboard and iTunes U content. RSS feeds automatically send new content to the subscriber any time a given web resource is updated.

These technologies have led to a marked increase in courses delivered entirely via online media. In 2006, the university adopted an intellectual property rights policy (Exhibit 2.E.131) that clarifies ownership of intellectual property, including electronic courseware. In 2008, CE and Summer Session offered $1000 stipends to faculty to teach a GE course in an online format. As a result, the number of online GE courses increased from two in 2007 to 16 in 2009. Online enrollment doubled from 608 in summer 2007 to 1345 in summer 2008. The total number of academic year online courses increased from 29 in 2006–2007 to 66 in 2007–2008 and 161 in 2008–2009. In summer 2008 the Office of Undergraduate Studies funded a faculty competition to develop online courses. They received 36 applications and funded 21 of them. See Exhibit 2.E.132 for all 453 distance education and web-enhanced courses offered in the 2008–2009 academic year.

Electronically mediated distance technology makes it possible to provide learning experiences to people in remote settings. CWU takes care to ensure that programs and courses offered through electronically-mediated or other distance delivery systems provide ready access to appropriate learning resources and provide sufficient time and opportunities (electronic or others) for students to interact with faculty (2.G.5). Students taking DE classes follow the same time schedule as the students in the originating classroom. Regardless of site, all CWU students can access all of the university’s online information services. They all have borrowing privileges at any member college or university library of the Summit Alliance system. In the case of some students in urban areas, some resources may actually exceed those of Ellensburg students. Instructors of distance education courses are required to visit each site at least once and frequently make multiple visits.

To help faculty members keep up with rapidly changing electronic media capabilities, MTIS workshops and ETC workshops and Library systems workshops are provided every quarter. See Exhibit 2.E.133 for recent workshop schedules. MTIS offers award-winning video production services to faculty members who want to create more elaborate video presentations. MTIS is also the home of Ellensburg Community Television, a community access cable channel.

CWU's compliance with each provision of Policy 2.6: Distance Delivery of Courses, Certificate, and Degree Programs is described in Exhibit 2.E.134. That exhibit also describes a summer 2008 survey of students who enrolled in online courses. One may conclude from this survey that students respond favorably to the online format and would not be deterred from enrolling in programs that include at least some online courses.

**Appraisal of 2.G and 2.H**

A particular strength of Central Washington University is the close coordination and mutual respect between regular degree programs and special learning activities. Academic departments are accorded ownership of all credit-generating courses and programs offered at any location, via any medium. Program development is guided by well-articulated policies that
are periodically reviewed and revised. While the college deans take primary responsibility for the development of degree programs, CE and the OISP take primary responsibility for the development of "special learning activities."

**Continuing Education.** CE assists the university by

- developing strong community ties with, for example, the state Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, educational service districts, school districts, and professional organizations.
- implementing programs that meet the specialized needs of learners. These programs consistently are given high marks by participants and are changed based on feedback.
- piloting innovative programs that explore the feasibility of new topics, sites, or delivery media.
- sharing its revenue to encourage departments to develop courses for a nontraditional constituency.

CE’s strong entrepreneurial spirit, customer service orientation, market sensitivity, and responsible fiscal management exemplifies its interest in building a reputation for high quality educational programs. An emphasis on assessment is evident in the new SEOI form designed for web-based courses, now in preparation, and CE plans to administer the Noel-Levitz Priority Survey for Online Learners to all students enrolled in online courses in summer 2009.

There remains greater potential to utilize Continuing Education’s benefits to the university. More could be done to use its skills to assist in educational outreach and meet the needs of special groups of learners. Its self-support mechanism gives it the flexibility to routinely incubate new programs and, with MTIS, new instructional media. A desirable model for the future would be to have one or two new program offerings always in trial development. Some operational refinements would enhance the contributions of CE. CE is a self-supporting operation. Each CE offering must not only support itself, but it must also support CE administration, assessment, and publicity. It would help if the university shared some of these costs. In addition, the university needs to develop more sophisticated methods for assessing long-term needs for its credit and non-credit programs.

**International Studies and Programs.** A walk through today’s campus reveals the increased diversity of the university’s student population compared to that of a decade ago. This increase in more diverse programs and participants has occurred through creative leveraging of limited state assistance into significant self-support revenue. OISP now is an important source of financial support for CWU, generating $1.85 million, about 11% of all self-support program revenues, in 2007-2008.

Six characteristics of OISP are noteworthy. First, strides have been made in developing an appropriate administrative structure with supporting policies and procedures. Second, a well-qualified staff supports the program. Third, students and faculty enjoy extensive orientation and advising programs. Fourth, the work of OISP has become more integrated with the campus and community. Fifth, OISP’s diverse programs support the internationalization of CWU’s regular curriculum. And sixth, OISP has developed strong working partnerships with academic departments, the Conference Center, the Office of Residential Services, and the Division of Student Affairs.
At the same time, OISP faces six critical challenges. First, OISP cannot fund all international initiatives from self-support funds. This is particularly true for faculty exchange and area studies programs, where departments require full replacement funding for participating faculty. Second, OISP would like to increase faculty participation in international educational opportunities. Student participation is greater when faculty promote the benefits of overseas study than when only the SAEP staff promotes the programs. Third, increased reliance on self-support revenues has resulted in a reduction in state funding available to support international education on campus, particularly student and faculty exchange. Fourth, state time-to-degree accountability measures should be altered to accommodate international learning experiences. Fifth, the university should promote UESL opportunities for ESL students at the university centers as well as on the residential campus. Finally, the emerging global recession will almost surely discourage all forms of international travel, including international education. Nevertheless, the university has stepped up its efforts to recruit students from other parts of the world and non-native residents to its degree programs.

Electronically-Mediated Distance Education. Administrative and technical support have combined with faculty enthusiasm to generate a wide and growing array of electronically-mediated instructional formats. In winter 2009 an administrative ad hoc E-Learning Task Force drafted goals for expanding electronically assisted instruction and faculty members were added to the task force in spring 2009. Further work is in progress at this writing.

In 2002–2003, an online survey of student opinion about Blackboard courses was initiated. The survey was administered through the Blackboard system, however, not through the instructors of the courses. Faculty members objected and the survey was discontinued. One of the recommendations of this review is that the survey of student opinion of Blackboard courses should be revived with instructor input and administered periodically. In addition, results of the quarterly Student Evaluation of Instruction given in all classes should be disaggregated by delivery medium so that electronically-mediated courses may be compared with conventional course presentations.
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Central Washington University mounts excellent programs of study at the bachelors and masters degree levels. A growing emphasis on interdisciplinary programs has evolved during the decade. The large majority of CWU faculty members hold the terminal degree in their fields of study, and, as a group, the faculty has compiled an outstanding record of teaching, scholarship, and service. Students work with these faculty in moderately-sized classes; and a dedicated staff provides support and continuity of services.

A thoughtful and rigorous program of general education, along with reinvigorated honors programs, is consistent with the faculty’s commitment to the value of the liberal arts and sciences. A strong program of undergraduate research engages undergraduate students with faculty in scholarly and creative pursuits.

The university's physical facilities are very well suited to its mission at all sites and its fiscal resources have been adequate during the decade. The university’s library and other information services are increasingly available in electronic formats and are well integrated into educational programs at all sites. Central Washington University’s undergraduate and graduate routine academic support and administration policies and procedures are created and carried out in close collaboration with the faculty. Admissions, advisement, and transfer course evaluation are examples. Curriculum development procedures are all products of the faculty and thoroughly institutionalized in administrative processes.

Student learning outcomes are published for individual courses and all major programs of study. The university has coalesced around an educational assessment plan that includes, among other elements, cyclical academic program review and assessment of student learning. The departmental program review regimen is in its second cycle and is yielding some of the anticipated benefits consistent with continuous quality improvement. Many programs are separately accredited by professional organizations and state boards.

CWU’s institutional transfer policies and procedures and transfer agreements with the state’s community colleges have resulted in a long history of generally smooth, predictable, routine transfer of credit, especially for students from other state institutions of higher education. Assessment evidence has led to a restructured program of academic advising at the undergraduate level. Objective measures of advising effectiveness are generally satisfactory, although the university continues to look for more effective approaches. The university admits and provides support and mentoring for promising students who may be underprepared on arrival for baccalaureate-level work.

The large majority of the university’s students are residents of Washington state, but Central has begun to explore greater recruitment of non-resident and international students. In recent years, recruiting has moved from more traditional means—brochures and magazine advertisements—to greater reliance on online recruiting including, at the graduate level, customized electronic brochures.

The university maintains a strong program of special learning activities supported through the Office of Continuing Education, which also serves as an incubator for new degree programs. The office also coordinates the university’s popular Cornerstone (College in the High School) program. Faculty participate in continuing education program development guided by well-
articulated policies that are periodically reviewed and revised. A long-standing international studies program assists students in developing skills appropriate to a diverse and global society. OISP brings international students to CWU and sends CWU students to foreign countries for short- or long-term study abroad programs.

The university actively exploits emerging technologies for connecting with students. While the university continues to rely on interactive television to deliver educational programs to place-bound students, the approach does not work to the advantage of time-bound students. Administrative and technical support have combined with faculty enthusiasm to generate a wide and growing array of web-based instructional formats that permit asynchronous delivery

Each of the university's four colleges brings unique strengths to the enterprise and contributes individually and collectively to the richness of academic life and cultural programming on the campus. Three of the colleges collaborate in the Center for Teaching and Learning, the unit that supports the preparation of school personnel. Self-studies reflect the qualities of each college and its accomplishments, challenges, and future directions.
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College of Arts and Humanities

Historical Perspective

In 1994–95, the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences (CLAS), composed of 20 departments and many interdisciplinary programs, was divided into two smaller units, the College of Arts and Humanities (CAH) and the College of the Sciences (COTS). The College of Arts and Humanities was comprised of eight departments, the Douglas Honors College, and two programs—Art, Communication, The Douglas Honors College, English, Foreign Language, History, the Humanities program, the Latin American Studies program, Music, Philosophy, and Theatre Arts. The dean of CLAS became the dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, and a former associate dean of CLAS became dean of COTS. The two daughter colleges continued to share the CLAS support staff, including an associate dean, administrative assistance, senior secretary, and office assistant through 1998. Many of the university records systems continued to treat the new colleges as a single unit over the following two years. The budgets of the new colleges were not separated until 1997.

A new dean of the College of Arts and Humanities was appointed in the fall of 1996 following the retirement of the first dean, and the new dean began to work with chairs and faculty to build an individual identity for the college. COTS later moved to a new location on campus, and both colleges were staffed successfully at the appropriate level. The colleges have operated completely separately since the late 1990s. A new CAH dean was appointed in 2005, and shortly before that the Douglas Honors College became a separate unit outside of the college, reporting to the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies. As of Fall 2007, CAH is comprised of 8 departments and four official interdisciplinary programs—Africana and Black Studies, Art, Asia-Pacific Studies, Communication, English, Film and Video Studies, Foreign Languages, History, Latino and Latin American Studies, Music, Philosophy and Religious Studies, and Theatre Arts (See organization chart in Appendix 2.A.1).

Current Situation

All of the CAH departments and programs offer an undergraduate major, minor, or both. Five departments offer master’s degrees, with Art offering the terminal MFA degree. CAH also provides approximately 32% of the general education program course offerings and extensive service coursework for the entire university. The college plays a major role in Central’s teacher education programs, offering bachelor’s and master’s degrees for students preparing to be secondary teachers and providing course work in educational foundations and discipline-specific methods for teacher education majors. Several new or unique program offerings are included in the curricular offerings of the college, including computer-based graphic art, the MFA in Art that is the only terminal degree program offered at Central, Africana and Black Studies, a film and video studies program incorporating both a critical studies and a production track, teaching English to speakers of other languages, musical theatre, a theatre master’s program for high school teachers, Latino and Latin American Studies, and convergent media in the Communication Department.
Building on a legacy of teaching excellence, CAH faculty are engaged in research, creative activities and service, involving students in the scholarship and practical applications of their various academic specializations, while making important contributions to the intellectual tradition and to society at large. Many are leaders in their fields, publishing, performing, and exhibiting at national and international levels. CAH faculty have won a majority of the nine CWU Distinguished Professor Awards in the past three years, and they have won state and national recognition as well. Many involve students in their research and creative work, and some of these projects take students and faculty overseas for study.

CAH faculty engage students in the practical application of their disciplines through such things as a student newspaper, student literary journal, internships, study abroad, faculty mentored research, student teaching, a lunch-time playwriting series, and a one-act play festival. Furthermore, CAH departments are highly active on campus, with faculty and students working closely together to provide diverse cultural programming for the campus and surrounding region. Activities include a wide range of art exhibitions in the college’s Sarah Spurgeon Gallery, musical recitals and concerts, theatre productions, lectures, symposia, and literary readings. The Department of Music is home to the Kairos Quartet, a resident chamber music quartet funded by an endowment. The college is also proud of its efforts to reach out to the residents of the state and beyond, particularly to the K-12 schools. Programs such as Bridges and Gear Up, the Department of Theatre Arts’ annual youth tour, the Central Washington Writing Project, World Languages Day, after school art classes, a grant funded strings prep program, summer music camps, a summer musical theatre conservatory, and over a dozen annual music festivals and competitions reach out to thousands of public school students and teachers in Washington state and surrounding areas.

The college continues to engage in initiatives to solidify its identity and to support faculty efforts. The CAH Speaker Series has been expanded, the college has established a new Lion Rock Visiting Writers Series, the college website has been completely redesigned to reflect the broad scope of college programs and initiatives, new marketing and publicity materials have been created, a new CAH Advisory Board is growing, and a very much expanded annual college banquet and awards ceremony is now in place that includes faculty, students, staff and alumni. The college has increased support for faculty development, with more travel funds awarded for full and part-time faculty, more summer scholarship/creativity grants, grants to support grant writing, development opportunities for chairs, and a grant for interdisciplinary teaching. These efforts, together with opportunities at the departmental and university levels, help develop and maintain a strong and well-qualified faculty.

The college participates in the university’s strategic planning process through the development of its own plan and the review of department strategic plans contained in program review documents. In November 2007, college faculty, students, staff and administrators completed the initial stages of a strategic planning process that resulted in a new mission, vision, and set of goals (See below) for the college. These goals will be used to develop specific tactics, and to help the college determine its direction, develop budget requests, support effective staffing, and develop and revise curriculum.

**Mission and Goals.**

**Mission.** The College of Arts and Humanities advances knowledge, promotes intellectual inquiry, and cultivates creative endeavor among students and faculty through teaching
informed by scholarship, creative activity, and public and professional involvement. The college is committed to helping students develop intellectual and practical skills for responsible citizenship and the challenges of contemporary life in a global society. The college offers disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs of the highest quality, acts as a steward of the foundational disciplines upon which all inquiry is based, and serves as a cultural center for arts and humanities for the university and the region.

**Vision.** The College of Arts and Humanities will be recognized as a distinguished learning community known regionally for scholarly and creative excellence, innovative and rigorous foundational liberal arts education, and undergraduate and graduate programs that are outstanding and unique in the state.

**Strategic Goals.**
- Create and maintain high quality academic programs
- Enhance support for faculty research and creative activity
- Improve visibility of the college
- Increase CAH share of resources and match resources to growth
- Build a more diverse college community
- Promote interdepartmental programming and collaboration
- Develop a climate of fundraising

**Student Learning Goals.**
- Ensure that students develop disciplinary specific competencies for success in their field
- Improve students’ knowledge of human cultures and diversity for success in a global society
- Facilitate disciplinary and interdisciplinary integrative learning for creative inquiry
- Develop students’ intellectual and practical skills for lifelong learning
- Enhance students’ civic knowledge and engagement locally and globally for responsible citizenship

**Organizational Structure.** The College of Arts and Humanities is one of four schools and colleges under the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The dean of the college reports to the provost. Within the college office the dean supervises one associate dean, one administrative assistant, and one secretary senior. Each of the departments described above has a chair, and each program has a director, all of which report to the dean. The college has two standing committees—a Scholarship Committee and Personnel Committee—and works closely with affiliated interdisciplinary programs in COTS and with the Center for Teaching and Learning. Through a series of interlocking committees, the college is allied with the organizational structure of the university at large.

**Planning and Effectiveness.** The College of Arts and Humanities bases its goals and plans on a combination of parameters provided by the university’s mission and goals, the academic affairs strategic plan, the strategic plans of the departments within the college, and program review recommendations. Last year under a new dean the college embarked on a strategic planning process with a strategic planning committee led by the dean. That committee together with the college chairs finalized a draft of a college mission, vision and set of strategic
and student learning goals to present to the college in Fall 2007. The draft was unveiled at an all college meeting in October, and then put on the web to allow for input from faculty, students and staff. The final version is outlined above and also on the web. Departments are currently aligning their goals with the college ones. The next step will be to devise tactics for each goal and targets for success, so that the college can work on short and long term efforts to achieve the university’s goals.

The new college goals together with linked department goals will now drive college efforts, particularly in the areas of staffing and budgeting. All staffing and funding requests from departments and individual faculty will need to be linked to department and college goals, as will the college staffing and funding requests to the provost. The dean works with chairs in an attempt to balance the needs of each department with the needs of the college. This generally results in consensus; however, the priorities developed do not always meet with universal agreement. The dean collaborates with appropriate chairs (Art, Music and Theatre Arts) to allocate arts production monies in as fair and effective a way as possible.

The college is plagued with inadequate funding, especially with respect to its responsibilities for general education and arts programming, making budget decisions extremely difficult. Many general education courses are funded with one-time monies from the provost and salary savings that are never certain from one quarter to the next. No program has adequate funding, and planning focuses on the best use of resources to meet developing needs. Not all planning, however, is budget-based. The college has made excellent progress in areas such as college mission and goals, curriculum, interdisciplinary collaboration, and program initiatives through its planning process. The college planning process continues to develop and contributes greatly to the cohesiveness of the unit.

The college’s policy manual, the CAH Handbook, contains policies related to planning, evaluation of department chairs and faculty, professional development opportunities for faculty and staff, and awards for faculty, students, and staff. The university’s new Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) mandated new college and departmental performance criteria for faculty, and devising such criteria was a major college and university effort in AY 2006–2007 that is still ongoing. A whole new system of allocating faculty workload was also implemented in AY 2006–2007, again mandated by the CBA. A huge challenge has been to carry out such mandates required by the CBA as of March 2006, and still carry out other forms of assessment and strategic planning.

**Accomplishments and Disappointments.** Each year the dean presents data at the all-college meeting regarding various indices of college success. These indices will now be linked to the new college goals. Departments regularly make public various accomplishments on the college’s good news website, and also discuss accomplishments and challenges in their program reviews.

**Accomplishments.** Among its most important accomplishments, the college

- Recruited and hired a diverse group of excellent faculty for tenure-track and full-time positions in all eight college departments, and in interdisciplinary programs.
• Enhanced support for faculty and staff development by increasing the amount of travel funding, increasing the number and amount of scholarship/creativity grants, and creating a new staff travel grant
• Received three Sphere of Distinction grants to hire new tenure track faculty for interdisciplinary programs (Latino and Latin American Studies and Africana and Black Studies), and to stabilize interdisciplinary programs
• CAH faculty have led the university in number of study abroad opportunities offered at CWU
• CAH faculty have won a majority of the 9 CWU Distinguished Professor Awards in the past three years, and they have won state and national recognition as well.
• Sharpened and clarified policies, procedures and criteria governing review of faculty to assure that they are articulated clearly and are in line with new university policies and criteria
• Made major curricular revisions and created new major and minor programs, including film and video studies, Latino and Latin American Studies, musical theatre, jazz studies, and Africana and Black Studies. Work is progressing on new interdisciplinary minors in non-profit organization administration and in ethics. New certificate programs in professional writing and community college teaching are in the planning stages.
• Boosted the total amount of external grant requests by over 10 times
• Completely revamped college and department websites, and created college marketing and publicity materials for better recruitment of students and faculty and to increase the visibility of college programming and achievements
• Established a new college mission, vision and set of goals to guide planning, budgeting and assessment
• Engaged in many impressive outreach activities (See website), especially with regional schools; several are funded by major grants
• Laid the groundwork for enhanced fundraising by visiting alumni, bringing alumni to campus to celebrate their achievements, hosting receptions for donors, creating sponsorship proposals, hiring a development officer, and establishing the college’s first advisory board
• Established 5 new scholarship endowments, one endowed professorship for $3 million, to be fulfilled in the future, one endowment for the Sarah Spurgeon Gallery, and one for the performing arts. CAH also increased the value of several other endowments
• Created formalized assessment procedures for each Department and for the College that should result in improved programs and planning

Disappointments. There also were disappointments during the period:
• New resources for programmatic growth have been limited. In particular, the college has received only a handful of new tenure-track faculty lines. Given national and state priorities, resources are going more to high demand programs in math and science. There has been insufficient internal reallocation to fund programs that are not high demand.
• The college’s adjunct budget base is roughly $400,000 short of what is needed to fund the college’s contribution to general education. Too much of the general education program is funded with one-time monies that are uncertain from one quarter to the next. This budget burden and uncertainty are really crippling the College of Arts and Humanities, which is central to the university in so many ways.
• University funding of computers and other critically important equipment for programs is insufficient. There is no regular equipment budget. Colleges and departments have to do costly building renovations in order to get much-needed equipment.

**Educational Degree Programs.** Appendix 2.A.2 lists all degree programs for the College of Arts and Humanities together with majors and graduates in each major over the past five years. The table includes data for both undergraduate and graduate programs. The data shows trends and changes for the time period under analysis.

**Statistical Picture of the College of Arts and Humanities.** College and department enrollment figures show changes in the past two years in student credit hours resulting from two sources: a) the change in the university's general education program that slightly reduced the involvement of the college, and b) reduction in time to degree for college students. A comparison of the number of degrees granted by college departments shows a 33% increase over the past five years, a very positive trend.

The average class size for college departments is slightly lower than other colleges in the university. This is primarily due to the nature of departmental programs, particularly in the Departments of Art, Music, and Theatre Arts, where small class sizes are critical to effective educational programs. Overall, the statistical picture for the College of Arts and Humanities portrays an active, vital college effectively serving the needs of its students.

**Fiscal and Physical Resources.** Fiscal resources for the college are barely adequate to meet needs. Of primary concern are funding for the general education program, equipment for faculty, instructional support equipment (including technology), and funds to support new initiatives, though the college very much appreciates the support it has had from the Spheres of Distinction program. The college appreciates the two new “non high demand high demand” faculty lines CAH received in spring 2008.

Physical resources for the college are adequate in some cases and in need of upgrade in others. The Department of Music recently moved into a new state-of-the art facility. The Department of Art has requested renovation to Randall Hall for ventilation, air conditioning, and lighting. The Department of Theatre Arts desperately needs more space for its rapidly growing majors and new musical theatre program, needs new sound equipment in the major theatre space, McConnell Auditorium. New seats have just been installed in Milo Smith Theatre. The Department of Communication has requested space renovations and equipment for its new film and video studies program. The humanities departments in the Language and Literature building are running out of office and classroom space. In December 2005 the college submitted a proposal for a new building to add classroom space and to house departments now in L and L, interdisciplinary programs, and the dean’s suite, which is now isolated from the college’s academic departments.

**Library and Information Resources.** The college appreciates the rapid advances in on-line resources available and commends the library staff for its work in the area. The college shares the concern of departments in the dwindling resources allocated for the purchase of new books and serials. This is a particular issue for the college's graduate programs, and for new programs.
Curriculum Development. CAH departments are conscientious regarding curriculum development. All departments participate actively in academic and professional associations related to their disciplines and use information gathered through these contacts and through assessment processes to keep curriculum current with national trends. Faculty make every effort to ensure that the curriculum meets the needs of the students, the discipline, and society. In particular, CAH faculty have been very active in developing interdisciplinary curriculum. Please see department strategic plans for details on curriculum development.

Educational Program Goals and Objectives. The college supports the development of program goals and objectives as a means of serving students more effectively and in making the best use of available resources. The departments and programs in the college have developed clear program goals and objectives, as well as student learning outcomes. They have linked their outcomes to CAH Student Learning Goals, which have been patterned after the goals endorsed by LEAP (Liberal Education and America’s Promise). These outcomes and goals will now be used to determine the effectiveness of CAH’s major programs.

End-of-Major Assessment Results. All departments are currently formalizing their end-of-major assessment processes, employing a variety of assessment methods (See Exhibits 2.E.31 and 2.E.32). The most common methods include student portfolios (used in Art, Communication, and English), capstone courses (Art, History, and Philosophy), end of major examinations (Foreign Languages, Music and Theatre), surveys (Art, Communication, English, Music, and Philosophy) and reviews of student projects (Art, English, Music, Philosophy, and Theatre Arts). Data from these assessment procedures are used in three primary ways: a) for curriculum development and improvement, b) for individual course change and development, and c) for needed faculty development. In areas where student performance is paramount (Art, Music, Theatre Arts), the departments continually use the strengths and weaknesses of student performance as a vehicle to analyze curriculum and faculty performance. Departments are currently formalizing what have been very informal assessment processes. Starting this year, assessment results will be written up in an annual end-of-year report that will be submitted to the Dean and the AVP for Undergraduate Studies.

Specialized Accreditation and Program Review. The Department of Music is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music. It is the only program in CAH that is accredited by an external agency. All CAH departments and interdisciplinary programs with majors undergo program review every 5 years. This program review process began in 2002, so all programs in the college, with the exception of the newest interdisciplinary majors, have been through one cycle of program review.

Appraisal

The college’s strengths lie in its outstanding faculty, high-quality academic programs, leadership on campus, service to students, and cultural programming for the campus and region. Through efforts of the faculty, chairs, staff, students and dean, a new college mission, vision and set of goals have just been adopted. These expressions of collective identity and aspirations will help the college to stay focused and to reach new levels of achievement over the next 3–6 years. The college is very proud of the vibrancy of its cultural offerings; the art
exhibitions, recitals and concerts, plays, lectures, and symposia offered by faculty and students vastly enrich the university community and the community at large. The college’s significant contribution to the university's general education program is of particular note, as that program gives students the knowledge and skills needed for success in an increasingly global society. In addition, the college strongly supports the preparation of K-12 teachers, and maintains innovative outreach programs with schools in the region.

Of primary importance for the future of the college are the excellent new faculty hired in the past five years. It is vitally important to the college and the university that these faculty are provided a climate in which they can flourish and develop. This means adequate faculty development funds, effective evaluation and feedback systems, and careful monitoring of progress toward tenure. The new CWU Teacher-Scholar Center should help to augment faculty development funding. Recently adopted university, college and department faculty performance criteria and procedures should help to clarify expectations for tenure and promotion.

The future of the college also depends on its maintaining current and creating new innovative academic programs that are unique in the state and region. Furthermore, CAH must do everything it can to link its curriculum and major and minor programs to changing technologies, workplace demands, and regional economic and cultural needs. Programs such as Latino and Latin American Studies, Film and Video Studies, Jazz Studies, Musical Theatre, and the M.A. in Theatre have been developed with this goal of uniqueness in mind. The college is currently working to establish a minor in Non-Profit Organization Administration that should open many employment doors for arts and humanities students. It is also working to increase the number of students who do internships and study abroad in an effort to better prepare students for the workplace and for living and working in a global society.

The next few years will see more aggressive student recruitment efforts in the college, though the music and theatre arts departments presently engage in very aggressive recruitment. The college needs more scholarships to attract the very best students, and it also needs to focus on developing a more diverse student body at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. A new minor in Africana and Black Studies should help the college recruit more African American students. In music, theatre arts, and creative writing, CAH is establishing summer conservatories, festivals and institutes mainly for high school students for purposes of recruitment. The Central Washington Writing Program has recently started summer youth writing camps for middle school students, which should serve as a model for others. The CAH college advisory board has created a summer enrichment program committee to help build more robust summer programs for middle and high school students. These summer programs together with many outreach activities during the academic year and efforts to create new scholarship endowments should help the college recruit more students.

The college continues to face the issue of funding, particularly for general education and for equipment, though overall university budgets over the past three years have been healthy as compared to the previous several years when budget cuts were common. The current state-level funding bias in favor of math and science and other “high demand” programs makes internal reallocation essential, if the arts and humanities are to be supported as they should be. Most importantly, funding for general education needs to be stabilized, so that the
program does not continue to compromise the College of Arts and Humanities’ ability to meet the needs of its majors and graduate students. Realistic funding for general education would not only improve that critically important program, but also allow the college to enhance program development for majors and graduate students, outreach to university centers, and faculty development. The college will continue to be aggressive in seeking increased funding from both internal and external sources.

Staffing, particularly the use of large numbers of non tenure track instructors, remains an issue for the college and the university as a whole. While the CBA has helped with improvements in pay, benefits, and integration into the university’s governance structure for such faculty, there are still things the college can do to improve the workplace environment for non tenure track faculty. Given that non tenure track faculty teach many lower division courses, CAH is working to improve mentoring for these critically important faculty.

The college also needs to develop greater consistency across departments in the use of student learning outcomes and assessment. The value of assessment has been well demonstrated by a number of college departments, most notably Communication, English, and Music. Each department and interdisciplinary degree program is now working hard to develop effective assessment instruments in line with new college goals, and these instruments will be used in the future to provide regular reports about progress on meeting goals and improvements made as a result of assessment data.

The future brings new opportunities and challenges. The College of Arts and Humanities will continue to refine and focus its identity within the university through careful planning and collaborative work with the departments and across the university. Given the centrality of the college to the mission of the university and to the campus and regional cultural life, the future looks positive indeed.
College of Business

Historical Perspective

The College of Business (CB), established as a separate academic unit in 1974, currently offers the following degrees and certificates:

- Bachelor of Science in Accounting,
- Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (with various specializations),
- Bachelor of Science in Economics (with various specializations)
- Certificate in Supply Chain Management, and
- Masters of Professional Accountancy

The College is comprised of the Department of Accounting, Department of Economics, Department of Finance and Operations & Supply Chain, and the Department of Management. The latter two departments were created when the Department of Business Administration was split in 2006. These departments share a common vision, mission, and set of shared values.

Current Situation

Mission Statement, Strategic Objectives and Goals. The CB Mission Statement is comprised of the vision, mission, and shared values. The VISION is a concise statement of aspiration and focuses on outcomes emerging from a scholarly community that values teaching and research:

**CWU’s College of Business will be recognized as a premier learning community creating an environment in which students, faculty and staff reach their full potential.**

Mission. The mission, last revised in 2005, describes the CB and its purpose.

**CWU’s College of Business faculty and staff create value and opportunity for our students by focusing on quality in undergraduate education at the Ellensburg campus and university centers in the Puget Sound and central regions of Washington state. We accomplish this through emphasis on excellence in teaching, strengthened by faculty research and supported by professional service.**

Shared Values. The statement of the college’s shared values enumerates a set of core beliefs and commitments shared by the CB faculty and staff. CB believes in:

- student success
- lifelong learning
- integrity and ethical behavior
- excellence

CB commits itself to:

- prepare students for the future
- impart knowledge on which students can build
- treat everyone with respect and fairness
- exemplify its values by serving as teachers and role models
- maintain currency in its academic disciplines and professional fields
- engage in scholarly activities that contribute to the body of knowledge in its disciplines.

Strategic Objectives and Goals. The value proposition from the CB mission centers on creating value, opportunity and quality in education. In support of the CB vision and mission, there are nine strategic objectives and goals associated with these strategic objectives.

Objective 1 - Faculty: Sufficiency, Qualifications, Management and Support

- To maintain a faculty sufficient to provide stability and ongoing quality improvement for instructional programs offered
To ensure intellectual qualifications and current expertise of faculty
To ensure that the CB has a clearly defined process to evaluate individual faculty member’s contributions to the CB mission
To establish well-documented and communicated processes to manage and support faculty members over the progression of their career

Objective 2 - Students: Admission, Retention and Support
To ensure that admission to degree programs offered are clear and consistent with the CB mission
To ensure that academic standards and retention practices produce high quality graduates
To provide a staff sufficient for stability and ongoing quality improvement for student support services
To maintain a faculty sufficient to provide stability and ongoing quality improvement for instructional programs offered

Objective 3 - Management of Curricula
To develop, monitor, evaluate and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs by using well documented, systematic processes

Objective 4 - Assurance of Learning
To assess the impact of curricula on learning

Objective 5 - University
To support and actively participate in CWU governance, enrollment management and marketing

Objective 6 - State and Local Communities
To develop partnerships with and serve the needs of state and local constituents

Objective 7 - Business Community
To broaden, expand and strengthen relationships with business professionals and business organizations in the Puget Sound and central regions of Washington state

Objective 8 - Alumni
To enhance alumni relations

Objective 9 - Executive Committee Leadership
To ensure efficient and effective management of the CB and its departments, and to expand the resources of the CB

Organizational Structure. The College of Business consists of 4 departments, each with a department chair. The college’s chief executive officer for academic, budgetary, and personnel is the dean. The dean’s office consists of an associate dean, an external relations officer, a coordinator for the Pre-Major Advising Center, a full-time administrative assistant, a half-time tech specialist (computer/web support) and two student assistants. Governance of the CB proceeds from the Executive Committee (comprised of the dean, associate dean, department chairs and faculty liaison, elected by the faculty). The organizational chart is presented in Appendix 2.A.1

There are four faculty committees linked directly to the first four strategic objectives: Faculty; Curriculum; Students; and Assurance of Learning. An atypical feature of the CB is that it delivers academic programs on the Ellensburg campus as well as a significant presence at CWU-Lynnwood and CWU-Des Moines, the “Westside” centers. About 40% of full-time equivalent students in the CB matriculate on the Westside while roughly 1/3 of the faculty reside on the Westside and are deployed at these two centers.

Planning and Effectiveness. The College’s mission statement and set of strategic objectives, identified initially in its Strategic Plan: “Shaping the Future” (winter 2002) as well as updated statements (April 2005), form the basis for the majority of activities pursued by the College. The following Accomplishments and Challenges section will describe planning and effectiveness as well as operationally defining the College’s mission.

Accomplishments and Challenges. The following tables and narratives illustrate the linkages among key elements of the mission, selected mission-aligned activities, and CB assessment indicators and activities for determining progress toward meeting its mission. The eleven mission elements presented in this section define the meaning of the CB mission and reflect results from the set of strategic
objectives and goals. Further evidence may be found in the NWCCU self studies of CB departments. Value. There are four mission elements associated with creating value.

Value Mission Element 1: “Prepare an Increasingly Diverse Student Population”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission-Linked Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Indicators &amp; Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- CB-sponsored Leadership and Diversity Lecture Series</td>
<td>- Monitor diversity data for the region, university, and college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase support for diversity-related student organizations</td>
<td>- Periodic review of support for student organizations and minority scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase minority scholarships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results to Date

Diversity Data. Data supplied by Institutional Research indicates that the percentage of minority students in the CB has increased from 18.8% in 2001 to 27.2% in 2007. The percentage of foreign students fluctuates and currently is around 5% of the CB student population.

Leadership & Diversity Lecture Series: Since 2000, a diverse set of speakers has been featured in the L&D Lecture Series. This includes African-American, Hispanic and Asian speakers as well as female. Diversity is reflected in activities such as the Business-to-Business Speaker Series, keynote speakers at the annual CB Honors Banquet and features in the CB newsletter, The Beacon.

Support to student organizations. In 2003, a Spanish-speaking business students club, ECO or Exit, Conocimiento, Oportunidad (Success, Knowledge, and Opportunity) was founded. The club mission has expanded its scope to a more international orientation.

Scholarships. The 1999 NWCCU self-study reported that $27,000 was awarded in student scholarships. By 2006, CB awarded $40,850 in scholarships; in 2007, $58,500, and in 2008, over $61,000. Donors include Boeing, which funded general business scholarships, a Boeing Supply Chain Scholarship, and a Boeing Minority Scholarship. Costco established the Costco Scholars scholarship fund, 50 percent of which was designated for underrepresented students. In 2008, almost $17,000 in scholarships was specifically designed for minorities.

Value Mission Element 2: “Knowledge, Competencies, and Skills for Productive Careers”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission-Linked Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Indicators &amp; Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Encourage student interest in internships; cultivate placement opportunities</td>
<td>- Internship and placement data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collect direct and indirect data</td>
<td>- Periodic curriculum review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Results of CPA exam in accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Results of ETS field exam in business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review of graduate satisfaction surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results to Date

Internships. During the 5 quarters after Fall 2006, the average number of CB students taking part in internships per quarter is 26.2. Faculty maintain networks through such events as annual recruiting events in Seattle and Yakima and visiting with recruiters from public accounting firms during their campus interview visits. Accounting also tracks placements. For instance, the Fall, 2007 data showed that 16 Accounting students graduating in 2007–2008 were already placed with an employer.

Periodic Curriculum Review/Results of Standardized Exams. Department self studies report how standardized examinations have led to curriculum reform. For example, CPA scores led the Accounting Department to restructure its Master of Professional Accountancy
curriculum to parallel the sections of the CPA exam. The Department of Management raised course admission standards and created courses for non-majors (in marketing and in management) after evaluating data from the ETS Major Field Exam. The Department of Economics added a capstone course and a new submajor concentration. It will adopt the nationally-normed ETS Major Field Exam for future assessments.

Graduate satisfaction surveys. As a recently introduced service, CWU Testing Services has begun surveys of alumni. In 2007, it surveyed alumni graduating in 2002–2006 from the Department of Business Administration. The knowledge, skills, and abilities listed here were chosen as benchmarks since they correspond most closely to the recently adopted (effective Fall, 2008) set of desired knowledge, skills, and abilities in the BSBA degree program. It is anticipated that focusing on these attributes throughout the curriculum will result in improvement as indicated from alumni.

### Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance in Job? Avg. on a Scale of 1 (not at all important) to 5 (critical)</th>
<th>How well did CB prepare you? Avg. on a Scale of 1 (very poor) to 5 (very well)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking Critically</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics in Decision Making</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading/Team Participation</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value Mission Element 3: “Delivered by Faculty who are Dedicated to Using Their Academic Preparation and Business Experience”**

**Mission-Linked Activities**

- Strong programs for faculty evaluation and faculty planning
- Support for faculty professional development
- Improve research productivity
- Encourage faculty participation in professional associations
- Develop and expand research grants awards program

**Assessment Indicators & Activities**

- Detailed databases maintained and reviewed for all faculty in the areas of teaching, research and service
- Annual review of Faculty Activities Reports for the past year and Faculty Plans for the coming year for all full-time faculty
- CB-wide research standards implemented and monitored

**Results to Date**

**Databases/Standards.** Since the implementation of the new Collective Bargaining Agreement, annual workloads and activity reports are maintained on a database by the Assistant Vice President of Faculty Relations as well as in the Office of Dean. In 2001 and reaffirmed in 2005, the CB adopted college-wide formal research standards for faculty to attain the AACSB accreditation standard for academically-qualified (AQ) status. The AACSB maintains similar standards for professionally-qualified (PQ) faculty. Reviews for this past year in conjunction with new hires beginning in 2007 indicate a significant improvement in the academic qualifications of faculty in the CB, as demonstrated in the following table of published refereed research journal articles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>In-press</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of articles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Support.** The Research Grants Awards Program, instituted to reward faculty for research productivity, has expanded considerably. Since November 2002, roughly $267,000 has been awarded to 45 CB faculty for 143 publications in peer-reviewed journals. These
awards, which are $2000 per CB author, with a maximum of $4000 per Category A article, are supported from external funding by the Advisory Board through their contributions to the Competitive Edge Fund. Within the CB, each department expends money to support faculty development and participation in professional associations. In 2006–2007, Accounting spent $19,809, Economics spent $9,580.64, the Department of Management spent $21,744.00, and figures were not available for the Department of Finance and Operations & Supply Chain. Each year, CB recognizes faculty who have excelled, respectively, in Teaching, Advising, Research and Professional Service. In addition, CB faculty are recognized at the university level. In 2007 CWU recognized Economics professor Peter Saunders as the 2007 Distinguished University Professor for Research and Creative Endeavors. Other recent awards and achievements are included in CB department self studies.

Value Mission Element 4: “Enhance Student Learning”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission-Linked Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Indicators &amp; Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Leverage faculty expertise across sites through the use of distance learning technologies</td>
<td>- Interviews with faculty involved with the distance learning program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Create additional “out-of-classroom” learning opportunities for students</td>
<td>- Accounting students participation in VITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Integrate use of case studies in capstone courses</td>
<td>- Industry guest speakers in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Curriculum review by capstone course faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student satisfaction surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results to Date

Distance Learning. In any given quarter, roughly 12% of CB courses are delivered via synchronous interactive television. In addition to the supplemental income paid to faculty, they receive travel reimbursements. For Fall 2007 in the Department of Accounting, reimbursement exceeded $5000. Hence, a substantial level of resources is devoted to this endeavor.

Student satisfaction surveys. As noted previously, in 2007, CWU Testing Services surveyed alumni graduating in 2002–2006 from the Department of Management (later Departments of Management and Finance and Operations & Supply Chain). As reflected in the following table, alumni were very content with their overall experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion about Business Education at CWU</th>
<th>Avg. on a Scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided useful perspectives</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate prep. For professional board/certification exams</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program prepared me well for professional challenges</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out-of-class experience. The most systematic “out-of-classroom” experience is the accounting course, ACCT 492 (Volunteers Income Tax Assistance). From 2005–2007, an average of 15 students in this class filed 250, 350, and 340 returns, respectively, for low income individuals.

Tracking class speakers is somewhat problematic; however, on the Westside for example, Operations & Supply Chain students in the last 12 months have had classroom speakers from Boeing, Port of Seattle, Johnson Controls, Microsoft, and Nintendo. On the Ellensburg campus, student clubs and the “Boardroom Meets the Classroom” experience enrich the educational experience. In 2006–2007, student clubs either held field trips or featured speakers from Anderson Hay, C.H. Robinson, Moss Adams, Seattle Mariners, Suncadia Resort, Dell, Boeing, Cigna Daily Record, and Cashmere Valley Bank. “Boardroom Meets the
Classroom” is a round-robin event where students meet with CB Advisory Board members. Last year’s event attracted 11 Board members and more than 80 students.

Curriculum Review. Approximately ten years ago, the faculty teaching capstone courses in the Department of Management decided to coordinate sections and, for example, administer case studies across all sections. By 2006–2007, an audit of syllabi indicated that case studies, live cases, or case simulations were being used in all capstone classes. Common course objectives have been developed for many other CB courses. There has to-date been little recognition of the need to measure, using a direct measure of assessment, the outcome of stated objectives. There is now a growing recognition of the importance of direct measurement, at least at the program level.

Opportunity. There is one primary mission element associated with creating opportunity.

Opportunity Mission Element: University of Choice for Students/State of the Art Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission-Linked Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Indicators &amp; Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- University of Choice for Students</td>
<td>- SAT/ACT scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employer of Choice for Faculty</td>
<td>- Number of employment offers accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Serving students through CWU Centers</td>
<td>- Numbers of students at Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State-of-the-Art Facilities</td>
<td>- Amount of money spent/# of new buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results to Date

University of choice for students. SAT/ACT data show that CWU is generally the 2nd or 3rd choice for prospective students. Western Washington University, Washington State University, University of Washington-Bothell, and City University are competitors for the Lynnwood Center and University of Washington-Tacoma is the main competitor of the Des Moines Center.

Employer of choice for faculty. Until 2005, the university had a salary cap of roughly $83,000 which was a deterrent to attracting faculty who could thrive under CWU’s teaching and scholarship conditions. In 2005, with the advent of the union and the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the salary cap was eliminated. The result was more successful faculty searches. In 2004–5, 5 searches were conducted and 1 offer accepted. In contrast, during 2006–2007, 13 searches were conducted with 10 hires occurring – all academically-qualified (AQ) faculty.

Serving students through CWU Centers. In 2006–2007, 42% of the CB student FTE’s were generated at the university centers, compared to 14% for the university as a whole.

State-of-the-Art Facilities. In the 1999 NWCCU report, it was noted that the Shaw-Smyser building had undergone a $10 million remodel in the early 1990’s and that the Westside centers were in need of improved facilities. A $17 million structure was completed in the Fall 2002 at the Lynnwood Center on the Edmonds Community College campus. By the Fall of 2005, a $30 million new building housed the CB program at the Des Moines Center on the Highline Community College campus. These modern facilities are described in Standard 2 and Standard 8.

Quality in Education. There are six mission elements associated with creating quality in education.

Quality in Education Mission Element 1: “Teaching Excellence is Our Priority”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission-Linked Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Indicators &amp; Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- CB faculty recognition program</td>
<td>- Track record of university &amp; CASE awards to CB faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty awards for teaching are mentioned in department self studies. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) data indicates a strong performance in the classroom by CB faculty for EVERY quarter since Winter 2004. The CWU Alumni Association chooses junior faculty from each college, each year for the “Excellence in Teaching” Award. Recent recipients include Mark Pritchard (2008–Marketing), Chad Wassell (2007–Economics); Graeme Coetzer (2006–Management); Ozden Bayazit (2005–Operations & Supply Chain). Since 1998–99, student representatives assisted the Dean with selecting the CB’s Award for Faculty Excellence in Teaching and in Advising.

Quality in Education Mission Element 2: “Learning Environment Where Students and Faculty Work Together”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission-Linked Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Indicators &amp; Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Create and maintain student-centered learning environment</td>
<td>- Student input to CB teaching and advising awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greater involvement of students in CB governance</td>
<td>- Regular meetings with CB Dean's Council of club presidents/leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greater faculty involvement in all CB-related club activities</td>
<td>- Student participation in CB faculty searches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student satisfaction surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results to Date
There are 7 CB student clubs. Their activity is vigorous and effective. For instance, since 1994 SHRM has been in the Top 10 Chapters nationally every year. In 2007, Beta Alpha Psi, the honor society for accounting and finance students, initiated the process to be officially recognized by the national association. In 2005, CWU students placed 1st in the UW Undergraduate Tax Competition and in 2006 and 2004, CWU Accounting students placed 3rd. In 2006 and in 2007, the American Marketing Association recognized CWU’s chapter as an Outstanding Collegiate Chapter, among the top 16 of over 200 active chapters. In 2005, two undergraduates won Undergraduate First Place in the APICS Donald W. Fogarty International Student Paper Competition. Since 1998–99, the Dean meets once a month during the academic year with the officers of the CB clubs and honor societies. It has been standard practice to have 1 student on each faculty search. Students are major forces behind the publication of the CB newsletter, The Beacon.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission-Linked Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Indicators &amp; Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Integrate contemporary trends in business into the curriculum</td>
<td>- Curricular review involving CB Advisory Board with focus on what businesses are looking for in the people they hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure key perspectives (ethics, global, political, social, legal &amp; regulatory, environmental, technology, and diversity) included in the core curriculum</td>
<td>- Regular curriculum review by CB Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promote well-rounded business school graduates</td>
<td>- Program review involving outside consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encourage team-based work projects</td>
<td>- Monitor requirement that at least 50 percent of coursework in “non-business”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emphasize important skills across</td>
<td>- Review of syllabi by departments and CB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
curriculum
- Foster outcomes assessment and continuous improvement
- committees
- ETS Field Exam for end-of-major assessment of learning

Results to Date
Curriculum/Program Review. The last large scale curriculum review by CB Curriculum Committee occurred in time for the 2004 NWCCU update. It was a syllabi audit focused on such “key perspectives” as ethics, global, political, social, legal, environmental, and diversity. No changes occurred as the result of this audit.

The College, in part or as a whole, has been reviewed by external reviewers as part of the Program Review Process. Program reviews and subsequent changes of the Department of Accounting (2003), Department of Economics (2004), and Department of Management (2008) are reported in detail in department self studies and the program assessment web site. The Department of Finance and Operations & Supply Chain is scheduled to be reviewed in 2010-11.

An internal CB review of syllabi in the last few years by the new Associate Dean revealed the following observations: Overall syllabi are very nicely done; many do not mention course prerequisites (only 300-400 level courses were examined). None are tied to the goals of the degrees/programs they are housed in. During a college-wide meeting in the Fall 2007, faculty had a first hearing on updating syllabi requirements (last updated 2001) which would address these deficiencies.

In 2007, AACSB mandated that outcomes assessment be used to “inform the curriculum.” So, faculty did indeed use outcome measures like the ETS Field exam to make changes in the curriculum. Finally, a survey of CB Advisory Board members will occur focusing on what businesses are looking for in the people they hire.

Quality in Education Mission Element 4:
“Students at the Individual Level, Innovative Instruction, Appropriate Technology”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission-Linked Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Indicators &amp; Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Working with students one-on-one</td>
<td>- # of Supervised Internships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pedagogical Approaches</td>
<td>- # of Independent Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of Technology in coursework</td>
<td>- Discussion of pedagogies and technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results to Date
As mentioned previously, during the last 5 quarters since Fall, 2006, the average number of CB students taking part in internships per quarter is 26.2. All internships are supervised by a faculty member. In addition, the number of independent studies/directed research occurring in 2007 was 81 and in 2008 was 53. Another measurement is research undertaken by and/or with students. In 2007, this type of activity resulted in 8 conference presentations and/or proceedings and in 2008, there 9 conference presentations.

CB was the first adopter of DE technology and very quickly adopted the use of team-based projects and case studies in the curriculum. Currently, Assurances of Learning standards are being implemented which, by their very nature, must address appropriate technologies.

Quality in Education Mission Element 5:
“Linkages with Alumni, CB Advisory Board, Employers & Professionals”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission-Linked Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Indicators &amp; Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Involvement of the CB Advisory Board, Alumni, and Employers/Professionals who</td>
<td>- Advisory Board attendance and participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
give time, expertise, and access to resources. - Alumni attendance and participation - Employers/Professionals events

Results to Date

Advisory Board. The CB Advisory Board has grown from 18 members in 1999-00 to the current board of 32. In 2008, 11 volunteered for the “Boardroom Meets the Classroom” program. While not asked to donate money specifically, they have been most generous. For instance, in 2008, Costco increased its scholarship contribution from $20,000 to $25,000. Boeing has donated $11,230. Donations from Advisory Board companies, outside of student scholarships, go into the Competitive Edge Fund (CEF) which supports the faculty Research Grant Awards Program, external relations, and student activities such as travel to national conferences. In fiscal year 2008, over $47,000 has been donated.

Alumni. Linkages with alumni are also becoming stronger, due in part to a dedicated External Relations Officer in the College. For instance, in Fall 2007, Moss Adams LLP who employs approximately 67 CWU alumni, cooperated with the College to host an Accounting Alumni Reunion event. For all Business-to-Business Speaker Series, alumni are specifically invited, and the Beacon now features a specific section devoted to alumni. CB maintains an active alumni page on its web site which features current events and information.

Although some alumni sit on the Advisory Board, about half of the members are not CWU alumni. This intentional strategy spreads the student employment networking possibilities. Another strategy, since 1999, for widening the network is the annual Economic Outlook Conference which typically hosts 100 participants in Ellensburg.

Quality in Education Mission Element 6: “Outcomes Assessment and Continuous Improvement”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission-Linked Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Indicators &amp; Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Data Collection</td>
<td>- Decision Making based on Data Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results to Date

The pursuit of AACSB-accreditation reflects CB’s commitment to continuous improvement FOREVER. The history of the CB reflects changes designed to improve student services, including but not limited to, establishing the Pre-Major Advisor Center in 1993 – the only such college-based advising service at CWU.

Educational Degree Programs. The College offers the following degrees and certificates: Bachelors of Science in Accounting, Business Administration (with various concentrations), Economics (with various specializations), a certificate in Supply Chain Management, and a Masters of Professional Accountancy.

Statistical Picture of the College: Students. The current number of majors and pre-majors for the college in 2007–2008 is 1100 having decreased by 100 from the peak in the early- to mid-1990’s of 1200. For the four year period from 2004–2005 to 2007–2008, an average of 230, 328, 23 students a year earned undergraduate degrees in Accounting, Business Administration, or Economics, respectively. This totals an average of 581 undergraduate degrees a year. Eighty-seven percent of the undergraduates at the Ellensburg campus are age 23 or under; 46% are at/below the age of 23 at Des Moines; and nearly 39% are under the age of 23 at the Lynnwood campus. The diversity of the CB student body was discussed earlier. For the past two academic years, FTE market share within the CB was roughly 28% for Accounting; 14%, Economics; 18%, Finance and Operations & Supply Chain; and 40%,
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Management. University-wide for the 2007–2008 academic year, CB is about 14% of total FTEs and 22% of the undergraduate degree conferred.

**Faculty.** Excluding the Dean and Associate Dean, for 2007–2008, the current number of tenured, tenure track, and annual contract, non-tenure track is 56 having grown since the 1999 NWCCU report of 50 full-time faculty. Of these 56, 41 are tenure/tenure track and 15 are annual contract, non-tenure track. Twenty percent of all current full-time faculty are female. Examining only tenure and tenure-track faculty, 18% are female and 75% of the annual contract, non-tenure track are all males and all white. Of the 13% non-whites, all are internationals.

**Fiscal and Physical Resources.** The budget for CB is currently around $4.8 million, almost exclusively devoted to salaries. The most significant change in recent events occurred with the discontinuation of the salary cap in conjunction with the creation of the union. The salary cap was a major deterrent to attracting PhD faculty who are willing and able to produce research in addition to the expected teaching excellence. While more faculty have been recruited and hired since the salary cap was lifted, the salaries are still woefully below salaries at similar business schools nationwide. Exhibit 2.E.135 reports the discrepancies between current CWU CB average salaries and reported CUPA average salaries. The only group of CB faculty ahead of the market is found in the Dept. of Economics at the rank of Full Professor. Summarized, CWU accounting faculty are under market roughly $10,000; economics faculty are under market approximately $2,000; and the rest of the faculty are under market approximately $7,000.

**Physical Resources.** Discussed earlier.

**Library and Information Resources.** Information is found in the NWCCU Report, Standard 5.

**Curriculum Development.**

**Major/Minor Curricula.** Curriculum Development in the college is currently being driven predominantly by outcomes assessment, either real or envisioned. For instance, the ETS Field Exam and a major capstone course are used to inform the curriculum, as described above. Further evidence is presented in CB departmental self studies.

**Interdisciplinary Curricula.** The CB does not regularly participate in interdisciplinary degrees. Other majors that include CB courses must contain no more than 25% of the College of Business curriculum. In addition, the title of the degree may not imply that it is some type of “alternative” business degree.

**General Education Curriculum.** The Economics Department offers four course options in the Breadth portion of General Education, but this is the extent of involvement for the College of Business.

**Educational Program Goals and Objectives.** In order to assume a certain level of preparedness, CB departments have established entry-to-major requirements that call for satisfactory completion of premajor courses and an overall GPA exceeding a departmental minimum. To circumvent the intent of these requirements, some students switched majors or
obtained instructor permission to enter major classes. Departments have altered their procedures to curtail these abuses.

Program goals and student learning goals have been developed for each of the undergraduate and graduate degrees offered by the College of Business. These are described in each department’s NWCCU self-study, in its program plan on the university web site, and in its 1-year and 5-year program review documents on the university web site.

End of Major Assessment Results. Educational Testing Service (ETS) developed a nationally normed test of general business in several fields. Following a successful pilot test during Fall Quarter 2002, the College of Business adopted the ETS Field Exam. Except for economics majors, the examination currently is administered to senior-level CB majors as part of MGT 489 (Strategic Management), an end-of-program capstone course. Results are described in department self studies and mentioned in the narrative above.

There are 3 fundamental results gleaned from the data. (1) CWU students scored consistently higher than the national average. They also provide a starting point from which to assess future improvements in curricula and instruction. (2) There is no appreciable difference based on location of students. Students at Ellensburg, Des Moines and Lynnwood scored about the same and scored consistently higher than the national average. (3) CWU students tended to score higher than the national average on the more quantitative areas of business (e.g., accounting, finance, economics, quantitative business analysis, information systems) and lower on the less quantitative areas (legal and social, international, marketing and management)

The MPA program currently uses a Master’s Thesis, Project Study, or Examination, but as discussed will be effective 2008–2009 aligning its outcomes more with the CPA exam.

Specialized Accreditation and Program Review. The academic year 2008–2009 is the self-study year initial AACSB accreditation. This will be the third attempt to obtain AACSB accreditation.

Appraisal

Numerous positive changes have occurred in recent years within the CB to better align its strategic objectives and goals with its vision and mission. Continuous improvement processes have been developed and implemented in key areas to ensure better advancement of the mission and achievement of vision. Data gathering, assessment activities, and the accompanying feedback mechanisms are increasingly more routine, including transparency and consistency of policy implementation. Significant improvements have been made in the processes of guiding and supporting the faculty in the areas of instructional effectiveness, research and professional service, with increasing levels of support for faculty professional development activities. For instance, it is clear what qualifications are needed for a faculty member to achieve and maintain academically-qualified (AQ) status. The standardization of syllabi, though perhaps viewed as trivial, performs a variety of functions including mentoring junior faculty into the explicit expectations of the school and university regarding appropriate parameters including but not limited to the treatment of the disabled as well as academic
integrity issues. All faculty, junior and senior, are required to contemplate their role in the curriculum by listing prerequisites but also their participation in the Assurances of Learning.
College of Education and Professional Studies

**Historical Perspective**

The School of Professional Studies was established in 1980 to coordinate a variety of professional training programs of the university. Included was its role as the organizing unit for professional preparation programs for the K-12 schools. In 1995, as the result of recommendations of a faculty task force, the college was renamed the College of Education and Professional Studies to emphasize the importance of teacher preparation at the university as well as within the college. At the same time, the Department of Education was divided into two departments: The Department of Teacher Education Programs (TEP) offered undergraduate majors in reading, bilingual education, early childhood education, elementary education, and special education and graduate programs in educational administration. The Department of Curriculum and Supervision coordinated the theoretical and pedagogical components for teacher preparation and provides master's level work for practicing teachers. At the request of the faculty, the two departments were reunited into the Department of Education in 2003. The Department of Home Economics Department was renamed the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences which better reflects its programs which include family and consumer studies, fashion merchandising, family studies, and recreation and tourism. The Department of Business Education was renamed the Information Technology and Administrative Management Department its programs in information technology, administrative management, and retail management. The Department of Industrial Engineering and Technology offers programs in electrical engineering technology, mechanical engineering technology, industrial education, construction management, safety and health management, and safety education (driver education). The Department of Aviation provides programs in flight technology, aviation management, and aviation maintenance management. The Department of Physical Education, Health, and Leisure Services was renamed the Department of Health, Human Performance, and Nutrition to better identify the focus on programs in physical education, exercise science, fitness and sports management, paramedics, athletic training, school and community health education, food service management, and nutrition. The Departments of Military Sciences (AFROTC) and Aerospace Studies (AFROTC) offer courses in military science and in aerospace studies respectively.

**Current Situation**

The College of Education and Professional Studies offers a wide variety of programs to meet the needs of students interested in professions ranging from teaching to leadership in the military. The quality of program offerings is reflected in the number of programs that have achieved specialized accreditation. Of approximately 10,000 students attending CWU, approximately 25% are enrolled in programs offered by the College of Education and Professional Studies.

**Departments and Programs.** The College of Education and Professional Studies is comprised of twelve departments. In March 2009, Health, Human Performance and Nutrition split into two departments – Nutrition, Exercise and Health Science and Physical Education, School and Public Health. As separate departments, the two departments still are quite sizable having
approximately 15 faculty and staff. The split allows one department to focus on educator preparation and the other to focus on the preparation of candidates in the area of clinical health sciences. In April 2009, the Department of Education split into four departments - The Department of Educational Foundations and Curriculum, Department of Teaching Elementary, Adolescent, and Young Children, Department of Language, Literacy, and Special Education, and Department of Advanced Programs. Transitioning from one department with thirteen programs and fifty-five faculty to four departments where program alignment is based on similar instructional, pedagogical, and experiential learning allows faculty and staff to focus on enhancing and growing the programs. The final step to split the departments will occur in July 2009 when each department is assigned a separate budget number. The CEPS departments are:

- **Advanced Programs.** The Department of AP houses Education Administration, Library Media, and Professional Certification programs for teachers and administers. There are four and a half tenured and one non-tenure track faculty assigned to this department. Education Administration offers programs off-campus at the Des Moines Center. Library Media is currently a summer-only program but is planning to have an on-line option during the 2009–10 academic year. Professional Certification is required by the state and is the second level of certification for teachers and principals. The CWU program is offered on campus, on-line, by distance education and at the CWU centers.

- **Aerospace Studies and Military Science.** Aerospace Studies is the Air Force ROTC program with three cadre; Military Science is the Army ROTC program with six cadre. Both programs are housed in Peterson Hall on north campus. Along with cadre and cadets, both programs offer two, three, and four-year scholarships for candidates interested in pursuing a career in the military.

- **Aviation.** The Department of Aviation includes Airway Science includes Aviation Management, Aviation Maintenance Management, Commercial Pilot, and Flight Officer programs. There are three tenure and tenure-track faculty and four full-time non-tenure track faculty. In addition to programs offered on the Ellensburg campus, Aviation also has an off-campus program located at the CWU Moses Lake center.

- **Educational Foundations and Curriculum.** The Department of EFC houses professional core courses that all pre-service teachers are required to take. The graduate program included is the Master Teacher. There are eighteen tenure and tenure-track faculty and two full-time non-tenure track faculty. In addition to programs offered on the Ellensburg campus, the professional core supports all off-campus education programs located at the CWU Des Moines, Lynnwood, Pierce, Wenatchee, and Yakima centers.

- **Family and Consumer Sciences.** The Department FCS includes programs in family studies, fashion merchandising, interior design, recreation and tourism management, teaching family and consumer science, business, and marketing subjects in secondary school. The graduate program is a Masters in Family and Consumer Sciences. There are a total of eleven tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty in the department.

- **Industrial and Engineering Technology.** The Department of IET includes programs in construction management, electronics engineering technology, mechanical engineering technology, industrial technology, safety & health management, and teaching business education, marketing education, and industrial and engineering technology subjects in secondary schools. Graduate programs include Engineering Technology. There are thirteen tenure and tenure-track faculty and five full-time non-tenure track faculty. In addition to
In addition to programs offered on the Ellensburg campus, the Masters in Engineering Technology is also offered at the CWU-Des Moines center.

- **Information Technology and Administrative Management.** In addition to programs in information technology and administrative management, the department includes programs in web and database administrative technology, network administration and management, and retail management & technology. There are six tenure and tenure-track faculty and four full-time non-tenure track faculty. In addition to programs offered on the Ellensburg campus, Bachelor of Applied Science in Information Technology and Administrative Management is offered simultaneously at the CWU Des Moines, Lynnwood, and Pierce centers.

- **Language, Literacy, and Special Education.** The Department of Language, Literacy, and Special Education focuses on K-12 teacher education endorsements in special education, reading, Bilingual Education, and Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) programs. Graduate programs include Reading and Special Education. There are seventeen tenure and tenure-track and one full-time non-tenure track faculty. In addition to program offerings at the CWU-Ellensburg campus, reading is offered at the CWU-Pierce Center, special education at the Wenatchee Center, and Teaching English as a Second Language at the Yakima, Lynnwood, and Pierce Centers.

- **Nutrition, Exercise and Health Science.** The Department of NEHS houses nutrition, dietetics, food service management exercise science, and paramedic training. Graduate programs include an MS degree in both Exercise Science and Nutrition. There are fourteen tenure and tenure-track and two non-tenure track faculty in the department.

- **Physical Education, School and Public Health.** The Department of PESPH houses public health, coaching, fitness, personal training, dance, physical Education and health Education. The graduate program is in Physical Education. In addition to programs offered on the Ellensburg campus, the Masters in Physical Education is an online program. There are fourteen tenure and tenure-track and three non-tenure track faculty in the department.

- **Teaching Elementary, Adolescent and Young Children.** The TEACH department focuses on K-8 teacher education endorsements in elementary education, early childhood education, and middle level education. There are eleven and a half tenure and tenure track and four non-tenure track faculty. In addition to the Ellensburg Campus, elementary education programs are offered at five of the CWU centers (Des Moines, Lynnwood, Pierce, Wenatchee, and Yakima) and early childhood is offered at the Des Moines Center. Middle level endorsements were approved by the state a few years ago and CWU is in the process of building this program.

In addition to the professional studies program, an important function of the programs of the College of Education and Professional Studies is to coordinate programs of preparation for K-12 school personnel. Students complete training programs leading to state certification in three of the university's colleges. The teacher preparation program is one of the largest in the state and has been for the last forty years. To continue to be a major teacher training institution in the region requires a strong faculty with an innovative spirit to explore ways of improving the preparation of teachers. An example of such innovation is the year-long student teaching experience that is offered in collaboration with the Ellensburg School District.

**Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL).** The center, previously the University Professional Education Committee, was established in 1992 to serve as the university's governance unit for the preparation of K-12 school professionals. The center was developed to reflect the
commitment of faculty across three academic units – the College of Arts and Humanities, the College of Education and Professional Studies, and the College of the Sciences – to the preparation of school personnel. It serves as the umbrella organization for all school personnel programs and has as its primary goal to facilitate communication, cooperation, and collaboration. The CTL is the NCATE accredited unit at CWU.

Funding for the administrative functions of the Center for Teaching and Learning is included in the budget of the College of Education and Professional Studies, although the courses leading to the individual teacher and educational specialist degree programs are funded in each of the three participating colleges of the CTL. The Center for Teaching and Learning is a university committee, which is governed by the Executive Committee. The Executive and Advisory committees serve as the first approval body for all curricula related to preparation of K-12 school personnel and provide advice to the center director on all policy matters related to personnel preparation.

Certification of K-12 School Professionals. A major function of the College of Education and Professional Studies is to recommend individuals for certification by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the state of Washington. The dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies oversees the Office of Certification where the staff processes applications for admission to the teacher education program, monitors student compliance with state certification regulations, clears students for student teaching through numerous checks including the WSP and FBI fingerprint checks that are required by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, processes applications for final certification and makes recommendation to the state for the initial teaching and educational staff associate certificates.

Black Hall houses the Center for Teaching and Learning and the Department of Education. Black Hall features state-of-the-art instructional capability to the departments and creates an environment in which students can develop sophisticated technological skills.

Mission and Goals. The mission of the College of Education and Professional Studies is to prepare competent, enlightened citizens who will enhance their respective professions, commit themselves to socially responsible leadership, and help develop the global economy in a spirit of cooperation. In collaboration with college department chairs, the mission statement was streamlined and aligned more closely with the CWU mission statement. Additionally, the goals, objectives and strategies of the College of Education and Professional Studies were modified to align with the CEPS mission statement. The goals are to:

• Provide for an outstanding academic and professional growth experience for students at all CWU locations.
• Prepare students to participate in an increasingly diverse economy and environment.
• Recruit and retain a diverse and highly qualified faculty to develop and sustain prominent programs.
• Build mutually beneficial partnerships with alumni, industry, professional groups, institutions, and the communities surrounding all campus locations.
• Provide professional, high-quality staffing, facilities, technologies, and appropriate resources to ensure the highest levels of academic and professional development.
Organizational Structure. The organizational structure of the college can be found in Appendix 2.A.1. The dean of the college is the chief academic, budgetary, and personnel officer. She is also the director for the Center for Teaching and Learning. The dean's staff consists of one half-time associate dean for Education and one full-time associate dean for Professional Studies, administrative assistant, secretary senior for the CTL, and two certification staff.

There are four standing committees of the college:
1. The CEPS executive committee, which includes the chairs of the eight departments and the associate deans, is the advisory group for the college dean.
2. The Center for Teaching and Learning, which oversees programs related to school personnel preparation.
3. The CEPS personnel committee who review faculty dossiers submitted for consideration for promotion and tenure. The committee provides written recommendations to the Dean.
4. The Professional Education Advisory Boards (PEAB) that provide advice on teacher preparation, administrator preparation, school counselor preparation, and school psychologist preparation respectively. The first two PEABs report to the dean of CEPS. The other two report to the program directors of the school counselor and school psychology programs, which are housed in the Department of Psychology in the College of the Sciences.

Departments maintain curriculum approval and personnel committee membership. The personnel committee oversees policy and makes recommendations related to reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. From time to time, ad hoc task forces are created to address emerging issues within the college, for example, accreditation or policy development.

Planning and Effectiveness. During the past three years, the dean and the executive committee have overseen the development of department and unit strategic plans. At the department level, chairs facilitate the development of their respective plans via discussion with all faculty (in smaller departments) or via strategic planning committees (in larger departments). The CEPS Executive committee modified the college strategic plan goals during the fall quarter 2007. The plan, particularly the goals of the college, was shared with college faculty, and their suggestions were considered in revisions of the plan.

Based on the goals established in the annual planning process, department and college-wide objectives are identified and related activities are outlined. Throughout the academic year, progress is monitored. The CEPS program review process is designed to gather and analyze data relative to obtaining the objectives. Each fall, the executive committee identifies department and college-wide activities that have occurred to address goals. Informal discussions with faculty are used to solicit input related to unmet goals; the college identifies courses of action to correct areas that have been identified for improvements. Five-year budget forecasting also addresses unmet goals.

In the past few years, the college has taken the following specific actions based on feedback about program functioning and effectiveness.
- Increased emphasis on accreditation activities, at both the university and programmatic levels
- Increased the number of programs at university centers
• Strengthened recruitment efforts for specific high demand programs
• Redefined the expectations of faculty in teaching, research, and service
• Increased emphasis on grant writing
• Converted course objectives to learner outcomes and identified assessment strategies.
• Completed performance benchmarks in teacher preparation programs and in administrator preparation programs and collected, summarized, and analyzed benchmark data

NCATE specialized accreditation visit. The Center for Teaching and Learning was approved in October 2007 for continuing accreditation with conditions on Standard 2: Assessment at the undergraduate and graduate levels and Standard 4: Diversity at the graduate level. A visit focusing on the conditions will occur during Fall 2009. The team praised partnerships with K-12 practitioners, unit resources, and faculty qualifications.

Accomplishments and Disappointments. The accomplishments and disappointments of each department are found in its strategic plan/self-study. Common elements and highlights are described here.

Accomplishments. During the past year, the college:
• Hired 23 faculty – 20 replacement positions and three newly allocated positions.
• Increased diversity in the faculty of the college.
• Modified and adopted college-wide policies.
• Identified learner outcomes for 95% of CEPS programs.
• Increased the number of grant submissions.
• Increased support for faculty development and conference attendance.
• Gained seven-year WA State approval of the teacher preparations programs
• Sustained high enrollments in summer school offerings.
• Established the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) to compile standards-based reports for CEPS programs; hired a data analyst to work with the director of OREA.
• Obtained funding to replace the Aviation building at the Ellensburg Airport; was granted funding for Phase I of a new building for Industrial and Engineering Technology.

Disappointments. During 2006–2008, there were some disappointments. Specifically:
• Two faculty searches were unsuccessful.
• Lack of adequate funding to support equipment needs of faculty.

Educational Degree Programs. As indicated in Standard 2.A, Central Washington University is one of the institutions in the state that graduates a large number of teachers. Trends from internal data as well as data provided by the state superintendent’s office reveal that large numbers of aspiring teachers are being certified in the surplus areas (for example, elementary education and social studies). At the same time fewer students are entering the areas of teaching where there are existing shortages (for example, special education, bilingual education, the sciences, and mathematics).

Statistical Picture of the College of Education and Professional Studies. The statistical picture of the College of Education and Professional Studies reflects a steady growth in enrollment over the past three years from 2003 through 2007. The number of bachelor’s degrees has
increased from 683 in 2004–2005 to 839 in 2007–2008 (Appendix 2.A.2). Master’s degrees, on the other hand have decreased from 82 in 2004–2005 to 65 in 2007–2008. A change in prerequisites for the education master teacher program, which now requires one year of teaching experience prior to being accepted into the program, has negatively impacted total graduate degrees granted. Although education still produces over half of the graduate degrees in the college, graduates have dropped from 63 in 2004–2005 to 42 in 2007–2008. Of over 2300 teaching certificates awarded in 2007-2008 in Washington State by 19 teacher preparation institutions, CWU produced 21% of the total (Exhibit 2.E.2).

The College of Education and Professional Studies has opportunities to broaden its program offerings in teacher education, school administration, instructional technology, and industrial engineering. Several programs are developing on-line courses with the goal of having entire programs delivered on-line. Other programs are delivering coursework by increasing the use of video and web-based delivery.

**Fiscal and Physical Resources.** The College of Education and Professional Studies has been adequately funded during the past five years. Facilities in the College of Education and Professional Studies range from satisfactory in the Industrial Engineering and Technology areas (Hogue Hall) to fairly good for Family and Consumer Studies and Aviation (Michaelsen Hall) to good for Information Technology and Administrative Management and Health, Human Performance, and Nutrition (Shaw/Smyser and the PE Building) to "state of the art" for the Education (Black Hall). Funds have been allocated to improve facilities for Aviation (located at the county airport) and remodeling of the facilities for Industrial and Engineering Technology (located in Hogue). Peterson Hall which houses the Departments of Aerospace Studies (Air Force ROTC) and Military Science (Army ROTC) is in need of remodeling to meet the growing needs of both departments.

**Library and Information Resources.** The addition in 1998 of the Educational Technology Center in Black Hall greatly enhanced the information resources available for the preparation of K-12 professionals. The new equipment and materials is state-of-the-art and is accessible via the Internet to all students of the university regardless of where they are completing their degrees. The library staff has been responsive to the needs of students in the College of Education and Professional Studies. The challenge will be to maintain the currency of the materials in the Education Technology Center. A priority for the 2007–2008 year will be to establish a revolving fund to ensure current curriculum materials are available for students and K-12 practitioners.

**Curriculum Development.** In this college as in all colleges of the university, the curriculum is viewed as the vehicle through which the university accomplishes its academic goals. Each department describes in its self-study the manner in which curriculum development proceeds within the department. Some larger departments have curriculum committees within the department. Generally, though, these committees assist in developing curriculum that eventually is approved by the entire department before moving through the curriculum process. The associate deans review curriculum changes to ensure their conformity with university policies and resources.
Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the K-12 school professional preparation programs, curriculum and policy modifications that involve these programs submit to an additional review through the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) curriculum committee whose membership is recommended by the CTL Executive Committee. Curriculum and policy modifications must be approved by CTL before proceeding either to the Graduate Council or to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.

Curriculum modifications can be proposed by any member of the university community, but typically originate with department faculty.

**Major/Minor Curricula.** Available in the CWU Catalog

**Interdisciplinary Curricula.** Department of Family and Consumer Sciences: The Family Studies specialization is an interdisciplinary study of interpersonal and family relationships

**General Education Curriculum.** There are four courses in the College of Education and Professional Studies that support the general education curriculum:
- IT 101: Computer Applications
- HED 101: Health Essentials
- IET 101: Modern Technology
- NUTR 245: Basic Nutrition
- FCSF 337 (W) Human Sexuality

**Teacher Preparation Curricula.** Located on the CTL website.

**Educational Program Goals and Objectives.** Departments have been engaged actively in developing student learning goals and corresponding assessment strategies. Departments have identified both course and program outcomes for degree programs. Learner outcomes and assessment strategies are available on the internet. Students also have print copies of learner outcomes and assessment strategies presented to them at the first meeting of the course. During the 2007–2008 academic year, all course syllabi related to educator preparation were redesigned and entered on the Internet.

**End-of-Major Results.** Each program also includes some form of end-of-major assessment. During the 2006–2008 academic year, departments developed program matrices that identify learner outcomes and strategies for assessment. Program changes that have occurred as a result of assessments are located at the same website where the program goals and objectives reside. For graduate students, the terminal thesis, comprehensive examination, or project serves as the universal end-of-program assessment method.

**Program Review.** In 2007–2008, the college began the second cycle of the college-wide program review plan. The process was designed to gather and analyze data relative to program quality. All CEPS programs, except for Education who participated in the NCATE accreditation process, have completed the self-study process. Education is completing the program review this academic year. Outcomes for the program review process are guided by the feedback they received from student focus groups and by the requirements of various specialized accreditation bodies. Data collected relate to the number of majors, faculty load, student credit hour generation, and course enrollment patterns. The learner outcomes,
benchmarks, and assessment strategies for each program in the college are included in self-study documents.

**Specialized Accreditation.** Several programs of the college submit to specialized accreditation review. The professional preparation programs of the Center for Teaching and Learning, which includes the majority of programs in the College of Education and Professional Studies, submitted to a full-scale review by NCATE in 2007. Washington State is an NCATE partnership state and folios submitted to national specialized organizations are no longer required.

The following organizations also approve programs of the college.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
- American Council for Construction Education
- Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
- Foundry Educational Foundation
- Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation
- Committee on Accreditation of Educational Programs for the EMS Professions
- National Kitchen and Bath Association
- American Dietetics Association (Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE))

In addition, the department self-studies (strategic plans) that were developed to inform university-wide goal setting and in preparation for the NWCCU accreditation visit required departments to review and comment on their educational degree programs.

**Appraisal**

The College of Education and Professional Studies encompasses a diverse group of programs designed to prepare baccalaureate graduates to perform such varied roles as teaching school children, flying airplanes, managing construction projects, and providing military leadership. The college's primary mission is to prepare students to be leaders in such professions as health and family care, dietetics and nutrition, business, manufacturing, military and aerospace sciences, and education. Its mission also is to prepare students to appreciate the uniqueness and contributions of the professions and the diversity of individuals and groups.

The College of Education and Professional Studies is in a transition phase. While the twelve departments are redesigning and rethinking innovative ways of delivering their programs on campus and at the university centers, the college also is undergoing change. The dean has the challenge and opportunity to facilitate the development of programs and services to prepare students in a rapidly changing career environment.

Particular opportunities and challenges facing the College of Education and Professional Studies are grouped into five primary areas.

1. Recruitment of faculty and students. With a large number of retiring faculty, there is the opportunity to recruit faculty with diverse backgrounds and experiences. During the 2008–2009 academic year, twenty-three new tenure-track faculty were hired and an additional five tenure track faculty were hired for the 2009–10 academic year. Almost one-third of the
The college’s approximately 100 faculty have been hired in the past two years. These faculty come from a variety of backgrounds and bring a wealth of innovative and diverse ideas to the college. Additionally, during this time of economic stress, numbers of majors and minors are increasing. For example, candidates for the CWU teacher preparation program have increased by approximately 300 applicants since 2005, the cohort for construction management candidates is filled, the cap for the 2008–2009 paramedic cohort increased by five candidates, Aviation has doubled the size of program candidates, and the Information Technology/Administrative Management (ITAM) on-line program is filled to capacity each quarter. ITAM, aviation, electrical engineering, and education programs are also offered at the CWU centers and provide opportunities for place-bound candidates to continue their education through CWU. The challenges are keeping pace with student program demand and growing college graduate programs.

2. Service to students of the college. Strategies have been developed to improve advising of candidates. As a way to advise a large number of candidates in an efficient manner, faculty in several of the larger programs in the college (e.g., early childhood education and elementary education) conduct mass advising sessions. For example, one faculty member has a specific time each week he is available to meet with candidates. This meeting occurs in a classroom so it is of sufficient size to accommodate many advisees. Other programs include advising issues in an introductory course. Cohorts of candidates enrolled in programs at the CWU centers attend a mandatory advising session prior to the beginning of the program. A challenge exists to continue building on the mass advising model. Another challenge is to increase the number of faculty mentored undergraduate candidates in research projects. Several candidates presented at the CWU SOURCE Conference, but that number could increase. Exemplary students and successful graduates of the college are recognized by their peers and the faculty through the college newsletter and information shared with internal bodies, such as the provost’s council, Academic Affairs, and college meetings. A challenge is to increase the ways in which student recognitions occur.

3. Redesign preparation programs. For students about to enter a much more demanding market place, diverse skills in collaboration, flexibility in adapting to new job skills, and communication of ideas and solutions to complex problems are needed. Strategies are in place to collect data and assess results of these innovative efforts and to develop ways to replicate the successful programs. For example, eight programs in the college are accredited and are required to collect, aggregate, and use data consistently to inform and improve programs. Education programs are designing and implementing new knowledge and skills competencies as mandated by the state Professional Education Advisory Board. Additionally, all programs are required to submit annual reports to the AVP for Undergraduate Studies and a program study is completed minimally every five years. Data from all these sources, as well as course data, help to inform program strengths and needs. A challenge is to provide program faculty with the time to continuously engage in these assessment practices.

4. Communicate the programs, services, and activities of the College of Education and Professional Studies. More effective ways to communicate with current students and recent graduates about programs and services, with alumni about pilot programs and scholarly endeavors by faculty, with colleagues across campus about the achievements and issues of the college, and with policy makers about the impact of legislation on the college are being
explored. The college newsletter is now electronic and can reach a wider audience. College meetings highlight the excellent work of the faculty. The administration is working with Government Relations office to highlight for legislators excellent student and faculty accomplishments, innovative programs, and planned events.

5. Improve communication about faculty accomplishments. Steps are taken to nurture new faculty into the culture and related demands associated with teaching, scholarship, and service. Each new faculty member receives a one course-release for the first year. They are assigned a faculty mentor and meet with the dean and associate dean to discuss promotion and tenure requirements and to ask questions that clarify the process. A challenge is to ensure new faculty have the time and resources to be successful. Finally, faculty members are recognized annual for their professional achievements at the college spring awards luncheon. At the luncheon, faculty newly promoted to professor do a presentation about their research agendas and three faculty members from each department are recognized for their achievements in teaching, scholarship, or service. Although faculty accomplishments are included in the college newsletter, a challenge is to continuously share faculty accomplishments throughout the academic year.
College of the Sciences

**Historical Perspective**

In 1994, the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences (CLAS), then composed of 20 departments and many interdisciplinary programs, was divided into the College of the Arts and Humanities (CAH) and the College of the Sciences (COTS). The twelve departments representing mathematics, computer science, and the natural and social sciences came to comprise COTS. The dean of CLAS became the dean of CAH and a former associate dean of CLAS became dean of COTS. The two daughter colleges continued to share the CLAS support staff, including an associate dean, administrative assistant, senior secretary, and office assistant, as well as the former CLAS quarters in Hebeler Hall. The division was gradually adopted in different university records systems from 1994 to 1998. The budgets of the new colleges were not separated until 1996–97. In January 1998, a full-time associate dean position was created for COTS, and in August 1998, a successful national search resulted in the appointment of a new dean of the College of the Sciences. Support staff consisted of an administrative assistant and a senior secretary. Also in 1998 the university dedicated a state-of-the-art instructional and research facility for the natural sciences. This structure houses the chemistry department, the biological sciences department, and the science education program.

Administrative change occurred in 2000 as an interim dean was appointed internally, followed by another interim dean appointment. In 2003 a new dean was appointed through a second successful national search. With administrative stabilization new support positions were created in various iterations in the dean’s office including a development officer originally shared with CAH and later shared with the University Development Office, an associate dean for Resource Development and Research initially filled internally and then eliminated after failed national searches, and two part-time fiscal technicians to support external grants and interdisciplinary programs. In 2007 the dean resigned and an interim dean was appointed.

**Current Situation**

The College of the Sciences is currently home to twelve departments (Anthropology and Museum Studies, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geography, Geological Sciences, Law and Justice, Mathematics, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology) and eleven interdisciplinary programs (American Indian Studies, Energy Studies, Environmental Studies, Ethnic Studies, Gerontology, Primate Behavior and Ecology, Public Policy, Resource Management, Science Education, Science Honors Program, Women Studies). The college directly supports teacher education through secondary math, science education, and social science education degree programs, course work in math, natural science, and psychology for elementary education majors, and graduate programs in school psychology and school counseling. The college offers a mix of basic research and pre-professional graduate programs including four programs in Psychology in the areas of experimental psychology, mental health counseling, school counseling, and school psychology. Geography and Anthropology jointly offer an M.S. in Resource Management. Anthropology, Biology and Psychology have teamed with CHCI to offer a new M.S. in Primate Behavior. Others master’s degrees include biology, chemistry, geology, and mathematics education. Centers supporting instruction, research, and
service affiliated with the college include: the Center for the Environment, Center for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Education, Center for Spatial Information, Center for Teaching and Learning, the Central Washington Archaeological Survey, the Chimpanzee and Human Communication Institute, the Community Psychological Services Center, CWU Astronomical Observatory, the Geodesy Laboratory and Pacific Northwest Geodetic Array Data Analysis Facility, the Geographic Information Systems Laboratory, the Microbial Observatory at Soap Lake, the instructional Murdock Environmental Geochemistry Laboratory, and the Visualization Research Laboratory.

The college completed a five year strategic plan in 2005. Beginning in 2002 the university implemented a staggered five year department program review process. All departments and programs in COTS have gone through at least one cycle. The program review consists of a comprehensive self-study describing the goals, accomplishments, planning and assessment activities, and future directions of each unit; an external review including a site visit; and evaluation by the dean and associate vice president for undergraduate studies. The planning process helps the college, departments, and programs establish direction, develop budget plans, and support effective staffing. The self-studies provide a base for responding to information requests throughout the year. Descriptions of many aspects of the college, its strategic plan, its policy manual and other documents and forms, and links to its departmental web sites may be found on the college's web site,

Mission and Goals.
College of the Sciences Mission. The College of the Sciences prepares students for enlightened and productive lives through learning and research in the classroom, laboratory, and field. As practitioners of scientific inquiry, students and faculty create and apply knowledge in solving human, social and environmental problems. The college values instruction, research, and service as interdependent activities that enable human curiosity and discovery.

College of the Sciences Goals.
• Goal I: Provide for an outstanding academic and student experience in the College of the Sciences.
• Goal II: Provide for an outstanding academic and student life in college programs and courses at the university centers.
• Goal III: Provide for outstanding graduate programs that meet focused regional needs and achieve academic excellence.
• Goal IV: Develop a diversified funding base to support curriculum and academic facilities, student and faculty research and scholarships, as well as faculty development, service and applied research in college disciplines.
• Goal V: Build partnerships that support academic program quality and student experiences in the college of the sciences, including those with private, professional, academic, government, and community-based organizations.
• Goal VI: Strengthen the college’s contributions to the field of education.
• Goal VII: Create and sustain productive, civil, and pleasant learning environments.

The mission and goals of COTS reflect university goals and are incorporated in its respective department goals. These statements reflect the following values:
• A student-centered curriculum reflected in an emphasis on small classes, opportunities for individual instruction, and scholarly partnerships with students.
• Disciplinary breadth in curricula for majors.
• Service to the university's general education curriculum, bringing the tools of science to bear on the informed citizen's tasks of critical thinking and problem solving.
• The social mission of the sciences, including promoting cultural diversity in its curriculum, its students, and its faculty.
• Unique regional qualities of the Northwest are emphasized in the college's curriculum, where appropriate.
• Interdisciplinary teams for research, for teaching individual courses, or for developing and presenting entire programs.
• Development of the disciplinary expertise of sciences faculty.

Organizational Structure. The twelve departments and eleven affiliated interdisciplinary programs of the college represent disciplines in the behavioral, natural, and social sciences, mathematics, and computer science. The departments and programs within the college offer bachelor's degrees, master's degrees, minors which supplement other degree programs, and an extensive range of service coursework for the entire university (See Appendix 2.A.1 for the college organization chart). The dean of COTS is the chief academic, budgetary, and personnel officer. The dean's staff consists of an associate dean, administrative assistant, secretary, development officer, and a part-time fiscal technician. There are two standing committees of the college: the Council of Department Chairs and the College Personnel Committee. The roles of these committees are described in the college policy manual. Ad hoc committees are formed as needed.

Planning and Effectiveness.
Strategic Planning. The strategic planning process is undertaken by the COTS Council of Department Chairs and led by the dean. Existing goals and priorities are evaluated, updated, and aligned with university strategic goals. Supporting management objectives are identified. The Council approved the COTS Strategic Plan 2005–2010 in January 2005. Evaluation occurs through academic program review, annual review of performance objectives, and reporting of metrics across academic affairs or within the college. Results are reviewed by the Provost’s Council, the college’s Council of Department Chairs, and at the academic department or program level. Strategic goals substantiate the budget request, prioritization, and allocation process, both for state base budget funding, as well as through competitive internal grant processes such as the Spheres of Distinction. Common elements related to planning in the college are discussed in further detail here. Reflections on each department's specific circumstances may be found in its program review self-study document.

Staffing and Budgetary Planning. The annual staffing planning cycle begins in winter quarter with a call for departmental staffing requests and faculty workload plans. Prior to February, 2006 departments were required to submit an annual department load plan on an Excel spreadsheet to the dean’s office. The chair either met with the dean to discuss the proposed instructional offerings, or provide a written justification. Beginning in February, 2006 individual faculty workload forms became a part of this process, and the meetings became mandatory and expanded to include the associate dean. Thus, now department chairs submit both individual faculty workload forms and department load sheet electronically and schedule an
appointment to meet with the dean and associate dean to discuss the proposed annual department level load plan.

Chairs are expected to develop department plans that meet institutional FTES targets and reflect the instructional needs of their programs; department load plans must not only reflect the sum of the individual workload plans plus the proposed need for NTT (both annual FT and quarterly PT) instructional support, but it must be responsive to the needs and demands of its student constituency. Department chairs assess how best to meet the needs of majors, minors, service and general educational offerings according to the department’s goals and objectives which to a great degree reflect larger college and university missions. In the meeting each chair makes their case for planned staffing levels with the dean and associate dean. The dean approves the plan in direct consultation with the department chair and in accordance with budgetary constraints. Chairs are expected to file changes in teaching assignments with the associate dean, and changes in individual workloads with the dean.

In the Spring of each year department chairs and program directors submit a budget request to the dean that includes requests for new faculty lines, staff positions, and goods and services. The chairs use program review recommendations in justifying their budget requests. The department requests are compiled and prioritized by the dean into a college request made of the Provost. The dean also uses program review results to justify the priorities. A separate but similar budget request process is carried out each Fall for capital improvements. Over the last decade the dean has made an annual request of the Provost to supplement the college’s staffing budget with one time funds to cover Spring quarter deficits in staffing support. While these one-time funds have allowed the college to meet its staffing needs, inadequate base budgets and uncertain supplemental funds have impaired effective planning.

Research and Scholarly Support Planning. Planning for the college’s productive program of research and scholarship involves anticipating needs for equipment, technical assistants, released time, travel, and collaborative consultation. The college’s research seems more stable and less affected by short-term funding crises than the instructional program, so more proactive planning is possible. The college encourages faculty-student research teams by supporting grant-writing activity, by providing external grant-matching commitments to the best of its ability, by advocating the expansion of technical support positions, and by lending support to requests for equipment upgrades and capital improvements that provide a favorable setting for scholarly activity. In recent years the dean, in conjunction with the Provost and the AVP for Graduate Studies and Research, has been able to fund research start-up costs for laboratory and field research and computer needs of new faculty. The dean’s office has implemented multiple programs to assist faculty in attaining their scholarly goals. These include the COTS Equipment Grant Program (~$50K/yr; suspended in 2008/09 due to budget concerns), COTS Faculty Professional Development Funds (currently $350/faculty/year), COTS Faculty Summer Research Grants ($14K), and COTS Undergraduate Research Grants ($3.5K). These programs give resources to departments to enhance equipment resources, to provide professional development for faculty, and to assist faculty working individually with students - a core value of the college.

Effective research and scholarship planning is indicated by frequent submission of scholarly proposals for external funding, a high number of faculty-student scholarly presentations at
professional meetings and campus symposia, publication of faculty work in peer-reviewed publications, and evidence of integration of new scholarship in the curriculum. The latter is indicated by offering of special topics courses, individual studies courses, and the addition of new regular courses and programs to the curriculum. The college's accomplishments in these areas have been outstanding. Improvements would result from funding to support repair, upgrade and maintenance of existing equipment, and for purchase of equipment and software, and development time.

Curriculum Planning. The curriculum planning process is described in some detail in a later section. Effective curriculum planning is indicated by smooth adoption of curriculum changes, collaborative relations with other programs, timely progress of students toward their degree goals, satisfactory end-of-major assessment measures, successful placement of graduates in professions and graduate schools, and concordance with disciplinary standards expressed by professional associations and accrediting standards. Performance on these measures has been commendable. Improvements could be effected by selectively pruning the curriculum, identifying and funding the costs of the general education program and better assessment of general education student outcomes.

Accomplishments and Challenges. The accomplishments and challenges of each department are found in its program review self-study. Common elements and highlights are described here.

Accomplishments. The vitality of the science programs of Central Washington University continues to grow. The College of the Sciences has outstanding faculty, staff, and students that have made numerous contributions that enhance the reputation of the College. These accomplishments are too numerous to list singly and summaries can be found in Standard 4 and in the department self studies. Infusions of new faculty, new successes in winning external funds, new disciplinary and interdisciplinary degree programs, and new student populations have built upon the tradition of high quality instruction and student partnerships established by senior faculty. Student research in laboratory and field settings and externally funded research have flourished in recent years. The traditional strength of COTS departments in externally funded projects and scholarly publication has been maintained. Grants awarded to COTS faculty generated approximately 29% (2007–2008) of all funding received by the university for external grant and contract awards. Especially noteworthy during the review period have been (a) a $300,000 grant from the M. J. Murdock Charitable Trust to develop a science honors program, (b) an NSF funded Science Talent Expansion Program for $275,000 and $999,711 (c) the Yakima WATERS NSF: GK-12 grant to enhance watershed research in the schools for $3,000,000, and (d) Bureau of Reclamation Native American Fellowships for $420,000. The Office of Graduate Studies and Research web site carries a complete report of externally funded grant awards.

Student-faculty scholarship routinely is presented at state, regional, and national professional society meetings. Many venues are provided on campus for the presentation of scholarly work. For example, the college continues to sponsor the interdisciplinary Symposium on Undergraduate Research and Creative Expression (SOURCE), and a poster session of undergraduate research from throughout the college has been mounted every quarter. In 2008 over 220 COTS’ student co-authors joined with faculty advisors to present 140 poster
presentations and oral presentations of their scholarly accomplishments at SOURCE. Throughout every year, the biweekly Natural Science Seminar series, organized by Biological Sciences faculty and students, provides a forum for interdisciplinary presentations and discussions among faculty and students from all science disciplines and the entire academic community. The recently initiated Social Science Seminars adds to the variety. Department lecture series in Computer Science, Geography, Geology, and Physics further enhance the college’s extracurricular offerings. Many COTS departments have student associations or honor societies which provide faculty-student contact.

Finally, the college has sought to diversify its mission and personnel across age, gender, ethnic, and geographic boundaries. Activities are too numerous to list here, but they range from a day of hands-on science career presentations for middle school-aged girls to active recruitment of faculty members from underrepresented groups to new programs and trial courses at the university centers. The college is especially pleased that new women and minority ethnic faculty appointees provide important role models to encourage science students from previously underserved populations. In the last 10 years, 43% of new faculty have been women and 16% have been members of ethnic minorities.

Challenges. Base budget shortfalls continue to be a challenge for staffing in the college. Although annual supplements for adjunct have been forthcoming in recent years, budgeting in this scenario requires an increased use of non-tenure track faculty. Many departments are teaching between 20% and 50% of their FTES with NTT faculty. In the last several years the budget process has been more clearly connected to planning and to programmatic expansion carried out in response to high demand programs but there are still budgetary requests that cannot be met, particularly with regard to tenure track faculty hires. Other department requests that have routinely not been funded are: hiring of technical support staff, replacement of equipment, increased student help, and increased goods and services allocations.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement calls for faculty to complete workload plans that reflect their planned effort in teaching, scholarship and service. It allows for changes in weighting of the three areas relative to each other at different times in a faculty member’s career and it ties evaluation to that weighting. In most cases college resources do not allow for flexibility in teaching loads. Departments are charged with meeting target FTES that were based on historical faculty teaching loads of 36 contact hours. Meeting the FTE quota without increasing faculty does not allow for flexibility without some faculty taking on greater teaching loads. Since faculty evaluation criteria require effort in all three areas, it is not in the best interest of faculty to take on greater teaching loads. Increasing the base funding for new faculty lines would provide greater flexibility.

Statistical Picture of the College of the Sciences. The enrollments of the college over the last three years have been essentially constant, as have the numbers of majors and degrees awarded. Any significant growth in student numbers will need to be accompanied by growth in resources to maintain standards of instructional quality and contact with students. The average class size (26.1) and FTE student/faculty ratio (19.8) of COTS are higher than the institutional averages (22.2 and 18.6, respectively). With a high proportion of laboratory classes and a substantial graduate program, one might expect these figures to be smaller.
than the university average. However, class sizes in the college are higher than the university average at every level, from 100 to graduate classes. Almost half of the practica, field experience, and individual study courses (300/634 per quarter, or 47.3%) of the university total is offered by COTS faculty. This data substantiates the college's commitment to intensive, individualized scholarly partnerships with students. COTS has also typically contributed a greater proportion of its course offerings (27.3%) to the university's general education program than other colleges.

**Fiscal and Physical Resources.** Fiscal support of the College of the Sciences has been improved in the last several years with successful high demand (HECB) and transfer grant (OFM) funding to the base budget. This funding has been used to support new faculty lines, new classified staff positions, programmatic expansion, marketing and recruitment, and materials and supplies. Also, the college has been highly successful in competing for Spheres of Distinction funding which has helped to stabilize interdisciplinary programs. Despite this infusion of resources the college still lacks adequate funding to carry on a full program of instruction, research, service, and ancillary support of these activities. One time funds have allowed balanced annual budgets but, as mentioned above, they come too late in the process to be incorporated into informed decision-making processes. Unique features of the college's mission with budgetary implications include the demands of ten graduate programs, class size limitations of laboratory classes, and the staffing and goods and services burden imposed by modern scientific equipment.

The physical resources of the college range from less than adequate to superior. The 10-year old Science Building stands as the flagship facility in the college. Its teaching and research facilities are outstanding while its equipment and instrumentation are beginning to require funds for maintenance and repair. The remodeled Dean Hall is now occupied by Geography and Anthropology; freeing up space in Farrell Hall and Lind Hall for other COTS programs. The college and its departments have taken advantage of the cost sharing ITS Win-Win and Academic Software Assistance programs to gain state-of-the-art computing hardware and software. Currently several departments are split among two to three buildings and interdisciplinary programs have no dedicated space. These needs could be reduced by a capital project to build Phase II of the Science facility.

At the university centers new facilities at Lynnwood, Des Moines, Yakima, and Wenatchee provide outstanding instructional spaces for non-lab sciences. Despite the excellent facilities, faculty offices are in short supply and instructional spaces are difficult to schedule at high demand times. Equipment reliability, training, and support personnel for technology-assisted distance education have improved in the last few years, but use of this medium has not yet become routine for most departments.

**Library and Information Resources.** In the last ten years burgeoning access to electronic information resources has continued. The staff of the library has proactively moved to convert the library's catalog to electronic format and to expand access to standard electronic scientific databases such as SciFinder. Access to electronic resources is the same as that found at any comparable institution and adequate for the undergraduate mission. The library staff augments book and journal allocations for disciplines with graduate programs. For specialized research, however, interlibrary loan and visits to larger libraries are often necessary. In recent
years, faculty and student library access at the university centers has been a matter of concern but new computer rooms and electronic document transmission procedures have improved access. The university has arranged borrowing privileges for students at the centers at any public or academic library in the state.

An active program of in service training at the Center for Learning Technologies provides short courses in common software at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels. Consultants are available for help with individual problems. The center has provided templates for instructors to facilitate moving course materials onto the World Wide Web. These services allow faculty members to make their scholarship available to the campus community. Again, these services are more available at the Ellensburg campus than at the university centers. Advances in electronic resources have been offset to some degree by reductions in conventional print media. In particular, reductions in journal subscriptions have been bothersome. Scientific journals are often more expensive than those in other fields and the library has commensurately allocated a large share of its journal budget to the sciences. Even so, rising subscription prices have forced difficult choices about the non-renewal of thousands of dollars worth of journal subscriptions. Some losses were averted by switching to an electronic version of one journal to avoid canceling another. Future journal cancellations seem inevitable and proposals for new subscriptions will be difficult to defend. The university's well-informed library staff has tried to minimize the impact of reductions on academic programs, but mounting subscription costs may gradually erode access to contemporary scientific discourse.

**Curriculum Development.** Throughout the university, there is pervasive respect for the faculty's ownership of the curriculum and the central role of the curriculum as the vehicle for accomplishing the academic goals of the university. Thus, departmental self-study documents are the best guides to the college's curriculum development process. There is no college curriculum committee. The associate dean reviews all curriculum change for conformity to university policies and fiscal feasibility. Special attention is paid to the effects of one department's curriculum changes on other departments and to statements of learning outcomes and assessment methods. Curriculum planning takes place throughout the year but peaks just before the January cutoff date for consideration by the Faculty Senate. Curriculum issues are considered at department meetings and at department retreats. Departments either act as a whole on curriculum matters or they have separate curriculum committees. Substantial curriculum changes are usually preceded by discussions between the dean, associate dean, department chairs, university center personnel, and representatives of other colleges or departments that might be affected by the proposal. The dean’s office helps with preparation of curriculum change forms and serves as an intermediary between proposing departments and administrative reviewers.

**Major/Minor Curricula.** Departments typically select a core of courses to present a coherent introduction to fundamental elements of their disciplines. The choice of fundamental elements is guided by professional organization curriculum standards, faculty engagement in contemporary scholarship, professional employment trends, and general agreements about the structure of a discipline. Where appropriate, core courses are arranged in orderly sequences and students are guided through sequences by course prerequisites, faculty advisement, and course numbering.
Major curricula typically offer students broad choices of specialization at the upper division, built around faculty expertise and employment opportunities. Graduate curricula tend to be more narrowly structured around faculty expertise to prepare students for doctoral study or professions in which the master’s degree has established standing. Currency of the curriculum is ensured by active engagement of the faculty in research and scholarship, professional association contacts and presentations, scholarly partnerships with students on research projects, and, in some cases, review by external bodies. The most important factor, however, is the individual faculty member's commitment as a professional educator and member of his or her discipline.

**Interdisciplinary Curricula.** The university's size and evolutionary history has encouraged the growth of interdisciplinary programs. A list of the college's interdisciplinary programs is provided in an earlier section of this document. All interdisciplinary programs have directors or co-directors that meet regularly with the associate dean. Interdisciplinary curricula are discussed in meetings among participating faculty, led by a program director or co-directors. All interdisciplinary programs offer courses, often taught by a team of instructors that integrate the perspectives of their constituent disciplines.

**General Education Curriculum.** College of the Sciences faculty members represent four of the university's nine-person General Education Committee. About two-thirds of the typical student's general education is comprised of mathematics, social science, and natural science courses. The college-level role in curriculum planning focuses on encouraging active faculty participation on the general education committee, working with departments to assess the impact of proposed changes, seeking resources to support changes, and supporting innovative curriculum initiatives.

**Teacher Preparation Curriculum.** Twenty-eight College of the Sciences faculty are members of the Center for Teaching and Learning, the university's teacher preparation unit. There are participating faculty from anthropology, biology, chemistry, geology, psychology, physics, and sociology that serve on the governance committees of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). The Dean serves on the CTL Executive Council. The psychology department teaches two courses required of all teacher candidates. Science education teaches science methods to all elementary majors. The College of the Sciences programs have been commended in accreditations for their assessment practices and communication with the education faculty in support of education programs. Teacher preparation curricula proposed by College departments must be approved by the CTL prior to submission to the faculty senate curriculum committee.

**Educational Program Goals and Objectives.** Each department and interdisciplinary program with a major program has articulated program goals and student learning outcomes. All departments publish their student learning goals and make them available on their webpage, in printed form in the department office, or both. The faculty have long thought about and discussed program objectives and student learning outcomes. During the 2004/2005 academic year the dean and associate dean seized upon this latent interest as the foundation for a college-lead initiative to formalize assessment practices in COTS. Assessment practices and issues began to be integrated into regular COTS chairs council and interdisciplinary...
program directors meetings and all degree-granting programs under COTS authority were required to develop assessment plans during this period. These efforts culminated in the college’s first assessment retreat which was held prior to the start of the fall quarter 2006. At the retreat department chairs and program directors submitted assessment plans in writing, and presented their unit’s plan to the others present. This forum provided an opportunity for discussions about learning goals and objectives, measurement and evaluation criteria, and the practical application of findings (programmatic change in response to assessment findings). Assessment-related issues continued to be incorporated into COTS chairs council and interdisciplinary program directors meetings during the 2006/07 academic year and a second assessment retreat was held prior to the start of fall quarter 2007. This retreat highlighted findings and programmatic changes made in response to department and interdisciplinary program assessment activities. Now that the university has begun to institutionalize assessment practices on a global level it is likely that the college will no longer need to sponsor its own assessment initiatives and retreats.

Various forms of end-of-major assessment gauge accomplishment of program goals. A broad array of assessment methods appear in departmental reports and every department in the college conducts some form of undergraduate end-of-major assessment. Exit or competency examinations, senior seminar or capstone courses, and portfolios are the most common assessment methods. Each department self-study describes any program changes based on end-of-major assessment. For graduate students, the thesis/project requirement is a universal end-of-program assessment method. In the sciences, the most common form of this requirement is the traditional research thesis.

Specialized Accreditation and Program Review. Each department engages in continuous review of its curriculum. Several departments and programs are accredited or certified by their respective professional organizations, accrediting organizations, or advisory boards. Every department and interdisciplinary program takes part in program review every five years. The review process includes a detailed self-study and evaluation by an outside examiner. All departments and programs have been reviewed at least once in the last six years. Graduate programs are reviewed as part of the process. Program review results in continuous improvement of College programs.

Appraisal

The College of the Sciences is strong and vibrant. The greatest strengths of the College are found in the university's most important settings: classrooms, laboratories, field sites, faculty offices, hallways – wherever students and faculty members come together to carry out the academic mission of the university. The values expressed in "Mission and Goals," above, are reflected in the everyday conduct of the talented and committed faculty. The college's students share in the faculty's growing research sophistication. CWU undergraduates have hands-on research and scholarly partnership opportunities that are available only to graduate students at many other universities. Student organizations, local symposia, and sponsored travel to regional and national professional meetings allow undergraduates an opportunity to present their research to informed audiences. The college is pleased with the regional flavor of its programs. The resource management, counseling, school psychology, geography, geology, law and justice, sociology, and anthropology programs all integrate local and regional issues
into the study of the general principles of their disciplines. An active commitment to issues of national and international significance and a cosmopolitan faculty prevents this regional quality from becoming isolationist or parochial in scope.

The college has strength in its faculty, staff, students, and programs but faces several challenges in the upcoming years. These challenges are not specific to the college of the sciences but are endemic to the university at large. The administration must work with the faculty union to smoothly implement processes delineated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Because the college represents the largest fraction of faculty, it is important to actively engage them in this process. The college needs to discuss and clarify the desirable balance of faculty commitment to teaching and individual research and support the conclusion through workload planning and faculty line allocations. With the implementation of the workload planning process and annual activity reports, it is evident that many faculty are working over a 45 workload unit allocation. While it may occasionally be the best solution to a situation, it is not good practice for sustainability and faculty morale. The college must garner resources to appropriately compensate faculty for a reasonable workload. In addition, there is no orderly program of equipment maintenance and replacement. Mature and collegial confrontation of these challenges will be necessary to maintain the health of the College of the Sciences in the future.
Standard 3 – Students

Central Washington University’s student programs and services support the achievement of the institution’s mission and goals by contributing to the educational development of its students. Student programs and services are consistent with the educational philosophy of the university. The university provides essential support services for students, regardless of where or how enrolled and by whatever means educational programs are offered (3.A). Under the primary leadership of the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM) and in collaboration with two other divisions, more than thirty departments are responsible for student service delivery. Student service departments outside of SAEM and addressed in Standard 3 include Dining Services, Police Services and Public Safety, Academic Advising, and Athletics. A cross-divisional coordinated and collaborative approach is essential and is guided by the institutional strategic planning process.

Standard 3.A – Purpose and Organization

Historical Perspective

In September 2000, the incumbent Vice President of Student Affairs left CWU and an Interim Vice President led the division until 2001. During this time, a university task force studied administrative roles and responsibilities as part of an administrative restructuring (See Standard 1). Enrollment services (Financial Aid, Admissions, and Registrar Services) previously existed as separate units and were merged with Student Affairs to form the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. Auxiliary Services (Bookstore, Dining, Conference Services, and Housing) moved from Student Affairs to Business and Financial Affairs.

In summer 2001, a new vice president was appointed to oversee the newly configured Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM). Over the course of the next seven years, the division experienced significant growth and development. The current SAEM organization chart is presented in Appendix 3.A.1 and Exhibit 3.E.1. Financial resources were secured for the division as responsibilities and services increased. The division established the CUPA 40th percentile as a target for SAEM salaries and wages. An increase in cross-departmental communication and collaboration was complemented by strengthened interpersonal relationships. SAEM has developed into a high-functioning team delivering cutting-edge programs and services and contributing to regional and national “best practices.”

Current Situation

The Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management provides programs and services to enroll, retain, and graduate diverse students who are eligible for admission. The division challenges and supports students’ holistic personal growth, academic performance, preparation for the global workplace, and development of responsible citizenship. In addition, the division monitors and responds to various factors that impact student satisfaction, success, and commitment to the university mission. Philosophically, the division is grounded in the knowledge that intellectual growth and personal growth are inseparable and that the primary academic mission is most fully served through the development of the whole person. Retention of students is a focus and is discussed at length in Standard 3.B.1.

The organization of student services is effective in providing a complete spectrum of services consistent with the mission and goals of the institution (3.A.1). SAEM completed a comprehensive strategic planning exercise in 2005. The resulting plan was directly aligned to the university’s mission,
vision, core values, and goals. In spring 2008, the division underwent a review and update of its strategic plan. A team was assembled to bring together working groups to review progress made toward strategic goals and objectives. The revised plan (Exhibit 3.E.2) incorporated changes to subsidiary goals which better addressed the current state of the division and its focal areas.

Each functional area develops measurable goals and outcomes in a strategic planning process and reports annually on the attainment of goals. Departmental strategic plans align directly with the division’s strategic plan, thus acting as operational plans for the division (Exhibit 3.E.3). The strategic planning process assists directors in developing plans that include goals, objectives, action items, and assessment measures (Exhibit 3.E.4). All SAEM departments are encouraged to include student learning outcomes, upholding the mission of the institution as well as the division.

Student services are primarily located at the Ellensburg campus. However, as enrollment has increased at the six university centers, staffing has been added to provide services at the centers. Student services at the centers have grown to include admission, recruitment, financial aid, career services, disability support services, and academic advising. In summer 2008, University Center Interdivisional Committees (UCICs) were formed to improve service delivery to students and serve as a collaborative vehicle for center staff and staff at the Ellensburg campus to identify strategic goals specific to each university center. Each university center hosts a UCIC comprised of individuals from academic and student affairs. The UCIC structure reports its findings and recommendations to the University Center Advisory Council which is also composed of personnel from across the university.

SAEM is staffed by highly qualified, trained and experienced individuals (NWCCU Table 3.2, contained in Exhibit 3.E.5 and Appendix 3.A.4). Assignments are clearly defined and published (3.A.2). Although a position description may not list a master’s degree or higher as a requirement, of the 108 professional staff in the division, 8 have earned doctoral degrees, 45 have master’s degrees, 51 possess bachelor’s degrees, and 2 have associate degrees or certificate program completion. Expectations for each position are clearly outlined in job descriptions and annual performance development plans, and self evaluations provide an opportunity to reflect on accomplishments and identify areas for improvement. Required qualifications and competencies are identified for each classified and exempt position. The competencies are based on assigned position responsibilities. Prior to 2006, postings identifying duties and qualifications were posted manually to the HR website during recruitment cycles. In 2006 the university implemented an online position description and applicant tracking system.

The performance of personnel is regularly evaluated (3.A.2). An annual Professional Development Plan (PDP) process has been mandated by the state Department of Personnel for non-represented civil service employees and negotiated by unions for represented employees. The PDP was developed and implemented in 2005 for all civil service employees and optional for exempt employees. The PDP process establishes goals, objectives, and expectations for each employee for the coming year. All administrative exempt employees are evaluated annually by their supervisors. Rates of completion for the division were 52.60%, compared with a completion rate of 64.54% for the university.

Appropriate policies and procedures for student development programs and services are established. The objectives of each operating component are compatible and support the goals of student services (3.A.3, also see 3.A.1). CWU follows the standards of the Higher Education Coordinating Board, Washington Administrative Code (WAC), and Revised Code of Washington (RCW). The institution adheres to federal and state policies and procedures such as the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Cleary Act, Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), and Student Right-to-Know Act. Based on mandated policies, codes, and best practices, the student affairs and academic affairs divisions have jointly developed student services policies and procedures such as the Student Code of Conduct, Student Rights and Responsibilities policies, and academic appeals and
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grievance procedures which are all published in the CWU catalog. Additionally, the University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3) and procedures manual (Exhibit GE.4) describe such general student affairs policies as hazing, alcohol, S&A fees, immunization, and sexual assault response policies. The University Housing and New Student Programs (UHNSP) Handbook (Exhibit 3.E.6) contains additional UHNSP policies in addition to the Code of Conduct. The development and revision of policy and procedure is ongoing and is conducted through a shared governance model that includes student input.

**Human, physical, and financial resources for student services and programs are allocated on the basis of identified needs and are adequate to support the services and programs offered (3.A.4).** SAEM receives funding from a variety of sources. Some departments charge and receive additional revenues for services rendered (Exhibit 3.E.7). Fees collected follow the Business and Financial Services procedures for handling money described in the University Policies Manual section 7-4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 SAEM Annual Financial Resources</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General (State)</td>
<td>$5,279,000</td>
<td>$6,588,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Housing</td>
<td>9,458,000</td>
<td>10,216,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Activities</td>
<td>5,261,000</td>
<td>5,244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union and Recreation Center</td>
<td>4,528,000</td>
<td>4,612,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Counseling</td>
<td>1,681,000</td>
<td>1,968,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Dedicated Fees</td>
<td>960,000</td>
<td>996,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>19,426,000</td>
<td>20,491,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>2,266,000</td>
<td>2,773,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Loans</td>
<td>1,529,000</td>
<td>1,567,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Foundation</td>
<td>206,000</td>
<td>298,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,594,000</td>
<td>54,753,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Human, physical, and financial resources for student services and programs are allocated on the basis of identified needs and are adequate to support the services and programs offered (3.A.4). SAEM receives funding from a variety of sources. Some departments charge and receive additional revenues for services rendered (Exhibit 3.E.7). Fees collected follow the Business and Financial Services procedures for handling money described in the University Policies Manual section 7-4.3.

Physical resources for SAEM have been a challenge since 2000. The completion and opening of the Student Union and Recreation Center (SURC) in 2006 provided a marked improvement in facilities for ASCWU, Diversity Education Center, Civic Engagement Center, Event Support Services, Student Union Scheduling and Operations, Campus Life, Campus Activities, David Wain Coon Center for Excellence and Leadership, Center for Student Empowerment, KCWU TV and KCWU Radio, Wellness Center, and Wildcat Sports, (Exhibit 3.E.8; See 3.D.15 for a detailed description of this facility). For others such as admissions, financial aid, registrar services, career services, the vice president’s office, and the health and counseling center, staff increases have created overcrowded work spaces.

The campus South Neighborhood Study (Exhibit 8.E.39) reviewed either remodeling the vacated old student union building for student services or building a new student services center. Due to limited funding, it was recommended that the old student union building would be used for an Information Technology Services center. Student Services offices are dispersed throughout campus, forcing students to receive services in a variety of locations. Currently there are plans to develop a centralized service delivery area by connecting Bouillion and Lind Halls with a breezeway in the next 10 years.

Two high rise residence halls, Courson and Muzzall halls, were removed in 2008 due to aging infrastructure and lack of student desire to reside in the two halls. To compensate, University Housing and other campus partners are now completing the 477-bed Wendell Hill Hall, which will open in fall 2009. University Housing also commits annual funds to preservation projects (See Standard 8).

**Appraisal of 3.A**

Since 2001, the Student Affairs and Enrollment Management branches of SAEM have developed increased interdepartmental cohesion. Although both areas have very different functions, the commitment to effective recruitment, retention, student growth, and development has facilitated
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collaboration and communication. This, coupled with the development of a comprehensive strategic plan, has allowed CWU to grow enrollments and increase retention, staffing, programming, and services. Together, the once-separate divisions have merged into an integrated division with strong unit leaders and dedicated professionals who focus on the enrichment of Central’s students, staff, and community. Growth in services has been accompanied by growth in space and facilities needs that have not been met for at least some of the division’s departments, as noted above. For these units, space limitations and scattered locations are challenges to effective service delivery.

SAEM delivers programs and services designed to meet the changing needs of students. Increased attention to changing demographics has enhanced student retention of freshmen cohorts (Exhibit 3.E.9). Over the past five years SAEM staff have delivered numerous national and regional presentations on best practices that demonstrate the division’s accomplishments. The division has received national and regional awards for signature programs. The division strives to approach student development holistically and is intentionally grounded in theory, thereby enhancing the implementation of empirically-validated practices. In addition to ongoing departmental peer reviews, in 2006 the division underwent two external evaluations (Exhibit 3.E.10) focusing on strategic planning processes, administrative structure, and assessment. The recommendations of those external evaluations have strengthened procedures and structural alignment, and increased attention toward “closing the loop” on departmental and divisional assessment measures.

Strategies have been implemented to strengthen consistent administrative processes for strategic planning and standardized annual reports. In spring 2008, the division created a Strategic Planning Review Team that reviewed and revised the division’s strategic plan. The plan guides departmental goals and objectives, which act as operational plans. Divisional assessment measures are being developed to align with the strategic plan. Departmental assessments need to be coordinated to avoid duplication among students and other respondents. In the summer of 2008, the division created an assessment council to guide division-wide assessment projects and implement a coherent assessment program across units (Exhibit 3.E.11). The SAEM Assessment Council met during summer 2008 to further develop its charge and role.

The economy and the budget crisis facing higher education in Washington state have created recent challenges for the university and for SAEM. SAEM recently took the largest divisional cut in state support budget (11.6%) in the university’s response to the state and global economic recession. The budget cuts were based on growth since 2001 and because SAEM grew the most, it was impacted the most by budget cuts for the 2009–2010 academic year. SAEM was able to absorb the cuts by freezing positions, self-support budgets, and Service and Activities (S&A) fund reductions without having to cut positions this year. It will be imperative for SAEM to meet its enrollment goals and continue to budget creatively over the coming year. It is anticipated that the economic crisis will impact Central into 2010–2011 and further budget cuts may come in the form of cutting positions or restructuring.

Comprehensive attention to enrollment management is needed to strengthen campus-wide enrollment retention. The president has created a university-wide task force of students, faculty, and staff. The task force charge is threefold: 1. Determine which students are leaving CWU before graduating, when they are leaving, and why they are leaving. 2. Recommend strategies for increasing CWU’s first-to-second-year retention rate from 75% to 82% within two years. 3. Recommend a strategy to engage all members of the campus community in CWU student success and retention.

Although Enrollment Management has gone through numerous leadership changes over the past few years, an enrollment management plan (Exhibit 3.E.12) has been collaboratively developed with student affairs and academic affairs partners. Joint quarterly summit meetings are held to maintain open communication channels, share challenges, and explore and develop new ideas. Although great
strides have been made in Enrollment Management planning, the division is in the process of reworking its vision and operational plan. The division has invested in Hobson’s client management software to better communicate with and directly market to current and prospective students. The university is continuing to increase the academic qualifications of admitted students and to better serve underrepresented populations.

The division will continue to address service delivery at university centers. In spring 2008 a proposal to the S&A Fees Committee encouraged seated representation of students who attend the centers. The division will continue to develop and revise policies and procedures for seamless service delivery of student programs, events, and club and organization activity at the university centers. Budget requests submitted to the S&A Fees Committee will be coordinated for 2009–2013 by functional areas delivering services to university centers. The University Center Advisory Council and center-specific University Center Interdivisional Committees will assist with this coordination.

**Standard 3.B – General Responsibilities:**

The institution provides student services and programs based upon an assessment of student needs, provides adequate support to achieve established goals, and adopts, publishes, and makes available policies that meet the needs of CWU’s students based on demographics and trends, student characteristics, and assessment feedback. Students play a key role in collaboration with faculty and staff in the development of policies, programs, and student life to meet the students’ academic goals.

**Historical Perspective**

Significant development of student programs over the past ten years has been initiated to support diversity, leadership, and civic engagement of students. The greatest growth has been in the assessment of student life, services, and programs. Opportunities for students to participate on committees was once rare; now students have many opportunities to contribute in the institutional decisions that affect their lives. The appointment of a student trustee on the board strengthened the relationship between students, faculty, and staff. Strategic planning, assessment, programming, and systematic review have been implemented to meet the mission and goals of the university that will meet the changing needs of its students.

**Current Situation**

*Central Washington University systematically identifies the characteristics of its student population and students’ learning and special needs. The institution makes provision for meeting those identified needs, emphasizing students’ achievement of their educational goals (3.B.1). CWU’s Ellensburg campus attracts primarily 18–22 year-old college-bound freshmen and transfers from the west and central regions of Washington State. CWU attracts the average college-bound student: 74% of CWU’s first-time, first-year students rank in the top 50% of their high school classes, 30.3% had a GPA between 2.50 and 2.99, and 55.5% graduate from CWU within six years (Exhibit 3.E.13). The average SAT and ACT scores at Central are lower than other four year state institutions, and 36% of the 2005 Washington high school graduates enrolled in college developmental math or English (Exhibit 3.E.14).*

From 2001–2002 to 2007–2008, CWU’s enrollment increased 18 percent and the student body has become more diverse. More than 96% are residents of Washington state and typically more than 25% are first-generation students. CWU centers contribute significantly to the total transfer student enrollment, with more nontraditional students who are 22 or older, female, and Pell Grant recipients. CWU attracts students interested in business, education, psychology, law and justice, the sciences and
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technology, and the arts and communication. The percentage of students of color has risen from 13 percent in 2001 to almost 21 percent in fall 2008. CWU continues to be a university of choice for Hispanic students, who make up about 8 percent of undergraduate students. While CWU enrolls and graduates a higher proportion of Hispanic students than any other state university, CWU's Hispanic enrollment is still below the percentage of Hispanic citizens in the central Washington area.

Applications from students of color have increased to 26% with undergraduate minority enrollment now at 18.7% (See Table 3.2). Freshmen enrollment has increased 40% since 2000, but is leveling off and is expected to remain constant or decrease statewide for several years. Transfer enrollment has remained stable over the last five years, but also is expected to remain constant or decrease statewide for several years.

Table 3.2. 2008 CWU Student Characteristics (IPEDS Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Levels</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>GRAND TOTALS</td>
<td>GRAND TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,505 HC</td>
<td>9,979 HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>100% PCT</td>
<td>100% PCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4,923 HC</td>
<td>4,717 HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5,582 HC</td>
<td>5,262 HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity and Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>257 HC</td>
<td>229 HC</td>
<td>28 HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>661 HC</td>
<td>648 HC</td>
<td>13 HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>282 HC</td>
<td>266 HC</td>
<td>16 HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>758 HC</td>
<td>724 HC</td>
<td>34 HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINORITY TOTALS</td>
<td>1,958 HC</td>
<td>1,867 HC</td>
<td>91 HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Middle Eastern</td>
<td>7,775 HC</td>
<td>7,382 HC</td>
<td>393 HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>185 HC</td>
<td>168 HC</td>
<td>17 HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>587 HC</td>
<td>562 HC</td>
<td>25 HC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The university’s Student Engagement and Retention Team (SERT) has coordinated and delivered “early-warning” academic interventions, primarily to freshmen identified to be at risk for academic difficulties. Risk factors are assessed by the College Student Inventory (CSI), an inventory of factors that predict college readiness. CSI data summaries for 2003–2008 may be found in Exhibit 2.E.39. SERT services and programs include mandatory academic recovery services for freshmen and sophomores on warning/probation, academic mentoring programs, and support at orientation and preview programs.

SERT identifies the top 20% of dropout-prone students and makes personal contact with each student by phone to check in and offer resources. Since 2002, the SERT has made personal contact with all students who have not graduated but who have not registered for the next quarter’s classes. Research on the SERT (Exhibit 3.E.15) indicates that the program significantly increases the rate of retention and grade point average for freshmen on academic warning or probation. Appendix 3.A.3 contains student retention and rate of graduation for the last 3 years, including the NCAA athlete graduation report.

In the past, CSI results (Exhibit 3.E.16) were delivered to students by residence hall advisors. Beginning in fall 2008, CSI results have been distributed to students by their University 101 instructor. University 101 instructors have a summary report of dropout proneness and recommendations. Each report contains individualized feedback for students. The University 101 syllabus includes a reflection paper on students’ perceived preparation for college incorporating evidence from the CSI self report. Individualized feedback reports include recommendations on student support services. Students are required to visit specific support services based on their self report and analysis. SERT utilizes this report during intervention with students on warning or probation following first or second quarter grades.
**Associated Students Board of Directors.** The institution provides opportunities for students to participate in institutional governance. Faculty are involved in the development of policies for student programs and services (3.B.2; also see Standard 6.E). Every enrolled undergraduate and graduate student is a member of the Associated Students of Central Washington University (ASCWU). The student body is represented by its elected Board of Directors (BOD), consisting of the President, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Student Life and Facilities, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Clubs and Organizations, Vice President for Political Affairs and Vice President for Equity and Community Service. The BOD works actively with university administration and faculty to promote shared institutional governance that represents the student point of view. The BOD manages several boards and agencies, oversees more than 140 campus clubs, places students on 38 university committees (Exhibit 3.E.17), and participates in university governance bodies including the President’s Advisory Council, the Faculty Senate, the Budget Advisory Committee, and the Board of Trustees. The BOD selects student members for the Service and Activities Fee Committee, a student majority committee with faculty and staff representation that recommends to the Board of Trustees the dispersal of over four million dollars in student funds annually. The involvement of students in university policy development is further documented in Appendix 3.A.5.

**Policies on students’ rights and responsibilities, including those related to academic honesty and procedural rights, are clearly stated, well publicized, readily available, and implemented in a fair and consistent manner (3.B.3).** The students’ rights and responsibilities, comprised of CWU policies and the state’s Student Judicial Code, are published in the CWU Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3, Parts 5 and 8), the appendices of the university catalog (Exhibit GE.2), the University Housing and New Student Programs (UHNSP) Handbook (Exhibit 3.E.6), and throughout the university website. The reference guide is distributed to all new students during orientation. Graduate students receive rights and responsibilities information during their orientation and in the catalog.

The central point of contact regarding student behavioral concerns is the Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. CWU developed a Problem Solving Team in 2001 comprised of individuals from several divisions to address student behaviors which violate the student code of conduct. The Problem Solving Team meets weekly to review alleged policy violations on and off campus and suggests intervention strategies. The Problem Solving Team is chaired by the assistant to the vice president who is designated as the chief conduct officer and includes representatives from University Housing, Public Safety and Police Services, the Wildcat Wellness Center, Counseling Center, and International Student Programs. The Problem Solving Team calls in other departments as needed to discuss emergency preparedness or specific student climate issues.

**Public Safety and Police Services.** CWU provides for the safety and security of its students and their property (3.B.4). The Department of Public Safety and Police Services is the university agency that oversees campus safety. CWU’s police agency operates 24 hours a day, 365 days a year and is a general-authority state police force. The department employs 13 armed police officers who are fully commissioned by the state of Washington and have the same arrest and investigative authority as other law enforcement officers in the state. The department has the primary responsibility for law enforcement on Central’s campus and works closely with all other law enforcement agencies.

Commissioned officers patrol the campus 24 hours a day with emphasis on crime prevention and education. In addition to commissioned officers, the department employs parking enforcement officers and a secretarial staff. Each year officers conduct between 60 and 75 crime prevention programs for the university community, with the majority held in the residence halls for the benefit of resident students. These programs focus on topics such as personal safety, emergency preparedness, rape awareness and prevention, bicycle registration, drug and alcohol use/abuse, and related crime prevention and theft prevention techniques.
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Information concerning student safety is published and widely distributed; especially among the residential student population (3.B.4). The Department of Public Safety and Police Services prepares an annual report (Exhibit 3.E.18) in accordance with federal reporting requirements. Each year the report is updated and released on the Public Safety and Police Services web site. The annual report, student surveys, general public opinion, crime trends, and employee input are used to create day-to-day operational objectives. These objectives are implemented at all levels of the department.

In compliance with notification provisions of the Jeanne Cleary Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act of 1998, CWU issues notifications to faculty, staff and students via email and the intranet of possible crime alert situations. In fall 2008, CWU Alert! was implemented, a campus wide emergency notification system. An annual notice goes out to CWU personnel and students with information regarding the Public Safety and Police Services annual report which includes statistics. Additionally, specific statistical crime data on CWU is provided to the US Department of Education as required by law (Exhibit 3.E.19).

Safety features such as timely warnings about crime, an emergency “blue light” telephone system located throughout the campus, an alert notification system, and a comprehensive crime prevention program are all part of the department’s targeted response to campus safety. Incidents of crime on campus are published in one local newspaper, one regional newspaper, and the campus newspaper. The university contracts with the community colleges where the university centers are located to ensure the safety of students at those centers.

**University Catalog.** The university catalog (Exhibit GE.2) is published annually and made available to both prospective and enrolled students in paper and electronic versions (3.B.5). Paper editions are available in limited quantities for academic advisors and others in need of print versions. The electronic version is the official version. The catalog reflects current policies and regulations of the university and describes the mission, admission requirements and procedures, students’ rights and responsibilities, academic regulations, degree-completion requirements, credit courses and descriptions, tuition, fees and other charges, refund policy, and other items relative to attending the institution or withdrawing from it (3.B.5). The material commonly included in a student handbook, such as information on student conduct, a grievance policy, academic honesty, student government, student organizations and services, and athletics, is combined with the university catalog and handbooks found in Appendix 3.A.2 (3.B.5).

Since the online catalog is the official compilation of the curriculum, the university has invested in Acalog™, an online catalog management software system. The new online catalog is interactive, provides multimedia sharing technology and student portfolio capabilities, and links to both internal and external CWU information. The online catalog went live for the first time in 2006 (see 3.C).

Although the catalog is the comprehensive guide to policies, information is available to students through many other publications, including the prospective student publication, freshman application packet, and transfer guide. The Housing Reference Guide, acceptance books, registration handbook, visitation brochures, international student recruitment publications, information postcards, and third-party publications such as Hobson’s Guide for Latino Students and the Native American Student Guide all provide students with detailed information about admissions policies and other appropriate information. Supplemental CWU handbooks such as the non-traditional student handbook contain information for special populations.

In accordance with NWCCU Policy 3.1, Central places a high value on the integrity with which it communicates to students through advertising, publications, and electronic distribution of information.
for the recruitment and retention of students. This is assured in a variety of ways, most notably by protecting the rights of individuals, by maintaining an open and deliberate decision-making process, by following guidelines established by accrediting bodies and state and federal laws, by ensuring truth in advertising, and by encouraging open and civil discourse and inquiry. Truth in advertising is maintained in university’s publications, including recruitment brochures and catalogs, which provide accurate information about the university’s services and the outcomes that students and other constituents can expect. Care is taken to ensure that information that is shared with media outlets, with government officials, and with citizens at large fairly represents the university and its actions and activities as described in Standard 9.A.3.

**Assessment of Student Services.** SAEM and the university periodically and systematically evaluate the appropriateness, adequacy, and utilization of student services and programs and use the results of the evaluation as a basis for change (3.B.6). The SAEM assessment tools (Exhibit 3.E.20) highlight departmental efforts toward assessing specific goals and student learning outcomes. Efforts have been made to “close the loop” on assessment measures, articulating uses, and communicating results to appropriate constituents. Through the recently-created Assessment Council (see below), the division will identify gaps in assessment and link assessment measures to the divisional strategic plan. Annual departmental reports include overviews of progress toward goals with supporting evidence. Each director in SAEM conducts an annual evaluation which is reviewed and used as a tool for assessing program effectiveness, anticipating training and development needs, and framing funding requests. Assessment routines are also described in Standard 3.A, above.

In 2007, SAEM adopted *Learning Reconsidered: A Campus Wide Focus on the Student Experience* (Exhibit 3.E.21) as the primary guide for developing divisional student learning outcomes. Using the Council of Accreditation Standards (CAS) and other appropriate national standards for various departments, the concepts in *Learning Reconsidered* provide a common dimension for strategic planning, internal assessment, professional development, and collaboration within SAEM. Exhibit 3.E.22 is a sample matrix used to ensure that each SAEM unit links its goals and assessment plans to the university mission and goals. Although some departments adapted to the matrix easily, others did not because they were using different standards.

In 2008 SAEM created the SAEM Assessment Council to standardize the division’s assessment plans for the best assessment practices at the unit and divisional level. Over the past year, the Assessment Council has been developing a division wide plan that is still in draft form. The developing plan divides assessment into three functional dimensions: internal, external, and student focus (Exhibit 3.E.23). In an effort to improve the functionality of assessment and to achieve greater alignment between planning and assessment practice, the division will standardize its annual reporting process. Each unit will follow a standardized annual report template that maps assessment measures to the unit’s objectives. Annual report content will be updated via a content management system and ultimately published online. Not only will the annual report become more user-friendly and functional for internal purposes, it will provide greater transparency for external constituents. Generating a standard template will necessitate a review of the standards and division-wide goals valued within SAEM.

**Appraisal of 3.B**

The institution has made significant progress in discharging its general responsibilities. The university has spent considerable time on assessment, survey of students, and compilation of data. As CWU progresses over the coming years it will be critical to organize assessment data to target specific areas that need improvement. An abundance of data now needs to be refined into useful indicators to identify programs that are doing well and to strengthen other programs that need more attention. A
good example is the increase in retention rates of freshmen on warning and probation. That program needs to be maintained while the university finds new ways to retain other students.

Data gathered from academic affairs, academic advising, and new student programs shaped the First Year Experience (FYE) program (Exhibit 3.E.24) that is being rolled out beginning with the Summer 2009 new student orientation program. This program will reaffirm CWU’s commitment to a supportive campus environment by addressing the transitional needs of first-year students through a coordinated first year experience. This program will organize individual initiatives into a cross-divisional program that will enhance the impact, communication, and assessment of its efforts.

Although CSI data has been utilized in University 101, departments could take more advantage of the data. Programmatic changes have emerged from the SERT Academic Recovery program. For example, changes have been made to the freshmen orientation program to explain the purpose of a liberal arts curriculum and developmental classes in English and math have been added. Other areas that have access to these individualized reports include the Student Transitions and Academic Resources program, CAMP, Housing and New Student Programs, Student Support Services and Academic Advising.

CWU’s public safety department is more than just a policing agency. Its problem-solving mission includes policing, parking, information and education. This leads to numerous opportunities to serve the campus in non-traditional means. Staff and students serve on committees, coordinate major events, handle press releases, write emergency preparedness plans, train employees, and a host of other safety-related activities. Because of these unique responsibilities, public safety officers often interact with many departments on campus and provide support necessary to facilitate their work.

The future role of the Department of Public Safety and Police Services will continue beyond its current scope. Along with traditional responsibilities there will be a variety of new tasks that will touch on all of the university divisions from academics to marketing. The department has started in that direction through increased cooperation with Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, partnering with local law enforcement, encouraging student recruiting and retention and many other facets of university life. The department will continue its emphasis on a community policing style of law enforcement that empowers the community and the police to resolve problems.

**Standard 3.C – Academic Credit and Records**

Evaluation of student learning or achievement and the award of credit is based upon clearly stated criteria. Academic records are accurate, secure, and comprehensive, based on best practices identified through national standards and guidelines set by federal and state agencies and professional organizations. The Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), and the state’s Higher Education Coordinating Board, Council of Presidents, and Intercollegiate Relations Commission (ICRC) are among the sources of CWU’s credit policies.

**Historical Perspective**

The policies and procedures for evaluating student learning or achievement and awarding credit at the undergraduate and graduate levels are based on national and state standards and educational goals set by Central’s faculty. Since 1999 CWU has updated the curriculum approval process to clearly state the goals, objectives, learner outcomes, and assessments for all courses and programs.
Over the past ten years Central has revised its transfer credit policies and upgraded its Student Information System (SIS) to a relational database purchased from Oracle/PeopleSoft that is now called Student Financials, Admissions, Financial Aid, Academic Progress, and Records Information (Safari). The new system has enhanced the university’s ability to track transfer credit and provide timely degree audit reports.

The undergraduate and graduate admissions processes are administered by separate offices, and both areas have streamlined their processes since the 2004 implementation of Safari. Registrar Services continues to be a hub for records maintenance, credit evaluation, and privacy and security for permanent records of the university. Over the past ten years, Registrar Services has received state approval for its records retention schedule, upgraded its security policy for Safari users, revised the FERPA policy, and tightened its student records security system.

**Current Situation**

**Credit Policies.** *Evaluation of student learning or achievement, and the award of credit, is based upon clearly stated and distinguishable criteria (3.C.1).* Policies concerning the award of academic credit are approved by the Faculty Senate, are part of the CWU Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5), and are described in the University Catalog and Registration Handbook.

The Carnegie unit system is still utilized as the primary method to determine the number of credits awarded, although some departments use other performance-based methods to determine credits. CWU does not award credit for past experience. One credit represents a total time commitment of three hours each week of the quarter. A regular load of 15 credits requires 45 hours of work per week for desirable student progress. The total time may include class time, studying, conferring with the instructor, writing, performing laboratory work, exercising, or performing other learning activities.

A minimum of 180 credits is required for an undergraduate degree; 60 credits must be upper division, and 45 credits must have been earned at Central. A graduate student must complete at least 45 credits in the 400–500 level groups, and at least 25 credits of the total required for the degree must be numbered 501 or above. In some cases, departments restrict the number of credits below 500. At least 30 of the credits included in the graduate student’s course of study must carry letter grades.

Full-time or part-time status is determined by the number of credits for which a student registers. Full-time undergraduate status is 12 credits or more, three-quarter time status is 9–11 credits; half-time status is 6–8 credits. Full-time graduate status is 10 or more credits; half-time graduate status is 5–6 credits. The normal maximum load is 18 credits for undergraduates and 15 credits for graduate students. Students may be granted exceptions to overload schedules with the approval of their major advisor and department chair or the school dean or graduate dean in some cases.

The university began to receive Washington state community college transcripts electronically when Safari SIS was implemented in fall of 2004. With this more responsive system, all undergraduate transfer credit typically is posted to Safari within 24 hours of receiving the electronic transcript once the student is matriculated. Further discussion of transfer credit policies is presented in Standard 2.C.

**Evaluating Student Learning.** *Criteria for evaluating student performance and achievement, including those for theses and portfolios, are appropriate to the degree level, clearly stated and implemented (3.C.2).* The criteria used to evaluate student performance and achievement are developed and approved through the curriculum review process described in Standard 2.A and published in the University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5). Evaluation of student learning is extensively described in Standard 2.B.

*Standard 3 – 11*
The curriculum approval process requires that each department must include learner outcomes and an assessment plan for all course additions, and programmatic goals and an assessment plan for new programs (see Standard 2.A). Course syllabi are available to all students from instructors. Degree requirements are determined by the Online Electronic Catalog (OEC) that is in effect at the time a student is admitted to his or her major or program of study. Graduate students admitted to the university may use the catalog they are admitted under or the current one. Exceptions and substitutions to program requirements may be approved by the advisor and department chair or registrar. In some cases, exceptions must have the dean’s approval. All exceptions and substitutions are entered and tracked on Safari, and posted to the student’s online degree progress report.

Graduate students are assessed by multiple indicators of student learning (see Standard 2.B, D, E, and F). In 2007 the Graduate Council approved a new thesis policy [Exhibit 3.E.25] which outlines evaluation criteria and methodology. A student accepted for graduate study must file a course of study that is endorsed by his or her graduate committee chair, department chair or graduate coordinator, and the Office of Graduate Studies. The credit on the course of study must be separate and distinct from credit applied toward any other degree.

All master’s degree students must demonstrate their ability to communicate effectively in writing by satisfactorily completing a thesis, a written report of a field study, internship, or creative project, or a comprehensive written examination. The written report must conform to standards described in the thesis regulations which are available in the Office of Graduate Studies and on the web. Departments and programs may impose additional requirements, but in all cases the graduate office minimums must be met. Additional information on the evaluation of graduate students is available in the university catalog (Exhibit GE.2).

Undergraduate and post-baccalaureate programs will often include a capstone or portfolio course, undergraduate thesis, or final field study within their major. See Standard 2.B for a discussion of capstone courses.

**Academic Records.** Academic records are accurate, secure and comprehensive (3.C.1). The institution makes provisions for the security of student records of admission and progress (3.C.5). The university complies with federal and state regulations that govern student privacy, and access to records, including the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Solomon Amendment, Cleary Act, and Release of Information Act. Central respects the rights and privileges under these acts while ensuring the confidentiality of records. The university publicizes policies and procedures related to FERPA and Release of Information (Exhibit 3.E.26) in the university catalog and on the registrar homepage.

Student records after January 1986 are stored in Safari. The student database is backed up nightly, and stored in a different building from the main production database. The majority of student history is stored within the Safari. Many of the hardcopy confirmations of grade reports, class rank, honor roll, and other reports are stored on the network drive and backed up on high volume, long life media.

Registrar Services supports the only secure printer at the university that has the ability to print official transcripts and enrollment verifications for students. No other offices can generate official transcripts, enrollment verification, or diplomas. The university utilizes security paper that cannot be duplicated to create its official transcripts.

Records prior to January 1986 are stored in a fireproof, climate controlled vault that is approved for retention and safety of records. CWU is in the process of indexing all hard copy transcripts to be digitized in the near future. The graduate office maintains its own student files in a secure area. The
records are not stored in fireproof cabinets but duplicate graduate records are maintained in academic departments. Registrar Services follows a state-approved records retention policy (Exhibit 3.E.27) for the proper destruction of records such as student permanent records, degree applications, admissions, degree progress, grades, faculty grades, and graduate records.

Students requesting that official transcripts, enrollment or degree verifications be sent to a third party or to themselves may do so in person with a picture identification and their signature or they may request the official document online through Safari, which connects the student to a secure third party site, the National Student Clearinghouse.

Online grading is available to all faculty utilizing their username and secure password. Eighty percent of the faculty utilizes the online grading system. Grade rosters may be submitted in hardcopy in case of technical difficulty or internet access problems. The implementation of Safari has allowed Registrar Services to provide tighter security over access to student information. There are only a few users within Registrar Services, CWU centers, Financial Aid, and Student Employment who may view a full social security number. The student is identified now through a system-generated identification number and assigned a personal identification number (PIN) that cannot be viewed by any CWU personnel. Safari allows the student to set up his or her own secure password for further confidentiality.

Access to Safari is available on request to the registrar when CWU faculty or staff have a legitimate educational interest. Once a person is granted access they are sent the SIS User Security Policy (Exhibit 3.E.28) that outlines the rules governing access to student information. In addition, Registrar Services provides training at new faculty orientation, and sends out annual email notifications to faculty and staff regarding these policies. University personnel provide additional training to parents and new students at orientations.

**Degree Credit.** Clear and well-publicized distinctions are made between degree and non-degree credit. (3.C.3). Courses are numbered 100 through 700. Non-credit courses are numbered 100 or 500 (Exhibit GE.2; Exhibit GE.3, Part 5). The catalog description of each course numbered 100 or 500 indicates that the course does not meet degree requirements. This is also noted on the transcript legend (Exhibit 3.E.29). Academic policies regarding non-credit offerings, such as those offered by continuing education, further state that “the university offers opportunities for learning which do not carry academic credit. The subject matter (content) of noncredit offerings must be consistent with the university mission and should reflect the general nature of the institution. They must not duplicate or compete for enrollment with credit bearing courses” (Exhibit GE.3, Part 5-10.5.14).

CWU allows undergraduate or post-baccalaureate students to take up to 15 credits of courses numbered 101 – 499 as a credit/no credit option to explore academic areas of interest. However, they may only take one such class a quarter and students can only choose from free electives, not general education courses, major or minor concentrations, or the professional education sequence. Credits earned under this option are not included in computing the grade point average. In order to receive credit for the course, the student must earn a C- or above.

**Transfer Credit.** Transfer credit is accepted from accredited institutions or from other institutions under procedures which provide adequate safeguards to ensure high academic quality and relevance to the students’ programs. CWU’s transfer credit policies are in full compliance with NWCCU Standard 2.C.4 as well as Policy 2.5, Transfer and Award of Academic Credit. The final judgment for determining acceptable credit for transfer is the responsibility of CWU (3.C.4). Transfer policies are identified in the CWU Policies Manual, Part 5 (Exhibit GE.3), and in the catalog (Exhibit GE.2). The recent history, current status, and issues related to transfer credit policies and procedures are thoroughly discussed in Standard 2.C. and 2.F.

---

*Standard 3 – 13*
**Appraisal of 3.C**

Policies and procedures related to the award of academic credit are reviewed on an annual basis by the Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, and Registrar Services. CWU complies with national professional association and institutional trends, and state, federal, and NWCCU policies.

The new Safari system has made access to student records more secure and allowed CWU to receive electronic transfer credit transcripts for more efficient credit articulations. Students and faculty can view transfer credit and degree audit reports as soon as a student is accepted and matriculated. The reporting capabilities of Safari are far superior to that of the legacy system. The query reporting tools allow university personnel to run more error-checking reports to ensure the accuracy of records.

Over the past ten years, CWU has concentrated on fine-tuning its curriculum policies and ensuring that there are clear goals, objectives, outcomes, and assessments for programs and courses, and that there are clear delineations between undergraduate and graduate level work. CWU has made great strides in ensuring that transfer credits are articulated accurately, timely, and are up to date. However, there is still work to be done to evaluate the number of community college lower division transfer credits accepted at CWU as upper division credit (see discussion in Standard 2.C). Digitizing student transcripts prior to January 1986 remains to be done. A review of imaging needs at CWU has been completed, but budget issues have delayed the selection of a campus wide imaging solution.

In the near future, the university will continue to update electronic technology to increase the communication between students, faculty, and staff. The Safari Student Information System will be upgraded to a new version over the next two years and assessed to ensure it is meeting the needs of advisors. In addition, the university will implement Hobson’s Retain software to increase communication, tracking, and retention of currently enrolled students, as well as piloting an early warning system in the fall of 2009. Further research will begin in the coming year to identify possible imaging systems to implement in the Enrollment Management Division that could possibly be rolled out to other areas of campus. CWU will continue to expand asynchronous online learning by increasing the web presence beyond major program classes. Hardware and support software will need to be continually monitored to ensure that CWU has state of the art delivery methods for learning.

**Standard 3.D – Student Services**

The institution recruits and admits students qualified to complete its programs. It fosters a supportive learning environment and provides services to sustain students’ achievement of their educational goals in concert with the strategic mission, vision, and goals of the university. Student Services has grown tremendously over the past decade by studying best practices in the industry, evaluating student needs, assessing programs, and adapting to changing economics and demographics of students. CWU has developed programs to improve retention, time to degree, and student satisfaction.

**Historical Perspective**

In summer 2001 a new vice president was appointed to oversee SAEM. Over the course of the next eight years the division experienced significant growth and development. Financial resources were secured for the division as responsibilities and services increased. Admissions, Career Placement, Residence Life and New Student Programs, Retention, Financial Aid, Scholarships and Student Employment, Health, Counseling and Wellness, Registrar Services, and many other student support programs all fall under SAEM. SAEM works closely with student services not under SAEM, such as Dining and Food Services, Bookstore, and Academic Advising.
Current Situation

Admissions. The university provides programs and services to enroll, retain, and graduate diverse students. All student services support students' holistic personal growth, academic performance, and preparation for success consistent with their educational goals. Student services promote student satisfaction, success, and commitment to the university. Student service areas are extremely collaborative, have participated in strategic planning, and make it a point to tie their processes and programs to the vision, mission, and goals of the university at all sites.

Between the 2000 and 2007 academic years, CWU experienced a 35% increase in freshmen applications. This increase was due to many factors, including demographic trends. The Office of Admissions was able to hire additional recruiters and admissions counselors to more fully develop the recruiting program (Exhibit 3.E.30). The university also benefited from two large grant-funded programs, Student Support Services (SSS) and the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP). Both programs bolstered recruitment and retention efforts for underrepresented students.

The university’s student admission policies are consistent with its mission. CWU specifies qualifications for admission to the institution and its programs, and it adheres to those policies in its admission practices (3.D.1). CWU’s admissions policies are informed by the standards of the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), the Inter-College Relations Commission (ICRC), the National Association of College Admissions Counselors (NACAC), and other professional and oversight organizations.

Every year the Office of Admissions reviews its policies and updates its strategic and recruitment plans (Exhibit 3.E.31) to meet the vision, mission, and goals of the university. The Office of Admissions strives through communication, personal interaction, and the use of the latest technology to recruit and enroll a diverse population of academically prepared students. Central Washington University strives to be the campus of choice for the students of Washington state and the Northwest. Recent improvements include updating and streamlining admissions processes and position responsibilities, redesigning web pages, implementing more aggressive recruiting practices, and updating publications such as the freshmen application packet (Exhibit 3.E.32), freshman acceptance book (Exhibit 3.E.33), the transfer guide (Exhibit 3.E.34), and transfer acceptance book (Exhibit 3.E.35). The student visitation program, once called the Central Sampler Program and now named Central Cat Tracks, has been recently revised. The visitation program is overseen by the assistant director of admissions, and is staffed completely by CWU students. A complete policy and procedure guide (Exhibit 3.E.36) has been implemented for training Cat Tracks students.

The Office of Admissions uses a comprehensive process (Exhibit 3.E.37) to evaluate applicants for admission. For freshmen, high school GPA, SAT or ACT test scores, and core course requirements are examined. The admissions index (AI; also see Standard 2.B; Exhibit 3.E.38), which combines cumulative GPA and test scores, is used for this initial process. The AI is a reliable predictor of subsequent academic performance. The initial AI, indicating cognitive abilities, is refined by looking at the quality of the coursework, as well as grade trends.

After the applicant is assigned a cognitive score, the admissions office examines non-cognitive factors that may affect a person’s ability to perform to his or her fullest potential (Exhibit 3.E.39). These non-cognitive factors include positive self-concept, realistic self-appraisal, ability to navigate the system, and preference for long-range vs. short-term goals. These factors are assessed by the student’s admissions application essay, which responds to general questions regarding the student’s past and present performance and future goals. The admissions office combines cognitive and non-cognitive factors to assess students who are slightly below the AI score that would automatically admit them.
Students that are identified as having potential for success based on the comprehensive review criteria will be admitted to CWU. Students that are denied admission can appeal (Exhibit 3.E.40) the decision.

In fall 2007 the Office of Admissions implemented an official appeal committee for students that did not meet initial admissions criteria and were denied admission (Exhibit 3.E.41). In the 2008–2009 academic year the admissions office will assess the success of the admissions review and admissions appeal processes.

Regular reports are provided on admissions funnel data, from prospect through confirmation (see Table 3.3), so that mid-course corrections can be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3 Admissions, Recruitment, and Yield Report*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FALL 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This table is the equivalent of NWCCU Table 3.1

The Office of Admissions works collaboratively across divisions. Other initiatives include:

- Increased outreach efforts to out-of-state prospective students.
- Increased Western Undergraduate Exchange students.
- Introduced Hobson's Enrollment Management Technology in 2008 to enhance tracking and e-communications for recruitment and retention.
- Responding to state demographic shifts, new publications and partnerships with the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) and Hobson's have been forged to ensure CWU that is known as a welcoming campus for first generation and economically disadvantaged students from diverse backgrounds.
- Increasing campus-wide involvement in marketing and recruitment activities.
- New or revised staff resources will be needed, including more effective use of student employees.

**Student Diversity.** CWU, in keeping with its mission and admission policy, gives attention to the needs and characteristics of its student body with conscious attention to such factors as ethnic, socioeconomic, and religious diversity while demonstrating regard for students’ rights and responsibilities (3.D.2). The university is dedicated to the recruitment and retention of a diverse student body. SAEM is committed to implementing these goals and continues to anticipate changing demographics. The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education provides demographic forecasting for the state of Washington with a specific focus on ethnicity. As the division has anticipated continued growth in the Latino/a population, new initiatives have been implemented including the development of the Living Learning Community Casa Latina, the launch of a Spanish-language university website, partnerships with HACU, increased attention to bilingual recruitment materials, and representation in the College Guide for Hispanic Students.

SAEM is connected to national professional associations that assist in anticipating shifts in demographics. For example, recognizing the growth and needs of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and
Transgender (LGBT) populations, LGBT student programming and services have grown since 2005. The university non-discrimination policy was broadened to include gender identity and gender expression, the division partnered with police services and other departments to implement a bias response plan, and the division hosted an inaugural LGBT student leadership conference. CWU is honored to be listed by The Advocate College Guide as a Top 100 College for LGBT Students in the United States.

The division has supported several diversity-oriented academic proposals funded by the Spheres of Distinction program, including the Center for Latino Studies, Center for the Dream, Africana and Black Diaspora Studies Program, and American Indian Studies. Additionally the division has sponsored and received Spheres of Distinctions awards including Civic Engagement and Academic Service-Learning, Westside Student Affairs, Non-Traditional Student Programs/Center Outreach, and the Child and Family Learning Center Program.

Departments in Enrollment Management work closely with a number of CWU offices (see Table 3.4) and external agencies such as GEAR-UP, Washington Achievers, and TRIO to assist a smooth transition for underrepresented student populations. The Office of Admissions employs recruiters that focus on Native American students, Latino/a students, and international students. Specific academic advisors focus on special populations as well as Achievers Scholars, multicultural students, and non-traditional students (See Standard 2.C).

The following departments provide support services for students with unique needs including disabilities, academically underprepared, non-traditional, and seasonal farm working and migrant students. This chart summarizes mission, desired learning outcomes, services offered and impact on students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Services Offered</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Center for Disability Services | • Ensure individuals with disabilities are provided equal access to programs, services and facilities   | • Identify the norms in the college community regarding persons with disabilities. | • Access Technology Resource Center  
• Adaptive Technology Services  
• Alternative Formattion Center  
• Alternative Testing Program  
• State Audio Services  
• Transcription and Interpretation  
• Time Management Mobile Assistive Technology. | • Students Served, Fall 2008  
Total Students Documented with CDS (408)  
Total Students Disclosed and Documented - 523  
Total Students Documented w/Multiple Disabilities - 95  
• 143 2007-2008 graduates.  
• 100% increase in documented students enrolled at westside centers.  
• CDS students with GPA of 3.0 or higher grows: Fall 2007: 185  
Winter 2008: 191  
Spring 2008: 203 |
| College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) | Dedicated to providing migrant and seasonal farm-working students the tools to enhance and maximize their opportunities in pursuit of post secondary education. | • Articulate support areas and resources for migrant students  
• Exercise college success strategies  
• Participate in peer mentoring program and specify benefits  
• Identify social, cultural, educational opportunities | • Recruitment  
• Academic Advising  
• Peer Support  
• Tutoring Services  
• Co-curricular activities UNIV 101 and 102 courses  
• Stipend and scholarship awards | • Retention: Exceed 85% retention rate fail to fail.  
• Recruitment: 60 first year students are recruited per year.  
• 72% of participants maintain or exceed a 3.0 GPA. |
| Early Childhood Learning Centers | Provides quality childcare services and an educational curriculum for children 1 month to 8 years old. | Early Learning Benchmarks (see WA state guidelines) | • Childcare for non-traditional students  
• Age focus: Infant-5 and afterschool activities for 5-8 year olds | • Age-appropriate activities  
• Parent-child activities,  
• WinterFest celebrations  
• Fieldtrips |
**Academic Placement.** CWU follows appropriate policies and procedures to guide the placement of students in courses and programs based upon their academic and technical skills. Appropriate placement ensures a reasonable probability of success at a level commensurate with the institution’s expectations (3.D.3). Standardized test scores are used to place first-year students into appropriate English and math courses (also see Standard 2.B). Proficiency requirements are clearly stated in the university catalog. Prerequisites also are designed to ensure appropriate preparation for courses.

Special provisions are made for “ability to benefit” students (3.D.3). The Office of Admissions works closely with nontraditional and home-schooled applicants to ensure they understand how the “ability to benefit” affects their access to financial aid. Students may work with the Department of Foreign Languages, Computer Science, or Information Technology and Administrative Management in order to test out of requirements in which they might already be proficient.

Students also are offered career placement testing and planning classes to help identify areas that will benefit their academic and personal strengths. CWU provides extensive advising and student support services through the student affairs programs noted in Standard 3.D.2 and the academic affairs programs noted in Standard 2.C that support the academic progress and career goals of “ability to benefit” students.

**Academic Standing.** The university specifies and publishes requirements for continuation in, or termination from, its educational programs, and it maintains an appeals process. The policy for readmission of students who have been suspended or terminated is clearly defined (3.D.4). Academic standards are established by the faculty and implemented by the Divisions of SAEM and Academic Affairs. Policies regarding academic standing, including grade appeal procedures and appeals, repetition of courses, scholastic standards, academic forgiveness, and class attendance and participation are clearly defined in the academic and general regulations sections of the university catalog (Exhibit GE.2), on the web in Section 5.9 of the Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3), and in the appendices of the university catalog. SAEM also displays this information on its web page (Exhibit 3.E.42) under “policies, conduct code, and related information.”

Section 2 of the appendices in the university catalog clearly describes the student judicial code, conduct, complaints, disciplinary sanctions, campus judicial council, and proceedings that may affect a student’s enrollment or termination at the university. Specifically, Part VII describes the suspension process, and Part VIII provides information on readmission after suspension. The full policy and procedures are available in the Office of the Vice President for SAEM.

A student’s academic standing is provided on the student grade report, if requested, or on the unofficial transcript. All students or former students may review their information on Safari, the student information system. Beginning in fall 2004, students have been notified of their academic standing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Services Offered</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Transitions and Academic Resources (STAR)</td>
<td>• Assists academically-at-risk students complete transitions into, through, and out of the university</td>
<td>• Complete first year of college &amp; re-enroll</td>
<td>• Academic Advising</td>
<td>Retention: Winter 07-Fall 08–100% Cohort 2007 – 20 of 24 students returned to CWU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop academic study skills and responsibility for learning</td>
<td>• Enroll in a minimum of 12 credit-hours per quarter</td>
<td>• Career and Financial Aid Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Achieve educational goals</td>
<td>• Earn and maintain a 2.0 or above GPA</td>
<td>• Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Participate in peer mentoring program &amp; describe benefits</td>
<td>• Peer Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Articulate motivation for attending college, formulate long and short term goals, identify factors influencing ability to accomplish goals</td>
<td>• Advocacy and Referral Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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electronically, even if they are on warning or probation. Prior to this time, academic standing was noted only on grade reports. Electronic communication to students includes advising options and who to contact regarding their academic standing.

If a student is suspended, the Office of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management notifies the student in electronic and hard copy format of his or her academic standing and what steps to take to appeal for re-instatement. If the student is denied reinstatement the student is notified in writing of requirements that need to be met in order to eventually re-apply for admission.

**Graduation Requirements.** Institutional and program graduation requirements are stated clearly in appropriate publications and are consistently applied in both the certificate and degree verification process (3.D.5). CWU publishes institutional and program graduation requirements in the university catalog and registration handbook in both hardcopy and online versions. These documents outline degree, certificate, major, minor, and specialization requirements for both state-supported and self-supporting programs, such as continuing education and international programs. The documents are based on the electronic catalog which is the official compilation of curriculum for the university. Each program must be approved through the curriculum committee approval process (see Standard 2.A). A team of degree audit specialists in Registrar Services ensures that each graduating student’s academic record satisfies all requirements before his or her degree is granted. Students may track their progress toward graduation by viewing an online degree audit report (CAPS report) at any time.

Program requirements are clearly described in specialized recruitment literature tailored for prospective undergraduate and graduate students for all CWU campuses, including Transfer Academic Program Plans (see Standard 2.C) that facilitate an easier transition into certain CWU majors from partner community colleges.

**Appropriate reference to the Student Right-to-Know Act is included in required publications (3.D.5).** The student Right-to-Know Act is published in the official university catalog (Exhibit GE.2) both online and in hard copy formats. CWU also provides students and parents with this information during new student orientations. Faculty and staff are provided documentation regarding student’s rights during new employee and faculty training.

**Financial Aid.** CWU provides an effective program of financial aid consistent with its mission and goals, the needs of its students, and institutional resources. (3.D.6). The Financial Aid Office at CWU administers financial aid, loans, scholarships, and student employment. When fully staffed the office employs 24 full time staff as well as student assistants. These offices serve over 75% of Central’s students and disburse approximately $90 million per year. Central participates in the William D. Ford Direct Loan Program and the Federal Quality Assurance Program. The mission of the Financial Aid Office is to support students in their academic goals by removing financial barriers to attending school and to maintain institutional eligibility for federal and state aid programs. The highly trained staff has extensive knowledge of a wide range of programs and federal and state regulatory requirements in order to provide the best possible aid for students.

By 2008, the last complete financial aid cycle, the Office of Financial Aid delivered total resources of $91,929,435 to CWU students. Those resources included $32,222,153 in gift aid, $9,980,988 in wages, and $49,726,294 in loans. Although the university expends over $7 million on student wages and recorded over $1 million in Job Location and Development (JLD) wages, it typically only includes “work study” wages when discussing amounts of “aid” disbursed. For this discussion, then, 2008 aid disbursed was $83,427,041. In 2008, 59% of aid disbursed was in the form of loans. The default rate was 2.2% based on the 2006 cohort. The national cohort rate is 5.2% and the average default rate in the state of Washington is 5.3%. CWU attributes its success to financial aid counseling that takes place
at orientations, on-line with the Direct Loan processor, and upon exit from CWU. In addition, the university participates in a default prevention program designed by the Direct Loan Program, concentrating on “late-stage” loan delinquents. The Financial Aid Office contacts the borrower and puts them in touch with the Direct Loan processor and default prevention team in a 3-way telephone conversation. This has proven to be an effective method of managing the default rate.

Tuition in 2010 will be $5,481, and the cost of attendance will be $19,011. The sources of CWU’s financial aid funds are shown in Figure 3.1. Although federal aid is by far the largest source, it has only grown by 53.5% from 2001 through 2008, while state funds have grown by 106.9%, institutional funds have increased by 118%, and outside resources have increased by 297%.

Seventy-seven percent (7440 students) of CWU students received some form of aid in 2008; 57% (5524 students) had recorded need totaling $69,260,661. After awarding all aid, CWU had “unmet” student need of $25,715,016. The Financial Aid Office served 2672 Pell-eligible students and 2923 students eligible for State Need Grants (SNGs), providing $17,356,085 through these two major need-based programs. Between 2001 and 2008, the number of Pell Grant recipients increased by 37% and SNG recipients increased by 39%. SNG eligibility varied between the 55th and 70th percentile of median state income during those years. The average educational debt of 2008 graduates who borrowed was $17,860. In 2001 the average debt of CWU graduates who borrowed was $18,461. The average debt is expected to increase since the annual and lifetime loan limits were raised in 2009.

Institutional resources dedicated to student access have increased by 135% since 2001. In 2002 enabling legislation allowed CWU to implement a merit aid program using tuition waivers. The Board of Trustees dedicated $1,175,000 in tuition revenue for recruitment of academically meritorious students. Since 1992 CWU has been authorized and funded to waive 8% of tuition. That percentage was increased to 10% by the 2007 legislature but it has only been funded to 9%. The institution has steadily increased student wages, spending $7,450,863 on student wages in 2008. Need-based aid remained constant with 3.5% of tuition dedicated to need-based grants and approximately 3% of tuition being waived for students with need. See Figure 3.2 for a summary of forms of institutional aid.

The Tuition Waiver Committee, chaired by the Vice President of SAEM and including members from financial aid, athletics, graduate studies, enrollment management, registrar services, and international programs, provides recommendations to the budget committee. Allocation of waiver money can be based on need, merit, or membership in special groups, such as veterans, police, or fire fighters.

There has been an increase of 297% in resources from outside entities from 2001 to 2008 (See Figure 3.3). Scholarships and guaranteed sources increased from $2,125,160 in 2001 to $3,716,140 in 2008. Outside private alternative loans grew from $351,077 in 2001 to $5,000,424 in 2008. These are primarily private loans, not guaranteed by the government, with interest rates and fees that exceed federal loans. In 2003 Financial Aid’s very successful JLD program helped secure jobs with outside entities for students who earned $238,498 in wages. The wages earned by students in JLD jobs grew to $1,051,531 by 2008. CWU has participated in the William D. Ford Direct Lending Program since

![Figure 3.1. Source of Funding](image-url)
1995. Last year, 2007–2008, $43,645,045 was processed through the Direct Loan Program. There are annual and lifetime limits per student which limit growth.

Two new federal programs began in 2007, the Academic Competitiveness Grant (ACG) and the National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent (SMART). Both are unusually difficult to administer. Another new and difficult program, the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) will be implemented at CWU in 2010. These programs have academic requirements that make these grants difficult for many needy students to obtain.

Figures 3.4 and 3.5 demonstrate the difference between state and federal aid. State aid that increased by 107% since 2001 is almost entirely gift aid. Federal aid is primarily loans. In 2008 Central students received $10,814,752 in gift aid from the state and $1,194,049 in State Work Study funds. The Washington State Need Grant attempts to keep pace with tuition. The full grant covers approximately 92% of tuition for resident students whose income or parents’ income fell at or below the 50th percentile of median state income. In 2001, 2,098 Central students received State Need Grants. In 2008, 2,923 Central students received SNGs.

CWU provides institutional accountability for all financial aid awards (3.D.6). The Office of Financial Aid actively seeks additional resources for Central students, administers all student aid, determines eligibility, keeps records, disburses money to student accounts, reconciles accounts, and prepares and submits all required reports in order to maintain compliance with state and federal regulations. The Office of Financial Aid is regulated tightly and has frequent audits to ensure compliance. CWU is a Direct Lending Institution. The federal treasury is the source of funds and there is no bank involved with our federal loans. The loan funds are always reconciled on time. Financial aid operations are
audited annually and the office has not had an audit finding in well over a decade. Central financial aid participates in the Federal Quality Assurance Program.

*Information regarding the categories of financial assistance (scholarships and grants) is published and made available to both prospective and enrolled students (3.D.7).* The Financial Aid Handbook is published on the web in both English and Spanish (Exhibit 3.E.43). The handbook includes a list of all the aid programs in which CWU participates. All scholarships are coordinated through the Scholarship Office and listed on the web. All CWU students can access the general scholarship application. As a result of efforts to inform students, applications have tripled for general scholarships.

*CWU regularly monitors its student loan programs and the institutional loan default rate (3.D.8).* CWU’s default rate is a very respectable 2.2%. The university’s low default rate is due in part to informational sessions conducted for financial aid recipients which give attention to loan repayment obligations (3.D.8). All first time borrowers must attend an entrance interview when they take out their first federal loan. Students who graduate or leave school are required to attend an exit interview if they have borrowed a federal loan. These sessions include information regarding loan repayment obligations, debt load, optional repayment plans, and consolidation options. In the case of Perkins loans a hold is placed on the student transcript until they have completed their exit interview.

**Academic Advisement.** A systematic program of academic advisement is provided. Advisors help students make appropriate decisions concerning academic choices and career paths. Specific advisor responsibilities are defined, published, and made available to students (3.D.10). Academic advising is both a teaching and learning process that is focused on student success. Students work in a collaborative environment with academic advisors and faculty in order to define and implement sound educational plans that are consistent with their interests and goals. Central’s academic advising program is fully described in Standard 2.C.

**Career Services.** Central’s career counseling and placement services are consistent with student needs and its institutional mission (3.D.11). Career Services is a strong, cohesive team with 14 resident personnel in Ellensburg, Des Moines, and Lynnwood dedicated to educating and assisting undergraduates, graduates, and alumni in the career development process. The department strives to address demographic shifts, multiculturalism, recruiting methods, complexities associated with global business, and technology-driven changes in career demands and opportunities. Career Services provides career counseling, online interest assessments, and professional preparation workshops and it administers the cooperative education academic program (See Table 3.5). The utilization of online software has led to an increase in student access to job and internship opportunities. Career Services’ revised website is its most effective marketing tool. Brochures that describe service areas are included in Exhibit 3.E.44. An assessment of student and employer satisfaction as well as student participation rates for the past three academic years can be found in annual reports (Exhibit 3.E.45).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.5. Career Services Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Counseling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Line Assessments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperative Education Program</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Employer Recruiting/Job Fairs/Special Events</strong></th>
<th>Organize 10 fairs or events per year and serves approximately 220 employers and 1,400 student participants. More than 120 employers hold on-campus interviews with about 630 students annually. Fairs include Accounting, Health Professions, the Majors Fair, Education Fair, Career Quest Fair, and the Writing, Performing, and Visual Arts Career Day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Placement Surveys</strong></td>
<td>Organize Education Job Placement Survey and compile results for OSPI and the College of Education and Professional Studies. Compile the Business and Arts and Sciences Job Placement Surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education/Teacher Placement Files</strong></td>
<td>House educational placement files including letters of reference and student teaching evaluations. Records are kept on file for 30 years. Each year, approximately 2900 files are sent to school districts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health, Counseling, and Wellness Services.** Professional health care, including psychological health and relevant health education, is readily available to Central’s residential students and to other students, as appropriate (3.D.12). The Student Health and Counseling Center strives to provide students with medical, counseling, and prevention services through a positive, proactive, cost-effective, accessible, and quality-driven delivery system. Additionally, the center provides wellness information and referral resources for students, faculty, staff, and parents. Staff are available for outreach programs, peer education, internshipt supervision, and other climate-enhancing services that promote the missions of SAEM and the university. Health and counseling services are supported through dedicated student fees and ancillary charges for lab, x-ray, supplies, and procedures. Medical and counseling services are housed in a Health and Counseling Center building that once provided limited inpatient medical care. Wellness services are housed in the Student Union and Recreation Center.

Medical services are now limited to out-patient/ambulatory care and utilize the examination, lab, and x-ray service areas of the building. Medical services are extended to the student population of CWU’s Ellensburg campus, including non-matriculated students taking a one quarter break from CWU and other CWU community members who pay the student fee. The Health Center is accredited by the Accreditation Association for Ambulatory Health Care. Counseling Services offers brief outpatient psychological therapy through individual, family, or group sessions. Specialty areas include evaluation for ADD/ADHD, anger management, anxiety, depression and developmental issues. Counseling services are augmented by the services of the Community Counseling and Psychological Assessment Center, the graduate training clinic in the psychology department. The Counseling Center is an American Psychological Association Accredited Counseling Internship site.

The mission of Wellness Services (Wildcat Wellness Center) is to reduce high-risk behavior related to alcohol and drug misuse; to provide sexual assault prevention, response, and advocacy; and to promote other positive health behaviors among all CWU students. Its educational programs and services are developed through the application of scientific evidence and relevant research. Funding for wellness services is obtained through the mandatory student health, counseling and wellness fee, and through the support of Housing and New Student Programs (HNSP).

Health, Counseling, and Wellness Services is focused on eight key initiatives:
1. Orientation for new professional staff, starting fall 2007.
2. Continue monitoring the capital budget process to plan for the proposed remodel and expansion of the Health & Counseling building, with or without state capital budget support.
3. Support the campus-wide revamping of the student suicide protocol.
4. Use an inclusive and logical decision-making process for determining any staff increases among the four service areas.
5. Maintain medical services accreditation.
6. Support the university-wide accreditation process.
7. Review, advise, and facilitate a revision of the alcohol prevention and intervention program.
8. Study, propose, and initiate a campus-wide suicide prevention and intervention policy.
The staff continues to grow and develop professionally and personally. Communication and conflict resolution skills are growing rapidly due to administrative initiative and the valued assistance of the ombudsperson. Relationships with campus departments continue to be marked by collaboration, consultation, and cooperation. Student satisfaction surveys (Exhibit 3.E.46) reflect general satisfaction with services and the staff. Combined health and counseling activity has declined by approximately 1,685 visits between AY 2005–2006 (17,402) and 2006–2007 (15,717) primarily due to the illness of two service providers. Limited space and related facilities issues may reduce utilization, staff morale, medical accreditation, and student satisfaction. Approximately 57% of the eligible population utilizes health and counseling services annually. Wellness Center activity continues to remain robust through the provision of sexual-assault programming, campus-community coalition activities, and alcohol prevention and sanctioning classes.

**University Housing.** The university’s student housing is designed and operated to enhance the learning environment. It meets recognized standards of health and safety and it is competently staffed (3.D.13). The SAEM Department of University Housing and New Student Programs (UHNSP) and its collaborating partners develop premier residential communities and programs that promote student learning and personal development throughout CWU’s 20 residence halls and three apartment complexes. UHNSP is committed to:

- providing quality service and responding to students’ needs;
- ensuring a strong community living experience;
- providing an orientation program that acclimates students to campus and augments student learning;
- assisting students in developing cultural and academic competence;
- promoting diversity, tolerance, and cultural competence;
- challenging students in the areas of personal wellness, integrity, and responsible citizenship;
- offering a safe, clean, comfortable, and academically enriched living environment;
- projecting future trends;
- interacting and collaborating with other departments to ensure seamless service, provide co-curricular experiences, and promote student engagement.

UHNSP serves over 2400 students in residence halls and over 600 students and dependents in on-campus apartments. The department is designed and operated to enhance the university’s learning environment and has become increasingly active in the educational program and support of other offices on campus. Students living in campus residences enjoy a high level of service, programming, and student leadership development. This is evaluated regularly through departmental assessment measures and evidenced in overall satisfaction rates as indicated through the Educational Benchmarking Instrument (Exhibit 3.E.47) and survey data (Exhibit 3.E.48). Costs to students are modest compared to other four year institutions in the state as noted in the Comprehensive Housing Master Plan (Exhibit 3.E.49). Although there have been increases in the cost of housing, the department maintains a 90–93% occupancy rate throughout the residence hall and apartment system. Students who live on campus have access to well maintained buildings; creative and educational programming for personal and community awareness; opportunities for personal growth, development, and academic enhancement; student representation through the Residence Hall Association (RHA) and National Residence Hall Honorary, and additional services such as free internet services (ResNet) and extended cable.

The Housing Advisory Board reviews room rates and services and gives input and recommendations to departmental leadership. The Housing Advisory Board is comprised of at least five students from the residence halls, one member of the RHA Executive Board, one to two students from the apartments, and CWU staff. The Housing Advisory Board recommended to the Board of Trustees the sale of bonds for the construction of Wendell Hill Hall.
In 1999, student needs for housing were being met by an aging infrastructure. In the last decade, Kamola Hall was completely renovated and opened in fall 2003. It was the first major renovation or new construction since 1968. Sue Lombard Hall was renovated in 2004 and reopened in fall 2005. Sue Lombard and Kamola were the two oldest residence halls on campus, and renovation was timely since previous debt obligations had been met. Courson and Muzzall Halls were demolished in 2008 when the university determined that the facilities no longer met the needs of students and that the funds required for safety needs and renovation could be spent more effectively on the new 477-bed Wendell Hill Hall that will open in Fall 2009 and renovation of other buildings.

UHNSP began assessment of its facilities during the 2005-2006 academic year by performing facility audits and an external consultant review. The review produced a 30-year comprehensive plan that would support the University Campus Master Plan (Exhibit 3.E.49). In 2007, the Board of Trustees approved the plan which calls for new facilities and almost a complete renovation of current residence hall and apartment structures. With new construction and renovation additional debt service will come to the university through its auxiliaries self-supporting operations. For the past 30 years the housing department has maintained a 4.7% rate increase per year. However, new housing plans will require increased housing rates from 2007-2010 of 8% per year, and will return to the state average of 5% in 2011. Rooms in the new facilities will have premium rates; however, these rates are still lower than many of the other institutions in the state (Table 3.6). The higher rates in the first few years will make it possible to fully fund renovations instead of increasing debt to the university. Financing has been obtained for the first two newly constructed buildings. The plan also allows for preservation funding for existing structures.

### Table 3.6 Housing Rates, State Public Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>WWU</th>
<th>WSU</th>
<th>UW</th>
<th>CWU</th>
<th>CWU New</th>
<th>CWU Renovated</th>
<th>EWU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
<td>$6,200</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$5,900</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$6,900</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$7,900</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$7,100</td>
<td>$7,600</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
<td>$8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
<td>$6,300</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$6,200</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
<td>$8,700</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$6,900</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$7,900</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>$9,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UHNSP participates in numerous benchmarking and other national assessments. Housing utilizes student focus groups and the Association of College and University Housing Officers International’s Educational Benchmarking Instrument (EBI) to assess quality of life for students. The EBI (Exhibit 3.E.47, p. 17 and pp. 21-22) is administered every other year to inform the department’s decision-making. Out of 300 participating institutions CWU ranks in the top third in overall satisfaction with residence halls. Longitudinal growth indicates that UHNSP has improved in all high-priority areas of the EBI (program effectiveness, learning outcomes, satisfaction in room assignments, satisfaction in programming and diversity interactions, satisfaction with facilities, and safety and security). UHNSP participates in the Student Voice National Benchmarking Orientation assessment to assess needs for the Discover! Orientation program (Exhibit 3.E.20). Housing has participated in the National Study of Learning Programs (Exhibit 3.E.50). In addition to the development of performance indicators based on goals and objectives, UHNSP facilitates an internal review by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. UHNSP worked with the University of Idaho on the Academic Champions Experience program funded through the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. These
assessment tools, along with exit surveys, focus groups, and program review, have led to changes and improvement of services throughout the campus, such as an emergency alert system, parent programming, and changes to the orientation program.

There are currently nine living learning communities and two themed communities that connect with academic departments or other student affairs offices: Aviation, Casa Latina, Douglas Honors College, Education, Female Experience, International House, Leadership House, Music, Recreation Community, Science Technology Enhancement Program, and Students for the Dream. These communities bridge student’s academic interests with their residence hall living experience. Students with common academic interests live together in the same residence hall and develop personal and academic relationships with other students and faculty from a field of study.

**New Student Programs.** CWU provides for the orientation of new students and transfer students, including special populations, at both undergraduate and graduate levels (3.D.9). Since beginning Discover! Orientation the summer of 2002, UHNSP has met with approximately 94% of the incoming undergraduate class through the two-day first-year orientation program and the one-day transfer orientation program. Approximately 700 parents also attend these orientation sessions. Currently, five two-day orientations are provided for first year and Running Start students during the month of July. Each session is limited to 300 students in order to maximize faculty and staff contact with students. Students interact with faculty at advising sessions and seminars aimed at sharing information about university resources and academic skills. Many other staff and students are involved in the Discover! Orientation program through academic advising, registration, and financial aid sessions. The program also includes a social component that helps students adjust to campus life. Discover! Orientation is the first tier of a three-tiered orientation program designed to fully integrate students into the academic and social life of CWU. Graduate students are oriented through the Office of Graduate Studies. Students who attend the university centers receive a one-day orientation on site, coordinated by the assistant to the provost for university centers. Graduate students and center students have contact with academic advisors and other student affairs resources to facilitate transition and connection to the university.

Building on the new students' experiences at Discover!, UHNSP coordinates Wildcat Welcome Weekend, the second tier of new student orientation. This four-day program takes place the week prior to fall classes with a proactive approach to the academic and social transition issues of first-year students through a series of seminars and other events. First-year students interact in residence hall or off-campus community meetings geared toward establishing community standards, sexual assault prevention, alcohol and diversity education, financial management, and personal development. Students also participate in social activities designed to create a sense of community and instill university pride. Students receive credit in their University 101 classes for attending these events. In order to facilitate the university transition, students, parents, and families are invited to participate in social activities on the first day of Wildcat Welcome Weekend. Students provide feedback on the event which helps shape future program planning. In 2007 more than 1600 students participated in the weekend, with more than 90% indicating the overall program was valuable to their transition to CWU.

**Dining Services.** Appropriate food services are provided for both resident and nonresident students. These services are supervised by professionally trained food service staff and meet recognized nutritional and mandated health and safety standards (3.D.14). Dining Services is a business auxiliary of the Division of Business and Financial Affairs. During the academic year Dining Services serves almost 36,000 customer visits a week in the food court, residential dining hall, espresso bars, and convenience stores (C-Store). Dining Services trains 38 customer service oriented employees and provides approximately 350 student employment positions on campus.
The CWU community depends on Dining Services to provide nutritious meals and snacks continuously throughout the day. Customers look for convenience, attractiveness, and a diversity of menu offerings when selecting a dining location. Dining Services believes in the importance of providing a wide variety in menu choices, including regional, ethnic, vegetarian, and “American comfort food” choices. All menus are created by CWU’s certified chefs.

The 2006–2007 academic year was a banner financial period for Dining Services as reported in the Auxiliary Services 2008 Business Plan (Exhibit 3.E.51). It is expected that with continued attention to meal plans, labor, and food costs, the organization will be able to maintain or surpass financial predictions. For the 2007–2008 academic years Dining Services increased the cost of meal plans by 4%. A reduction in labor costs has been accomplished and continuous examination of pricing and food costs will be conducted to ensure they reflect supply costs.

Dining Services had an 8% growth in sales in 2008 as students, faculty, and staff were attracted to the new dining facilities and menu choices. Dining Services participates in the NACUFS customer service survey (Exhibit 3.E.52) and has seen an improvement in menu selection, customer service, and customer satisfaction with facilities, meal plans, and overall appearance on campus. Dining Services and the ASCWU Board of Directors have recently established an advisory committee of students. The Dining Services Student Advisory Committee will assist Dining Services management in its continual effort to receive feedback from a changing student body and implement responsive changes. Dining Services has developed quarterly customer surveys to assess service and menu offerings, as well as gain feedback on new ideas, such as hydration stations, increased restocking of supplies, food options, and hours of operation. Surveys in fall 2007 and fall 2008 have already been completed and analyzed. Dining Services also participates in two NACUFS benchmarking surveys: one based on customer service and another based on operations and financial information.

Dining Services is committed to advancing the cause of sound nutrition to the campus community and achieves this through nutrition counseling, nutrition analysis of menu items, and nutrition presentations. The nutrition staff is led by a registered dietitian. Dining Services is launching a new quarterly newsletter (Exhibit 3.E.53) highlighting new menus, nutrition tips, theme dinner events for CWU staff and students, new C-store items, and dining services guest servers.

**Extra-Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities.** SAEM offers an array of programs and services that foster the intellectual and personal development of students consistent with the institution’s mission. The institution adheres to the spirit and intent of equal opportunity for participation. It ensures that appropriate services and facilities are accessible to students in its programs. Co-curricular activities and programs include adaptation for traditionally under-represented students, such as physically disabled, older, evening, part-time, commuter, and, where applicable, those at off-campus sites (3.D.15). Departments include Campus Life, Center for Student Empowerment, Don and Verna Duncan Civic Engagement Center, David Wain Coon Center for Excellence in Leadership, Diversity Education Center, Center for Disability Services, Educational Opportunity Services, and Student Transitions and Academic Resources (see Standard 3.D.2, Table 3.4, and Exhibit 3.E.54).

The university offers extra-curricular and co-curricular activities and programs that foster the intellectual and personal development of students consistent with the university mission. Campus Life, through professional management and advisement, provides the students and university community with a broad spectrum of social, educational, and leisure experiences. Campus Life operates a 228,000 square foot Student Union and Recreation Center complex (SURC; Exhibits 3.E.55, 3.E.56, and 3.E.57) and manages the use of campus sports facilities and outdoor fields. Current operational budgets (Exhibit 3.E.58) for all Campus Life departments exceed 6.8 million dollars annually. This includes a yearly bond payment of 2.8 million dollars on the SURC.
The funding supporting Campus Life programs and the SURC comes from multiple sources including S&A funds, facility space and equipment rentals, ticket sales, program charges, and a Recreation Center membership fee mandatory for students and optional for university employees. Students pay a $159 quarterly building use fee. The fee breakdown includes a $64 student union fee and $95 recreation center fee, which is considered a membership. By the second year of the SURC’s operation a reserve had been created of over two million dollars.

The director of campus activities and the seven-member Student Program Agency schedule (Exhibit 3.E.59) over 200 events annually, including a special “What’s Hot” link (Exhibit 3.E.60), providing university students with experiences that supplement the academic environment. The publicity center’s success is reflected in the overwhelming number of requests for assistance by university departments and national awards for design from the Association of College Unions International.

Student Union management is provided collaboratively by the senior director of campus life and the assistant director for operations. The Student Union provides office and program space for the Associated Students of Central, the Center for Student Empowerment, the Civic Engagement Center, the Diversity Education Center, the Center for Excellence and Leadership, Campus Life Administration, Campus Life Accounting and Ticket Center, the Publicity Center, the Program Agency office, KCWU-FM, and Student Union Operations and Information Center. The facility has three paying tenants, the University Connection Card office, the Wildcat Wellness Center, and U.S. Bank. In addition, Campus Life leases space to two ATM companies, Wells Fargo and Bank of America. Event and meeting space includes a 242-seat state-of-the-art theatre, a 9,000 square foot ballroom which divides into four rooms, eight meeting rooms, a large third floor executive meeting suite with outer lounge, and two major lobby areas. The Student Union partnership between Dining Services, the Wildcat Shop (University Bookstore), and the Recreation Center contributes to a consistent flow of over 8,000 visits daily.

Student Union Operations handles all scheduling of space and support for the SURC and is contracted to schedule all non-academic classroom use utilizing the Resource 25 software system. Operations management has developed over the past six years a service enterprise unit called Event Support Services. This unique department provides university wide and local community event management support and an extensive inventory of rental equipment. This program has grown from $6,000 in rentals seven years ago to over $109,000 last year. Student Union Operations scheduled over 15,200 university space usages in 2008. Over 5,300 of these were in the Student Union and over 5,100 were for student use campus wide. Union Operations plays an important institutional role in the administration and application of university policies and procedures as they relate to students, administration, faculty, staff, and off campus groups.

Exhibit 3.E.54 provides an overview of additional co-curricular functional areas including the Center for Excellence in Leadership, Center for Student Empowerment, Civic Engagement Center, Diversity Education Center, Early Childhood Learning Centers, and Wildcat Wellness Center. The exhibit details the mission, desired learning outcomes, programmatic focus, sample programs, and demonstrated impact for each department.

The co-curricular program includes policies and procedures that determine the relationship of the institution with its student activities; identifying the needs, evaluating the effectiveness, and providing appropriate governance of the program are joint responsibilities of students and the institution (3.D.16). Programs are bound closely to institutional policy, which establishes boundaries on program development. The Commercial Activities Policy and Facility and Vehicle Use Policy, found in section 2 of the University Policies Manual, Substance and Alcohol Use policy (Exhibit G.E.3), the Advertisement Policy (CWU Policy 3), University Emergency Plan (Exhibit 3.E.61), Student Union Board policies, and
Business and Contracting policies all contribute to intentional program implementation. Student Union Operations and Campus Life personnel administer and enforce these policies, creating a consistent approach to campus program success. Programs are subject to risk management and liability advisement from both the business affairs and assistant attorney general’s offices. Program management complies with affirmative action and ADA compliance and the laws of the state of Washington. The Washington Administrative Code as authorized by the Revised Code of Washington is the standard for institutional programming policy. The safeguards for adherence to policy lay primarily at the administrative advisors’ level supported by the assistant attorney general, internal auditor, Business Services and Contracts Office, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, ASCWU BOD, the Student Union Operations Office, Office for Equal Opportunity, Facilities Planning, and Center for Disability Services.

**Recreation and Intramural Athletics.** CWU provides abundant opportunities and facilities for student recreational and athletic needs apart from intercollegiate athletics (3.D.17). University Recreation (Exhibit 3.E.62) successfully operates the SURC recreation center and is achieving many of the goals set forth in the department’s strategic plan. On average, 1,500 members visit the recreation center on weekdays. Many University Recreation programs have strong participation and financial support: Intramural Sports continues to be an anchor program with more than 3,000 participants annually; Outdoor Pursuits and Rentals has greatly expanded the available rental inventory and has established a diverse offering of guided trips based on student input; Collegiate Sport Clubs engages over 400 participants in 23 individual clubs; the rock climbing program is established and increasing in popularity among the student body and the Ellensburg community; recreational swimming hours have increased with hundreds of students participating daily and the demand is still unmet. Group Fitness and Personal Training programs have been established since 2006 and the Recreation Center has offered national certifications in these areas to student employees. Attendance at the summer day camp is increasing. In June 2008, a challenge course was constructed on campus for leadership and team building programs. The design and functionality of the new challenge course will accommodate individuals with physical limitations. University Recreation employs 11 full-time staff members and 120 to 140 part-time student employees. It operates with a total budget excluding Recreation Center debt service of over $1,400,000.

Many University Recreation programs require staff to effectively manage risk and implement safety measures. University Recreation seeks consultation on risk-related issues from CWU Business Services and Contracts to ensure best practices. University Recreation is committed to accommodate students with disabilities by providing adaptive exercise equipment and an access-compliant facility layout.

During the summer of 2005, University Recreation initiated an external peer review (Exhibit 3.E.63) process that yielded quality input from experienced sources. The review found the Recreation Center business plan to be realistic and recognized that many aspects of the Recreation Center’s design would contribute to an efficient operation. University Recreation was cautioned to ensure that existing programs did not lose their individual profiles and funding autonomy once the SURC opened.

Each functional area within University Recreation assesses and evaluates its operation and program offerings to improve its services to the student body (Exhibit 3.E.20). Frequent verbal and quarterly written evaluations by students provide data to consider. Many programs have been established or retooled based on student input. During the 2004–2005 academic years, University Recreation staff played a key role in the Blue Ribbon Commission on Athletics, which included the analysis of intramural sports and sport clubs, along with Intercollegiate Athletics. The final report details recommendations for strengthening and enhancing each program (Exhibit 3.E.64).

*Standard 3 – 30*
**Wildcat Shop (University Bookstore).** The Wildcat Shop supports the educational program and contributes to the intellectual climate of the campus community (3.D.18) by creating a superior customer experience in an inviting setting. The Wildcat Shop is committed to offering competitive, environmentally-conscious products and services that meet the academic and individual needs of the university community. The store offers a complete course materials department, custom publishing department, general books department, academic and art supply department, emblematic clothing and gift department, electronics department, and computer hardware and software department. The Wildcat Shop sponsors and co-sponsors a variety of co-curricular events such as author visits and book signings which support the intellectual climate of the campus community. The bookstore experienced tremendous growth during the first year in the new SURC. Sales for fiscal year 2006–2007 increased 19%, bringing the store to just under $7 million in sales. For fiscal year 2007–2008, the store increased by another 13% from the previous year, even with 400 fewer FTE students. The strong growth demonstrates that students have welcomed the product mix in the new store.

The Wildcat Shop’s Point of Sale system is fully integrated with the Wildcat Shop’s web site, allowing students to purchase their needs for classes at all sites online (Exhibit 3.E.65). Other bookstore products available online include educational software, class supplies, clothing, and gifts. The Wildcat Shop offers computer hardware and software necessary to the academic pursuits of the students, faculty, and staff. One of the most frequently requested product lines, computer hardware sales for 2007 were $226,000. Sales for 2008 showed significant growth to $612,237. Continued expansion of the computer hardware line is essential to meet the needs of students, faculty, and staff.

Custom Publishing publishes over 120 course packets a quarter. Annual sales for this department are now over a quarter of a million dollars. Custom Publishing has assisted professors in the transition from self-generated course packs to actual published books that deliver 100% use by faculty and cost savings for students. The department also offers convenient copying, printing, laminating, and binding services for class and personal projects.

To ensure that students, faculty, and staff have the opportunity to participate in the development and monitoring of policies and procedures (3.D.18), the Wildcat Shop recently completed a full policy and procedure manual (Exhibit 3.E.66) for the store and revised the existing student/temporary employee manual (Exhibit 3.E.67). Sound fiscal policies are monitored by enterprise accounting, which also produces monthly operating statements. The bookstore is audited annually by state auditors and the internal auditor (Exhibit 3.E.68).

**Student Media: The Observer and 88.1 The Burg/KCWU FM.** The Observer is the campus newspaper at CWU (Exhibit 3.E.69). It is published weekly during the three academic quarters and also is available online (Exhibit 3.E.70) for the convenience of students at the centers and interested others. To better serve the student demand, the Observer Online has been joined by an independent website called The Pulse. Students write and produce stories for both media.

The Observer is housed in the Communication Department and is produced by students, a faculty instructor/adviser, and a business manager. While technically a laboratory newspaper, the Observer emphasizes student control of editorial content. Students produce the newspaper as part of two courses; Communication 468, Campus Observer, and Communication 478, Advanced Newspaper Editing. The Observer staff has grown from an average of 20 students per quarter to 50 students per quarter over the past ten years. The faculty instructor/adviser receives five credits (33%) of load for the work each term. The business manager is a ten-month, part-time classified staff employee. Advertising representatives, an office assistant, an advertising production manager, the editor in chief, and six editors are paid student positions. The editor-in-chief is responsible for content generation and news judgment. Students are graded for their performance, in part based on evaluations of student editors.
The mission of the Observer is two-fold: to serve Central Washington University as a newspaper and to provide training for students who are seeking a career in journalism. The Observer seeks to provide complete, accurate, dependable information to the campus and community; to provide a public forum for the free debate of issues, ideas, and problems facing the community at large, and to be the best source for information, education, and entertainment news. As a training program, the Observer is the practical application of the theories and principles of journalism. It teaches students to analyze and communicate information that is vital to the decision making of the community. It provides a forum for students to learn the ethics, values, and skills needed to succeed in their chosen career.

In 1996, the Communication Department, the university administration, and the students in the program worked together to adopt a formal statement that emphasizes the role of the Observer as a community newspaper and as a part of the journalism curriculum. It establishes the responsibility of the department and the college for budgetary oversight and long-range planning. These documents formed the foundation of the clearly defined and published policy of the institution’s relationship to student publications and other media (3.D.19). While the adviser/faculty instructor and the business manager are paid by departmental funds, students raise $70,000 to pay student salaries, printing costs, supplies, and computer and equipment purchases. In 2004, the S&A Fees Committee recognized the importance of a student-controlled newspaper and allocated $40,000 per year.

In spring 2008, the Communication Department developed a Student Media Charter (Exhibit 3.E.71) that established a Media Board to oversee the Observer, the Pulse and the student-run television programs that are also housed in the Department of Communication.

KCWU-FM, the campus radio station, has been on the air since April 30, 1999. Licensed to the Board of Trustees, the radio station underwent a full facility redesign from 2004–2006 in preparation for occupancy in the new SURC Building. KCWU-FM engages students in on-air programming, news/public affairs program production, routine audio production, on-air training, and program preparation. KCWU-FM has 14 student employees, four full-time professional staff, and a minimum of 40 on-air volunteer staff, 90% of who are students. KCWU-FM trains an average of 15 new student participants every quarter, and offers 38 live on-air programs per week.

Over 41% of CWU students attending the Ellensburg campus listen to KCWU-FM every week. KCWU-FM is also a member of four professional broadcast associations and is certified compliant with all pertinent FCC operational regulations. KCWU-FM receives an average of four public service announcement requests per week.

KCWU-FM developed “The Big Picture,” a public affairs documentary program that analyzes local community issues and enhances the station’s Ellensburg community service. In addition, student participants receive training based on an actual broadcast and audio production curriculum developed by KCWU-FM’s Broadcast Technician III.

---

**Appraisal of 3.D**

**Student Services.** Student Services has increased student participation in programs over the past decade and has increased overall CWU student satisfaction. Because of the change and growth that has taken place it is time to start re-evaluating to ensure that the university has streamlined where appropriate and will continue adapting its services to changing student demographics. Central has spent the past few years concentrating on growing a diverse student population by offering programs that respond to many dimensions of a changing student base. The Diversity Center, STAR, Civic Engagement, Leadership, Empowerment Center, CAMP, and GEAR-UP programs serve as examples.
Student Services will need to continue to fine tune and standardize its assessment plans. State budget cuts in the wake of the global recession will challenge the unit to find new and creative ways to increase revenues to help support the university while meeting the needs of a diverse student population. Financial Aid will need to pursue ways to increase waivers to support the unmet financial needs of the student population. Financial Aid, the CWU Foundation, and Alumni Affairs will need to collaborate to increase donor contributions to assist CWU’s students. Admissions, Registrar Services, and other student support programs will need to explore new ways to communicate with students as technology and modes of communication change, as well as provide support systems for armed service veterans who are returning to school after conflict. In addition, there is still work that needs to be done to recruit a more diverse student population, and to continue to provide multi-cultural programs that cater to unique student groups.

**Health, Counseling, and Wellness.** Health, Counseling, and Wellness has provided increased programs to support mental health conditions, sexual assault programs, and drug and alcohol awareness programs. This area has also been challenged by decreased medical provider staffing and aging facilities. However, the satisfaction survey’s for 2007–2008 demonstrate that student’s are satisfied with the services provided by Health, Counseling and Wellness services.

**Financial Aid.** Financial Aid has been able to increase tuition waiver funds and offer financial aid packages that support students who still have unmet need. Financial Aid works with a variety of Student Affairs programs to ensure that students know financial options that are available to them. Financial Aid has also provided increases in merit scholarships for high achievers, honors college waivers, and veteran and international student waivers. Not only has Financial Aid provided better packaging for CWU students, but they have kept their default rates well under the national average.

**Career Services.** The successes of Career Services are mixed with some challenges. Career counselors have been hired for three university campuses, where they streamline guidance programs, administer assessment procedures, and effectively communicate policies and procedures to students. The university has identified a need for a campus-wide system for collecting assessment and evaluation data. Career Services would benefit from this development. Career Services has not been successful in getting business or arts and sciences graduates to respond to the job placement survey. More assistance from faculty and Alumni Relations is needed to achieve results. Despite excellent departmental data, a need exists for further qualitative analysis. The department will continue to adapt innovative ways of delivering managed career services at all CWU campuses.

**Housing and New Student Programs.** Selected aspects of new student programs, such as the orientation structure at the university centers and the financial resources of the Discover! Orientation, should continue to be evaluated for maximum benefit. UHNSP and SAEM need to continue to evaluate coordination of the Conduct System. The aging housing infrastructure is a concern and the Comprehensive Housing Master Plan needs to be a continuing priority for the administration. Emergency planning will still need to be a priority for UHNSP. Because there is already a high level of deferred maintenance, it is difficult to provide the upgrades in technology needed for text messaging, enunciator panels in the buildings, alarms that are independent of fire systems, and other new emergency services. Housing currently has a strong training program, good response plans, and quarterly drills but will need to accommodate future facility security needs such as building lock downs, announcements to students, card access, and surveillance cameras.

**Dining Services.** Dining Services has increased participation in meal plans and made improvements in its facilities as noted in the Auxiliary Services Business Plan (Exhibit 3.E.51). Dining Services and the ASCWU have appointed a student advisory committee to review and offer suggestions for areas of improvement. The opening of Wendell Hill Hall will place additional students, foot traffic, and general
need in the North Campus area. North Village Café (NVC) is currently underutilized and will be an ideal location to meet the eating and gathering needs of these new customers. Because of the increase in the number of residence hall students, Dining Services will examine ways to expand the delivery of convenience items at NVC. This expansion would need to be located in a separate facility, freeing more space for dining and gathering at NVC.

Even with the new plans for additional residence halls, the actual bed capacity on campus remains about the same. Dining Services can accommodate an increase in student enrollment with its current facilities. Serving hours and menu selection can be increased to offset the increase in customer flow and to prevent crowding of the facilities.

Dining Services must explore ways to utilize its facilities during slower times or off-hours. Currently, the department is working with Campus Activities to present entertainment in dining venues. Dining Services is also looking at ways to better serve the campus community with ideas such as meal delivery, small satellite venues, organic, nutritious, and vegetarian options, and “anytime dining” that meet the demands of its customers.

**Extracurricular and Co-Curricular Activities.** Campus Life programs have experienced substantial growth since the last accreditation. Staffing has increased, the scope of programs has increased, and the management structure has become more focused on strategic planning. The partnership between Dining Services, the Wildcat Shop, Student Union, and the Recreation Center has fostered a sense of belonging with the new student facility. Over 120 student clubs and organizations utilize meeting and event space every day of the week.

The demand for services, particularly event management, facility use, marketing and advertising, and programming is often a topic at management meetings. The increase in staffing in Student Union Operations, Publicity Center, Accounting, and the radio station is a response to this issue. As fiscal and staffing support reaches the saturation point a reduction in growth must be anticipated. Additional co-curricular programming and support areas will continue to identify ways to share resources and collaborate on programming and other initiatives. A consistent process for measuring learning outcomes in each of the functional areas might be a logical next step.

**Recreation and Intramural Athletics.** University Recreation has grown exponentially between 2005 and 2008. The department now needs to confirm that facilities can accommodate existing programs before expanding into new long-term programs. The department has strong support from the student body as well as other members of the campus that utilize its facilities and programs. The department will continue to evaluate program offerings to respond to its clientele. In 2010, University Recreation will be participating in a national recreation benchmarking assessment through Student Voice (Exhibit 3.E.72).

The mission of University Recreation is clearly stated and the establishment of the department’s strategic plan includes all full time employees in its area. A standardized tool for evaluation of student employees was implemented in 2008 (Exhibit 3.E.73).

Continued expansion challenges University Recreation to manage growth with good planning and foresight to ensure proper financial sustainability and sufficient human resources to meet its objectives. Outdoor facilities have not kept pace with program growth and demands. It has become increasingly difficult to provide the proper level of support for Intramural Sports and Collegiate Sports programs. There is a documented need for additional growth in recreation programs (Exhibit 3.E.74) and general student outdoor recreation.

University Recreation will continue to seek ways to partner with its academic colleagues to provide programs to enrich and enhance the students’ experiences, both physically and cognitively, which

*Standard 3 – 34*
contribute to their entire educational development. University Recreation offers practical application opportunities for students of exercise science, physical education, nutrition, and recreation management.

**Bookstore.** The Wildcat Shop plans to have a bookstore advisory committee in place by fall 2009. Communication with faculty is an area in which the Wildcat Shop will improve. In order to have books, supplies, and study aids in stock for students, timely communication with faculty is essential. A brochure detailing procedures will help promote clear communication between store personnel and faculty members.

Over the last five to ten years, book prices have soared making it difficult for students to afford tuition and book prices. The Wildcat Shop has a 15% margin on new books, among the lowest 4% of college bookstores in the United States. This commitment was made to CWU students ten years ago, before book prices dramatically increased. The Wildcat Shop works to keep prices low and give students a wide selection of used books. The ratio of used to new books is approximately 50% compared to the 30% average of most college bookstores.

New technology is altering the face of the college bookstore industry. The replacement of the textbook with another platform is imminent and the store is working to position itself as the logical and most practical distributor for the next replacement of the textbook. Preparations are being made to sell digital books through one of the store's vendors in addition to academically priced software and computer hardware. The future of the industry will revolve around these products and the store will continue to integrate them into the store product mix.

The Wildcat Shop must educate students on services, special pricing, and lower cost of books. Many students blame the Wildcat Shop for the high price of textbooks; however, the price is set by the publisher. Getting the message out to both faculty and students on this issue will improve the store image on campus. The store is working on developing programs that will help students sell used books for greater profit both in-store and electronically. Continual updates to the web site are vital for student accessibility.

**Student Media.** The Observer is a well-established newspaper supported by the university, which has been committed to allowing a free-expression student press to flourish. The newspaper is well integrated into the journalism program. It has a reputation for aggressive reporting, a position encouraged by the professional staff and the Department of Communication. The Observer keeps current with changes in technology and has implemented an online version that will offer experience for students in this new medium. The Observer is incorporated into the strategic plan of the Department of Communication, allowing needs to be addressed appropriately. The department will be seeking additional resources and space to address staff growth and facility demands. The Observer staff and department faculty are involved in discussions about best practices with regards to technology and online media.

KCWU-FM has been challenged by changes in technology. Professional staff must maintain expertise in computer hardware and software applications, as well as network administration in order to remain productive. Full-time staff are specialists in their own fields. Cross training is limited and should be expanded. Professional staff are challenged to effectively train and mentor six highly-specialized student staff positions, paid support staff, and over 40 volunteers. This is an area that will need attention over the next two years.
KCWU-FM must constantly assess programming strategies to remain attractive to its target listener demographic. Meanwhile, it is difficult to maintain long-term consistency in on-air programming with weekend volunteers occupying only 30–40% of shift capacity.

Proposed federal legislation could impose significant rate hikes to providers of online audio content such as KCWU-FM over the next three to five years. The prospect of affordable online internet audio streaming, and how copyrighted online content will be formally regulated, remains uncertain. KCWU-FM will also be required to move its broadcast tower site/transmitter location before October, 2013. This move will cost an estimated $80,000 to $100,000. Funding sources have not yet been identified.

KCWU-FM will focus on student and professional staff development. Efforts will include regional and national conference attendance, in-house guest speakers and lecturers, and further collaboration with CWU and community partners. KCWU-FM wants to proactively market and enhance its online web stream, as the station is currently reaching approximately 1/8 of its potential online listener audience.

**Standard 3.E Intercollegiate Athletics**

*The university’s intercollegiate athletics programs and financial operations are consistent with the educational mission and goals of the institution and are conducted with appropriate oversight by the governing board, chief executive officer, and faculty (3.E). The university’s intercollegiate athletics programs contribute to the mission of the university by increasing grade point averages and graduation rates of student athletes, increasing the number of individual and team awards, contributing to the diversity of the university’s student cohort by recruiting students who represent the diversity of the region, addressing social, health, and other issues that affect the lives of student athletes through training and monitoring, and increasing the number of student athletes who are involved in community outreach.*

**Historical Perspective**

The intercollegiate athletic program at CWU has a long tradition of success on and off the field. Currently the intercollegiate athletic program consists of six men’s and seven women’s National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)-sponsored sports. In addition, the athletic program oversees the cheer program which is not considered a NCAA sport. NCAA sanctioned competition is held in the following men’s sports: baseball, basketball, cross country, football, indoor track and field, and outdoor track and field; and in the following women’s sports: basketball, cross country, indoor track and field, outdoor track and field, soccer, softball, and volleyball.

In 1998, CWU was accepted as a full member in NCAA Division II. Central had been a member of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) for the previous 50 years. The move allowed the intercollegiate athletic program to join a group of schools with similar goals and philosophies. In July 2001, CWU became a charter member of the Great Northwest Athletic Conference (GNAC). Joining the NCAA and GNAC provided CWU athletics with its regional competition framework, enabled CWU athletics to gain better access to NCAA post-season play, and created rules and guidelines that help the overall operation of the athletic program. Since moving to the NCAA and GNAC, CWU has made NCAA playoff appearances in women’s volleyball, men’s basketball, football, cross country, and track as well as having a number of athletes earn academic All-American status. CWU had its first NCAA national champion in 2009 when Krissy Tandle won the indoor women’s shot put.

The athletic program has had some challenges during the transition to the NCAA. One was the lack of conference and regional competition in certain sports. Most schools in the conference were not
sponsoring teams in wrestling or swimming and the decision was made to drop men’s and women’s swimming and men’s wrestling after the 2003–2004 season. Additionally, the football program elected to join the North Central Conference starting fall of 2006, while the remaining athletic teams remained in GNAC. Both were very difficult decisions, but they were made in an effort to help the athletic department operate in an appropriate competitive and fiscal environment. Another challenge was gaining access to funds needed to operate in NCAA Division II.

**Current Situation**

_Institutional control is exercised through the governing board’s periodic review of its comprehensive statement of philosophy, goals, and objectives for intercollegiate athletics (3.E.1)._ The university president has responsibility for and authority over the Athletic Department. This includes budget oversight, auditing, and determining the institution’s position on major issues of NCAA, GNAC, and relevant state policy. The daily oversight of the athletic program is delegated to the Director of Athletics, who is assisted by the Assistant Athletic Director for Compliance and Academics, the Faculty Athletic Representative, the Senior Women’s Administrator, and the Fiscal Support Specialist. The Athletic Director makes annual presentations regarding the program, including its philosophy, goals, and objectives to the CWU Board of Trustees. These elements are also required in annual reports to the NCAA.

This administrative team monitors the practices of the Athletic Department to assure sound practices and conduct within the NCAA Compliance Manual (Exhibit 3.E.75) and university’s rules and guidelines (Exhibit 3.E.76). The Athletic Compliance Committee (ACC; Exhibit 3.E.77) and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) currently advise the Athletic Department. The ACC is comprised of faculty, student-athletes, administrators, and athletic staff and meets quarterly to discuss issues and concerns within the department. The SAAC is comprised of student-athletes who represent all 13 university sponsored sports. The SAAC meets bi-weekly and is responsible for conveying concerns of the student-athlete to the director of athletics and the university president.

_The athletic program is evaluated regularly and systematically to ensure that it is an integral part of the education of athletes and is in keeping with the educational mission of the institution (3.E.1)._ The Athletic Department is required annually to submit Title IX information and graduation rates to both the state of Washington and the NCAA. The Athletic Department is subject to fiscal audits by the university auditor (Exhibit 7.E.29) as well as the completion of a required self-study every five years that is submitted to the NCAA (Exhibit 3.E.78). The department is currently being audited and completed the NCAA self-study in 2006–2007. The athletic department conducts an exit interview survey (Exhibit 3.E.79) for each student and makes it available for NCAA review. The ACC and SAAC contribute to the evaluation process and recommend enhancements to the athletic programs.

NWCCU Standard 3.E.2 asks that _the goals and objectives of Central’s intercollegiate athletic program, as well as institutional expectations of staff members, are provided in writing to candidates for athletic staff positions_. Unit mission statements accompany each posting of an athletic position on the CWU website. These include the goals and objectives of the athletic program. All employees of the athletic department follow the same code of conduct that is expected of every university employee.

_Policies and rules concerning intercollegiate athletics are reviewed, at least annually, by athletics administrators and all head and assistant coaches (3.E.2). The duties and authority of all personnel involved in athletics policy-making and program management are stated explicitly in writing in the Blue Ribbon Commission document (3.E.2; Exhibit 3.E.64)._ CWU’s president is required to evaluate the director of athletics yearly, using predetermined goals and objectives as a guideline. The policies and rules of the intercollegiate athletic program are developed by the coaches and reviewed annually by the

**Standard 3 – 37**
Admission requirements and procedures, academic standards and degree requirements and financial aid awards for student-athletes are vested in the same institutional agencies that handle these matters for all students (3.E.3). Central's athletes are, first of all, students and have no special privileges; they follow all institutional procedures related to financial aid, admissions and academic standards through the same institutional agencies that serve all students. All financial aid for athletes is administered through the CWU Office of Financial Aid. Student-athletes are required to maintain good academic standing and a 2.0 cumulative GPA to represent the university in competition (Exhibit 3.E.83). CWU is required by NCAA guidelines to submit a certification of eligibility to NCAA prior to game time for students to be eligible to play (Exhibit 3.E.84). Athletes are also required to complete HED 205 “Drugs and Sports” before they have reached junior status.

Athletic budget development is systematic; funds raised for and expended on athletics by alumni, foundations, and other groups shall be subject to the approval of the administration and be accounted for through the institutions generally accepted practices of documentation and audit (3.E.4). All fiscal management is conducted by the fiscal support specialist for athletics, is subject to the approval of the administration, and is accounted for through the university’s generally accepted practices of documentation and audit (Exhibit 3.E.85). When the state auditor conducts the bi-annual audit of the entire university, athletics routinely is a part of that inquiry.

The athletic program is committed to the fair and equitable treatment of both male and female athletes in providing opportunities for participation, financial aid, student-support services, equipment, and access to facilities (3.E.5). CWU complies with the provisions of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 by following the third of the three-prong test of compliance: to “fully and effectively accommodate the interests and abilities of the under-represented sex.” All shared facilities and equipment are used equally. Practice and playing opportunities are equal for both men and women, and are determined by NCAA guidelines. Travel arrangements and per diem allowances are equal. All athletes receive the same opportunities for academic tutoring and access to medical and training facilities and services. All athletes have equal coverage for health, accident, and injury, and must comply with the athletic use and substance abuse policy (Exhibit 3.E.86). The athletic department is required by the state of Washington to report and maintain an acceptable proportionality between men’s and women’s participation rates (Exhibit 3.E.87). The athletic department closely monitors squad sizes to remain compliant with state guidelines. Improvements to the men’s and women’s locker rooms, women’s soccer field, softball facility, and Nicholson Pavilion shows a commitment to improving the quality of both men’s and women’s facilities (Exhibit 3.E.88).

The institution publishes its policy concerning the scheduling of intercollegiate practices and competition for both men and women that avoids conflicts with the instructional calendar, particularly during end-of-term examinations (3.E.6). Intercollegiate practice and playing schedules are reviewed by the compliance coordinator and the athletic director to ensure that conflicts with the instructional calendar are kept to a minimum. Although some national competition unavoidably occurs during final examinations, faculty work closely with athletes to accommodate their needs as specified under policy CWUP 5-90-010(7). Scheduling of athletic competition is mandated by national and conference rules and regulations and Title IX. These determine the minimum and maximum number of contests, the lengths of the playing seasons, and the dates of regional and national competition. The formal policy for class attendance and participation can be found in the university policy manual (Section 5-90-010(11)) and in the University Catalog under “Athletic Participation” (Exhibit 3.E.89).
Appraisal of 3.E

The mission of the CWU intercollegiate athletic program is to promote the growth of individuals through intercollegiate competition and encourage student-athletes to take full advantage of the university’s educational opportunities to achieve academic goals while acquiring skills necessary to function in a diverse society. It is also the goal of the athletic department to strengthen the CWU community by providing school-related events.

To make the most of the student-athlete’s experience, the athletic department needs to field competitive programs. That means the department’s coaching staff must attract outstanding student-athletes to enroll at Central. To successfully recruit these student-athletes, prospective student-athletes need to be provided with competitive athletic waivers, athletic facilities, and support.

The department has had difficulty finding the necessary funds to stay on par with our peers. With increases in tuition, room, board, and fees it has been a struggle to fund the same number of scholarships each year. The athletic department gives athletic aid below the NCAA Division II average in six of its nine sports. The athletic department’s operational budget comes from a $35 quarterly student fee established in 1997 that no longer adequately covers operating expenses. To cover the deficit the athletic department has had to implement fund raising and divert student athletic fee revenues from being used as athletic aid. An initiative to raise the fee to $53 per quarter was not approved in spring or fall 2008 ASCWU student elections balloting. In 2009 the ASCWU passed a $7 increase in the athletic fee for a total of $42 per quarter. The increase will help stabilize the operational budget so that the athletic department can maximize all of its revenue and fund raising opportunities.

Athletic facilities have undergone radical transformation since the year 2000. Softball and women’s soccer had new fields built, including new scoreboards. Tomlinson Stadium (football) received an upgrade to the stadium seats and press box along with a new scoreboard, sound system, and 25-second clock. The track program received a new hammer pit along with upgrades to the jumping pits. Nicholson Pavilion has gone through a total remodel, including renovation of the men’s and women’s locker rooms and the training and weight rooms, renovation of the gym floor, seating, sound system, and scoreboard and message center, the creation of offices for administrators and coaching staff, and inviting space for meetings with donors, alumni, and student-athletes. With these upgrades the athletic facilities are some of the best in the GNAC.

Coaches should continue to take an active role in academic success of the student athletes by utilizing support services such as academic advisors, writing center, math and computer labs, and the Center for Disability Services. Many programs provide study hall, academic feedback reports, attendance checks, flexible practice times, and verbal reinforcement of academic expectations. This emphasis on academics at CWU is reflected in the federal graduation reports (Exhibit 3.E.90) that consistently have a higher percentage of CWU student-athletes graduating than the general student body.

Creating an athletic department that embraces the true meaning of the term student-athlete has always been a priority at Central Washington University. The best gauge of success is indicated by the student-athletes themselves. The university had a confirming moment during a women’s softball game in spring 2008. Two CWU softball players exhibited Wildcat character and sportsmanship as they carried an injured opponent around the bases after she had hit a home run in a crucial game. That moment gained national media attention at the ESPY award and a feature article in Sports Illustrated. This clearly illustrates the spirit of intercollegiate athletics and what the CWU athletic department strives to create.
Over the coming years athletics needs to concentrate on progressing towards the elimination of its financial deficit. It must work to increase annual giving and fund raising for athletics while continuing to be competitive in all sports by increasing athletic scholarships, emphasizing competition in the GNAC for both men and women, promoting quality student athletics off the field and in the classroom, and continuing to maintain gender equality and proportionally as required by NCAA and state guidelines. The physical resources have been upgraded in Nicholson Pavilion, but the stadium, bleachers, lighting, fencing, and parking for baseball, softball and soccer fields need to be improved. Increasing partnerships with retail stores to increase visibility and sales will be important over the coming years, as well as improving visibility, graphics, and coverage of the athletic program on the web.

**Standard 3 Summary**

Students are the highest priority of CWU. The university challenges and supports students' holistic personal growth, academic performance, preparation for the global workplace, and development of responsible citizenship regardless of where or how the university and its students come together. Central monitors and responds to factors that impact student satisfaction, success, and commitment to the university. A summary of successes and challenges is outlined below.

Many changes have occurred since the last self-study. Cross-divisional coordination and collaboration has increased the quality and depth of programming offered to Central students. This has taken place under the primary leadership of the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM) and in collaboration with other divisions. It is clear from the study that the Student Affairs branch and the Enrollment Management branch of SAEM have developed increased interdepartmental cohesion. Although both areas have very different functions, the commitment to effective recruitment, retention, student growth, and development has facilitated collaboration and communication. This, coupled with the development of a comprehensive strategic plan, has allowed CWU to grow enrollments and increase retention, staffing, programming, and services. SAEM delivers programs and services designed to meet the changing needs of students by focusing on strategic planning processes, administrative structure, technology, data collection, and assessment to create and maintain student support services, programs, dining services, athletics, and safety.

State budget cuts in the wake of the global recession will challenge the unit to find new and creative ways to increase revenues to help support the university while meeting the needs of a diverse student population. Financial Aid will need to pursue ways to increase waivers to support the unmet financial needs of the student population. Career Services will continue to adapt innovative ways of delivering managed career service programming at all CWU campuses and to find new ways to assist students in job placement in difficult economic times. Extensive attention to enrollment management and retention is required to strengthen enrollment. Key programs such as Discover!, Leadership, Health, Counseling and Wellness Programs, Civic Engagement, Empowerment Center, Diversity Center, CAMP, and STAR will continue to grow and be supported. Recently implemented programs such as the First-Year Experience, Hobson’s Connect, and Retain will gain momentum to support our middle tier of Central students.

Central conscientiously carries out the responsibilities required by accrediting agencies, follows federal and state guidelines, and implements best practices throughout its programs. Central ensures that technology enhances the academic experience, that security of records is maintained, and that transfer credit policies promote access to higher education for all students. Central promotes safety and wellness for its students and the surrounding community by offering students a safe place to live and study. Ellensburg offers a variety of nutritious offerings in its dining halls, an innovative bookstore that responds to the needs of our students on and off campus, living-learning communities that enhance the educational experience, new residence halls with excellent student programming, and public safety
and police services that take a proactive approach to problem solving. Central provides excellent extracurricular and co-curricular Campus Life activities housed in a beautiful Student Union and Recreation Center that supports student services, programs, clubs, and the Associated Students of CWU.

Central is recognized for promoting the growth of individuals through intercollegiate competition and encourages student-athletes to achieve academic goals while learning to function in a diverse society. Academic All-Americans and the ESPY award for sportsmanship testify to the success of these efforts. Central has recently upgraded locker rooms, training and weight room, fields, Tomlinson Stadium, and Nicholson Pavilion, now considered to be among the best facilities in the conference.
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Standard 4 – Faculty

Standard 4.A – Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare, and Development

Central Washington University long has considered the quality of its faculty as the single most important predictor of program effectiveness. CWU, like many universities, hired a large cohort of faculty in the late 1960s and early 1970s, many of whom have reached retirement age in the past decade. The university has vigorously recruited new faculty of high quality. Clearly stated roles and evaluation standards are designed to strengthen each person’s contribution to the institutional whole. Programs that promote faculty welfare and professional development reflect the university's investment in career-long faculty service.

Historical Perspective

There have been dramatic changes between 1999 and 2009 in the policies and procedures related to faculty selection, evaluation, roles, welfare and development. The most significant stimulus for change has been the successful engagement by the administration and faculty in collective bargaining, first sanctioned by the state legislature in 2002. Through the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA; Exhibit GE.7) the Academic Affairs community has established practices for future negotiations regarding faculty personnel issues.

In 2005, the Central Washington University administration negotiated its first faculty union contract with the United Faculty of Central. During the negotiation process, the parties considered collegial standards and expectations for scholarship and pedagogy across the country, peer university standards, and NWCCU accrediting standards including Policy 4.1 – Faculty Evaluation. Additionally, the negotiation team was very aware of the necessity of meeting the requirements of NWCCU Policy 6.2 – Collective Bargaining. The CBA was approved by the CWU Board of Trustees on March 3, 2006.

The new contract represents a changing culture at the university. Prior to the CBA, faculty evaluation policies and processes were governed by the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure (Exhibit 4.E.1). Since 2006, because faculty evaluation procedures are associated with working conditions, they now are determined by collective bargaining. In the Faculty CBA (Exhibit GE.7), Faculty evaluation is addressed in Article 20—Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-tenure Review. Non-personnel issues related to faculty status, rights, and responsibilities are contained in the current Academic Code (Exhibit 4.E.2).

Current Situation

This last decade has seen many retirements and a resultant influx of new faculty energy and talent. Changes within the faculty community include a new focus on pedagogy and its relationship to scholarly endeavors, an effort to consolidate and achieve coherence in the guiding statements regarding faculty rights and responsibilities, and the advent of a union contract.

Central Washington University has long prided itself on being a student-centered, safe, and welcoming learning environment, guided by intellectually and pedagogically innovative teacher-scholars. To guide
faculty personnel decisions, consistent policies regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review have been articulated at the university, college, and department levels (Exhibit 4.E.3). Recognition of excellence in all areas of the professoriate is provided through multiple award processes, most notably the awards for Distinguished Faculty in Teaching, in Public Service, and in Research/Artistic Accomplishment and Invention (Exhibit 1.E.17). Each year, students, faculty, and alumni of the university nominate faculty who have brought recognition, in the highest sense, to the university and to themselves through outstanding performance in these areas. The Distinguished Faculty Awards are the highest awards attainable at the university and must represent the highest level of performance. The awards are overseen by the Central Washington University Faculty Senate. Funding for the awards ($2,500 for each category) is provided by the Office of the President.

Salary issues are being systematically addressed through collective bargaining, and the processes and procedures for faculty hiring and evaluation have been clarified and more consistently documented through electronic systems overseen by Human Resources. The Labor Management Council, a group of administrators and faculty union representatives, was formed to address issues related to conditions of employment that emerge between negotiating periods (see Standard 6). Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty have also experienced positive changes in their working conditions, although there are issues yet to be addressed. At CWU, this group includes faculty characterized at other institutions as adjuncts, part-time faculty, lecturers, and other instructors not eligible for tenure. In all, Central’s faculty have, with general success, engaged in complex forms of dialogue which can be problematic but which have also clarified some of this decade’s issues related to faculty “selection, evaluation, roles, welfare and development.”

**Faculty Qualifications and Sufficiency.** In accordance with Standard 4.A.1, the institution employs professionally qualified faculty members with primary commitment to the institution and representative of each field or program in which it offers major work. In 2008–2009, Central contracted 601 full and part-time faculty to teach in 147 undergraduate and 31 graduate programs at seven campuses and three teaching sites. Of these, 346 were full time faculty members, either tenure track or non-tenure track, and 255 were part-time NTT faculty members. The quality of the faculty is evidenced both by their extensive and varied teaching and professional accomplishments and by the quality of their academic credentials. The faculty profile (NWCCU Table 4.1, found in Appendix 4.A.1) shows that full professors have spent a median of 18.2 years on campus, and associate professors have spent a median of 10 years.

Of the 432 full-time faculty members employed in 2008, 322 (75%) held the doctoral degree, and 95 (22%) held a master’s degree, considered the terminal degree for some positions in Journalism, Music, Art, Theatre, Engineering Technology, and the Libraries (Table 4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-terminal Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The terminal degrees have been awarded from nearly 100 higher education institutions, adding to the richness and diversity of the faculty (NWCCU Table 4.2, found in Appendix 4.A.2). A specific measure of the quality of Central’s faculty is that in three of the past nine years, CWU professors were awarded the

**Standard 4 – 2**
distinction of Washington State Professor of the Year by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (Exhibit 4.E.4).

Assuming that healthy universities include faculty with successful experience and institutional history as well as faculty with fresh energy and ideas, current data show an acceptable balance across the university and within each college related to tenure status (Exhibit 4.E.5). Tenured faculty at the full professor level constitute 37.6% of tenure-track faculty; associate professors constitute 29%, and assistant professors constitute 33.3%. Non-tenure track (FTNTT) faculty constitute 19.4% of total full time faculty.

Data on employment trends from 1999 to 2009 shows a 2.8% increase (7.4 more total FTE) in tenured and tenure-track faculty employment, a 222.2% increase (62.2 FTE) in annually contracted FTNTT faculty, and a 13% increase (12.5 FTE) in adjunct employment (Appendix 4.A.3). These percentages reflect the national tendency in higher education to rely increasingly on NTT faculty to meet instructional needs.

As a context for interpreting these figures in terms of sufficiency, total faculty FTE rose by 21% and the FTE student enrollment increased by over 22.8% in the same time period, supporting the observation that the budget for faculty employment is, in this decade, doing slightly more with less. Certainly enrollment increases and new program approvals offer evidence of institutional success, and CWU has conscientiously examined and creatively responded to the staffing implications of this new growth and progress, particularly during several years when the legislature did not fully fund enrollment. That said, 13 of 28 departments report in their department program reviews (Exhibit 4.E.6) concerns about potential over-reliance on NTT faculty as a long-term strategy for program delivery. The departments that manage academic programs based at CWU centers are significantly more reliant on NTT faculty, especially on those who teach part-time. In addition, six departments noted an inability to hire and retain faculty because of low salaries and high teaching loads and four of those departments have experienced recent failed searches. In short, while programs are being taught by qualified, capable, and productive faculty, that faculty group is increasingly non-tenure track.

The faculty welcomes the trend toward more tenure-track hiring that emerged in the past two years coincident with the 2007–2009 biennial state budget that fully funded CWU’s enrollment for the first time since 2001. Still, the current economic downturn threatens continued progress on this front.

**Faculty Diversity.** In their self-study reports, all four colleges affirm their commitment to achieving the benefits of a diverse community of faculty and students (See Standard 2). In addition, the Academic Affairs Division Strategic Plan 2006 – 2012 (Exhibit 2.E.11) establishes an intention “to recruit, support and retain a diverse. . .faculty. . .” (p. 12). The data show a 40% increase from 1999 to 2008 in the number of tenure-track faculty who are people of color; expressed as a percentage of the faculty as a whole, faculty of color constituted 12% in 1999 and 15% in 2008. There have been increases in the numbers of African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native, but there has been a slight decrease in Hispanic faculty.

The total number of women faculty increased by 40% between 1999 and 2008. The percentage rose from 30% in 1999 to 37% in 2008. Gender ratios differ by academic ranks: Women make up 28% of the 131 full professors, 37% of the 95 associate professors, and 46% of the 92 faculty members at the assistant professor rank. At the instructor and lecturer ranks, men (54) slightly outnumber women (47). Women represent 33% of the tenured library faculty members. Appendix 4.A.4 summarizes the gender and ethnicity profile of the university.
The Academic Affairs Division Strategic Plan 2006–2012 (Exhibit 2.E.11) charges the academic affairs leadership to “develop benchmarks and targets for faculty diversity.” Thus far, those benchmarks have not been established. The available data indicate, however, that efforts to attract and retain both women and minority faculty should be reemphasized if the university is to continue to make progress toward assembling a diverse faculty whose multiple perspectives can help students develop the balanced intellect and open-mindedness that the future will reward.

One tactic identified in the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan for achieving this goal has been to “Develop curricula[ ] that attract culturally diverse . . . faculty.” On that front, CWU has made noteworthy gains. New interdisciplinary programs in Asia/Pacific Studies, Latino/a Studies, American Indian Studies, and Africana/Black Studies have been created and are growing in popularity and visibility. Three of these four programs have been the recipients of the president’s Spheres of Distinction grants (See Exhibit 2.E.5), demonstrating commitment from the highest level to the development of a diverse curriculum and faculty. New faculty have been hired to anchor and teach in those programs.

Another tactic pursued by the Office of the President to create a welcoming climate for faculty of color, GLBT faculty, and faculty with disabilities was the creation in 2001 of the President’s Diversity Council (Exhibit 4.E.7). The membership of the Council includes nine faculty as well as staff, students, and community representatives. The Council discusses and recommends university-wide initiatives that “nurture a recognition and respect for the diversity within our state, our nation, and the world; foster a climate of inclusion; solicit and examine views and concerns of the university community on all aspects of diversity; achieve excellence and quality through diversity; and assist the university in addressing diversity issues that arise on campus.”

A third tactic being overseen by the Human Resources Department is that beginning spring quarter 2008, entrance and exit surveys have been regularly conducted in order to gather baseline data that can help CWU make effective decisions and take positive actions related to faculty diversity. Exit surveys have been conducted for several years; results were reported to the President’s Cabinet. Staff from the Department of Human Resources and the Office for Equal Opportunity worked together in 2008 to develop new exit and entrance surveys that were implemented in spring 2008 and winter 2009. The results are tabulated on the HR web page under “Performance Indicators,” where copies of the surveys are also included (Exhibit 4.E.8). While the data are still too limited to provide a reliable basis for changes in policy and procedure, they will be used to improve recruitment and retention strategies as well as to ensure that departmental and institutional processes do not unintentionally discriminate against women and minorities.

**Faculty Roles and Responsibilities: Institutional Governance.** At CWU, faculty have the opportunity and responsibility to participate in collaborative governance related to academic planning, curriculum development and review, academic advising, and institutional governance (4.A.2). All key governance documents commit CWU to practicing collaborative institutional management. The 2006–2012 Academic Affairs Strategic Plan articulates a commitment to effective communication among faculty and staff university-wide (Exhibit 2.E.11). The Academic Code (Exhibit 4.E.2) provides a framework for collaborative governance through the mechanism of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement (Exhibit GE.7) articulates areas of collaborative negotiation related to working conditions, compensation, and personnel issues. Key university committees involved in governance (Exhibit GE.3, Section 2-1.0) include the University Assessment Committee, the Graduate Council, and the President’s Diversity Council. In all areas except those identified in the CBA, faculty participation is in an advisory role.

In the words of the Academic Code, “collectively the faculty has principal responsibility for academic policies and academic standards for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and
methods of instruction, research, faculty status (as defined in the CBA), and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.” Further, the administration consults with faculty on other issues that significantly affect the academic character and quality of the university. When planning involves institutional academic priorities, such as the development or elimination of academic programs or the organization of academic structures and units, consultation with the faculty is especially important. Ideally, decisions will reflect consensus between the administrative leadership and the appropriate bodies of the faculty. See Standard 6 for further details related to collaborative governance practices.

Areas for faculty consultation include, but are not limited to:
- university and college mission;
- undergraduate and graduate admissions, enrollment management, and scholarships;
- policies related to academic assessment;
- budget;
- hiring and evaluation of academic administrators;
- recommendation of candidates for honorary degrees;
- academic facilities, including instructional technologies;
- aspects of student life that affect academic climate and quality;
- policies related to academic calendars.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities: Curriculum Development and Review. The responsibility for curriculum development resides in academic departments or, in the case of interdisciplinary programs, in accordance with the program’s charter. Departments forward curriculum proposals to the associate deans, who review proposals to ensure their conformity to university policies and resources. Proposals are then forwarded through a series of reviews and approvals, including those of the appropriate college dean and the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. See Standard 2.A for a complete description of the curriculum review process.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities: Academic Advising. CWU recognizes two kinds of advising: program advising and general or pre-major advising. Responsibility for major advising is handled by department faculty; each department’s advising protocol is different and is described in its program review documents (Exhibit 4.E.6). Advising forms, pre-major advising courses, and student advising centers are variously used by departments to assist students in program and career planning and assessment. In addition, many departments encourage professional clubs, interest groups, and organizations that enable the students and faculty to interact in a setting where advisement and learning are more casual. Faculty members serve as advisors to these organizations.

In the past, responsibility for general advising has been shared by the Office of Academic Advising and the faculty. During spring term of 2008, a decision was made by the Office of Undergraduate Studies to provide all academic advising for pre-majors and transfer students through the Office of Academic Advising. See Standard 2.C for a detailed discussion of general and major program advising.

Faculty Workload. Faculty workloads are designed to reflect the mission and goals of the institution and the talents and competencies of faculty, allowing sufficient time and support for professional growth and renewal (4.A.3). In several of its key documents including the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan, the university has characterized the identity of the faculty member as that of the “teacher-scholar,” a term associated with Ernest Boyer’s Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (Exhibit 4.E.9). In alignment with the argument presented in that document, faculty loads are expected to reflect a balance, as well as an integration, of teaching, scholarship, and service.
That balance and integration is managed and monitored through a framework of faculty load forms and annual activities reports. As a consequence of the collective bargaining process, faculty submit annual Faculty Workload Forms online for use in strategic planning for the following academic year (Exhibit 4.E.10). Department chairs and college deans review and, when necessary, modify the plans to ensure that all program needs will be met. See Standard 6 for a more specific articulation of the workload process.

The workloads of nearly all faculty at Central are dominated by the instruction of undergraduate and graduate students. This emphasis is consistent with Central’s mission (Exhibit GE.1), which describes a university community that “values teaching as the vehicle to inspire intellectual depth and breadth, to encourage lifelong learning, and to enhance the opportunities of its students.” The normal workload for faculty at regional comprehensive universities in Washington is 45 workload units. The CBA (Exhibit GE.7) defines a workload unit as equal to “one contact hour of teaching or equivalent scholarship or service effort.” Of that, the traditional load division has been 36 workload units related to teaching, 6 related to scholarship and creative activity, and 3 related to service. One of the expressed purposes of the workload process was to introduce more flexibility into faculty assignments based on professional development and research goals as well as university service and administrative needs.

The workload summary report for Fall 2009 (Appendix 4.A.5) presents a comprehensive picture of faculty load assignments across the three areas of professional engagement. The 2009 data show that faculty in all four colleges are averaging workloads slightly in excess of 45 units at 45.6. Across all colleges, the faculty workload data show that the average faculty workload consists of 30.6 instructional units, 7.6 units of scholarly and creative effort, and 7.5 units assigned to service or administrative duties. There are multiple challenges to the way that load averages are being calculated; these are described in the Standard 4.A appraisal section that follows. More relevant to decision-making are patterns of balance and flexibility reflected in workload assignments across colleges and departments and within departments in relation to tenure status, patterns that can be examined in future dialogues about load equity and strategic load planning. The data will become more meaningful as they are compared with annual activities reports to determine what levels of load credit are assigned to various levels and types of service and scholarship.

For the past two academic years, faculty have completed an Annual Activity Report (Exhibit 4.E.11), and data on productivity have been collected and analyzed by college, type, and level (Appendix 4.A.6). In these reports, faculty document their accomplishments of the prior year and relate them to the original load form commitments. Faculty also have the opportunity to explain any differences between the work predicted on the load form and actual work accomplished. This review is part of the CBA process and is independent of the comprehensive annual reviews of probationary faculty and the three-year cycle of reviews of tenured faculty. Data on scholarly and creative contributions collated from the Annual Activities Reports are documented in Section 4.B; service contributions are documented in Exhibit 1.E.17. At this time, data on faculty contributions from the Annual Activities Reports cannot be collated with faculty load assignment data to observe, for example, how much faculty load time is assigned for specific administrative and service tasks.

**Faculty Salaries.** One of the recommendations of the 1999 NASC site visit highlighted the university’s effort to provide “faculty salaries to attract and retain a competent faculty.” In 2001, the Faculty Senate established the Salary Administration Board (Exhibit 4.E.12) to develop salary goals and procedures for implementing them. Between 2001 and 2003, the university pursued improvements in faculty salaries following the SAB recommendations. The process assumed that the state would continue to provide periodic cost of living adjustments as it had in previous biennia. However, about the time the SAB recommendations were being fully implemented, the state entered a period of economic downturn; although the end result was far less progress than had been originally predicted,
there still has been visible and significant progress toward achieving salary gains that are on par with those of CWU’s state peer institutions.

Currently, the minimum, median, and maximum salaries by rank have increased substantially as a result of both the SAB processes and the CBA negotiations. As is evident in Appendix 4.A.7, the mean salaries of assistant professors at CWU rose from $44,280 in 2002 to $55,434 in 2008. During the same time period, associate professor salary medians rose from $51,487 to $62,299. Full professor salary averages rose from $61,166 to $77,296. By 2008, CWU average salaries for assistant professors had risen to exceed those of both Eastern Washington and Western Washington Universities; associate professor salaries approached but still lagged behind those of Eastern and Western; the full professor salary average in 2008 exceeded that of EWU but was still slightly lower than that of WWU.

This ongoing history of attempts to enhance faculty salaries is evidence of CWU’s continuing commitment to ensuring that faculty salaries and benefits are adequate to attract and retain a competent faculty and are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution (4.A.4). In the Academic Affairs 2006–2012 Strategic Plan (Exhibit 2.E.11), the “lack of an effective reward structure and appropriate faculty compensation” is listed as a “major weakness” that is a priority for action. Early salary discussions regarding “adequacy” focused on the goal of setting salary ranges that are in the top half of those of our national peer institutions—a goal CWU has essentially met at the assistant professor rank and have approached at both the associate and full professor ranks (Appendix 4.A.7). Positive change can also be seen in the area of salary policies and procedures: the CBA has consolidated and clarified salary information to help ensure that policies on salaries and benefits are clearly stated, widely available, and equitably administered (4.A.4). Policies regarding faculty salary issues are included in sections 12 and 13.1-10 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Exhibit GE.7).

In Articles 13.6, 13.7, and 13.8 of the CBA, criteria are specified for compensating faculty in special programs such as study abroad, faculty exchanges, and non-credit or extension credit programs, as well as for overloads, summer session appointments, and multi-site classes. Regarding employment and evaluation, all hiring decisions and workload approvals for faculty assignments, including for continuing education programs, are the purview of the departments and colleges. Assignments to study abroad programs and international faculty exchanges are negotiated through department chairs and deans in setting the annual workload agreement; policies and procedures for developing and delivering international instructional assignments are overseen by the International Studies and Programs Advisory Committee (Exhibit 2.E.115).

Processes and criteria for awarding two levels of performance-based salary increases are articulated in Article 14 of the CBA. The current agreement stipulates that department chairs and personnel committees nominate candidates for performance adjustments (Exhibit G.E.7). College Performance Adjustment Committees and deans review the nominations and forward to the provost a list of candidates for both types of performance adjustments. Each college list must be comprised of no more than 15% of the college’s faculty. The provost reviews recommendations for performance adjustment awards and also designates no more than ten faculty members for an exceptional performance adjustment. The amount of the award is dependent on the amount of funds bargained for this purpose. Performance-based salary increases were awarded in the spring of 2008 and are under way for 2009.

Faculty Evaluation Processes and Procedures. At the time of the NWCCU 2001 focused interim visit, the university reported on three concerns regarding faculty evaluation and review that were raised by the 1999 evaluation team: uneven notification of faculty related to the review process, evaluation criteria not fully understood by faculty, and compliance with Policy 4.1, Faculty Evaluation. All three areas were addressed initially through academic policy changes and more recently in the CBA and the
Academic Code. While there are still opportunities to improve both the consistency and clarity of implementation, the university believes its revised processes and procedures for faculty evaluation bring it into full compliance with the standards set by NWCCU. In accordance with the University Faculty Performance Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review (Exhibit 4.E.3), college personnel policies (Exhibit 4.E.3), the University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3), and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Exhibit GE.7), the institution provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities. The institution’s policies, regulations, and procedures provide for the evaluation of all faculty on a continuing basis consistent with Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation (4.A.5).

Because faculty evaluation procedures are associated with working conditions, they now are governed by the CBA. For the most part, however, these procedures were the norm for many years prior to the faculty contract negotiations. Faculty evaluation is addressed in Article 20 - Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-tenure Review (Exhibit GE.7). Included in Article 20 are provisions for criteria, evaluation cycles, eligibility, personnel committees, general procedures, and personnel actions. There are three levels of evaluation: university, college (including the library), and department. Since the adoption of the CBA, these criteria have been revised for consistency and clarity. University and college-level guidelines and criteria for personnel decisions have been approved; most department guidelines are approved and a few are undergoing review by the provost to ensure their alignment with college and university expectations (Exhibit 4.E.3).

Faculty are assessed on a regular and systematic basis using department, college, and university criteria. Multiple modes of assessment are typically used in accordance with department and college requirements (see matrices of evaluation procedures in Exhibit 4.E.5, department program reviews). New faculty are introduced to the standards as a part of their new faculty orientation (Exhibit 4.E.13), and faculty evaluation procedures require that candidates for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review include the department, college, and university expectations in their portfolios. Current procedures require submission of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) summary reports on every class section taught, and faculty are encouraged and in some departments required to include peer reviews as a part of their assessment portfolios. The forms, assessment functions, and summary data of the SEOI are presented in Standard 2.B.

The Professional Record is the basis of evaluation at all levels of review. Included in this record are workload agreements, annual faculty activity reports, performance evaluations, SEOI scores, and evidence related to the scholarship, instruction, and service components of the individual faculty’s workload assignment. The evaluation process (Figure 4.1) begins with the department personnel committee and the department chair; the committee and chair submit independent evaluations and the Professional Record to the appropriate dean. The dean and the college personnel committee conduct simultaneous reviews of the record; the college committee submits its report to the dean. The dean and college committee meet to discuss any differences in conclusions, and then the committee and the dean forward letters with the Professional Record to the provost. The provost writes an independent evaluation of the candidate and
submits a recommendation to the president for action by the Board of Trustees. At every stage, the faculty member receives all letters of recommendation and has the opportunity to correct factual discrepancies in his or her evaluation.

Probationary tenure-track faculty are evaluated annually in their first through fifth years and are normally reviewed for tenure in their sixth year. Tenured faculty undergo post-tenure review on a three-year cycle. Those probationary faculty who are reappointed with reservations or tenured faculty who are continued with reservations construct Professional Development Plans with their chairs to be submitted to the dean for approval. This plan provides the basis for the subsequent review. Promotion requests are considered by department chairs and personnel committees and, when approved, forwarded to college deans and college personnel committees. Positive and negative decisions are documented with formal letters of evaluation that specify the evidence for the decisions. Except in the cases of sixth year tenure decisions, letters include specific expectations for future improvement. Numbers of personnel actions for the second and third CBA contract years are presented in Table 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2. Personnel Actions</th>
<th>2007–08</th>
<th>2008–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year Probationary Files Reviewed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved without reservations</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved with Reservations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd to 6th Year Probationary Files Reviewed</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved without reservations</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved with Reservations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and Promotion to Associate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Full</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-tenure Review</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointed</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointed with reservations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Development. At the university level, several mechanisms provide systemic, ongoing professional development. These mechanisms are intended to maximize every faculty member’s effectiveness and achievement by providing relevant, targeted support.

• New faculty orientation (Exhibit 4.E.13) is designed to introduce and explain the professional expectations on which future personnel decisions will be based.

• Professional development plans, as previously mentioned, articulate a focused and specific set of outcomes and, where necessary, establish support mechanisms or pathways for the faculty member to assist him or her in meeting professional expectations. This is not a punitive process but is intended as a collaborative opportunity to increase professional success.

• The faculty mentor system, still in development in some departments, recognizes the empirically validated positive effects of mentoring. The deans were charged with implementing by the fall of 2004 a plan in which every new faculty person is officially paired with a mentor using the College of Arts and Humanities procedures as a model. Mentors are also assigned to faculty who are continued with reservations.

• The Center for the Teacher-Scholar, newly established in 2008, is expected to become a resource clearinghouse for faculty support related to all areas of professional responsibility.

• Quarterly Faculty Development Days are designated for university, college, and departmental activities in support of shared goals (Exhibit 4.E.14).

In addition to these university-level strategies, faculty have access to institutional funding for faculty development. Between 2002 and 2005, the Faculty Senate received $100,000 from summer
revenues for faculty development. Each year, the Faculty Senate Development and Appropriations Committee was charged with recommending a distribution plan for these funds. During that time, from 80% to 85% of the funds were distributed to departments for individual and group faculty development; in the majority of cases, the funds were spent on faculty travel and equipment upgrades. The remainder was allocated by the committee through a competitive process to fund proposals focusing on the shared concerns of program, department, college, or university groups. These funds enabled the initiation of some very successful programs, including support for over 50 faculty to become Academic Service Learning mentors (Exhibit 4.E.15). The last allocation of summer revenues to be used by the Faculty Senate for shared professional development was in 2005–2006. The CBA now provides an annual $700 allotment per tenured or tenure track faculty member to support individual faculty development.

Other sources of professional renewal and development are provided, as needs are identified, from several sources. Departments and colleges receive summer revenues and most have allocated some measure of that funding to address needs identified through the department and college program review processes. College-sponsored development opportunities have included travel grants, international exchanges, summer research and creative activity grants, reassigned time for research projects, equipment allocations, visiting speakers, and workshops on issues of shared concern, e.g. integrated learning, creating effective assignments, using rubrics, and integrating technology. The provost’s office, as well, funds workshops on shared issues, notably assessment, innovative pedagogy, uses of technology, and multiple modes of course delivery. Continuing Education supports the development of online instruction. Faculty development is also provided by the Multimedia Technology staff and by the Educational Media Center of the Center for Teaching and Learning (Exhibit 4.E.16).

Recruitment, Appointment, and Retention. Effective faculty recruitment and retention processes are essential to achieving CWU’s strategic plans. In accordance with its commitment to excellence in teaching, CWU defines an orderly process for the recruitment and appointment of full-time faculty. Institutional personnel policies and procedures are published and made available to faculty (4.A.6). The Human Resources Department publishes a specific and inclusive Faculty Hiring Checklist (Exhibit 4.E.17) that defines the processes of recruiting and appointing faculty. In addition, the Office of Equal Opportunity provides information on recruitment and hiring practices that ensure compliance with federal and state law and increase the likelihood of a diverse candidate pool (Exhibit 4.E.18).

The faculty hiring process (Figure 4.2) begins with departmental discussions regarding its unmet instructional, scholarship, and service needs, often, but not always, occasioned by the departure of an existing faculty member. If a hiring request is approved by the department, the college dean, and the provost, department search committees meet with representatives of HR and OEO to review polices that guide consistency, coherence, and coverage in hiring, as well as to address the institution’s commitment to generating a diverse pool of candidates. A position description is developed that lists the required and desired educational background and skills required of candidates. Although deans,
department chairs, and faculty are expected to follow HR and OEO guidelines during the interview, selection, and hiring processes, colleges and departments may vary the standard procedures when the nature of a position calls for alternate approaches. For example, they may advertise a particular position in business as well as in academic employment listings, may include out-of-department members on the hiring committee, or may ask a candidate to prepare a research presentation or to teach a class.

The department chair and dean approve the terms and conditions of employment contained in the letter of offer from the Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. This letter, in concert with the provisions of the CBA and the Academic Code, becomes the sole basis for determining the faculty member’s contract. The letter defines the position, academic rank, salary, specification of appointment (permanent, probationary, or limited-term), and expectations with respect to the completion of advanced degrees in relation to rank and tenure, as well as any other special or limiting provisions. The president, as appointing authority, must approve all conditions of initial employment and all renewal agreements until tenure is granted.

Partly because of lagging salaries in critical higher education fields, faculty retention rates are a concern. Eighty-nine tenure-track or tenured faculty have left the university's employment in the past three years; their reasons for leaving are represented in Table 4.3. Of the 35 resignations, 25 (71%) accepted positions elsewhere, 20 in other universities and the others returning to the private sector or moving to government agencies (Appendix 4.A.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Leaving</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired/Entered Full Retirement from Phased</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resigned, no reason given</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resigned for other positions in higher education, government, or private sector</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health or Personal Reasons</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reason recorded</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property.** The CWU Policies Manual, the CBA, and the Academic Code all ensure that the institution fosters and protects academic freedom for faculty (4.A.7). The Board of Trustees asserts its support of the broad concept of academic freedom in the University Policies Manual Sections 1-4 when it states its belief that “an atmosphere of academic freedom is a fundamental prerequisite for excellence in higher education” (Exhibit GE.3). See Standard 9 for further discussion of these policies. The CBA directly and specifically addresses the issue of academic freedom in Article 6, which asserts that faculty members “should be free from institutional censorship or discipline” (Exhibit GE.7). The CBA also establishes a procedure for monitoring the consistency of policies related to intellectual property in Article 14; that article also references CBA Appendix C, a document that articulates current policies (Exhibit GE.7). In addition, academic freedom is addressed in section 1.A.3 of the Academic Code (Exhibit 4.E.2). The code’s description is in agreement with the CWU Policies Manual and the CBA. All of these documents conform to the expectations of NWCCU Eligibility Requirement 11 and Policy A-8. The CWU Policies Manual, the CBA and the Academic Code place academic research and creative activity within the context of the culture of both higher education and the larger community, establishing the necessity of ethical considerations regarding accuracy, appropriate restraint, and respect for the opinions of others. These documents also hold the faculty responsible for making it clear that they do not speak for the institution.

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty.** Central’s faculty includes a strong contingent of full time and part time non-tenure track faculty, who are qualified by academic background, degree(s), and/or professional experience to carry out their teaching assignment and/or other prescribed duties and responsibilities in accord with the mission and goals of the institution (4.A.8). Of Central’s FTNTT faculty, 34.5% have earned doctoral degrees and 57% have earned master’s degrees in their professional disciplines, for a
total of 98.5%. Seven FTNTT faculty have bachelor’s degrees or other professional certifications. (Appendix 4.A.1). In addition, NTT faculty bring a wealth of experience to their positions, as is evident in Table 4.4. FTNTT faculty teach 30% of the university’s general education courses and part-time NTT instructors teach 40% of general education courses, testifying to the vital role played by these faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.4. NTT Faculty Experience in Years, 2008–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Article 11 of the CBA codifies policies and procedures related to non-tenure track faculty more specifically than at any time in the past. Specific benefits negotiated for NTT faculty include:
- The possibility of individually-negotiated multi-year contracts
- Salary differentiation between levels of preparation and amounts of experience
- New titles that recognize contributions over time: Senior Researcher, Senior Lecturer
- New Distinguished Professor award for NTT Teaching
- Presence in the print and online catalogs
- Access during the summers to faculty resources including online library access and e-mail
- Voice for full time non-tenure track senior lecturers in department chair elections. Formerly, voting practices in chair elections varied across departments.

In addition, the CBA delineates in Article 10, subsection 2 an annual evaluation process for NTT faculty on the basis of their contracted responsibilities. The CBA also asserts the principle that all faculty have access to across-the-board raises and access to a grievance process. A January 2007 revision to Article 10 of the CBA presents a clear “complaint process” in which NTT faculty, accompanied by union representation, can request that a dean re-assess the faculty member’s record. NTT faculty also have faculty senate representation not only by their department faculty senators, but also by a NTT senator who represents NTT interests. In 2008–09, they became eligible to serve on some key committees of the faculty senate. In recognition of the service of the NTT faculty, the Office of Graduate Studies and Research and the individual colleges have established travel grants and awards for excellence for NTT faculty. Resources such as the Center for the Teacher-Scholar, new faculty orientation, and other professional development opportunities are now available to NTT faculty as well as tenure-track faculty members.

Guidelines for NTT faculty, as articulated in the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 4.E.19), include dissemination of information regarding the institution, the work assignment, rights and responsibilities, and conditions of employment (4.A.9). The original handbook was written by the previous associate provost for undergraduate studies in collaboration with the assistant deans of the four colleges. Subsequently it was revised by the Office of Faculty Relations and is available online. The continuing responsibility for ensuring that CWU periodically assesses institutional policies concerning the use of NTT faculty in light of the mission and goals of the institution (4.A.10) lies with the college deans.

**Appraisal of 4A**

*Qualifications, Sufficiency and Characteristics.* Historically, Central has cited the faculty as its core asset, and all key institutional documents establish the teaching-learning enterprise as the university’s highest priority. Evidence presented on the numbers and sources of terminal degrees (Appendix 4.A.1 and 4.A.2) as well as data on the service and scholarly accomplishments of Central’s faculty (Appendix 4.A.6) present a clear picture of a qualified, engaged, and productive faculty. While there is a great deal of evidence that supports faculty excellence, there are still challenges to the questions of sufficiency and characteristics.
First, Central faces the challenge of its explicit strategic commitment to increasing the ratio of tenured/tenure track to non-tenure track faculty appointments. Effort on this front has been significant in the past two years, during which 20 new tenure lines were established and 12 full time NTT positions were translated into tenure lines. This progress is in part due to the fact that between 2000–2007, the legislature did not fully fund enrollments and CWU was surviving on tuition dollars for nearly 600 students by the end of that period. Until enrollment was again fully funded in the 2007–2009 biennium, some tenure track positions had gone unfilled and others were restructured as annual contracts. Nevertheless, from 1999 to 2009, employment trends show that the number of tenured and tenure track faculty has increased slightly while the numbers of full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty have increased substantially (Appendix 4.A.3). No current benchmark for the ratio of TT to NTT positions is set; however, in the 2004 Fifth Year NWCCU Interim Report, a goal was established of employing no more than one FTE non-tenure track faculty member for every five tenure-track or tenured faculty members (Exhibit 4.E.20). The current ratio is one NTT faculty member for every two TT faculty. Perhaps a future strategy for altering the trajectory of change in the TT to NTT ratio would involve establishing a new benchmark in the context of the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan and conducting a review of what strategies might assist in achieving and maintaining the benchmark.

Second, while important gains in the gender and ethnic diversity of CWU’s faculty were cited earlier in this report, the institution should establish clear benchmarks for diversity that align with the 2006–2012 Strategic Plan for Academic Affairs and pursue innovative tactics for moving toward those benchmarks. Of course, numbers are not the only indicators of a diverse and welcoming institutional culture, and CWU has moved on multiple fronts to strengthen its connections with diverse communities. The spring 2009 Diversity Summit convened by President Gaudino highlighted campus diversity efforts and outlined his agenda for continued attention to diversity as an institutional value.

Finally, as reflected in the OEO data in Appendix 4.A.4, in the past decade, administrative employment has increased 129%, and middle-management positions in student and institutional support have increased by 84% and 77% respectively. During the same period, faculty tenure lines have increased only 12%. Results from the Fall 2007 “Ice Cream ‘n Dream” forum—an all-university community opportunity to reflect on institutional strengths, weaknesses, and ideas for change—revealed a shared sense that the university funding priorities have shifted away from faculty hiring and teaching and toward administration and professional support (Exhibit 4.E.21). Such comments and data document a situation in which community perception has a basis in fact—growth in permanent faculty positions compares negatively to growth in administrative and professional support positions. These trends are not unique to CWU, nor can they be seen as the result of any conscious strategy. One possible corrective tactic already being planned is to conduct a careful audit of administrative and management responsibilities in order to see where change might result in efficiencies (See Standard 6).

**Roles, Responsibilities, and Workload.** The CBA-specified procedures for establishing, approving, and reviewing faculty workloads have clarified the roles and responsibilities of faculty. The new workload forms provide a mechanism for balancing a load to best reflect the talents and competencies of faculty (4.A.3). The college deans report that they are relying on the workload forms to plan for instruction while taking into account scholarly and creative endeavors and the administrative and service needs of the colleges and departments. At the present time, flexibility in load assignments is challenged by the economic climate, making the use of workload data for strategic planning even more crucial.

Workload flexibility is naturally constrained by each department’s need to staff its course offerings. In the early part of the study period, departments met average teaching loads of 36 contact hours per faculty member. The CBA allows deviation from this standard but it is still used as a general rule of thumb. Some activities do not fall easily into workload categories. For example, faculty are regularly
invited to take on administrative assignments, including department and program administration, assessment and accreditation projects, and specific tasks related to collaborative governance. These responsibilities are in nearly all cases in addition to, not in place of, expectations for committee service at the department, college, and university levels. Faculty are also awarded sabbatical leaves and grants which impact their instructional workload. Each of these essential forms of professional engagement could reduce, in effect, the instructional load averages within departments.

Now that workload data are available which offers a more detailed picture of the work being accomplished in all professional areas, opportunities for flexibility will be increasingly evident. The administration is committed to addressing technical limitations that currently hamper the integration of workload data with other campus databases, including data collected from Annual Activities Reports. The goal is to construct a comprehensive approach that should make it possible for any administrator with responsibility for academic program oversight to conduct routine data analyses, to plan strategically for program delivery as well as for flexible load assignments, and to reduce redundancy in routine faculty reporting efforts.

**Faculty Salaries.** Minimum, median, and maximum salaries have increased substantially in every rank since 1999, and multiple efforts have been made to address issues of equity and compression. Policies on salaries and benefits have been clarified through the CBA, and a system of performance adjustments has been implemented to reward exceptional contributions. Salaries are negotiated every two years between the CBA and administrative negotiating teams. It may be possible to link the most egregious salary inequities of the past and the most prolonged periods of salary stagnation to influences beyond the university’s own financial decisions, but now if such problems occur, it is more likely that the attentiveness and transparency enforced by the negotiating process will reduce the depth and duration of any negative implications and impact. The looming global recession will provide a case study in the effectiveness of the collectively bargained agreements in difficult financial circumstances.

While the questions of equity and salary compression were primary concerns of the Salary Administration Board and of pre-CBA salary adjustment efforts, they have not yet been explicit concerns of the current union contract and may, in the future, be focuses of the negotiating process. Both the union and the administration are prepared to continue the essential process of finding ways to bring faculty salaries into line with those of peer institutions.

**Faculty Evaluation.** CWU has taken many positive steps toward instituting faculty evaluation procedures that recognize and promote effectiveness in all areas of faculty excellence and that bring the university into compliance with Policy 4.1 – Faculty Evaluation. In fact, CWU’s progress in the area of faculty evaluation is one of the most significant areas of change in this decade. As a consequence of each evaluation, faculty receive targeted feedback for contributions in all areas of endeavor. Recommendations regarding revisions in the SEOI forms are before the Faculty Senate and a pilot project to determine the impact of new forms on the validity and utility of results is now in progress (Exhibit 4.E.22). See Standard 2 for additional information on the SEOI review process.

Three aspects of faculty evaluation are receiving focused attention. First, efforts are being made to evaluate faculty at the CWU centers as well as instructors of online courses in a manner consistent with the practices for classroom-based courses on the Ellensburg campus. Center support staff reported to the Standard 4 Committee that currently the procedures for conducting classroom evaluations vary from department to department; for example, instructors are not uniformly required to request and submit evaluations. For faculty teaching online courses, receiving helpful assessment information is especially difficult; the instructional technology team is working to improve online course assessment and a pilot project is underway.
Second, the evaluative dimension of scholarly and creative productivity requires further clarification. The 2006–2012 Academic Affairs Strategic Plan (Exhibit 2.E.11) cites the framework of the Boyer Model for recognizing different forms of scholarship, but the framework is not clearly integrated with faculty evaluation criteria in all colleges. This can be remedied by a focused review of the implications of the Boyer model as manifested in each college and discipline. That review was initiated at the fall 2008 Faculty Development Day; further discussion is being facilitated by the deans and the chairs through personnel committee discussions and faculty retreats.

Third, the university must continue to consider efficiency as well as effectiveness in its policies regarding data collection, asking whether the information gathered is worth the effort required to collect it. Frequency of collection is one consideration: for example, the collective bargaining process is examining whether reviews for reappointment might be as useful if conducted in the second, fourth and sixth years rather than annually. Another consideration is redundancy; adopting a uniform, electronic, annually updated faculty vita template to be used for all reports and analyses would address this concern.

**Professional Development.** The responsibility to tie faculty development opportunities to faculty and student needs revealed through relevant assessment is established in NWCCU Standard 4.A.3, which calls for “sufficient time and support for professional growth and renewal;” in Standard 4.A.5, which states that evaluation be done “in order to ensure teaching effectiveness;” and in Policy 4.1, which states that “it is the obligation of the administration to ensure quality and effectiveness of the educational program through the evaluation of faculty performance.” Faculty have access to a wide variety of professional development opportunities, including the new Center for the Teacher-Scholar, quarterly faculty development days, mentoring, professional development plans, and conference attendance and participation, as well as university, college, and department-sponsored events and workshops. However, the university has not yet articulated a coherent, assessment-driven plan for faculty development that can inform strategic funding. Faculty and academic administrators share the belief that a strategic plan for faculty development is warranted in order to efficiently and effectively support professional growth in the context of college and department goals.

In terms of access, faculty at the university centers report that it has sometimes been difficult to take advantage of professional development opportunities even when closed circuit television linkage is provided. Strategies for professional development should be shared equitably with center faculty in order to ensure that they are effectively integrated into collaborative dialogues.

**Recruitment and Appointment.** Attention has been given to clarifying recruitment and appointment procedures to ensure consistency and to increase the success of searches. The Human Resources Recruitment and Hiring Checklist (Exhibit 4.E.17) and the Office of Equal Opportunity recruitment and hiring compliance guidelines are particularly useful and accessible resources. Many recruitment and appointment procedures have been recently transferred to electronic formats that are convenient for both applicants and search team members.

**Academic Freedom.** The past decade has seen the collaborative review and broad dissemination of clear policies regarding academic freedom, including in the areas of instruction and assessment. The 1999 self study stated that “faculty retain academic freedom with respect to their methods of delivery of instruction and the strategies they employ to assess student performance” (Exhibit 4.E.23). This statement explicitly aligns academic freedom not just with the pursuit of knowledge but also with the dissemination and assessment of knowledge. Though institutional-level measures of student achievement are a necessary component of the university’s accountability efforts, CWU balances standardized measures with the flexibility and freedom necessary to allow faculty members to identify
assessments that are appropriate and meaningful within disciplinary contexts and complementary to institutional goals.

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty.** Close to half of those who qualify as full or part-time faculty under the CBA are non-tenure track. However, Central's mission statement, which describes Central as a community of faculty who work together in teaching, scholarship, and service, in some measure describes only tenured and tenurable faculty, depending on departmental climate. Although the Senate approved NTT faculty representation as a step toward inclusion and recognition, the issue of the NTT role in governance is still somewhat ambiguous. Neither committee service nor scholarly and creative efforts are typically recognized in a NTT faculty member’s contract. Thus, although many NTT faculty are willing and eligible to serve on committees, compensation for non-teaching activities is difficult to arrange, and non-tenure track faculty cannot commit to committee service that extends beyond the length of their contracts. Chairs and deans cannot easily modify NTT contracts to compensate committee work in mid-year when the work is actually needed by the unit. These are challenges facing every institution that is positively confronting the goal of creating a cohesive and inclusive academic community.

Consistent policy and practices in hiring, supporting, and evaluating NTT faculty are much clearer than they have been in the past. The CBA negotiations have encouraged CWU as a community to recognize and reflect on the degree to which they rely on NTT faculty to deliver programs and services. There has been considerable progress made toward ensuring NTT faculty access to relevant professional development, adequate office space in order to meet with students, and access to the equipment required of their profession, including access to computers, library databases, e-mail accounts, and office support. The college personnel manuals and the NTT Handbook also clarify NTT policy and practice. Authority for ensuring attentiveness to and consistency among these policies in accordance with Standard 4.A.10 lies with the deans.

An explicit goal of the provost and the deans is to increase the number of tenure track positions where data warrant the added lines. Long term progress toward decreasing the number of faculty in non-tenure track positions will depend on the ongoing appraisal of program staffing needs, hiring and employment practices, budgetary realities, and working conditions at all seven CWU campuses.

**Standard 4.B – Scholarship, Research, and Artistic Creation**

**Historical Perspective**

Although Central faculty have been recruited and hired with the knowledge that teaching is their primary duty, scholarship has historically been included as a faculty expectation in the Faculty Code. In the past many faculty have compiled solid, even exceptional and international records of publishing, performing, and exhibiting, even though these achievements were not always strongly or consistently embedded into the academic culture of CWU as ends in themselves. Since 2001, there has been an effort to ensure that the expectation of scholarly and creative productivity is more consistently and clearly expressed and applied.

As faculty interest in research, scholarship, and creative efforts has increased, so have institutional expectations for productivity, sometimes resulting in questions of how changing expectations can be fairly applied to faculty who were hired at different times. At the same time, there has been an evolution in the types of faculty engagement that have been regarded as “scholarship.” In the fall of 2001, the provost disseminated the publication Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the
Professoriate (Exhibit 4.E.8) and initiated a lasting faculty discussion regarding author Ernest Boyer’s conclusions. Boyer offers a paradigm for faculty scholarship that recognizes various forms of scholarly activity and questions the existence of a reward system that pushes faculty toward research and publication and away from teaching.

A campus conversation proliferated among departments and colleges and the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan 2006–2012 (Exhibit 2.E.11) cites the Boyer Model as a document that informs CWU’s systems of expectation and reward. Most recently as the focus of the fall 2008 Faculty Development Day, university-wide conversations continue regarding definitions of and expectations for scholarly and creative productivity, both within and beyond the context of the Boyer model.

Current Situation

At Central, consistent with the institutional mission, faculty are engaged in scholarship, research, and artistic creation as defined by NWCCU Standard 4.B (4.B.1). CWU acknowledges the interactive roles of scholarship, research, artistic creation, instruction, and service as measures of faculty excellence in its university, college, and department performance criteria (Exhibit 4.E.3).

The university mission (Exhibit GE.1) defines scholarship as integral to effective teaching and to service: “All members of the university community support a relationship between teacher and student which makes them both partners in learning, scholarship, research, creative expression and the application of knowledge to solve human and societal problems . . . The University’s sponsored research and public service programs improve the quality of life for all citizens.” Section I.B.1.d of the Academic Code (Exhibit 4.E.2) describes “scholarship including research and creative activity, freedom of scholarly inquiry, and standards for evaluation of faculty scholarship” to be one area of faculty responsibility. Article 7 of the CBA (Exhibit GE.7) specifies that “the primary professional responsibilities of tenured and tenure track faculty members are teaching, scholarship, and service.” Finally, the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan 2006–2012 (Exhibit 2.E.11) articulates both a general commitment to scholarly and artistic endeavors and specific tactics for realizing the best potential of all faculty. The institution’s commitment is “to promote the highest standards of teaching excellence informed by active faculty scholarship and creative activity.”

Central expects all tenured and tenure track faculty members to remain fully active in scholarship, research, and artistic creation and the faculty rises to this expectation, creating important work of impressive quantity and quality, individually, in teams, and in collaboration with students. The range and depth of faculty scholarship and creativity are easily observed in the faculty vitae (Exhibit 4.E.24) and are cited in the department and college self studies created for this review. Sites of faculty research include classrooms, airplanes, fields of ancient bones, stages and studios, rivers and streams, the past—both recent and ancient—cyberspace, global and international networks, the heart—both physical and metaphorical—sports events, the human body, the infrastructure of cities, the Earth, and the sky. Through their scholarship and creative activity, CWU faculty contribute tremendous benefits to the institution, the community, and the world, as is evidenced in Appendix 4.A.6.

Any attempt at representing the whole body of faculty accomplishment by offering a sample will regrettably overlook many noteworthy accomplishments. Nonetheless, a sample of the national and international journals in which Central faculty work has recently appeared include:

- American Anthropologist
- American Ethnologist
- Aviation, Construction
- College Composition and Communication
- Economics Research Journal
- Education Economics
- Eighteenth-Century Fiction
- Engineering And Safety
In the last available reporting year, 2007–2008, faculty reported 75 scholarly or creative books or book chapters, 333 articles in refereed journals, and 398 professional conference presentations (Appendix 4.A.6). A representative sample of 2007–2008 scholarly book, article and monograph titles illustrates the institutional and public impact, and suggests the range of topics, perspectives, and methodologies, of CWU faculty scholarship.

- “A Knight Of Stories: A Community Storytelling Event As Civic Engagement”
- “The Need to Redress Experiences of Injustice in Child Abuse and Neglect.”
- “Age Related Performance Decrement In Triathlon Sub-Components In Elite Age-Group Athletes”
- “Depiction of ‘The Hostage Crisis’ of 1979 in History Textbooks: A Turning Point In US-Iran Relations”
- “Evaluating The Chronology For Human Land Use In The Southern Washington Cascade Mountains”
- “American Indians in Pursuit of their Academic Dreams”
- “Post-conflict and Self-directed Behaviors in Tibetan Macaques”
- “Focus On Form And Learner Uptake In An ESL Classroom: What Types Of Focus On Form Facilitate Students’ Learning?”
- “Geographies Of Freshwater Sport Fishing In The United States”
- “International Joint Project Using Blackboard Web Technology: Foreign Direct Investment Of USA Retailers In Slovakia By Slovaks And USA College Students”
- “The Effect Of Concurrent Task Management Training On Single Pilot Task Prioritization Performance”
- The Wenas Creek Mammoth Project: 2007 Interim Report on Excavations at 45YA1083

Institutional and Public Impact of Faculty Scholarship. Several successful institutional and grant-supported research and artistic initiatives afford opportunities for faculty research. These institutes and corresponding research interests are just a representative sample of the projects that link CWU faculty expertise with community needs; others are referenced in the department program reviews. (Exhibit 4.E.6).

- The Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment, located in the College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS), has as its mission “to examine questions and accreditation standards relative to teaching and learning in schools and colleges for the purpose of understanding the impacts of practice, program, and policy.” Illustrating CWU’s research and scholarly presence in K–12 education as a “partner in learning,” CEPS has long-established partnerships with K–12 schools and works with districts and Washington State’s Education Service Districts to pursue the best possible methods of teaching and learning for all students.
- Supply Chain Management Institute: Affiliated with the College of Business, SCMI “was established by the College of Business to engage with the industry in the development, support, and facilitation of Supply Chain Management knowledge and expertise.”
- Chimpanzee and Human Communication Institute: As a part of the College of the Sciences (COTS), CHCI has as its goal to “promote quality, humane research on the communication and behavior of the chimpanzees in CWU’s care, as well as research that further the care of captive chimpanzees and conservation efforts to save chimpanzees from extinction by serving as a resource for the students of Central Washington University, its faculty, and visiting scientists.”
• Center for Spatial Information; Also in COTS, the CSI was created at CWU “to coordinate and enhance the application of established and emerging technologies used to create, manage and analyze spatial information.” In recent years, CSI has “focused its energies on environmental and economic problems related to shorelines and associate wetlands, which confront many rural-based agencies and communities in the Pacific Northwest. These problems include water quality, water quantity and availability, salmon habitat conservation and associated conflicts, flood and associated geologic hazards, and the impact on all of these resulting from land-use change.”

• Public Contributions to the Arts: The College of Arts and Humanities sponsors institutes, performances, and exhibits that serve the public and advance the arts in local, regional, and national venues.

A number of interdisciplinary programs support the integration of student learning, faculty research, and public dissemination of information. For example, the Central Washington Archaeological Survey (CWAS) is a research and public service office affiliated with the Department of Anthropology. Recently CWAS has received significant publicity for its Wenas Creek Mammoth Project, a faculty and student investigation of mammoth bones found on private land in the Wenas Creek Valley near Selah, Washington. The investigation is interdisciplinary, using methods from paleontology, archaeology, and geography (Exhibit 4.E.25). Central Washington University is also the lead institution for the Pacific Northwest Geodetic Array (PANGA; Exhibit 4.E.26), a collaborative project funded by the National Science Foundation, NASA, and the Department of Natural Resources of Canada, among others. PANGA has deployed an extensive network of Global Positioning System (GPS) tracking sites, which measure tectonic activity in the region. The Central Washington Writing Project (Exhibit 4.E.27) is committed to improving student writing by improving the teaching of writing in the public schools. It both trains teacher consultants and provides in-service programs to the region's schools.

Integrating Scholarship and Teaching. Faculty whose primary passion is teaching have found new ways to integrate research into the laboratory of the classroom, to involve undergraduate and graduate students in the research process, and to disseminate their discoveries regularly through presentation and publication. Two of CWU’s most successful examples are the Don and Verna Duncan Center for Civic Engagement (Exhibit 4.E.28) and the annual Symposium on University Research and Creative Expression (SOURCE; Exhibit 4.E.29). Participation in these opportunities has steadily increased in numbers of faculty and students, as well as in numbers of departments represented.

Interdisciplinary degree programs, several of which are funded through presidential Spheres of Distinction grants and all of which integrate student learning with faculty research and community-service initiatives, focus on Africana and Black Studies, Asia/Pacific Studies, Film and Video Studies, Latino/a and Latin American Studies, Women’s Studies, American Indian Studies, and Environmental Studies.

Policies and Procedures. At the university, department, and college levels, institutional policies and procedures, including ethical considerations, concerning scholarship, research, and artistic creation, are clearly communicated (4.B.2). Faculty are directly involved in developing and implementing policies related to scholarship, research, and artistic creation through the faculty governance structure (See also Standard 6). The Academic Code and the CBA commit faculty to participation in policy-making, assessment, and accreditation activities sponsored by departments, colleges, and the university, including this NWCCU self study. In addition, college-level personnel committees communicate research expectations and provide avenues for faculty input into professional productivity policies. The expectations for scholarship, research, and artistic creation are articulated through the performance criteria published in print and digitally in university, college, and department policies (Exhibit 4.E.3).
College and department personnel policies are published on their websites and disseminated initially at new faculty orientation and subsequently included in every professional record submitted for formal review. The numbers and types of accomplishments required to meet these expectations vary by college and department in accordance with disciplinary practices. Department expectations are reported in the department program reviews (Exhibit 4.E.6) and cannot be less demanding than those expressed in the college or university policies. Scholarly and professional obligations of faculty members and the expectations for promotion are found in the CBA (Exhibit GE.7), which is given to each faculty member by the United Faculty of Central and is available online. Ethical considerations are included in these university policies and special considerations, such as for the ethical treatment of human subjects, are reviewed and monitored by faculty and staff committees.

Although some policies regarding research are explicitly dictated by external bodies, for example, federal animal care policies, all other aspects of policy development rest with the faculty. Therefore, consistent with institutional mission and goals, faculty have a substantive role in the development and administration of research policies and practices (4.B.3). The Office of Graduate Studies and Research (OGSR) oversees university-wide policies, procedures, and requirements related to research and scholarship. Documents articulating services, requirements, deadlines, and criteria are available at its website. The Human Subjects Research Committee (HSRC), the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), and the Sabbatical Leave Committee report to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, who also reviews and approves proposals for external funding of scholarly projects. The HSRC reviews all research proposals and protocols involving human subjects. Committee membership includes a physician and four faculty members. The IACUC is made up of two faculty members, one veterinarian, one community representative, and a university staff member. The IACUC periodically inspects the animal facilities at Central to ensure compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations and to assure that the animals receive humane treatment. The Sabbatical Leave Committee, comprised of five tenured faculty members, evaluates the scholarly purposes of sabbatical leave proposals.

**Internal and External Support for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity.** Consistent with Central’s strong commitment to the value of intellectual inquiry, and consistent with its mission and goals, the institution provides appropriate financial, physical, administrative, and information resources for scholarship, research, and artistic creation (4.B.4). Because the process for internal funding of scholarship and creative activity requires alignment with unit strategic plans, sponsored research and programs funded by grants, contracts, and gifts are consistent with the institution’s mission and goals (4.B.6).

As reported in Standard 4.A, the CBA provides for an annual $700 allocation per faculty member to be used for faculty development support; much of this funding is used to support travel to conferences and other costs associated with productivity in research, scholarship and creative activity. Another significant form of support, the professional leave program, operates under the guidelines described in Article 19 of the CBA, “Sabbaticals,” and in accordance with the provisions of RCW 28B.10.650 – “Remunerated sabbatical leave for faculty members of an institution of higher education.” As described in the CBA, “The purposes of sabbatical leave are to enhance the university educational environment and to promote the professional development of eligible faculty members by affording opportunities for sustained periods of concentrated scholarship free from regular on-campus obligations.” Sabbatical proposals are considered and evaluated by the university Sabbatical Leave Committee and awarded by the provost and the Board of Trustees.

Although some internal support for research and faculty development is provided through the CBA, departments and colleges, the CWU Foundation, and the university as a whole in the case of the professional leave program, the OGSR takes the lead in coordinating other internal and all external
support for faculty productivity. The Research and Sponsored Programs Administrator provides information to faculty on sources of funding, both public and private. The administrator keeps faculty apprised of possible funding opportunities through e-mail messages targeted at individual faculty research interests. The office also maintains a funding information library and a collection of grant, fellowship, and proposal-writing information. Other duties include providing assistance to faculty and staff in preparing grant applications, reviewing each grant proposal, reviewing budgets, and approving completed grant proposals. Resources are also available for matching grant activity, publication subvention, and travel.

Currently, the OGSR administers the following internal sources of support:

- The Seed Grant Program. Each year, faculty are encouraged to apply for up to $2,000 in faculty seed grant awards. Many faculty look to this competitive grant program for equipment and supply needs. New faculty consider it an important source of start-up funding.
- Faculty Research Appointment Program. Successful applicants receive a quarter's leave with full pay to pursue their research/creative interests, without teaching obligations. Each year, 12 to 20 applicants submit proposals, and between three and six research leave grants are awarded.
- Summer Research Leave. Between two and eight faculty receive summer research stipends of $4000 each year.
- GAP (Generating Another Proposal) Grant. On a case-by-case basis, faculty may apply for GAP funding to support completing a major externally funded project and preparing their next proposal or to provide support for resubmitting a proposal that was not funded but received strong reviews.
- SOAR (Scholarly Opportunities for Academic Researchers) Grant. The SOAR Grant provides reassigned time to develop a grant proposal for a clearly identified target funding source supporting research, scholarship, creative activities, teaching, and/or program development.
- Travel Funds. The OGSR has provided $300 travel awards for faculty who acquire matching funds from their deans or departments to present the results of research or creative endeavors.
- Manuscript Publication. A portion of the OGSR’s recovered indirect costs has been set aside to support manuscript publication costs and page charges. Costs are typically shared with the faculty member's college or department.

Scholarship also is supported by external sources. The 2007–2008 Annual Report of Grant Activity (Exhibit 4.E.28) documents steady increases in funding (Figure 4.3), the number of grants submitted, and the percentage of grants funded during this decade. Current and archived accounts of grant acquisition demonstrate that CWU’s faculty have received grants and awards from a growing list of external private and public sector agencies and organizations, including:

- National Science Foundation
- US Department of Education
- Quest
- M.J. Murdock Charitable Trust
- Getty Foundation

Figure 4.3
Grants Funded, Fiscal Years 1999–2008

- National Writing Project
- Andy Warhol Fund
- National Endowment for the Humanities
Scholarship and Workload. The Faculty Workload and Annual Activity Report processes, described in the CBA and cited elsewhere in this report, are designed to ensure that the nature of the institution’s research mission and goals and its commitment to faculty scholarship, research, and artistic creation are reflected in the assignment of faculty responsibilities, the expectation and reward of faculty performance, and opportunities for faculty renewal through sabbatical leaves or other similar programs (4.B.5). The CBA provides the basic premises on which faculty workloads are calculated and the procedures for calculating them: “Faculty shall be responsible for forty-five (45) workload units per academic year. The 45 workload units are composed of responsibilities in teaching, research/creative activity, and service to the university or the community.” It also ensures that “faculty with externally funded research commitments shall be guaranteed the opportunity to buy out workload units as required to meet the commitments; provided that the overall teaching, scholarship, and service needs of the unit can be met, as determined by the department chair and approved by the dean/director.” The language of the CBA reinforces CWU’s commitment to the role of the teacher-scholar by mandating research and creative activity in individual load assignments, while recognizing the institution’s need for flexibility and program delivery (Exhibit GE.7, Section 15.4.9).

Because scholarship is a component of total workload, sabbatical and research leaves are included when workload unit averages are calculated. This temporarily and artificially raises the scholarship and creative activity averages for departments and colleges in which faculty received these awards. That said, the percentage of total workload units dedicated to scholarship as reported through the workload forms varies significantly by college and department, from 10% to 21%. University full-time tenure track faculty report an average assignment for scholarship and creative activity of 7.5 units, or 16.6% of total load. The College of Arts and Humanities average is close to that of the university, at 17%, with a range of units from a low of 4.1 in Foreign Languages to a high of 14.4 in History. The College of Business units for scholarship average 20%, ranging from 8.3 units in Economics to 9.5 in Accounting and Finance. The College of the Sciences average is 21%, though the range of assignments varies from 5.1 units in sociology to 17.7 in Geological Sciences. The College of Education and Professional Studies average is 10%, with a range of 3.3 units in Industrial and Engineering Technology to 5.3 in Aviation and Information Technology/Administrative Management.

Two observations about institutional workload data should guide future use of workload data related to scholarship. First, there appear to be no public statements of rationale or policy that provide a context in which the significant college and departmental differences in scholarly workload assignments can be meaningfully and usefully justified or interpreted. Second, although no conclusive comparisons can be calculated because the databases are not interactive, disconnects exist between the average scholarly load units assigned to some departments and the comparative productivity of those departments as reported in the Annual Activities Reports. Although more complete access to current patterns of faculty engagement and productivity is now available, the university needs to move forward on its commitment to establishing inclusive, interactive databases for faculty information that can inform strategic planning and decision-making.
Perhaps a single model of scholarly productivity cannot be equally relevant across all departments and colleges. The result of further review of CWU’s standards and practices may be increased specificity by discipline in the quantity and quality of faculty contributions required.

**Academic Freedom for Scholarly Pursuits.** A commitment from the most senior governing body, the Board of Trustees, ensures that faculty are accorded academic freedom to pursue scholarship, research, and artistic creation consistent with the institution’s mission and goals (4.B.7). The Board clearly states its support of the broad concept of academic freedom in the CWU Policies Manual when it ensures all members of the academic community the “freedom to learn and the freedom to conduct research and report the findings in the spirit of free inquiry” (Exhibit GE.3, 1-3.2). Other policy assurances of academic freedom in the CBA and Academic Code are discussed in Standard 4.A, above, and in Standard 9.

---

**Appraisal of 4.B**

The commitment of CWU faculty and administration to multiple types of scholarly and creative activity informs institutional documents, including the CBA, the university mission, the CWU Policies and Procedures Manual, and the university, college, and department personnel policies, strategic goals, and initiatives.

The term scholarship is interpreted broadly at Central Washington University to accommodate variations in faculty work across all disciplines, including scientific and humanistic scholarship, pedagogical theory and research, invention, and creative activities. The university takes the position that research and creative activities of its faculty strengthen the university's ability to offer state-of-the-art instruction from individuals whose work resides on the cutting edges of their disciplines. Such endeavors also contribute to the faculty’s intellectual vitality and stimulate interdisciplinary discussion. They increase the university's prestige, its capability to attract more and better students, its ability to recruit excellent faculty, and its probability of attracting external funding.

The university would benefit from further strategic discussion about research expectations to achieve a coherent vision for faculty productivity and its representation on the Annual Activities Reports (Appendix 4.A.6). It is clear that there are pressing and multiple demands on the 20% of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member’s workload which must stretch to include participating in governance; staying current in research; producing new knowledge, innovations, and creative experiences; and participating in assessment and accountability efforts. The university needs to use workload data to determine the kind of professional balance that makes sense for the university’s particular circumstances and mission in the context of a long-term plan.

**Standard 4 Summary**

Central Washington University rightfully prides itself on the qualifications, characteristics, and productivity of its faculty. To attract, retain, and reward excellence, Central has established clear personnel procedures and expectations, and the faculty union and administration will continue to work together through the negotiating process to sustain a competitive salary structure. A more specific discussion of the issues, gains, and challenges of collective bargaining is included in Standard 6. The CBA and the Academic Code specify equitable language that provides a context for positive, collaborative conversations.

Those conversations will include attention to using the mechanism of the workload form to balance the three important activities of the professoriate, pedagogy, scholarly and creative productivity, and service to institution and community. Particularly in an institution that prides itself on small class sizes...
and student involvement in research and creative activity, CWU must stay committed to providing an adequate instructional budget as enrollments increase. The university must also develop benchmarks for increasing diversity; refine and consistently apply policies and procedures related to hiring and evaluation; plan strategically for faculty development to promote instructional excellence; and make strategic decisions at all levels based on informed analysis of relevant data. An accurate and comprehensive record of faculty contributions to disciplinary knowledge and regional needs is essential to institutional arguments related to legislative and public support.
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Standard 5 - Library and Information Resources

CWU’s library services encompass the services of the Brooks Library on the Ellensburg campus, CWU supported and staffed libraries at two of the seven university centers, electronic resources available to all students and faculty, and the resources of its consortium partner libraries. Library and information resources and facilities at the centers meet the same commitment to appropriate services and facilities found on the Ellensburg campus. The university strives for seamless inclusion of the centers in the educational programs of the university. Unless otherwise noted, the narrative of Standard 5 applies to the all sites of the university; the university centers will not be described separately.

Two additional units, Information Technology Services (ITS) and Multimedia Technology and Instructional Support (MTIS) provide the IT infrastructure for students and faculty. The Educational Technology Center (ETC) provides training and additional collections. Occasionally in this standard, the term “all units” will be used to mean Library Services, ITS, MTIS, and the ETC collectively.

Standard 5.A - Purpose and Scope

The primary purpose for library and information resources is to support teaching, learning, and, if applicable, research in ways consistent with, and supportive of, the institution’s mission and goals. Adequate library and information resources and services, at the appropriate level for degrees offered, are available to support the intellectual, cultural, and technical development of students enrolled in courses and programs wherever located and however delivered.

Historical Perspective

The library’s mission and goals were updated in summer 2007 during a recently instituted annual faculty retreat. The library’s goals now are much more clearly tied to institutional goals than at the time of the past review (see Exhibits 5.E.1 and 5.E.2). For example, the library complements the university’s Strategic Goal 1 (“Maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life on the Ellensburg campus”) with the following objectives:

- Maintain and strengthen study environments conducive to individual needs and learning styles.
- Maintain and strengthen online access to information resources campus-wide.
- Provide physical access to the library during times when access to other university facilities might not be available.
- Provide information resources from global sources.

ITS responds to the same university strategic goal with:

- Goal 1: Distinguish CWU as a modern and innovative University that provides a quality and state-of-the-art learning, living, and working environment for students, faculty, and staff.
- Objective 1: Provide technologies that support the diverse campus environments, departments, and University Centers of Central Washington University.
- Strategy 1: Support technologies which expand the learning and teaching experience beyond the traditional brick and mortar classroom.

To enhance its ability to meet the teaching and learning needs of students and faculty, the library has maintained cooperative agreements and relationships, such as interlibrary loan services, a regional union catalog service, and consortial database purchases. In recent years, budget shifts, the impact of inflation and the growing need for access to electronic resources has necessitated changes in the allocation of funds from print collections to electronic resources, predominantly journals and aggregator packages. Since electronic resources have grown into a significant portion of the collection,
the library is dependent upon the technological support infrastructure. A larger portion of the budget than in the past is now devoted to staffing and maintenance of the equipment necessary to access electronic resources than was required at the time of the last review. Staffing in the Library Systems Services unit has grown from two to four full-time employees (also see Standard 5.D.4).

There are four primary departments which provide information technology services (IT) across the institution: Information Technology Services (ITS), the Brooks Library Systems Services unit, Multimedia Technology and Instructional Support (MTIS), and the Educational Technology Center (ETC). The last three report to the provost and senior vice-president of academic affairs. These departments, along with specific departmental technology support personnel, collaborate to assure the overall technology expertise needed to achieve the university’s academic mission. The joint CWU IT Strategic Plan of March 2008 (Exhibit 5.E.3) was co-authored by these departments and illustrates this cooperation.

The Educational Technology Center is located in a renovated section of Black Hall. In 2001–2002, the College of Education and Professional Studies changed the director’s position from staff to a tenure-track faculty in the Department of Education. The current director joined the ETC in August 2003. The ETC holds most of the curriculum materials needed for the academic Department of Education. The Brooks Library continues to collect juvenile literature materials in support of those program needs. The ETC catalog is available online and has bibliographic representation in the library’s catalog. Exhibit 5.E.4 lists the services and collections of the ETC.

The university has delivered educational services to several locations away from the Ellensburg campus for several decades. A courier service first provided library and information resources to students at the centers. In recent years, services to students at the centers have been enhanced by access to electronic resources, a longstanding library at CWU-Des Moines, and the establishment of a new library at CWU-Lynnwood. CWU staffs both these libraries and has assigned one library faculty member to assist in providing services to faculty and students at all the centers. Exhibit 5.E.5 presents a complete list of library services at the university centers. In 2004, the Brooks Library created the professional position of Instruction and Outreach Librarian to serve students at the centers. In 2004, the library also initiated an Archives and Special Collection program to fulfill its mission as a cultural archive for the institution, with the goal of collecting and preserving materials of value to the region.

**Current Situation**

The institution’s information resources and services include sufficient holdings, equipment, and personnel in all of its libraries, instructional media and production centers, computer centers, networks, telecommunication facilities, and other repositories of information to accomplish the institution’s mission and goals (5.A.1).

Current library resources holdings are approximately 1,316,282 titles (2,277,101 items). They are described fully in Exhibit 5.E.6. Table 5.1 compares summary statistics from AY1999 and AY2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY1999</th>
<th>AY2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book volumes</td>
<td>485,417</td>
<td>440,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial subscriptions</td>
<td>1,908 print; 7,000+ online</td>
<td>1,183 current subscriptions; 25,938 online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government documents</td>
<td>454,383</td>
<td>503,314 (monographs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical recordings</td>
<td>13,218</td>
<td>11,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video materials</td>
<td>4,272 (VHS)</td>
<td>5,877 (VHS and DVD formats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-text e-resources (non-journal)</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>61,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers for students</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>136, including laptops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff workstations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79 (including for student employees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 5 - 27**
In 2002, Washington’s and Oregon’s public universities formed the Orbis Cascade Alliance (Exhibit 5.E.7). The Alliance supports the consortial catalog, Summit. Through state-level funding and the power of consortial purchasing, the library has been able to expand its electronic resources since the last review period, thus enhancing the access for all students and faculty. The library now provides password-protected online access to full-text resources for all users, from any location, to well over 25,000 journal titles and a large number of monographs and reference works (Exhibits 5.E.6, 5.E.8, and 5.E.9).

The library currently employs 30 classified staff members and 9 faculty members. Their titles and qualifications are described in more detail in the response to Standard 5.D and Exhibit 5.E.10. In winter 2009 there were eight vacancies (approximately 20% of total personnel); staffing continues to be stretched thin. The library has focused on coverage adequate to maintain its hours of operation and services to students and faculty.

The institution’s core collection and related information resources are sufficient to support the curriculum (5.A.2). Central Washington University emphasizes its teaching mission, and the library provides strong support for that mission. Over the past 10 years, growing campus emphasis has been placed on undergraduate research and faculty research. Undergraduate research is strongly encouraged and is described as a major strength in the current Academic Affairs Strategic Plan (Exhibit 2.E.11). Faculty research plays a prominent role in the teacher-scholar model which is emphasized in the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan and is taking form in the institution of a Center for the Teacher-Scholar (See Standards 2 and 4).

Evidence from program reviews, departmental self-studies for this accreditation report, and the spring 2007 LibQUAL survey, an industry standard assessment tool of perceived satisfaction rates, explicitly document that library resources and services are sufficient to support the curriculum. In the five-year departmental program reviews no negative assessments are to be found regarding library services (Exhibit 5.E.11); similarly, services and resources were supported most recently in the self-reports from departments created for this accreditation review (Exhibit 5.E.12). A number of individual programs have met the criteria for external accreditation (Exhibit 2.E.15) and the library met the standards of the accrediting body. Finally, the LibQUAL survey captured faculty and student general satisfaction with the content, currency, and quality of the collection (Exhibits 5.E.13 and 5.E.14). In all assessments, however, faculty and graduate students show signs of needing more materials to support the university’s growing emphasis on scholarship at all levels.

Information resources and services are determined by the nature of the institution’s educational programs and the locations where programs are offered (5.A.3). The institution and the library have a variety of consultative committee structures in place (Exhibit 5.E.15), to assure that planning of library collections and services is determined by the institution’s programs in the context of the delivery site. As one example, there is a longstanding liaison program connecting members of the library faculty and staff to instructional departments regarding library services and collections. The Collection Development policy (Exhibit 5.E.16) is also explicitly linked to the institution’s programs. The collection at each center library is tailored to the programs offered there.

The structure and function of the Archives and Special Collections unit are consistent with CWU’s standing as a regional university and its responsibilities described in campus policies. That unit maintains a number of specific collections, among them the Central Washington History and Culture Collection, the Regional Literature Collection, and the Darwin Goodyear Native and Western American Art, Culture and History Collection. See Exhibit 5.E.17 for more details.
Appraisal of 5.A

The Brooks Library and ITS/MTIS have missions and goals that are clearly stated and periodically reviewed. Those goals are explicitly tied to the university’s goals and support them. The Brooks Library has made strategic moves to advance its primary purpose of supporting teaching, learning, and CWU’s increased emphasis on research. Library services added the position of Instruction and Outreach Librarian to assure that students at the university centers have the necessary resources and services for their curricular needs. The library has also created the Archives and Special Collections unit and worked diligently with campus faculty to bring collections into that unit to support research. There are institutional structures in place that allow library, ITS/MTIS, and campus instructional faculty to work together to ensure that the all units provide information resources and services determined by CWU’s educational programs and locations.

As the emphasis on faculty and student research grows, a tension between the resources available and those needed is developing, as reflected in this assessment comment from the Geology Department: “While interlibrary loan is a substitute for having direct access to journals and other resources, the time lag, in some cases, presents difficulties. This is particularly true because the time available to do research at CWU can be quite fragmented” (Exhibit 5.E.12, p.6). However, based on the other assessments, the library and ITS/MTIS provide adequate library and information resources and services, at the appropriate level for degrees offered.

The department liaison program has experienced mixed success due to time conflicts and varying participation across departments, yet the structure is there and appears to assist in focusing the collection to meet institutional goals. Based on assessments, some faculty and graduate students would benefit from increased on-site holdings in their disciplines. Just as clearly, the current on-site holdings, online subscriptions, interlibrary loan service, and consortial borrowing services provide adequate resources for student and faculty needs. The personnel in the library are sufficient, although currently stretched thin. The required infrastructure (telecommunication facilities, networks, classroom technology) is stable and robust enough to support the institution’s mission and goals.

Standard 5.B - Information Resources and Services

Historical Perspective

At the time of the last review, the library was addressing the need to deliver access to resources newly available in an online format. The situation was coupled with the expansion of programs at the university centers and the university's initiatives into distance education. The library then provided 7,000 subscriptions available to all faculty and students at any location 24 hours a day. This limited array of database subscriptions provided for research and instructional needs in nearly all academic programs. The library was able to participate in the statewide Cooperative Library Project through which the Washington State Legislature allocated funds ($345,000 in 1998) for the six public university libraries to jointly purchase access to databases providing indexing, abstracts, and full text of journal, magazine, and newspaper articles, a project that continues to this day. The traditional extension service—Interlibrary Loan (ILL)—has been offered by the library since the early 1940s.

In 1998–99, the library had what were for the time conventional resources for faculty and students—printed book and serial volumes, print indexes to journal articles, print journal subscriptions, and a government publications in print as well. Library orientations for incoming freshmen, routinely about 50 sessions each fall, included a physical tour of the library building. The fifth year interim NWCCU report
Standard 5 noted that the core collection is the result of years of professional collection activity responding to the university’s changing curriculum needs.

**Current Situation**

Current library holdings were described above and are detailed more fully in Exhibit 5.E.6. Over this past decade, the library has increased the integration of electronic resources into its collections, moving from reliance upon print periodicals indexes to electronic indexes and aggregator databases—currently EBSCOHost and Lexis/Nexis—as the primary means of locating journal articles, many government documents, and financial data. All students have password-protected worldwide internet access to CWU’s electronic resources. A dramatic example of improved access is that in 1999 the library offered approximately 7,000 full-text e-resources and now offers over 25,000 of them.

Students can submit online requests for materials from Summit Alliance libraries or ILL. Transactions for ILL services dropped from about 20,000 to 13,000 (about 38%) from FY 2005 to FY 2007, but are now rebounding to an estimated 16,000 transactions for fiscal year 2009 (Exhibits 5.E.19 and 5.E.20). The number of items borrowed via Summit very closely follows the previous decline in ILL transactions (Exhibit 5.E.21). The use of ILL is expected to increase due to a change in the Summit interface in late December 2008 that makes ILL requests easier to create than in the past.

CWU has developed library sharing agreements (Exhibit 5.E.22) with the community colleges hosting the Des Moines and Lynnwood centers. Each has a full-time classified staff person to facilitate access to resources. In 2004, the library hired an Instruction and Outreach Librarian to provide instruction and other professional services for the programs at all of the centers and to maintain communication with the community colleges where the university centers are co-located. Students at all the centers may also use the co-located community college library or any nearby state university or Summit Alliance library. All students have electronic access to CWU resources at the main campus, including the holdings of the Alliance member libraries by means of the Summit catalog and interlibrary loan services via ILLiad. Articles are frequently delivered the same day or next day. See Standard 2.A for more information on library and information resources for educational programs.

**CWU’s library equipment and materials are selected, acquired, organized, and maintained to support the educational program (5.B.1).** In addition to the collection development policy (Exhibit 5.E.16), internal library structures coordinate equipment and materials with the educational programs. Librarians and staff communicate regularly with faculty and utilize that information in library decision-making meetings. Each instructional department has a specific budgetary allotment for its programs that is reviewed annually by the collection development librarian. Lastly, librarians serve on campus committees (e.g.: Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee) to facilitate appropriate collection development and service activities.

**Library and information resources and services offer support and training to develop the ability of students, faculty, and staff to maximize their independent and effective use of library resources (5.B.2).** This is accomplished by means of a number of methods that reflect the complexity of today’s information environment.

- A library orientation and introduction to the library's electronic resources is required of all freshmen in their University 101 classes (See Standard 2.A and 2.C). Annually, approximately 1,200 students receive the UNIV101 orientation.
Library faculty and staff are available to visit classes, to provide subject- or discipline-specific training to classes, and to assist faculty or departments in understanding what materials are available and how to access them. Annually, approximately 600 students receive specific bibliographic instruction sessions related to their courses. The instruction and outreach librarian teaches LIB 345, a library research methods class (Exhibit 5.E.23).

Drop-in classes for faculty and students targeted at specific databases and topics (Exhibit 5.E.24) and a recently instituted faculty orientation in the library each fall have been established as well as a library presentation at the fall new faculty orientation.

All units make use of the faculty email distribution list to help faculty become aware of new or modified services or resources and to solicit feedback.

The ITS Department provides ongoing training in standard software applications in common use and available in all student laboratories and classrooms, such as database, spreadsheet, presentation, and email applications. ITS also offers specialized training in support of CWU’s enterprise information system (EIS) used by faculty, staff and students. Information on ITS Training Services, courses available, and focused training opportunities is available online. All users have telephone, web, and drop-in access to technology support via the ITS HelpDesk, located in Bouillon 112. Helpdesk performance indicators and other information and is available in Exhibit 5.E.25. A comprehensive guide for students regarding technology at CWU is published by ITS and is Exhibit 5.E.26.

MTIS provides training (http://www.cwmu.edu/~media) in interactive video instruction and online content management. Class capture tools are also under consideration for this purpose. Learning facilities and meeting rooms on the Ellensburg campus and at the centers include technology enhancements for information display and exchange. MTIS employees are available to train instructors, staff, and students in the use of the systems these technology-enhanced facilities provide. Standard 2.H and Exhibit 2.E.133 describe MTIS services in greater detail.

Beginning in 2003, informal needs assessment and anecdotal research demonstrated that many of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) faculty members either did not have basic technology skills or needed further training in how to incorporate instructional technologies in pedagogically appropriate ways. In response, the ETC developed and implemented several workshops (Standard 2.H; Exhibit 2.E.133) to better train and motivate faculty to master basic technology skills and to achieve greater levels of technology adoption and curricular integration. ETC library materials are found in the Curriculum Lab, the Professional Collection, and the Children’s Literature Center. See Exhibit 5.E.4 for more detail on these collections and workshops offered.

One of the major adaptations to the electronic information environment is demonstrated by the development and utilization of the Electronic Research and Instruction Center (Room 154) in the Brooks Library. It opened in January 1999 and was renovated in 2006. Librarians now can offer in-depth instruction in online research methods to classes in any discipline and at any level. Another means of developing independence for students and faculty is through online bibliographic access to the Marcive service (for government publications) and the Serials Solutions service (for online subscription resources). See Exhibit 5.E.27 for more information regarding media circulation.

The traditional walk-up instruction for patrons is also highly utilized. Much time is now spent answering infrastructure questions (30% of the reference unit’s total) for students and faculty and helping them navigate the complexities of the scholarly publishing environment to select and use appropriate resources. In AY 2006, the library’s reference and documents staffs provided help to 563 patrons per week compared to 244 and 453 per week respectively at state regional peers, Eastern and Western Washington Universities. For AY 2009 the CWU weekly average is 423. In addition to the methods of
instruction already mentioned, the library website (Exhibit 5.E.28) is a rich resource of information for faculty and students (e.g. dynamically built subject guides).

Proper security is required for effective use of electronic resources. CWU’s IT Security Plan is updated annually to comply with all security requirements, including the requirements of the Washington State Department of Information Services (DIS) and Information Services Board (ISB). The Security Plan is audited every 3 years; during the 2007 audit, CWU received a perfect assessment with no compliance discrepancies. (Exhibit 5.E.25). ITS also maintains the IT Disaster Preparedness and Recovery Plan (Exhibit 5.E.29) to assure that CWU can survive and recover from damage to the computing infrastructure. Plans for improvements to Central’s Hogue Technology Building include a 2,600 square foot Data Center.

_Policies, regulations, and procedures for systematic development and management of information resources, in all formats, are documented, updated, and made available to CWU’s constituents (5.B.3). Information regarding library policies (Exhibit 5.E.16), resources, and services is made available on the library website. The only policies or procedures not available online are those that pertain to library personnel. Each unit head is responsible for maintaining and updating relevant policies as necessary. Revised policies are discussed and approved by the Library Council. ITS and MTIS units work individually or collaboratively to create and update relevant policies (see also Standards 5.A and 5.E)._**

_The university provides opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to participate in the planning and development of the library and information resources and services (5.B.4). The library employs existing campus committees (Exhibit 5.E.15) to provide access for input by faculty, staff, and students. A library faculty member serves on the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee and faculty members and a student are members of the Library Advisory Committee. The University Information Technology Advisory Committee provides a forum which guides and coordinates the acquisition and organization of information technology equipment and materials. The library liaison and departmental library representative programs have been described above. Academic departments also evaluate the adequacy of library resources and policies in their five-year program reviews._

_Computing and communications services are used to extend CWU’s boundaries in obtaining information and data from other sources, including regional, national, and international networks (5.B.5). Enrollment at the Ellensburg Campus has grown over the decade and currently rests at approximately 9,000 FTE students. The university now has more than 30 programs at the six main university centers as well as cooperative projects initiated at two other teaching sites (Exhibit 5.E.30) which together account for approximately an additional 1,070 FTE students. (See Standards 2.A and 3.B for more enrollment detail). The library reaches out to these students via electronic full-text resources, wired and wireless technology, a laptop-checkout program, and ILL services through ILLiad to facilitate access to worldwide resources. The circulation and systems services units implemented the Docutek program for distributing electronic reserves, a highly utilized service (Exhibit 5.E.21)._**

_The state’s Inter-University Consortium of Chief Librarians (ICCL) continues to manage the Cooperative Library Project (CLP) which was initiated in 1995. Since the last review, this project has joined with Oregon’s Orbis project to form the Orbis-Cascade Alliance and provides access to 9.2 million different titles from 36 academic libraries in the region (Exhibit 5.E.31). This service provides access closer to home for students at the university centers and greatly complements the library's holdings. On-site computers are another means of providing information to all library users._

_CWU’s technology services operate with the goal of “making the campus the classroom, and the world the campus.” The university not only provides seamless access at the university’s six centers, but also assures access to university resources from anywhere on the globe via the Internet. Online tools such
as CWU’s Blackboard and distance education resources support the goals of the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board to improve access to higher education across the state and ultimately across the globe. More information can be found in Exhibit 5.E.25.

**Appraisal of 5.B**

All units make continuous improvements to assure that information resources and services are sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, and currency to support the institution’s curricular offerings. The library provides online resources and uses the library website and catalog to make them known and accessible to students and faculty; the ILL service uses state-of-the-art software; the Docutek system was implemented for reserves; and the library and ITS are members of regional networks that greatly enhance the resources students and faculty have at their disposal. The Brooks Library has taken concrete steps to extend its boundaries in obtaining information and data through regional, national, and international networks.

The faculty and staff of the Brooks Library have implemented and maintain up-to-date methods of instructing students and faculty. They have created a modern reference instructional facility which allows them to provide instruction to all levels of users. Students and faculty have access to guidance of many types, from individual personal consultation to 24/7 online access. One area of possible future exploration is that of online tutorials, which have the potential to engage more users. Overall, the library and information resources and services provided by the Brooks Library are oriented toward developing the ability of students, faculty, and staff to use the resources independently and effectively.

Feedback from students and faculty largely supports the value of cooperative relationships (Exhibits 5.E.11, 5.E.12, 5.E.13), and students and faculty demonstrate enthusiasm for the services they receive directly from library personnel. In the LibQUAL survey of perceptions, 85% of the written comments from the patron-base praised the public services faculty and staff (Exhibit 5.E.13). In 2004–2007 surveys of graduating seniors, the library received an average 66% approval rating of very or mostly satisfied, and was ninth of the 25 campus offices and services included; computer labs and equipment averages 77% and ranks second (Exhibit 5.E.32).

Student and faculty comments critical of the sufficiency of on-site holdings are generally mitigated by statements such as: “I think the CWU library does very well with its limited resources. ... ILLiad helps and so does Summit”. Still, the comments indicate areas that guide the library toward better resources for students, for example “Materials related to Business Majors are outdated or does not [sic] exist. ... The Library does not even carry the Top 10 Wall Street Journal business books” (Exhibit 5.E.13, p.8). The more specific collection concerns described by the Department of Education related to the ETC appear to be the most acute at this point (see Exhibit 5.E.4).

The Brooks Library has established a number of cooperative agreements. Consortial participation in the Orbis Cascade Alliance carries the single largest benefit for students and faculty, both in borrowing materials and in the leveraged purchasing of electronic full-text journals and archives. The frequent and systematic communication between librarians, ITS/MTIS staff, and the instructional faculty helps assure that cooperative relationships and externally provided information sources are stable and complement rather than substitute for the university's own adequate and accessible core information services. Internal unit committees, campus-wide committees and liaisons, and the university’s five-year academic program review cycle provide opportunities for a wide array of input regarding services and resources to help assure that they are sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, and currency. The program review self-reports should be better utilized in the library as regular and systematic perspectives that can be mined for improvements to information resources and technology services.
Overall, the Brooks Library, ITS and MTIS have made strategic moves to improve electronic resources and technology related to the research and academic interests of students and faculty.

**Standard 5.C - Facilities and Access**

**Historical Perspective**

The current main campus library building, the Brooks Library, was started in 1973 and completed in 1976. The building occupies a relatively convenient location on the north-central part of campus, near the academic buildings of the campus, with an immediately adjacent parking lot and several parking lots located within one to two blocks. It is a brick building with little structural flexibility and has reached a near limit for electrical provision on the current campus grid. In 2003, the building was named in honor of Dr. James E. Brooks, a former president of CWU. The building contains 143,324 square feet of floor space, of which about 106,000 square feet is assignable for public use.

At the time of the last review, space at the main campus library was considered inadequate or approaching inadequacy (Exhibit 5.E.33). Facilities at the university centers at the time of the last review were only adequate. Students relied on the courier service for delivery of materials, had fewer options for online resources, and CWU maintained only one branch library, at the SeaTac Center (now CWU-Des Moines).

**Current Situation**

Currently, the Brooks Library houses ten of its own service units as well as two separately administered services, Ellensburg Community Television and MTIS. The ten service units are: Archives and Special Collections; Cataloging; Circulation Services; Media Circulation; Collection Development; Government Publications, Maps and Microforms; Instruction and Outreach; Reference, including ILL and Music Listening; Serials; Systems; and the dean/senior administrator’s suite (Exhibits 5.E.34 and 5.E.10).

The physical and computing infrastructure is detailed in Table 5.2. Highlights are: two distance education capable classrooms; an instructional classroom in the Music Library; the Electronic Research and Instruction Center (Room 154); and a large group study room (the Fishbowl) which provides access to photocopiers. In spring 2007, an outside consultant, Mithūn, conducted a library programming, planning, and visioning study as part of a campus-wide facilities review. The report and draft recommendations are in Exhibit 5.E.35 (also see Standard 8.C).

| Table 5.2. Library Public Access Computers / Instructional Facilities / Study Rooms |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Room 154                                   | 30 PCs / Instructional room                 |
| Reference area (1st floor)                 | 30 PCs + 10 Macs                           |
| 1st floor                                  | 10 Macs (main hallway access)              |
| Serials area (2nd floor)                   | 8 PCs                                      |
| Government Publications (3rd floor)         | 5 PCs + 2 GIS machines + Microformat reader-scanners-printers |
| 4th floor                                  | 4 PCs                                      |
| Laptops                                    | 20 PCs and 4 Macs                          |
| Viewing carrels                            | 6                                          |
| CWU-Des Moines / Lynnwood                  | 4 PCs / 3 PCs                              |
| Room 305                                   | 12 PCs / Instructional room                |
| Room 409 (Music)                           | Instructional room                         |
| Rooms 152 and 153                          | Distance Education rooms                   |
| Assigned study carrels                     | 23                                         |
| Fishbowl (2nd floor)                       | Large open study group-study area + Photocopiers |
| Group study rooms                          | 6 (3 each on the 3rd and 4th floors)       |

*Standard 5 - 34*
The library utilizes an open-stacks system for patron access to most monographs and government publications. It maintains approximately 100 public-access computers as well as 24 laptops for checkout. The motion image collection and some of the CD audio collection are in closed stacks available when the library is open. The Media Circulation unit received approval in May 2009 from the Student Technology Fee Committee for up to $4500 in funds to purchase digital voice recorders, digital HD video cameras, a 20-inch iMac, and video editing software to address burgeoning student needs.

With the exception of two classified staff in the Government Publications unit, all faculty and staff and have assigned workspace that is adequate and secure. All library personnel have updated workstations and adequate computing capabilities. The library is on a three-year cycle for computer upgrades although current budget restraints could compromise that.

In summer of 2004, a large weeding project was undertaken to create space for the Archives and Special Collections resource area on the fourth floor. Over 18,000 items were removed from the collection. A weeding project has been undertaken in the bound periodicals area on the second floor, removing rarely used journals and some duplicated by online services. Collection Development also has a standing weeding procedure for monographs: every new edition purchased generates a review of the older edition(s). These actions have ameliorated the space concerns from 1999 (Exhibit 5.E.33).

In an effort to provide a more comfortable space for study, the main reference area in the first floor was remodeled in 2007. In early 2008 some minor modifications were made to the entrance lobby—an unwelcoming environment noted in the Mithūn report. Students are now appropriately using the new spaces for study (reference) and socializing and cell phone use (entryway).

The Music Library on the fourth floor was remodeled in late 2007. The instructional classroom was renovated with improved video, audio, and computer display modules, and two additional video viewing areas were created.

The atlases were moved from Reference on the 1st floor to join the rest of the cartographic collection in the Government Publications unit on the 3rd floor. Media Circulation provides faculty, staff, and students with access to a variety of motion image materials, as well as media equipment such as projectors, voice recorders, and digital video cameras. Wireless-capable laptop computers circulate from the Media Circulation desk. These 24 machines were checked out more than 12,000 times in the last two academic years and comprise over 60% of all Media Circulation transactions. There are six media viewing carrels available in Media Circulation and they are scheduled for some upgrading.

At the university centers, two new branches have been built in partnership with the co-located community colleges at CWU-Lynnwood and CWU-Des Moines. In 2003, the Yakima Valley College upgraded a number of buildings and facilities for students and faculty. In fall 2006, Wenatchee Valley College constructed new facilities. Students and faculty at CWU-Lynnwood and CWU-Des Moines are served by Brooks Library employees and the instruction and outreach librarian. For more on facilities at these locations, see Standard 8.1.

Library and information resources are readily accessible to all students and faculty. These resources and services are sufficient in quality, level, breadth, quantity, and currency to meet the requirements of the educational program (5.C.1). All public information services units maintain hours that meet the needs of the Ellensburg campus and the two libraries at the largest university centers (Exhibit 5.E.36).
Due to the vacancies, library staffing is barely sufficient at the moment to maintain support for students and faculty (see section 5.D.1). Students do have stable 24/7 access to all electronic resources and online services as well as adequate physical access to collections and services.

Computers available in the Brooks Library to students and faculty were presented in Table 5.2. Networked computers in Room 154 allow for direct student participation during instructional sessions and provide students opportunities to practice what they are learning. When the room is not in use for instruction, it is a public lab for student research, work on projects, etc. The computers are all equipped with the Microsoft Office suite of programs. Library computers now constitute the highest usage computer “lab” on campus, providing up to 43% of student computer access (Exhibit 5.E.37). The high utilization of these computers, combined with the high utilization of electronic resources (Exhibits 5.E.38–39), reflects the marked shift in means of information access that has occurred since the last review.

The Brooks Library Systems service unit maintains the internal network connectivity as well as hardware and software on library computers. Combined with the work of ITS, access to the electronic resources available from the Brooks Library is virtually 24/7 for all patrons from any networked computer. Campus-wide improvements to the computing infrastructure have been significant. Some highlights, drawn from the 2008 State of IT Report (Exhibit 5.E.25) are:

**Desktop Computing.** In 2004 over 50% of the desktop computers located in labs, classrooms, and offices were over 5 years old, and less than 15% of the equipment was being replaced annually. Today nearly 30% of desktop computers are replaced annually, resulting in a modern desktop environment and reduced maintenance costs.

**Network Architecture and Bandwidth.** CWU’s current network infrastructure provides a quality wired and wireless environment that meets the needs of faculty, staff, and students across the university. Prior to 2004-2005, wireless network access was virtually non-existent at CWU. Today, nearly every academic, administration, and student service facility has secure, state-of-the-art wireless access, including at many outdoor and recreational venues.

**Central Computing Environment.** The university has modern equipment located in its Central Computing Facility (servers, network equipment, ancillary equipment, etc.) This funding and the design/architecture of the environment allow Central to have a robust, reliable, and performance-based computing infrastructure designed to meet current needs and planned growth of applications on campus.

CWU Library Services has formed cooperative arrangements with other library and information resources. In these cases, formal documented agreements are established. These cooperative relationships and externally provided information sources complement rather than substitute for the institution’s own adequate and accessible core collection and services (5.C.2). The Brooks Library has entered into agreements with the community colleges at which the Centers are located. The library has also made agreements with local groups (Ellensburg Public Library and the Kittitas County Historical Museum) and regional ones as well to fulfill its mission and provide greater access to information resources for students and faculty. See Exhibits 5.E.22 and 5.E.40 as examples.
Appraisal of 5.C

While faced with budgetary challenges found at all institutions in the state, the university administration has worked with the Brooks Library, ITS, and MTIS to strategically improve the facilities and the components of the collection to address the emerging needs of CWU’s students and faculty. Physical access and online access to the collection is extensive and stable and supported institutionally in an integrated manner.

The fourth floor group study and open viewing area facilities have not been utilized as much as was expected. The updated classroom is very useful for outside faculty as well as for ongoing peer-to-peer instruction within the library. There are noted improvements in facilities at the university centers and on the Ellensburg campus. The recent strategic planning and visioning process for the Brooks Library facility, conducted with the outside consultant Mithūn, demonstrates the integration of the library into the campus vision, though it remains unclear what the overall commitment is to the results. Even so, the process was fruitful as is evident in some recent changes to the facility. Proposed changes would further enhance the facility.

Suggestions from patron assessments (e.g.: LibQUAL survey) are considered and investigated. For example, the student interest in loan period changes was considered, but the library had little flexibility to adopt policies that differed from the consortial loan periods of the Summit agreement. Some patron comments indicated a preference for extended hours at CWU-Des Moines and weekends on the Ellensburg campus. In response, the library now employs a temporary staff member at CWU-Des Moines and has altered its Brooks Library weekend hours. One suggestion for a 24-hour computer lab is being investigated and is included in the phase one project described in the Mithūn document (Exhibit 5.E.35).

CWU students, faculty, and staff enjoy state-of-the-art technology for their academic, administrative, and student life needs. Today, technology is truly ubiquitous across the university and is not only present in traditional classrooms and offices, but in support of Distance Education (DE), and online learning through the Blackboard Enterprise Learning Management System. The library is an active partner of the units that administer these services. In addition, CWU’s technology infrastructure continues to be modernized and refreshed to support the mission of the university and the trend to mobility of users. Wireless connectivity now exists in virtually every academic, student services, and administrative facility, along with numerous outdoor and athletic venues. With the construction of new residence halls (and remodeling of old), wireless is gradually being integrated into these facilities as well. More detail is available in Exhibit 5.E.25.

Based on data from program reviews, external accreditations, and internal surveys, the Brooks Library, ITS, and MTIS provide a high level of access to services and resources to students and faculty. These services and resources are sufficient in quality, level, breadth, quantity, and currency to meet the requirements of the educational program.

Standard 5.D - Personnel and Management

Historical Perspective

Staffing needs have changed in the last decade. Exhibit 5.E.34 shows the current organizational structure, IT units on campus, and the library’s 1999 organizational chart for comparison. The numbers, credentials, and organizational structure have adapted to meet programmatic needs and changes. Electronic resources and offerings at the university centers were growing in prominence in
1999. During the past decade, the university has expanded its programs and enrollments numbers at the university centers and emphasized research and creative activities for undergraduates via the SOURCE program (see Standard 2.C). Additionally, the university has strengthened the role of faculty research and placed an increased emphasis on the teacher-scholar model (See Standard 4).

**Current Situation**

The institution employs a sufficient number of library and information resources staff to provide assistance to users of the library and to students at other learning resources sites (5.D.1). Overall, the library employs 40 persons, essentially the same number as in 1999. The ITS Department has 1.5 FTE positions dedicated to providing training in many key technology areas for students, faculty, and staff. As mentioned in 5.C, the library houses ten service units. Currently, there are seven full-time vacancies in the library: full-time faculty in Archives (1) and Reference (2), one full-time administrative exempt (Circulation), one dean, and two classified staff (Catalog and Reference).

In 2004 the library used lines from vacancies to create the professional positions of instruction and outreach librarian, serials and electronic resources librarian, and archivist. These positions brought in the expertise needed to serve the university centers and support the Archives program. Classified employees were also moved to staff the branch libraries at CWU-Lynnwood and CWU-Des Moines.

The library has permanent staff at the service desks a majority of the time that it is open (See Table 5.3 and Exhibit 5.E.36). The number of personnel, when vacancies are filled, is adequate to maintain public service desk hours for the Brooks Library of 98.5 hours per week (57% of a 24/7 schedule) during the academic year and for 91 hours per week during the summer. These hours are slightly above those of its in-state peers, Eastern Washington University (85 hours) and Western Washington University (94.5 hours). ITS and MTIS maintain hours of operation and services that are comprehensive and covered in detail in Exhibit 5.E.25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hours open</th>
<th>Student staff only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWU-Des Moines</td>
<td>36 (Mon–Thu)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWU-Lynnwood</td>
<td>36 (Mon–Thu)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg: Reference</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>17 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg: Docs</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28 (33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 5.3, Library Service Hours |

Library and information resources staff include qualified professional and technical support staff, with required specific competencies, whose responsibilities are clearly defined (5.D.2). There are currently seven tenure-track librarians, three non-tenure track librarians, and 29 classified staff. Librarians are designated as faculty and have at least a master’s degree in library science. Current vitae and position descriptions for faculty are included in Exhibit 5.E.10. Position descriptions are reviewed yearly for classified staff. For faculty, workload agreements are developed every spring for the coming year in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) (See Standards 4, 6, and Exhibit 5.E.41).

CWU provides opportunities for professional growth for library and information resources professional staff (5.D.3). Professional development is Goal 3, Objective 3 of the ITS strategic plan (Exhibit 5.E.42), and MTIS adheres to the CWU Performance and Development Plan, Part 2: Training and Development Needs/Opportunities. There is a professional growth section in the performance management notebook for each employee in MTIS. Through 2003, each library department received annual funding for faculty and staff development. In general, all costs for attendance at professional activities were covered if the budget allowed it. Released time was granted to attend on-campus training, generally from the ITS and ETC units. The CBA was ratified in March 2006 and mandates funding for each faculty member for professional development. In 2006 the library implemented a policy not to augment CBA funds. This policy denies library faculty the ability to apply for Office of Graduate Studies and Research matching funds for travel to conferences after CBA funding has been expended (Cf. Standard 4.B).
In August 2006, library practice was changed so that non-faculty employees would receive only 50% of their costs to attend development activities or conferences, regardless of budget availability. Attendance and participation in on-campus trainings continue to be supported by released time.

Library and information resources and services are organized to support the accomplishment of institutional mission and goals (5.D.4). As described in section 5.A, the goals and objectives of all units are closely aligned with those of the institution. The library’s mission and goals were updated in summer 2007. The organizational structure of the library and related campus units is shown in Exhibit 5.E.34. The library has added the positions of archivist, instruction and outreach librarian, and increased the number of employees in Systems. The Media Circulation service unit reported to the head of Circulation until January 2009 and now reports directly to the dean.

Organizational arrangements recognize the need for service linkage among complementary resource bases (e.g., libraries, computing facilities, and instructional media and telecommunication centers) (5.D.4). The head of library systems is a member of the main cross-divisional committee regarding information technology, the University Information Technology Advisory Committee. The library has established and stabilized the duties of the instruction and outreach librarian to enhance services to students and faculty at the university centers.

The university consults library and information resources staff in curriculum development (5.D.5). Library faculty serve on the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, and the Graduate Council. New course and program proposals require a statement regarding the suitability of the library collection to adequately address the needs of the course or program (See Standard 2).

The university provides sufficient financial support for library and information resources and services, and for their maintenance and security (5.D.6). In 1998-1999 the university invested $2,795,785 in library staff and materials. In 2007-2008 the comparable amount was $3,935,545. These allocations are sufficient but not plentiful. Biennial capital funding of nearly $1,000,000 is made available to continually modernize and expand the network backbone and electronics on a three to four year cycle, assuring a high level of performance and reliability. Additional biennial funding is provided to modernize older local area networks. For the Brooks Library, during 2005-2006, the last year comparison data are available, CWU spent $3,269,626, $1,000,000 less than the nearest regional peer in the state and $334 per FTE student, $43 less than the nearest in-state peer. The collection development budget for the last five years has increased from $876,017 to $970,895. In purchasing power, however, assuming a 10% inflation rate for library materials in that period, that is a net reduction in purchasing power of $311,681 (See Exhibits 5.E.43 and 5.E.44 for more budget detail).

**Appraisal of 5.D**

The LibQUAL survey (Exhibit 5.E.14) testifies to the strength of the Brooks Library staff; 29 of 34 responses (85%) regarding staffing were positive remarks. Academic department self studies prepared for this accreditation also demonstrate an appreciation for the services provided by library faculty and staff. Negative comments found in either of these sources focus on insufficient resources and funding but support the library’s services and its budget priorities. Considering the contrast with peers in spending per student and the loss of purchasing power due to inflation, the positive assessment by the campus community reflects well on the expertise and quality of service of library personnel.

The library’s policies and the ALA Code of Ethics Principles (Exhibits 5.E.1 and 5.E.45) encourage professional growth by providing development opportunities for all library employees. Clearly the goals, the current policies, and the implementation of those policies are in conflict and undermine the improvements noted in the institution’s fifth year interim report (Exhibit 5.E.18). Some uncertainty and
an important challenge resides in the number of personnel vacancies and the turnover rate. The library faculty and staff look forward to improved management-personnel relations and staffing that is stable and qualified, in accordance with RCW 27.04.055 (Exhibit 5.E.45).

Through strategic internal reallocations, the Brooks Library, ITS, and MTIS have made proper decisions to assure that personnel are adequate in number and in areas of expertise to remain current with the scholarly publishing environment and to provide services in the development and use of library and information resources provided to their students and faculty.

**Standard 5.E - Planning and Evaluation**

### Historical Perspective

The library has been included in university planning processes since the first long-range plan was written in 1992. In addition, the library created its own strategic plan in 1999 (Exhibit 5.E.2). In 2002 the university implemented a systematic academic program review schedule. The structure of the program review has varied somewhat over time, but all reviews have included an assessment of library and technological resources by location (Exhibit 2.E.14). In 2006 CWU's Academic Affairs Division finished its strategic plan for 2006-2012 (Exhibit 2.E.11), including plans for library resources. As a United States depository library, the Government Publications, Maps, and Microforms service unit is required to have a plan for its materials (Exhibits 5.E.46-48).

The university has had a Library Advisory Committee for many years, as well as the liaisons program and library faculty membership on appropriate senate and campus committees. Evaluations of resources and services have come from all of these sources and the Library Suggestion Box in the library online catalog. Surveys, such as LibQUAL in 2007 and those produced in-house in 1995 (referenced in Exhibit 5.E.49), are administered to the campus community as needed to determine areas of strength and challenge.

At the time of the last review in 1999, it was noted that “the formal planning process provides an opportunity for coordination between different areas of campus; however, it has not always achieved optimal linkages between units that must collaborate . . . Efforts to improve integrated planning already are underway, but some problems remain” (Exhibit 5.E.49, p. 17-18). The library’s planning process over the review period changed and includes widespread participation. In response to increased student enrollment away from the Ellensburg campus, library staff created the new outreach faculty position and dedicated staffing at CWU-Lynnwood.

### Current Situation

*The university’s library services have a planning process that involves users, library and information resource staff, faculty, and administrators (5.E.1).* Library policies are publicly available, and the process involves all campus constituents. The Collection Development Policy (CDP), revised in 2007 (Exhibit 5.E.16), and others guide faculty responsible for building collections and services for instructional programs and research needs. The CDP directs the acquisition and maintenance of library resources, sets priorities, and distributes decision-making responsibilities. The CDP is augmented by other procedures, especially those regarding weeding and materials withdrawal (Exhibit 5.E.50). These policies are shared with the campus via departmental liaisons and the library website.

In summer 2006 the library began an annual summer retreat for library faculty, the dean, and the administrative exempt employee who served as head of the circulation services unit. These were one-
day planning sessions for the next academic year’s activities. At these retreats the mission and goals of the library were reviewed and updated. In spring 2008, the library underwent an organizational culture assessment after a change in leadership and also an internal audit of processes. Both had positive outcomes; their results are in Exhibits 5.E.51 and 5.E.52 respectively.

Information technology initiatives at CWU are managed by an effective information technology governance structure. The two primary governance bodies are the Enterprise Information Systems (EIS) Governance Team which oversees enterprise business and student administration systems such as CWU’s PeopleSoft Human Resource, Financial Services Campus Solutions (Student Administration) modules; and the UITAC which focuses on academic and infrastructure technology initiatives. See Exhibit 5.E.15 for the UITAC membership and mission statement. Both of these groups report through the Assistant Vice-President for Information Technology to the IT Executive Steering Committee whose membership includes a member of the President’s Cabinet. Planning for technology on campus has matured via the UITAC and overall communications between the library, ITS, and MTIS.

The institution, in its planning, recognizes the need for management and technical linkages among information resource bases (e.g., libraries, instructional computing, media production and distribution centers, and telecommunications networks) (5.E.2). Since the time of the last review, CWU has made a more concerted effort for cross-divisional planning of information resources. In addition to the primary governance structures mentioned in Standard 5.E.2, two other groups provide specialized IT governance. These are the Student Technology Advisory Committee (Exhibit 5.E.25), which oversees the yearly expenditure of nearly $800,000 in student technology fee funding; and the University Communication Team, which focuses on consolidated communication technology infrastructures and utilities. Information on the CWU IT Governance Structure is in Exhibit 5.E.25. As mentioned in Section 5.C, the Media Circulation unit purchased computers for student use in the library with a $4500 grant from the Student Technology Fee Committee in May 2009.

The institution regularly and systematically evaluates the quality, adequacy, and utilization of its library and information resources and services, including those provided through cooperative arrangements, and at all locations where courses, programs, or degrees are offered. The institution uses the results of the evaluations to improve the effectiveness of these resources (5.E.3). As already mentioned, the systematic academic program review process includes an assessment of library resources and services. While cooperative arrangements (e.g.: the Summit catalog and services) are not specified in the review requirements, they are positively commented upon as a great asset to scholarly activities. Institutional Research includes ratings of the library and computing labs in graduating senior survey. (Also see Appraisal of 5.B). MTIS conducts and utilizes surveys of faculty (Exhibits 5.E.53, 5.E.54, 5.E.55). Monthly reports from ITS assessing its activities are publicly available and relate directly to its strategic plan.

The library’s major comprehensive evaluation during this review period was the LibQUAL survey, conducted in spring 2007 and scheduled for fall 2009 (Exhibit 5.E.14). LibQUAL is an industry-standard assessment tool of student and faculty perceived satisfaction. The 239 undergraduates, 91 graduates, and 69 faculty who responded indicated overall satisfaction in most areas of library services and resources. The library instituted changes where solutions to problems were possible (see also Appraisal of 5.C). All campus units have initiated changes in services and staffing over the review period to meet emerging needs of students and faculty.

**Appraisal of 5.E**

The current process of strategic planning provides an opportunity to integrate the various facets of information resources and avoid unnecessary duplication by forming appropriate linkages. A major
cross-divisional structure exists and links management of several information resource bases; libraries, instructional computing, media production and distribution centers, and telecommunications networks. An overall atmosphere of both formal and informal cooperation exists among the divisions and departments responsible for the management of information technology.

The academic program review process provides a systematic evaluation of resources as do specialized accreditation processes. An effort should be made by the library in the future to receive a copy of each such review so that this information can be better incorporated into the library's planning processes. The creation of the Instruction and outreach librarian position adds a means of gathering information from widespread sites. Although the library has not created a new strategic plan since 1999, it has been active in planning for new resources and services. The initiation of an annual retreat helped fill the gap of strategic long-range planning, but is not a substitute for it. There are institutional structures in place that require departmental and program assessments of library services and resources at all locations.

**Summary of Standard 5**

External accreditations and internal assessments show that CWU’s information resources and services are sufficient to accomplish its mission and goals. Library and information resources support the institution’s teaching, learning, and research mission and goals. Information resources and services are adequate and appropriate for the degrees and programs offered at all sites.

CWU has more consistently than in the past worked collaboratively to focus its goals and plan a successful path to achieve them. The Brooks Library, ITS, and MTIS have clearly stated missions and goals which are current and explicitly tied to the university's. Structures are in place that utilize and facilitate cooperation among library, ITS, and MTIS, and instructional faculty to provide information resources that meet educational program needs at the sites where those programs are offered.

The faculty and staff of the Brooks Library have implemented and maintain up-to-date methods of instructing students and faculty. All units strategically employ information technology that supports the evolving scholarly environment of students and faculty alike. While faced with budgetary challenges, the university administration has worked with all units to improve information facilities and resources. Physical access and online access to the collection are extensive, stable, and supported institutionally in an integrated manner. Other indications of the integration of library and information resources into the institutional planning process are the improvements in facilities at all sites and the recent strategic planning process conducted with the outside consultant Mithûn.

Some faculty and graduate students would benefit from increased on-site holdings of materials in their disciplines, yet it is clear from assessments that at this time students and faculty have sufficient resources and equipment to access needed resources for curricular and scholarly pursuits. The library and ITS are members of important regional networks which greatly enhance the resources students and faculty have at their disposal. Established cooperative agreements provide a significant benefit for students and faculty, both in borrowing materials and in the leveraged purchasing of electronic full-text journals and archives. The frequent and systematic communication between library personnel, ITS/MTIS staff, and the instructional faculty helps assure that institutional cooperative relationships and externally provided information sources complement rather than substitute for the university’s own adequate and accessible core resources.

Library and ITS/MTIS personnel are well qualified for their positions; the high number of vacancies in permanent positions in the library, somewhat alleviated by recent hires of non-tenure track faculty, strain the university’s ability to provide its best services in all areas. The library faculty and staff
maintain their expertise by attending professional meetings and external workshops despite some funding reductions which deviate from published library goals and ALA Code of Ethics Principles to support professional growth. The faculty and staff in the library look forward to a new dean and stability in leadership that will facilitate the realization of library goals and mission.

University committees and the university’s five-year review cycle provide a wide array of input regarding information services and resources to help assure that they are sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, and currency. Cross-divisional structures exist and link management of several information technology and resource bases: libraries, instructional computing, media production, and telecommunications networks. The library’s recently completed program review and this accreditation report could form a sound basis for a new library strategic plan. Informal campus communications are utilized and demonstrate that an overall atmosphere of cooperation exists among the divisions and departments responsible for the management of information technology and learning resources.

Gate count, circulation statistics, the use of electronic resources, and the use statistics for the computers within the library, are generally trending upward. These quantitative indicators complement the supportive comments in the assessments which indicate the adequacy of library and information resources and services provided by Central Washington University.
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Standard 6 – Governance and Administration

Central Washington University's system of governance provides many and varied opportunities for leadership. Since each component of the system is defined by its relationship to the whole, shared governance enables the university to make strides toward expressing its core values. Central's current leadership encourages different constituencies to influence discussions of key issues related to Central's overall mission. For example, Standard 1 provides a thorough discussion of how Central revised its Mission and Strategic Action Plan in a collaborative fashion. All university committees are designed to have broad representation from the campus community.

Standard 6.A – Governance System

**Historical Perspective**

In 1999, the NASC evaluation team recommended that the “the Board, administration, faculty, staff, and students undertake a major commitment to revitalize and strengthen governance and administration at Central.” Since that finding, the Board of Trustees has invited additional constituent groups to participate during board meetings, the faculty has unionized, the number of vice-presidential divisions was reduced and constituent departments realigned, and the President’s Advisory Council membership has expanded. Additionally, channels of communication throughout the campus community have been strengthened through the use of intranet and email, electronic circulation of the University Bulletin, and non-tenure-track faculty representation on the Faculty Senate. The university’s web environment has expanded and is extensively used. Fireside chats for students with members of the President’s Cabinet have become a quarterly favorite. Building on successful governance mechanisms established prior to 1999 and modified since, the university’s governance structure has adjusted to additional pressures in the past ten years and remains vital. The policies of the university undergo regular review and revision, resulting in several changes over the decade.

The 1999 NASC recommendation regarding governance was replaced by commendations for progress in the 2001 NWCCU focused visit and the 2004 regular interim visit.

**Current Situation**

Central Washington University is a single-unit governance system (6.A.4) with a residential campus, six university centers, and three smaller teaching sites. The residential campus in Ellensburg is the main delivery site and the home base of the large majority of the university’s personnel. Program directors and administrative staff at the centers serve as liaisons to the Ellensburg campus. Departments and colleges develop and approve academic programs for implementation at all sites. The current executive level organization chart may be viewed in Appendix 6.A.1. In addition to this overview, organization charts are provided for the Divisions of Academic Affairs (Appendix 6.A.2), Business and Financial Affairs (Appendix 6.A.3), Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (Appendix 6.A.4), and University Relations (Appendix 6.A.5). As a public institution of higher education in the state of Washington, CWU was established by the legislature and the regulations for its operation are included in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) (Exhibit 6.E.1). This serves as both the institution’s articles of incorporation and its by-laws and is supplemented by the CWU Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3).

The university’s system of governance ensures that the authority, responsibilities, and relationships among and between the board of trustees, administrators, faculty, staff, and students are clearly described in the CWU Policies Manual (6.A.1). The CWU Policies Manual is the official policy document.
for the entire university. Now completely online, the manual is available on the university’s web site (Exhibit GE.3) and includes the following sections: Board of Trustees, General University Policies and Organization, Administrative Offices, Academic Code, Academic Affairs, Exempt Employees’ Code, Business and Financial Affairs, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, and sections of the Washington Administrative Code (Title 106) relevant to Central Washington University. The policies are subject to continual review and revision, and the dates of policy development reflect a dynamic review and revision process. The other standards of this self study discuss the specialized policies and procedures documents of various units of the university. These unit policies all are consistent with the provisions of the CWU Policies Manual.

The board of trustees, administrators, faculty, staff, and students understand and fulfill their respective roles as set forth by the university’s official documents (6.A.2). Information about roles is widely distributed, and the continuous process of review and revision of policies speaks to efforts to ensure the clarity of the university’s official documents. In the various minutes from student, staff, faculty, and administrative organizations, their respective roles as detailed in the Policies Manual are frequently discussed. Each of these sets of minutes may be found online: the Associated Students of Central Washington University (Exhibit 6.E.2), the Faculty Senate (Exhibit 6.E.3), the Employee Council (Exhibit 6.E.4), and the Exempt Employees Association (Exhibit 6.E.5) are structural entities that communicate to their constituents their respective roles and represent these constituents to the university community. The bylaws and mission and goals statements for the various university organizations also depict a clear understanding of the roles each entity plays in relation to the university’s mission.

Soon after the state legislature passed enabling legislation, the faculty voted to unionize in 2004. Since 2006, the faculty has been represented by a collective bargaining unit, the United Faculty of Central (Exhibit GE.7). Portions of the university’s classified staff are represented by the Washington Federation of State Employees (Exhibit 6.E.6) and the Public School Employees of Washington. Those classified staff not covered by collective bargaining have specific published guidelines regarding layoff procedures (Exhibit 6.E.7), per Department of Personnel rules (WAC 357-46). Administrative exempt employees are governed by the Exempt Employees Code, Part 6 of the CWU Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3).

Throughout the ratification process of the CBAs, the various faculty and staff organizations updated their bylaws to reflect their changing roles. The faculty senate (Exhibit 6.E.8) and the employee council (Exhibit 6.E.9) both have worked closely with administration and union representatives in drafting their policies. The exempt employee association (Exhibit 6.E.10), which is not unionized, has also worked closely with administration in updating its bylaws. Human Resources maintains a file of position descriptions for each job. Descriptions for senior administrative positions are provided here (Exhibit 6.E.11).

The policies of the university describe a structure of shared governance. They call for the participation of faculty, staff, exempt employees, and students and consideration of their views at various, though not all, levels of decision-making. The university’s governing policies make provision for the consideration of faculty, student, and staff views and judgments in those matters in which these constituencies have a direct and reasonable interest (6.A.3). These policies are collected in the CWU Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3). The Academic Code (Exhibit GE.3, Part 4) describes faculty participation in decision-making, and Sections 0.003 and 1.03 of the Exempt Employees’ Code (Exhibit GE.3, Part 6) speak to participation in decision-making. The CBA also provides faculty with a voice regarding wages, salaries, and working conditions.

Standard 6 - 47
The Board of Trustees includes a student member, as provided by state law. The Board of Trustees has invited the chairs of the Associated Students of Central Washington University Board of Directors and the Faculty Senate and on a quarterly rotation, the chair of the Exempt Employees Association, the Employee Council, and the classified staff union to sit with the board and present reports. This practice will be reviewed in late 2009 because only the participation of the Exempt Employees Association is stipulated in the board’s bylaws.

In order to further clarify the roles of faculty and administrators, a dispute resolution section was added to the CWU Academic Code in 2008. This document (Exhibit 6.E.12) establishes an appeal and resolution process appropriate for disagreements and conflicts involving faculty that fall outside the CBA or other university policies. Issues covered by this policy include, but are not limited to:

- disputes between faculty members on issues of collegiality, professionalism, civility, etc.;
- disputes between administration and faculty regarding the grade of a student or other matters pertaining to classroom management and instruction, and
- matters of academic policy administration (see Exhibit GE.3, part 5).

**Appraisal of 6.A**

Central Washington University historically has organized its staff into three categories: faculty, exempt employees, and classified staff, even though there are important subdivisions within these groups that bear on their rights and responsibilities. Information on collective bargaining agreements for all groups is detailed in Exhibit 6.E.13, documenting the university’s compliance with NWCCU Policy 6.2.

The breadth of positions encompassed by the administrative exempt category—administrative, managerial, and professional employees—has led to some concerns about the growing functions and commensurate growing size of the university's administrative ranks. For example, Student Affairs saw growth in its Civic Engagement Center and Center for Excellence and Leadership; Academic Affairs grew with the development of the Faculty Relations Office. There have also been concerns voiced regarding the way shared governance worked in the past. As the university entered the era of faculty collective bargaining, a new understanding of shared governance was required and that understanding has only recently begun to solidify.

The current system of governance and policies of the university promote shared governance and participation by members of the university community. Students, faculty, and classified and exempt staff have formal and informal avenues through which their opinions can be presented to upper-level administrators and the Board of Trustees. Despite this openness, there is room for growth. Faculty and staff have asked for more opportunities to meet with upper-level administrators and the Board of Trustees. Additional interactions could lead to fewer misunderstandings and more objective differences of opinion.

For example, faculty and administrators have different interpretations of the percentage of the entire university budget directed to academic affairs over the decade, depending on what is included in the entire budget. Both President McIntyre during her tenure and President Gaudino have been committed to sharing the university's budget numbers and finding agreement on this issue. The potential for the global recession to result in losses of faculty positions has given added weight to this issue. Shared understanding is a challenge that openness and continued collegial discussion can meet.

Changes in administrative positions have occurred over the study period. For example, the university has added a chief planning officer, reduced the associate vice president for faculty affairs to an assistant VP, and created an associate VP for student affairs. In 2001 the university merged the division of Student Affairs and the division of Enrollment Management into the Division of Student Affairs.
Affairs and Enrollment Management, replacing two vice presidents with one. Changes in staffing budgets have followed these actions.

The leadership of the university has changed markedly over the past two years. From 2007 to 2009, new administrators stepped into roles as college deans for two of the four colleges and the library, the dean of the graduate school, the provost, the associate vice president for undergraduate studies, the vice president for business affairs, the vice president for university relations, and the president. In recent years, changes have led to improved cooperation with the faculty union and more tenure-track faculty have been hired. One such cooperative change, which was also a response to recommendations from the 1999 NASC report, involved the tenure and promotion system. Prior to the beginning of the academic year, a calendar of personnel events is now emailed to faculty (Exhibit 6.E.14).

Changes outside of academic affairs have also strengthened the structure of leadership. The Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management provides a myriad of services, programs, and accommodations that directly enhance student success at Central Washington University. Standard 3 describes how these 19 departments provide programs and services to enroll, retain, and graduate diverse students.

Overall, the governance of the university has undergone substantial change. Given the number of new deans, a new provost, and president, more time must pass before the university as a whole can assess the effectiveness of this new group. Even though CWU has a smaller proportion of administrators than its in-state peers, there has been some concern regarding the growth of new administrators across the campus. For example, the Department of Education recently divided into four departments, the Department of Health, Human Performance, and Nutrition split into two departments, and the College of Education and Professional Studies is discussing dividing into two colleges.

**Standard 6.B – Governing Board**

**Historical Perspective**

The Central Washington University Board of Trustees is appointed by the governor of the state of Washington under authority and requirements in RCW 28B and has been in continuous existence since the university’s founding in 1891. Board members are not financially compensated for their services, except for travel reimbursement for meetings.

Between 1892 and 1896, the board was comprised of six state-appointed members and three local members. In 1896, the board of trustees was reduced to three or four members. In 1957, the board grew to five appointed members. The legislature increased board membership to seven members in November 1985 and added a student trustee to governing boards in 1998.

The relationship of the board to university personnel has passed through several stages. Tensions arose during the 1992 presidential search. These issues were noted in the 1999 NASC report, and led to fundamental changes in the board’s subsequent hiring practices. When selecting presidents McIntyre and Gaudino, the board sought input from the university community in the development of the leadership profiles and the job descriptions. A member of the faculty chaired the search committee; a member of the Ellensburg business community sat on the committee, and the number of student members rose from one to two. The board’s willingness to seek community involvement has led to an increased respect for the way the board has functioned.
**Current Situation**

The board of trustees includes adequate representation of the public interest and/or the diverse elements of the institution’s constituencies (6.B.1). Central Washington University has an eight-member board, one of whom is a student member (Appendix 6.A.6). Board members are citizens of the state of Washington who are appointed by the governor. Typically, at least one member is appointed from the three largest cities surrounding the residential campus, Ellensburg, Yakima, and Wenatchee. The current board has a member from each of these general areas and Spokane. Three additional members are from the western part of the state where the three largest university centers are located and from which a large percentage of the university's student body is drawn. The student member was added to the board in 1997–98 as a result of state enabling legislation following advocacy by student governments from throughout the state. The student member is given all rights of other members of the board, except that he or she cannot participate in or vote on personnel matters. The CWU governing board’s membership is culturally diverse and gender balanced. In the past ten years, board membership has included one African American, two Latino/as, and one Asian American. During the 2007–2008 academic year, women and men were equally represented. In June 2009, there were four women, two men and two open positions.

Policies are in place that provide for continuity and change of board membership (6.B.1). Rotation of board members is established by RCW 28B.35.100 (Exhibit 6.E.15). Board members serve a term of six years except for student members who serve only one year, and the terms are staggered to prevent more than two members from leaving during a given year. Board members are appointed by the governor.

University employees, including the president, do not serve on the board. (6.B.1) The president reports to the board. The chair and vice chair of the board are elected from among the voting members according to policies established in section 1-10.040 of the CWU Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3). The treasurer and secretary are elected from the university administrative staff and are not members of the board. For a list of board members and officers from 1999 to 2009, see Appendix 6.A.7.

The board acts only as a committee of the whole. No member or subcommittee of the board acts in place of the board except by formal delegation of authority (6.B.2). Section 1-2 of the CWU Policies Manual states that “[the board] governs the university as a body representing the people, and individual members have no authority. No member can bind the board by word or action, unless the board has, in its corporate capacity, designated that trustee as its agent for some specific purpose, and then that person can go no further than he or she has been empowered. Even during a regular meeting of the board, its control is exercised as a body and the individual member has no right beyond his or her own voice in any matter.” When committees meet, they report to the board as a whole. The standing committees include Academic Affairs, Resources/Audit, and Student Affairs. The board’s commitment to function as a unit is documented in the board’s minutes and in the video recordings of its meetings, made public on the university web site (see Exhibit 6.E.16).

The duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, organizational structure, and operating procedures of the board are clearly defined in published policy documents (6.B.3). The governor of the state of Washington provides instruction to newly appointed members of the Board of Trustees regarding their duties and ethical standards (Exhibit 6.E.17). The board operates under the guidelines of RCW 42.52, Ethics in Public Service (Exhibit 6.E.18). The RCW details the financial reporting requirements of public officials including members of the Central Washington University Board of Trustees [RCW 42.17.2401(4)]. This code includes specific restrictions and details the powers of the board (RCW 28B.35).
The duties, responsibilities, organizational structure, ethical standards, and operating procedures of the board are also defined in sections 1-10 through 1-80 of the CWU Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3). The manual includes a statement of professional ethics for the Board of Trustees, indicating that the board is subject to the laws of the state of Washington regulating ethical behavior. Specifically, there are provisions related to the open public meeting act, public disclosure requirements, and ethics in public service. These guidelines are in keeping with the ethical guidelines set down in RCW 42.52: Ethics in Public Service (Exhibit 6.E.18).

All formal actions of the board are included in its minutes (Exhibit 6.E.16). Personnel and other actions routinely are approved as consent items by numbered reference to a consent agenda. The university operates six centers throughout the state in addition to the Ellensburg campus, and one board meeting each year is held at one of the centers on a rotating basis.

Consistent with established board policy, the board selects, appoints, and regularly evaluates the president (6.B.4). RCW 28B.35.120 (2) empowers the trustees to employ the president, but it does not dictate the procedure whereby the board selects and appoints the president (Exhibit 6.E.19). Because the selection and appointment of a president happens infrequently, the procedure is established on each occasion according to the conditions that exist at the time.

The Board of Trustees is charged with performing presidential review in Section 1.1-6 of the CWU Policies Manual. In compliance with the president's contract (Exhibit 6.E.20) and the exempt employees' code, the board annually reviews the performance of the president. The president first conducts a self-evaluation based on performance goals that have been established for the year. The self evaluation forms the basis of discussion between members of the board and the president. The president receives either verbal or written performance feedback, including commendations and recommendations.

The board regularly reviews and approves the university mission. It approves all major academic programs of study, degrees, certificates, and diplomas. It approves major substantive changes in institutional mission, policies, and programs (6.B.5). Section 1-1.6 of the Policies Manual requires the board to review the university's mission statement (Exhibit GE.1) at least every ten years. In 2006 the board revisited and reaffirmed the current mission statement, originally adopted in 2000. Since that time, the board has engaged in on-going discussions about the mission statement (See Standard 1). The board also reviews and approves all degree programs of the university (Policies Manual Section 1-1.6) (Exhibit 6.E.16).

The board regularly evaluates its performance and revises, as necessary, its policies to demonstrate to its constituencies that it carries out its responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner (6.B.6). In 2007, the Board of Trustees and president participated in the board’s most recent joint external evaluation. A consultant from the National Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges facilitated the process. Focusing on priorities for the future and presidential transition, the consultant encouraged the board to set ambitious goals for the university and develop a leadership partnership with the president to achieve university aspirations. The consultant praised the leadership team for providing “a high quality, attractive and safe place for students to live and learn” (Exhibit 6.E.21). He noted that the president’s strong and capable leadership had led the board to be less active, and he recommended it take a more active role as it hires and welcomes a new president. He encouraged the board to be involved in finding ways to help Central become “a premier comprehensive university.” He noted recent stumbles in the university’s efforts with respect to two specialized accreditations—the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and the American Association of Colleges and Schools of Business—and cautioned the board to be particularly vigilant and set clear expectations about specialized accreditation. It will be important to watch the BOT during the early phases of the
Gaudino presidency to see if the board takes a more active presence regarding the university's direction. In May 2009, the board heard and made concessions to a peaceful student protest regarding planned tuition raises. Such interaction with campus groups is a positive sign.

The board also holds retreats to discuss its function and responsibilities, typically during the summer months. At the 2007 board retreat, the trustees examined strategic planning issues and determined a process to discuss the issues in detail during the academic year meeting schedule. The 2008 retreat focused on presidential search and transition matters. A scholarly faculty presentation or performance is a regular feature of summer board retreats.

Board meetings also comply with open meeting laws (Exhibit GE.3, 1-50.020). Meetings are broadcast over KCUW-TV, the university's television station, transmitted by distance education technology to select university centers, and available live on the Internet via streaming video. A video record is maintained of board meetings. Meeting minutes are available on the board web site (Exhibit 6.E.16). In addition, the trustees meet with different groups of constituents to seek their input on a variety of topics of concern to the welfare of the university.

The Board of Trustees has final authority for setting direction and policy for the university. In addition, the board oversees the academic integrity and financial health of the university. Through the president, it ensures that the university is organized and staffed to reflect its mission, size, and complexity. Through the president, it approves an academic and administrative structure to which it delegates the responsibility for effective and efficient management (6.B.7). The board operates within the guidelines of RCW 28B.35.120 (Exhibit 6.E.19), conferring upon it the “full control of the regional university and its property of various kinds, except as otherwise provided by law.” Through Section 1-1.7 of the CWU Policies Manual, the Board of Trustees may and does “delegate to university groups or individuals certain appropriate operating responsibilities.” Section 1.80 identifies those delegations of authority, specifically “appointing authority” and “contracting authority” (Exhibit GE.3). The Board of Trustees and its appointed officers operate within the regulations of the state of Washington, including the expressed budgetary and operational guidelines and limitations that are an integral part of operating as an agency of the state.

The board takes no direct hand in managing the university. Rather, it relies on the president to make such decisions, and it insures that the president is doing so by routine oversight and evaluation (Exhibit GE.3, Section 1–20). The board evaluates the performance of the president who is responsible for ensuring that the institution is organized and staffed to reflect its mission, size, and complexity and that the university operates with an effective academic and administrative structure. The board meets with and receives reports from college deans, the provost, and the president. Representatives of constituent groups within the university, for example vice presidents, student body president, faculty senate chair, and exempt association chair may participate during board meetings, and each may submit a report to the board at each meeting (Exhibit GE.3, Sections 1-70-020). Board members address questions to these representatives and consider their recommendations.

To clarify the board’s policy-making delegation and affirm the board’s trust in the president’s ability to make necessary policy judgments, the board adopted a resolution in December 2003 delegating certain authority to the president and retaining all other authority as outlined in Part 1-1.6 of the CWU Policies Manual. In February 2004, the board adjusted language in Part 1-1.6 to reflect twelve general powers and duties carried out by the board as prescribed by law (RCW 28B.35.120, Exhibit 6.E.19). Those areas include review and approval of the budget, review of the fiscal audits of the university, approval of all degree program additions and deletions, setting tuition and fees within state guidelines, agreements with employee groups (employee benefits, bargaining agreements, faculty and exempt code), ethics and nondiscrimination policies, health and safety, athletics, and student policies. That
RCW section also states that during each ten-year period the board will review the mission statement of the university and conduct a formal evaluation of itself. All other authority has been delegated to the president unless modified by the board. The president is under obligation to keep the board informed of policy-making decisions [Exhibit GE.3, Sections 1-60-040].

The board approves the annual budget and the long-range financial plan, and reviews periodic fiscal audit reports (6.B.8). The president and the vice president for business and financial affairs report regularly on the financial status of the institution. The board approves budget requests and the operating budget of the university (Exhibit GE.3, 1-60-040) (Exhibit 6.E.16). It receives and reviews each fiscal audit when it is completed.

The board is knowledgeable of the university’s accreditation status and is involved, as appropriate, in the accreditation process (6.B.9). The president or provost, who is the accreditation liaison officer for the university, regularly reports to the board about accreditation status. When the university or a unit of the university is preparing for an impending accreditation visit, the provost or designee provides status reports to the board. The board receives copies of the standards of accrediting bodies, and it receives written reports about the progress toward accreditation. The various accrediting boards for university programs are provided in Exhibit 2.E.15. The board receives updates on all accreditation visits, as is indicated in the minutes.

**Appraisal of 6.B**

All of the Board of Trustee’s resolutions and motions are posted on the board’s website (Exhibit 6.E.22). The university publishes Campus Life, as a means of providing the community at large with up-to-date information about the university (Exhibit 6.E.23). The president’s state of the university report is also archived on the president’s web page (Exhibit 6.E.24).

Board members as a group seem concerned about and take pride in their work on behalf of the university. They attempt to fulfill their responsibilities and maintain a sense of community. The board invites informal feedback through meetings with constituents. Meetings are streamed across the university web site and open the public. It acts as a unit, has a well-developed set of policies that guide practice, and makes both the policies and its actions available to members of the university community and to the public. Dissenting views are encouraged and valued, and both the board and administrators revise their positions or policy on the basis of input from the university community.

The board could continue to improve its feel of the university’s pulse. Few campus faculty and staff interact with board members, and limited interactions have led some to see the board as aloof. Quarterly lunches with faculty might help to alleviate this. Trustful relations between the board and university units will be increasingly important as the consequences of the global economic recession emerge. The addition of a student member to the Board of Trustees during the 1998–1999 academic year addressed a longstanding request of students and has brought an important student perspective to board decisions. The board must continue to work collaboratively with student government to ensure that new student board members understand the role of the student trustee.

The board has also attended to faculty concerns and continues to seek ways to know more about the faculty role at the university and to endorse publicly the important role of faculty. One of the important challenges in the coming era will be to find ways to remain abreast of faculty and staff concerns as they arise and to create a strong working relationship with the new president. Creating additional mechanisms for feedback would help in this regard.
Perhaps the most important duty of any board of trustees is the appointment of a new university president. The process for choosing a new president encourages greater engagement by faculty and students and enhanced transparency. For example, during the most recent presidential search, open forums were offered, forums at the centers were provided, the committee asked the campus what qualities they wanted in a president, and the NWCCU accreditation committee met with all candidates.

**Standard 6.C – Leadership and Management**

*Historical Perspective*

At the time of the last full-scale review, the university was under the leadership of an interim president. The previous president had left the university following a vote of no confidence. The interim president, Dr. James (Dolph) Norton, set the stage for a new president to inherit a more positive and energized campus. He empanelled a committee to review the leadership structure and make recommendations for change. From that work, the number of vice presidents was reduced from six to four, in concert with a reorganization of several divisions of the university. He implemented the recommendation of the 1999 NASC evaluation team that the university come to closure on a mission statement. The new mission statement was developed early in 2000.

Dr. Jerilyn S. McIntyre became the 13th president of Central Washington University in 2000. President McIntyre was the first woman to serve as the president of CWU. With a commitment to excellence in academics, research, and educational resources, President McIntyre’s leadership positioned the university as a well respected regional comprehensive institution in Washington state. During Dr. McIntyre's tenure, the university completed extensive renovation and restoration of the historic Kamola and Sue Lombard residence halls and ground was broken for a new 476 bed residence hall in summer of 2008. The Music Education Building and the Student Union and Recreation Center, funded and constructed during her tenure, have been recognized with national architectural awards. Over the last seven years construction and renovation projects provided state-of-the-art facilities at CWU's university centers in Lynnwood, Des Moines, Steilacoom, Wenatchee, Moses Lake, and Yakima. For more information on these projects, see Standard 8.

President McIntyre improved the university's communication with students, parents, policymakers, and the public. The Performing Arts and Presidential Speaker Series, which McIntyre initiated in 2002, has brought nationally renowned speakers and artists to Ellensburg, providing a window through which to view various ideas, cultures, and art forms. McIntyre also encouraged excellence and creativity through the Spheres of Distinction initiative (Exhibit 2.E.5), which supports innovative and resourceful approaches to academic, student, and campus life. These spheres were defined as “innovative and resourceful approaches to academic, student, and campus life giving regional, national, or international prominence to Central Washington University.”

Under McIntyre's leadership, the university began its first comprehensive fund-raising campaign, surpassing its $21-million goal by June 2008 (see Standard 7.D). In addition, funding associated with grants and research has tripled since 2001 to $9.5 million (see Standard 2.A). In Sept. 2007, McIntyre proposed and won support from the Board of Trustees to create the CWU Research Foundation (see Standard 7). The foundation will enable the university to manage the significant increase in research funding and to use its expertise to serve the community in a more agile and responsive way.
**Current Situation**

Dr. McIntyre announced her decision to retire in December 2008. James L. Gaudino was hired on January 1, 2009. Careful attention was given to the position description, which may be viewed in Exhibit 6.E.25. Under the section on Qualifications and Qualities, this document explains that the president is “the chief executive officer of the university and is responsible for all operations including overall leadership and guidance of the institution, its academic and student life programs, fund raising, and the maintenance and administration of resources.” The new president will have the opportunity to assist the university in the following ways:

- Enhance funding for Central through interactions with federal, state, local and private individuals and organizations; build on strong relationships with regional businesses.
- Build upon recent successes to augment the university’s reputation, maintain or increase student enrollment, and improve retention.
- Provide collaborative leadership that will define the next exciting phase of university growth and achievement.
- Enhance the ability of faculty and staff to deliver exceptional academic and student life programs.
- Provide leadership in a collaborative process that defines and markets CWU’s distinctive characteristics.
- Create a more integrated and cohesive institution by strengthening connections between the Ellensburg campus and the university centers.
- Continue to diversify the university through thoughtful attention to recruitment and retention of a diverse workforce and student body; provide leadership and support for enhancing an environment that values a diversity of ideas, experiences and beliefs, with the goal of making CWU a university that is even more inclusive of and sensitive to people with diverse backgrounds.

*The president’s full time responsibility is to the institution (6.C.1).* Both Dr. McIntyre’s and Dr. Gaudino’s contracts are confidential but are available in the exhibit room (See Exhibit 6.E.20). Dr. Gaudino’s contract states that the “President may accept outside employment for private consultant services and board of director responsibilities with private companies or organizations, provided that such activities: (1) do not fall within his official duties as President, interfere with the carrying out of his official duties, or involve a conflict of interest with respect to such duties; (2) do not involve the improper personal use of University resources, time, materials, or facilities; (3) are otherwise in compliance with the Ethics in Public Service Act, chapter 42.52 RCW, and other applicable laws; and (4) are each approved by the Chair of the Board of Trustees. Any income received by the President in connection with his approved outside activities shall have no effect on his compensation under this agreement.”

*The duties, responsibilities, and ethical conduct requirements of the institution’s administrators are clearly defined and published. Administrators act in a manner consistent with them (6.C.2).* Administrative position descriptions are maintained in the Human Resources Department. All position descriptions were updated within the past year and are updated when a position is open (See Exhibit 6.E.11 for all senior position descriptions). Conditions of employment of administrative exempt employees are governed by the Exempt Employee's Code. The category of exempt employees encompasses a wide variety of positions from the president to professional staff. Ethical conduct requirements are clearly defined and published in the Policies and Procedures Manual, Part 6 (Exhibit GE.3). The board of trustee’s supervises the compliance of the president and his cabinet. The cabinet then has the authority to supervise the level beneath it. Compliance issues are described in greater detail in Standard 9.

*The president is responsible for implementing appropriate procedures to evaluate administrators regularly (6.C.3).* The Exempt Employee's Code requires the evaluation of all exempt employees at least
In June 2009, the president initiated a new evaluation policy. Working with the cabinet, the president will institute a 360° evaluation system for all senior administrators. Each administrator, while working with his or her supervisor, will use the position description to develop a set of personal goals for the year. At the end of an evaluation cycle, the administrator will prepare a self-evaluation, which is shared with those evaluating the administrator. A committee, comprised of three or four members, is then created for each administrator, after a few more steps of gathering information and inviting the administrator’s response, the supervisor prepares a final evaluation for inclusion in the administrator’s file. In the evaluation cycle, shared governance is likely to receive significant attention. The president noted that the Faculty Senate evaluation will be an important piece of the overall evaluation of academic administrators and will be fully integrated into a biennial evaluation. Given some of the challenges in the past year, the coming evaluation period may carry significant weight.

In the 2009 faculty survey, faculty rated administrators on a variety of issues including whether he or she “Behaves in a manner consistent with the spirit of shared governance.” Four administrators, including the new president, averaged scores of “agree” or better. Three administrators averaged scores in the “neutral” range. Four administrators received average scores in the “disagree” range. For the first time, all of these scores are in the public domain, and this assessment data will be included in the administrator’s self evaluations. Results of this survey are further discussed in the appraisal section below.

**Administrators are qualified to provide effective educational leadership and management (6.C.3).** CWU administrators are appointed by the president normally following a national search to ensure that the most highly qualified and capable person for each position is secured. The university offers competitive compensation, conducts national searches, and designs position descriptions comparable to those at peer institutions. The Recruitment, Retention, and Hiring policy provides for exceptions to a national search. A quarterly report is provided to the cabinet on the number of exceptions to the normal search process. The search process also allows for internal searches. President Gaudino established a subcommittee to review alleged irregularities in the search process of some recently filled internal positions. This committee reported to the President in June, 2009 that there were no violations of either law or policy in searches. Committee members agreed that searches should be conducted for all positions; that the minimum expectation should be an internal search for all positions; that searches should be national/international for all faculty, academic administrative, and other high-level exempt positions; that exemptions from or exceptions to searches should continue to be rare, and that reasons for exceptions should be communicated to the university community (see Exhibit 6.E.26).

The attention paid to hiring practices reflects the university’s commitment to the spirit and letter of affirmative action and non-discrimination standards. During the course of the last ten years, the university has refined its policies and stepped up its efforts to increase recruitment of women and people of color for faculty and staff positions and as students of the university. Central Washington University has an extensive published policy on affirmative action and non-discrimination. Basic policy for Central’s stance on affirmative action and non-discrimination is embodied in Part 2, Section 2-0 of the university Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3). The director of the Office for Equal Opportunity is responsible for implementing, assessing, reviewing, and recommending changes to the policy. She reports to the president. The Equal Opportunity Committee (Policy 2-60.010) and the Equal Opportunity Grievance Committee (Policy 2-60-010) support the effort. Exhibit 6.E.27 provides an extensive discussion of CWU’s compliance with NWCCU Policy 6.1, Affirmative Action and Non-Discrimination.

Ongoing training, sponsored by the Human Resources Department’s enrichment program, helps maintain the highest quality of administration. This program incorporates and facilitates the different resources of succession planning, mentoring, performance management, recruitment, and training and development. Through this collection of resources, the university is able to strengthen its workforce.
planning and maximize employee effectiveness. A sample list of trainings provided by Human Resources is available on its website (Exhibit 6.E.28).

Institutional advancement activities which include development and fund raising, institutional relations, and alumni programs are clearly and directly related to the mission and goals of the institution (6.C.4). The Division of University Relations establishes and maintains relationships between Central and its donors, alumni, friends, and with the greater public. The division is responsible for developing comprehensive philanthropic, public relations, and alumni programs for the university. These efforts include fund raising, alumni relations, community relations, news and information, sports information, publications, and the retiree councils as explained in the CWU Policies Manual section 3-20-040 (Exhibit GE.3). Supporting the division are two independent 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporations, the CWU Foundation and the CWU Alumni Association, each with a board of directors of between 20 and 30 members. Memoranda of understanding between CWU and the CWU Foundation and CWU Alumni Association (Exhibit 6.E.29) establish that the mission of each organization is for the exclusive support of the university. Some recent publications and documents illustrating the work of those two groups include Central Connections, the Transforming Lives Campaign of the CWU Foundation, the Rapport Newsletter, and the myriad of alumni newsletters for various programs and groups (e.g., The College of Business’s Beacon, HR Quick Tips Newsletters, Gear Up Newsletter, College Assistance Migrant Program newsletters, etc.).

Administrators ensure that the institutional decision-making process is timely (6.C.5). Schedules for submitting changes of status for faculty, budget requests, and other routine administrative decisions to the Board of Trustees are clearly established, (Exhibit 6.E.30) and these schedules are followed with very rare exception. Timetables for reports to the Board of Trustees on work in progress and meeting work plans are established routinely (Exhibit GE.3). The President’s Cabinet and the councils of each of the divisions meet regularly and address matters of importance that come before them. Deans meet regularly with their department chairs. Departments are not required to meet regularly, although many do. Representative bodies of the university maintain and distribute minutes of their activities as well. Evidence of the timeliness of these decisions may be found in the President’s Cabinet and Advisory Council Minutes (Exhibit 6.E.31). Despite this process, there is a perception among some faculty that change is difficult to cultivate. President Gaudino has addressed this topic in several public forums, and there is optimism that new policies will result a more responsive structure.

Administrators facilitate cooperative working relationships, promote coordination within and among organizational units, and encourage open communication and goal attainment (6.C.6). Structural mechanisms are in place to encourage dialogue and participation by the university community in decision-making, and the minutes of planning meetings of all sorts are distributed widely. Decision-making related to budget, programming, and marketing involve public review and comment. This process was strained during the current academic year, as budgetary concerns mounted. Minutes of the president’s cabinet, the academic council, and the councils of the vice-presidents for student affairs and business affairs are available on-line. The president also presents an annual university address, diversity address, fall faculty gathering, and civil service forum. Other communication forums include the president’s fireside chats with students, labor/management committees, employee council (Exhibit 6.E.4), faculty senate (Exhibit 6.E.3), UFC (faculty union), and exempt employee association (Exhibit 6.E.5).

Deans meet with chairs on a regular basis, and their meetings are informal. Some colleges circulate minutes of their meetings, though not all do. Policy recommendations are communicated to the faculty at large, and faculty members are encouraged to comment. The Academic Department Chairs Organization (ADCO) chair sits on the Academic Affairs Council of the university.
After the last NWCCU review, the president created an Ombuds office as a faculty and staff resource for concerns or disputes that might arise. The Ombuds Office was created in 2001 and reports directly to the president. The function of the Ombuds Office is described in Exhibit GE.3, 2-30.140.

The Ombuds work is confidential, informal, and neutral. The Ombudsperson assists university personnel with their concerns by listening, reframing issues, developing options, facilitating dialogue between individuals, mediating directly or by referral to an outside mediator, facilitating group discussions, recommending university policy change, and referral to a more formal grievance process. The Ombudsperson can also recommend policy changes to the appropriate groups and can give input on repeated patterns of problems and complaints to administrators. The union contracts generally make note of her services as a possible informal pre-grievance route for disputants. The Ombudsperson does not participate in formal grievance processes or testify in lawsuits.

When grievances occur, additional interventions may be necessary. In 2008, the initiation of collaborative meetings between the provost, president of UFC, and the senate chair has helped to clarify roles and responsibilities, and the passing of a new dispute resolution process for disputes among faculty and others that fall outside the CBA, are indications that a more formal relationship is developing. Faculty senate motion 07-59 (Approved, May 28, 2008) resulted in the addition of Section IV, Dispute Resolution to the CWU Academic Code (Exhibit 6.E.12).

*Administrators responsible for institutional research ensure that the results are widely distributed to inform planning and subsequent decisions that contribute to the improvement of the teaching-learning process* (6.C.7). Central Washington University long has had an Office of Institutional Research that develops and circulates reports of importance to decision-making at the university. The Office of Institutional Research has been particularly instrumental in providing data to the state of Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board related to the institution’s accountability measures and providing data to academic departments for their periodic program review self studies. Testing and Assessment Services has also played a role in assessing teaching and learning. Its primary function involves collecting and distributing the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI). The role of educational program assessment is discussed in more detail in Standard 2.B.

Both the institutional research and the testing and assessment functions have a presence on the university's web site, and it is through these sites, as well as through distribution of print copies of reports, that data are made accessible to the university community. Despite these efforts, this data is not commonly viewed by faculty. In addition, many administrative units of the university have direct access to certain reporting screens on the main database systems of the university. Individuals with accounts and appropriate access permissions on the university computing network also can access frozen university budget files. Further, all reports of the university are available either through distribution or upon request. The university operates openly with respect to data. During the past decade, our legacy database systems for financial services, student administration services, and human resource management have been replaced by the PeopleSoft relational database system. In addition, numerous other legacy applications and systems have been modernized or replaced by modern systems that function independently, or which interface with the central PeopleSoft environment. While institutional research continues to make positive strides, there is still no data warehouse available on campus. Users sometimes find it difficult to retrieve needed data and IR staff are often overwhelmed by questions for information. There have been significant concerns regarding the ability of institutional research to receive, process, and report data in a timely manner (see Standard 1).

*Policies, procedures, and criteria for administrative and staff appointment, evaluation, retention, promotion, and/or termination are published, accessible, and periodically reviewed* (6.C.8). The
university’s policies with regard to administrative, exempt, and civil service positions are well
developed and published in Part 6 of the university Policies Manual. Criteria for evaluation of exempt
employees are developed individually for the specific characteristics defined in each position
description. The university appointing authorities, the Human Resources Department, and the Office for
Equal Opportunity monitor the implementation of the procedures, which are reviewed and revised
periodically. The state of Washington Department of Personnel and the Central Washington University
Assistant Vice President for Human Resources oversee the rules applicable to the classified staff
published in Title 357 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). This code provision requires the
university to conduct annual performance evaluations of classified staff. A copy of the Performance
and Development Plan is in Exhibit 6.E.32. A summary of Initial Performance Expectations and
Performance Evaluations Received as of 12/31/2008 is in Exhibit 6.E.33.

Administrators’ and staff salaries and benefits are adequate to attract and retain competent personnel
consistent with the mission and goals of the institution (6.C.9). CWU uses the College and University
Personnel Association (CUPA) position numbering system and annual salary survey as the basis for
salary evaluation. Comparison groups vary according to position, with a few positions being unique to
CWU and others having more than 80 comparisons. A comparison of CUPA salaries for 2008 is
provided in Exhibit 6.E.34. The administrative exempt employees are benchmarked to the fortieth
percentile in relation to comparison schools. Classified staff salaries and yearly increments are set by
the state of Washington and are comparable across the state institutions of higher education (see
Exhibit 6.E.35). Faculty salary ranges are also provided (Exhibit 6.E.36). The university provided
increases September 2008 to bring anyone who was below the 40th percentile up to that level. Salary
ranges for administrators are provided according to CUPA ranges for the state (Exhibit 6.E.37). Benefit
information for all employees is also available (Exhibit 6.E.38). Salaries for all Central Washington
Employees may be viewed on the Office of Financial Management’s web page.

Appraisal of 6.C

All academic administrators are evaluated every two years by the faculty. This evaluation is conducted
by the Faculty Senate. Scores from the past decade are summarized in Exhibit 6.E.39 (available in the
exhibit room) and the most recent scores are available on the faculty senate web page. While a number
of college deans have received marginal evaluations, many changes in leadership have occurred since
2007. Many of the leaders who received low ratings no longer serve in the same capacity. The
Associate Vice-President for Faculty Affairs left the university, and a realignment of responsibilities in
the provost's office has helped improve administration-faculty relations. Two of the four college deans
are new (Interim Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies and Interim Dean of the
College of the Sciences), as is the interim dean of libraries. In 2008, the former associate vice
president for graduate studies, research, and continuing education became provost. A new (interim)
deral of graduate studies and research was appointed and continuing education reporting shifted to
the provost’s office. This new leadership team in academic affairs appears to have positive synergy,
which is evidenced in part by positive faculty reviews for the president and provost and anecdotally
from reports by faculty senate and union officers. These reviews are especially positive given the
current budget and staffing consequences of the global recession.

Each of the vice presidents conducts a self-evaluation, using a series of questions that are provided by
the president. The president also uses a 360° evaluation tool, soliciting feedback from co-workers,
subordinates, and constituents of the vice presidents. The president reviews the self-evaluations,
provides written feedback to each vice president, and holds individual meetings to discuss the
feedback. These documents are available for committee evaluation in the Human Resources office.
The faculty senate had decided to wait on its two year review until President Gaudino had spent a year
on campus, but the president recommended maintaining the current evaluation schedule. This move was well received throughout the campus.

Several well-functioning entities assisted the recent transition in leadership. The Ombuds office is a welcome addition to Central’s campus. There is considerable stability at the department chair level, perhaps more than there has been at the dean level. Well developed lines of communication between chairs and deans should assist in the transition. Finally, the mandatory supervisory courses sponsored by the Human Resources Department’s enrichment program (Exhibit 6.E.40) should help faculty and administrators understand each other’s roles and duties as they relate to the university’s goals and mission.

**Standard 6.D – Faculty Role in Governance**

**Historical Perspective**

The academic role of faculty in institutional governance is embodied in the Faculty Senate, its committees, and other department, college, and university-wide structures. The Faculty Council was created in 1947 and was transformed into the Faculty Senate in 1962. In collaboration with the administration, the senate created and maintained the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure, a comprehensive set of regulations that included personnel policies, committee roles, and curriculum procedures. The senate operates as a representative body. Every department, regardless of size, has at least one representative, and larger departments may have up to four, determined according to a formula established by the bylaws of the senate (see Exhibit 6.E.8). Representatives are elected by members of their constituencies, e.g., department faculty elect department senators, faculty based at university centers elect center representatives, non-tenure-track faculty elect NTT senators, etc.

The advent of a collective bargaining environment necessitated an overhaul first of the CWU Faculty Code, to separate bargainable and non-bargainable portions into the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Academic Code, respectively, followed by a thorough revision of the Senate Bylaws to update and clarify the senate’s role and responsibilities. This process was completed in the fall of 2007. To understand this change in governance, it is important to review the role of the senate prior to 2007. The following committees and boards have largely changed:

**Faculty Senate Budget Committee.** Until the implementation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee was “concerned with [making] recommendations regarding the budgetary and financial affairs of the university, the level of financial support for the university, short- and long-range budgetary projections, and distribution of funds within the university.” The chair of this committee and the chair of the Faculty Senate were informed of major budget discussions and decisions of the university. The committee was also involved in interpreting the recommendations of the Salary Equity Study, initiated by the senate in November 1999. On the basis of the committee’s recommendations and the concurrence of the administration and the board of trustees, a series of steps were taken to remedy long-standing issues of salary inequity and compression. With the implementation of the new Academic Code, the committee was disbanded during 2006–07. The Senate Executive Committee took over the role of providing budgetary input to the administration. This input is communicated by the chair of the senate. The chair sits on the University Budget Advisory Committee but does not participate in creation of the budget proposal.

**Faculty Senate Development and Appropriations Committee.** Until 2005, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee disbursed faculty development funds via the Faculty Senate Development and
Appropriations Committee. Faculty development funds were allocated from summer session revenues. This committee was disbanded with the approval of the new Academic Code and the establishment of the United Faculty of Central as the representative for the faculty in regards to wages, hours, and working conditions.

**Faculty Senate Public Affairs Committee.** This committee was “concerned with matters relating to developing and expressing faculty positions for presentation by authorized university representatives before the State Legislature, Congress and other legislative bodies, as well as other bodies, public and private, which affect faculty interests and welfare. It shall advise the Faculty Legislative Representative[s], ascertain and articulate faculty positions on issues, [and] act as liaison with the Director of Legislative Relations.” This committee was disbanded with the approval of the new Academic Code. With United Faculty of Central representing faculty with regard to wages, hours and working conditions, the focus of the Faculty Legislative Representative (FLR) became more academically oriented. Information on the FLR may be found in Exhibit 6.E.41.

**Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Salary Administration Board.** As a result of the Faculty Senate endorsement of the Market Definition Report of 2000, the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Salary Administration Board was formed and charged with developing a process that would move the faculty’s salary average to the CUPA mean, based on discipline and rank (see Standard 4.A and Exhibit 4.E.12).

For several years running, the state did not allocate funds for salary adjustments and actually cut the university's budget. This made the SAB process the only way faculty could improve their salaries. The president set aside funds out of existing revenues over three years for this purpose, and did make a significant dent in salary deficits relative to CUPA means, particularly for some ranks. The criteria for SAB consideration was broadened to include more than just equity issues, such that parts of the evaluation process resembled a merit process. This caused some confusion and frustration on the part of faculty, particularly when no monies were earmarked for true merit. Funding for the SAB ended shortly after the faculty elected to unionize.

**Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Instruction.** The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Evaluation of Instruction Committee was created in 2002. It was charged with determining a comprehensive and systematic process for evaluating instruction. The committee initially considered Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI), peer review, self-review, and administrative assessment.

The committee recommended a balanced approach to faculty assessment, including student, peer, administrative, and self-evaluation, as well as a proposed time-line for implementation and sample assessment instruments. The report (Exhibit 6.E.42) was presented to the Senate in March 2005, and forwarded to the offices of the provost and president. In Spring 2009, a faculty senate ad-hoc committee on faculty evaluation completed a report with recommendations which is under consideration by the Senate Executive Committee. A new SEOI protocol is currently being piloted. See Standards 2 and 4 for additional exhibits on this topic.

**Current Situation**

The role of the faculty in institutional governance, planning, budgeting, and policy development is made clear and public; faculty are supported in fulfilling that role (6.D). The role and function of the Faculty Senate is articulated in the Academic Code (Exhibit 6.E.43). An updated mission statement was approved in the Fall of 2007 that articulates more clearly the role and responsibilities the senate embraces. The statement begins with the following paragraph:
The Faculty Senate of CWU acts for and on behalf of the university's faculty with respect to all academic matters and issues related to the intellectual life of the university. In a university community that declares in its mission that it “values teaching as the vehicle to inspire intellectual depth and breadth, to encourage lifelong learning, and to enhance the opportunities of its students,” the Faculty Senate is committed to enabling faculty to provide quality academic programs and other opportunities for students in support of the university’s core values, rooted first and foremost in “each student’s greatest good.”

Faculty members who are elected to the senate serve as uninstructed representatives of their departments. While senators’ votes are advised by the opinions of their department colleagues, they are not bound by them (see Exhibit 6.E.44). Senators are encouraged to discuss issues that come before the senate with their department colleagues. Upcoming initiatives and documents of the senate are typically made available on the senate’s web site or via e-mail.

The university president, provost, and elected members of Associated Students of CWU are ex-officio, non-voting members of the senate (Exhibit 6.E.8, section I.A.2) and are given the privilege of the floor. The chair of the senate serves on the provost’s Academic Affairs Council, President’s Advisory Council, ADCO, the university’s Budget Advisory Committee, and participates in meetings of the Board of Trustees.

The senate’s role in governance relies not only on consideration and action by the full senate, but also the active involvement of its standing committees (see below) in policy development and review. These committees are charged to consider routine issues in the areas indicated by their names and to bring forward proposals to the senate for action. In addition to standing committees of the senate, there are 34 university committees which, combined, require participation by approximately 125 faculty members. Faculty also are recruited to serve on ad hoc committees, search committees, and task forces to consider emerging issues that do not fit conveniently into the charge of an existing committee. All faculty of the university are invited yearly to identify their willingness to serve on senate (Exhibit 6.E.45) and university standing (Exhibit 6.E.46) committees and to identify committees of interest.

The faculty senate executive committee consists of eight current senators. Until spring 2008, the senate elected an executive committee each year with nominations from the floor. During the academic year 2007–08, changes were made to the bylaws and election procedures such that the executive committee is now constituted of senators representing each college, nominated and elected to three-year terms by faculty in their respective colleges (i.e., Arts and Humanities, Sciences, Education and Professional Studies, and one from the college of Business/Library). One additional at-large position is nominated and elected from the senate floor. A senate chair-elect is elected by the new executive committee, committing to a three-year term as chair-elect, chair, and past chair. The chair serves as the liaison to the administration of the university. The senate meets at least three times a quarter during the academic year. The executive committee’s responsibilities are described in the new senate bylaws (Exhibit 6.E.8).

In addition to changes in the senate and the executive committee, a collective bargaining environment necessitated significant changes in senate standing committees. Currently there are five standing committees of the senate: Academic Affairs, Curriculum, General Education, Bylaws and Academic Code, and Evaluation and Assessment. A detailed description of committees is provided in Exhibit 6.E.45.

The Academic Affairs and Curriculum committees have remained essentially unchanged by the adoption of collective bargaining. The General Education Committee became a formal senate standing
committee after the last accreditation review. After collective bargaining, the former Code Committee spent three years as an ad hoc committee but was determined to be of sufficient value to become part of a standing committee on bylaws and academic code. The former Personnel Committee, which dealt primarily with issues of working conditions, was disbanded after the faculty became unionized. After a brief time, the committee has been recast as the Evaluation and Assessment committee. In addition to being responsible for completing charges given by the Executive Committee, standing and ad hoc committees are empowered to initiate proposals for action on any issue or concern that fits the committees’ powers and responsibilities.

Other Faculty Roles in Governance. Faculty also exercise their voices through 34 university committees (Exhibit 6.E.46). Although these committees report directly to officers of the university rather than to the senate, committee reports that have implications for academic policy come forward to the senate through its standing committees. Faculty often chair some of these committees.

Over the years, the Faculty Senate has initiated inquiries and actions in a wide variety of special areas of interests, such as distance learning, salary equity, grade inflation, and many others. When concerns are raised from the floor, the Executive Committee determines the best course of action, whether direct action or referral to committee. Many of the charges given to committees begin as faculty issues brought to the senate floor. With the advent of collective bargaining, the relatively open processes of the faculty senate no longer apply to issues of compensation and working conditions. It is still unclear if or how this change has affected the faculty’s sense of personal investment in the university.

**Appraisal of 6.D**

The Faculty Senate is the only representative body with clearly defined status to represent faculty academic interests and to make decisions concerning the academic environment of the university. Its role in oversight of the curriculum has not been challenged. The senate maintains close ties with the faculty and with the administration in various ways. The senate chair’s membership on the Academic Affairs Council, President’s Advisory Council, ADCO, and other committees creates an important liaison between the faculty and the administration. The president’s and provost’s memberships on the senate serve the same function. In addition, quarterly meetings of the executive committee with the president, provost, and other key academic administrators, as well as monthly meetings between the senate chair and president, provost, and ADCO, provide opportunities for consultation on a range of academic issues.

The university supports half-time release for a faculty member to serve as senate chair, quarter-time release for the chair-elect, a full-time administrative assistant, and the cost of maintaining the senate office. In addition, the university pays for release time (up to 12 workload units), travel, and other expenses for CWU’s Faculty Legislative Representative who advocates for faculty before the state legislature. University policy provides opportunities for faculty participation in governance in a variety of ways. Faculty are well represented on university committees in addition to the number who serve on committees of the senate. Very few actions of the university are taken without opportunity for review and comment by faculty and input from at least one committee. There is some concern that at times faculty opinion, while solicited, is then ignored or devalued, and this has hampered participation and buy-in to committee processes. Committee representation is defined in the University Policies Manual and in the Senate Bylaws, and most committees include faculty representation from the four colleges and library of the university. Non-tenure track faculty and students are also a part of the senate and university committee structure.

The United Faculty of Central now represents faculty in the areas of wages and working conditions, and there is a certain risk that concerns in these areas distract and dominate discussion between faculty
and administration. It has worked best that the senate, the executive committee, and its officers (chair and chair-elect) be as proactive as possible to ensure the senate’s equal participation in the shared governance of the university. In the development of the new collective bargaining agreement, the senate re-asserted its presence consistent with its mission and bylaws.

In the transition to a collective bargaining environment, there was considerable concern about how the academic and employment/working conditions portions of the old Faculty Code would be divided or revised. The Faculty Senate Code Committee began the process by presenting a draft of an Interim Academic Code to President McIntyre who forwarded it to the Board of Trustees for consideration at its March 3, 2006 meeting. She recommended that the code be adopted except for three sections related to summer session (6.10, 6.20 and 6.30) where the administration and the faculty were at an impasse. Essentially, 6.10 set the summer faculty appointing authority with the respective deans. 6.20 had several sections dealing with summer school appointments, but the most contentious section dealt with preference given to CWU faculty who apply to teach over non-CWU personnel of similar training and experience. And finally, and equally contentious, 6.30 extended the Faculty Academic Code to apply to summer session with possible exceptions to this requiring review by the Faculty Senate. The code, exclusive of the three contested sections, was subsequently adopted. A joint task force consisting of faculty members nominated by the senate and administrators appointed by the BOT was appointed to turn the Interim Code into a permanent document that would address academic roles and responsibilities of faculty, as well as other non-CBA policies. During this period, there was considerable concern regarding how the senate’s role at the university would change. Several campus-wide meetings took place, and a new permanent Academic Code was eventually approved by the BOT in December 2006. This change brought the senate to its current state.

A number of changes have been made since the last NWCCU evaluation. For example, in the past review, the following recommendations were made:

1) Improve integration of senate governance with university governance.
2) The senate should assert its right to influence administration.
3) Improve involvement of faculty and administration in senate activities.
4) Shift the senate’s focus from being driven by a few strong personalities to something based on clear principles.

In response,

1) Both the senate and the UFC agree that collaboration and improved communication are in the best interests of the university. Efforts on the part of the administration to involve faculty representatives from the Senate and the UFC as appropriate at the earliest possible stage in policy and program development has paid off in renewed confidence on the part of faculty. Further, a change in leadership in the position of associate vice president for faculty affairs, the maturing of the relationship between the United Faculty of Central and the administration, and the development of the Joint Labor Relations Council—whose role is to discuss emerging concerns before they reach crisis status—have all initially contributed to improved faculty and administrator morale with respect to bargaining.

2) Senate assertiveness has also improved for reasons similar to those in the preceding paragraph—recognition and proactivity have been catalysts for improvement, and senate committees are constantly encouraged to be proactive in their actions. Most growth in this area has occurred since January 2008.

3) Faculty are more willing to engage in the faculty senate than in 2000, but there is still a need to reward involvement in the senate through workload reallocations. Recent proposals that the Academic Code estimate workload units associated with senate activities attempt to make this service tangible. Communication between the senate and the university community continues to
improve, with more user-friendly web site information, including current and past committee reports, meeting minutes and agendas.

4) While the issue of leadership personalities always will be a potential concern, the new vision and mission statements, as well as the new, expanded Bylaws and Academic Code have made great strides in identifying and clarifying the senate’s roles and responsibilities. The favorable impression made by President McIntyre, her administrative team, and others of “Team Central” has created a positive response to CWU in Olympia. The senate has also become more community focused, sponsoring numerous forums to gather information from faculty and the community, such as a forum held in February 2008 to hear concerns from non-tenure track faculty, co-hosted by the senate executive committee and UFC.

Overall, the most important indicator of an effective faculty role in university governance will be the continued successful relationship between the senate and UFC. Continued cooperation will provide a unified voice for faculty concerns. One such example involves the joint UFC/senate recognition ceremony, which is held each fall for those faculty who have earned tenure, advancement to senior lecturer status, or promotion. It would be useful, however, to create more formal guidelines for senate/UFC interaction in the next few years for the sake of further clarification and keeping lines of communication open and active.

Finally, one of the best developments in shared governance has been the frequent opportunity for the senate chair, UFC president, and provost to meet. Between 2000 and 2007, relationships between various faculty leadership groups and specific administrators were strained. Shared governance functioned below faculty expectations, strengthening the motivation for a faculty union. Since 2004, the senate chair started regular meetings with the provost. The UFC president joined these meetings in fall of 2007, and the meetings have become a regular event. The results have been positive from the senate’s and union’s perspectives because of the willingness of all individuals involved to engage in candid discussions of the current issues. Over the past year, some of the momentum for these meetings diminished, but progress is still apparent.

The most significant challenge for the future is how shared governance will work in the current administration. There are some concerns about how the administration, senate, and union will continue to work together. It is also unclear how faculty and staff will see their role in shared governance within the new framework.

**Standard 6.E – Student Role in Governance**

Students play a vital role in governance at CWU. The role of students in institutional governance, planning, budgeting, and policy development is made clear and public; students are supported in fulfilling that role (6.E). Serving alongside members of the faculty and administration on a variety of committees, students provide input and vote on issues that involve the student body. Virtually no decision concerning the student body is made without first educating its constituents and obtaining their input.

**Historical Perspective**

Two decades ago, student government had a somewhat limited scope. Students were involved in distributing student activity fees, lobbying about tuition, and assigning student members to university committees. At the time of the last NWCCU accreditation review, students were becoming active in university politics and administrative concerns.
Over the past decade, Central Washington University students have experienced increasing influence and representation in the governance of the university. Notwithstanding a constantly changing student body, the constitution for the Associated Students of Central Washington University (ASCWU) clearly articulates the organizational protocol for placing students on standing committees across administrative and divisional units. The past ten years can be characterized as growth years for student involvement in the governance of the university.

**Current Situation**

At CWU, there is a variety of ways for students to actively influence the governance of the institution. Generally speaking, student voice and perspective is represented:

- At the Board of Trustees level through the student trustee, committees, and the President’s Cabinet.
- In shaping budgetary policies by voting membership on the Services and Activities Fee Committee.
- On a variety of academic, student affairs, and policy generating committees.

The Associated Students of Central Washington University (ASCWU), under the direction of the elected Board of Directors (BOD), coordinates student involvement in CWU governance. The ASCWU Constitution and Bylaws set forth the protocol by which students are appointed to serve on policy-generating committees. The BOD consists of seven elected students who represent students in any area pertaining to daily life at Central. From facilities to academics, the BOD advocates student concerns, creates programs to improve student morale, and finds ways for students to get involved campus wide. As indicated on the BOD web site (Exhibit 6.E.2), its meetings are open to the public.

**Student Initiatives.** The ASCWU Constitution, Section 6.1 (Exhibit 6.E.47) provides the right for a student to create a student body initiative. By initiative in 2004, gender identity and gender expression were added to the protected groups. This addition, first initiated by students and supported by all facets of the institution, has attracted national attention to CWU as one of the first higher education institutions to codify protections for these groups.

**Campus Committees.** Central values student input on a wide variety of issues. The ASCWU-BOD appoints students to over 110 student seats on 32 key university committees (Exhibit 6.E.48). Students have made significant contributions to these university-wide discussions, and the presence of a student representative on the Board of Trustees has been an invaluable asset for the board. The students undertake significant issues and programs on behalf of the student body and work well with the administration to accomplish their goals. The president of the ASCWU is now a voting member on the President’s Advisory Council.

**ASCWU Board of Directors.** As per the ASCWU Constitutional Bylaws, ASCWU-BOD members hold the following rights and responsibilities associated with institutional governance (Exhibit 6.E.46). Student involvement in the BOD is explained in further detail in 3.B.2.

**Club Senate.** Club Senate is comprised of one student representative from each of the 124 university-approved student clubs or organizations (Exhibit 6.E.49). Under the direction of the ASCWU-BOD, Club Senate influences campus governance in two significant ways: 1) through Club Senate, students can be appointed to Funds Council, thereby overseeing the allocations of Services and Activities fees to clubs and organizations on campus; 2) As one of the largest and most active student organizations at CWU, Club Senate shares its voice by developing proposals for the Board of Trustees.
**Appraisal of 6.E**

Relative to ten years ago, the evidence suggests CWU students now enjoy increased opportunities to influence institutional governance. The addition of a student member to the Board of Trustees has been well received and helpful. Adding a student voting member to the President’s Advisory Council has also helped to solidify the role of students in campus leadership. Other positive changes since 1999 include improved influence in the distribution of student funds through the Services and Activities Fee committee and the Funds Council.

These important improvements have opened the way for additional areas for improvement. While the influence of student leaders is pervasive, there are groups of students who have little to no influence. Students at the university centers are even less engaged in governance activities than those on the Ellensburg campus. A clearly articulated protocol for student presence on committees or regular meetings with center administration would enhance student representation at the university centers. Similarly, graduate students are not represented by their own campus level organization; rather, they are pooled with undergraduate students in the ASCWU. As a result, graduate students appear less likely to engage in ASCWU initiatives and committee assignments. Graduate students represent a vital voice in a university community and improved efforts should be made to enlist graduate students in matters of institutional governance.

It is relatively common for some of the 110 seats reserved for students on university committees to go unfilled, especially those seats on committees that are populated primarily by faculty such as Faculty Senate committees. The university will need to do more to recruit students for these leadership positions.

There is also some uncertainty about how the campus climate will change under a new president. President McIntyre, had been personally responsible for some of the improved student involvement in campus governance. Dr. Gaudino has already taken positive strides toward continuing student representation in matters of institutional governance.

**Summary of Standard 6**

Central Washington University has undergone significant changes over the past decade. The majority of current senior administrators were not part of the last accreditation process. For the most part, the governance of the university has made significant improvements across campus. Salaries improved against state averages during the decade. The faculty chose union representation and a Collective Bargaining Agreement was ratified. Mechanisms for bridging gaps between faculty and administration were established (e.g., Ombuds Office), and a successful president has come and gone. Throughout it all, Central has grown in student numbers, expanded its offerings at university centers, received national accreditation in several programs, and continued to excel in key diversity areas.

**Significant Changes Since 1999.**
- In 2000, Central hired a new president, replacing the outgoing president in a timely and efficient manner. This president, Dr. Jerilyn S. McIntyre, served with distinction for eight years and retired in December of 2008.
- In 2001, the Ombuds Office was created. The ombuds reports directly to the president.
- In 2002, the Washington State Legislature passed legislation to allow university faculty to collectively bargain for wages, benefits, and working conditions.
- In 2004, the faculty of Central voted to unionize. The United Faculty of Central Washington (UFC) replaced the Faculty Senate as the organization responsible for negotiating faculty salaries.
benefits, and working conditions. The union began negotiating its first contract with the University in spring 2005. The Faculty Senate developed a new mission, academic code, and committee structure in response to the new role of the faculty union. One such change resulted in eliminating the Personnel Committee, as the union assumed these duties.

- Throughout the academic year of 2007 and 2008, the university underwent an unprecedented change in leadership. The provost and the dean for the College of the Sciences took other jobs. The dean for the College of Education and Professional Sciences stepped down. The associate vice president for undergraduate studies retired, and we hired a new dean of graduate studies. Toward the end of 2008, the dean of the library stepped down, and the vice president for business and financial affairs announced his retirement.

- In August 2007, Dr. McIntyre notified the CWU board of trustees of her plans to retire on Dec. 31, 2008. The Board of Trustees immediately began the process of searching for a new President, with input from the campus community. On January 1, 2009, James L. Gaudino began work as CWU’s current president.

**Strengths**

- **Student Involvement:** Central has greatly improved its faculty, student, and staff involvement in shared University governance. This culture of shared governance should assist the University as it moves forward in a new area of faculty unionization.

- **Collective Mission:** Abundant opportunities exist for faculty, students, and staff to provide input on discussions of key issues related to Central’s mission. The process for updating Central’s Mission and Strategic Action Plan, for example, included a wide variety of input and consideration.

- **Involvement of Professional and Classified Staff:** Professional and classified staff continue to enhance Central Washington University and the wider Ellensburg community. Their work is recognized and appreciated by the university.

- **New Leadership Team:** Central recently underwent a dramatic change in senior leadership. While such changes bring significant concerns, the group of new administrators is functioning together well. While the successful leadership transition improved morale early in the 2008–2009 academic year, morale has diminished as the current economic crisis endures.

**Challenges and Next Steps**

- **Evaluation of Administrators:** The Faculty Senate will continue to examine how evaluations of key administrators, even in times of flux, can utilize faculty input more effectively. This will be important over the coming years, as the majority of senior administrators will be new. While faculty reviews of administrators are passed to the administrator’s supervisors, there is no formal process for using this information.

- **Involvement of Graduate and University Center Students:** Though undergraduate students on the main campus are extensively involved in shared governance, students at the university centers and graduate students on the main campus have limited involvement in the ASCWU. Neither group has its own advocacy organization.

- **Collaboration between Unions and Administration:** Central has made great progress in this area. Future steps will involve articulating lines of authority, reporting, representation, communication, and accountability. Central will continue to work out avenues for staff representation in shared governance.

- **Familiarity with the Board:** Central’s Board of Trustees is strong, stable, and well suited to lead the university. However, faculty have limited access to the board and there are ripples of concern about this. Open forums for faculty/staff and a mechanism for feedback to the board would provide a better flow of information.

- **Openness of Governance Decisions:** There is a perception on campus that decisions are made in secret and without adequate faculty and staff representation. President Gaudino has made progress in this regard with his task force, but ending the perception may require additional changes to the university's decision-making structure.
• **Adherence to Appointment Policies:** Concerns have been raised about the method in which hiring decisions are made. Policies are generally followed, but occasional exceptions to these policies have led to confusion and concern.

• **New Leadership:** In the recommendations from the 1999 Accreditation Report and the 2004 interim report, considerable emphasis was placed on finding a successful chief executive. President McIntrye assumed her post in 2000. She restructured the administration and replaced four new vice presidents through a national search process. She established an open communication style that encouraged participation of the campus community. Her President’s Advisory Council included representation of all major campus constituent groups. The strategic planning process provided campus groups with a predictable framework in which to move forward as a university. James L. Gaudino was hired on January 1, 2009 and immediately made public statements are preserving the university’s mission and attacking the budget crisis. Both leaders provided strong, open styles that were generally well received.
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**Standard 7 – Finance**

Central Washington University has a long history of fiscal solvency. As a public baccalaureate institution, the university receives state support to provide access and educational services to students. The state also has funded the construction of educational facilities at all six CWU centers and several new construction and remodeling projects on the Ellensburg campus during the study period. CWU has enjoyed considerable enrollment growth and had its largest freshman class in the fall of 2008. Achieving the university’s primary goals during the decade—to increase access while maintaining instructional programs and support services of high quality—has been challenging in light of enrollment growth, increasing costs, and decreasing revenues. The global recession has compromised the flow of state operational support, resulting in relatively flat or declining state subsidy and steady increases in student tuition and fees, as shown in Figure 7.1. The recession has also had an impact on giving to the CWU Foundation, compromising CWU scholarship and faculty resources and creating uncertainties about the stability of enrollment. Another challenge has been the increasing competition from other educational institutions for students.

![Figure 7.1](image-url)

Over the last few years, the state of Washington has directed more resources toward high demand enrollment and categorical funding. In 2007, Initiative 960 was enacted requiring most new and increased taxes and fees to be approved by the state legislature. The state of Washington identified that student tuition and fees fall under this initiative, so the university must now receive legislative authorization to increase tuition and fee resources.

To ensure continued financial stability and to keep education affordable while increasing access and providing programs and services of high quality, the university has taken a number of steps. First, the university has endeavored to find supplemental resources, resulting in substantial growth in grants, foundation support, and new or increased user fees. In addition, the university has re-evaluated its budget, budget process, and resource allocation to ensure that each dollar is used to maximum benefit. Last, greater attention and support are being focused on student recruitment, retention, and the resources those students bring.

In addition to the challenge of maintaining sufficient resource growth, the university is striving to overcome obstacles in controlling expenditures. National events have increased administrative concern

---

2 These data are for the entire year’s university revenues, including summer quarter. The state supports about 97% of the student FTE enrollments during the 9-month regular session but there is no state support based on summer enrollment. Thus, the proportion the state contributes to revenues is lower for the entire year’s program than for the 9-month regular session.

Tuition and fees became the largest source of the entire year’s revenue in 2004. State support is now approximately 60% of the 9-month regular session revenue. The university projects that tuition and fees will overtake state support of the 9-month revenue in 2010.
about emergency preparedness which will require greater resources. Significant energy rate increases make it difficult to maintain budgets, particularly with the increased square footage constructed to meet growing student demand. Another challenge arises from the growing demand for technology by students, faculty, and staff as discussed in Standard 5. In addition to the cost of replacing and maintaining current equipment and software, there are increased expectations for new services, wireless systems, and greater accountability. In striving to meet these growing requirements, greater demand is placed on staff to meet the constant challenge to test and implement patches, fixes, and upgrades, as shown in the ITS Major Projects–Six Year Roadmap (Exhibit 7.E.1).

The university has been and will continue to be challenged with shifting resources and greater reliance on tuition and user fees, the need to find external funding sources, competition for resources due to the economic downturn, increased state controls over revenue, and the ongoing demand for resources to meet continuing and increasing service demands. At the same time, the university will continue to expend funds to best meet student and university needs while balancing the demands to provide for greater instructional opportunities, instructional support, student support, administrative needs, and facility requirements while providing greater accountability.

NWCCU required documentation tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, and 10 may be found in Appendix 7.A.1.

**Standard 7.A – Financial Planning**

**Historical Perspective**

The major change in financial planning over the last decade has been a progressive effort to integrate financial planning more clearly into the strategic planning process of the university as discussed in Standard 1.B. Based on planning, prioritization, and decision making at the unit and division level, budgetary implications of changes in programs, operations, and facilities are incorporated into the yearly budget plan. The budget also reflects, in recent years, the priorities of the State Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) with regard to funding for high demand programs.

The university’s Budget Office manages the budget document preparation and its printed and online submittal to the HECB. The university maintains annual and biennial operational and capital budget cycles. The Board of Trustees approves the biennial operating and capital budget requests based on information provided by the state of Washington’s approved budget process. The board approves the annual budget but does not make specific allocation decisions (Exhibits 7.E.2, 7.E.3, and 7.E.4). The budget is developed by the Budget Office based on tuition revenue projections and state allocations. Once approved, the president allocates available funds based on prioritized unit requests. The Budget Office monitors the annual budget, reconciles it to state appropriations monthly, and creates and posts to the web monthly reports showing the financial position of all state, self-support and capital funds.

The authority and responsibility for financial planning and budgeting for the university is vested in a Board of Trustees as discussed in Standard 6.B. Through the board, the state gives the institution appropriate autonomy in financial planning and budgeting matters within overall mandates and priorities (7.A.1). RCW 28B.35.120 sets forth the general powers and duties of the trustees. In addition to any other powers and duties prescribed by law, each board of trustees of the regional universities “shall have full control of the regional university, shall with the assistance of the faculty members prescribe the course of study in the various schools & departments, establish such divisions, schools or departments necessary to carry out the purposes of the university and may promulgate such rules and regulations, and perform all other acts not forbidden by law, as the board of trustees may in its discretion deem necessary or appropriate to the administration of the regional university.”
The following is a partial list of citations that authorize the operations of the university:

- RCW 28B.10 College and Universities Generally
- RCW 28B.15 Colleges and Universities Fees
- RCW 28B.35 Regional Universities
- RCW 28B.45 Branch Campuses

The president of Central Washington University is chosen by, and is directly responsible to, the Board of Trustees for the administrative direction and supervision of all operations of the institution. The governing structure of the university is discussed in Standard 6.A.

**Current Situation**

The university’s financial planning includes multiple year projections of major categories of income, specific plans for major categories of expenditures, and plans for the management of capital revenue and expenditures. Short and long-range capital budgets reflect the university’s goals and objectives, and relate to the plans for physical facilities and acquisition of equipment (7.A.2). All areas of financial planning are tied to the university’s strategic plan. The university’s strategic planning, which includes facilities, information technology, academic program planning, and budget projections, has been modified and simplified to promote timely and useful input from departments. Academic program review entered its second five year cycle during the 2007–2008 academic year along with a more robust faculty evaluation system. This became the means by which the institution engages in systematic financial planning for instruction, research, and public service consistent with the university’s institutional mission and goals. Divisions of the university have considerable discretion in their use of funds to provide academic programs and support consistent with the university mission.

Central Washington University submits an operating and capital budget document to the Board of Trustees for approval in June of each fiscal year (Exhibits 7.E.2, 7.E.3, and 7.E.4). These documents include an overview of funding sources as well as detailed information on significant legislative policy changes, policy requests, base funds, and funds available and not available for internal allocation. This document is the final stage in a defined budget process (7.A.3) that begins the prior summer with biennial or supplemental operating and capital budget requests submitted to the Office of Financial Management in Olympia. The state Office of Financial Management distributes capital and operating budget submission instructions during the month of May in even years as shown on in Exhibit 7.E.5.

The operating budget cycle for CWU is both annual and biennial in nature. Internal executive budget and planning discussions, including vice presidential division goals and priorities with appropriate communication from the Board of Trustees, occur in the President’s Cabinet during the fall. Campus involvement in the budget process begins in December of each year and coincides with the opening of the legislative session. As the proposed budgets from the Governor, the House, and the Senate are released, Central provides campus updates and analysis of potential impact of the proposed budgets on our campus. This information is commonly circulated on the campus intranet, in the monthly online Campus Bulletin, or, in urgent cases, by group email. Concurrent executive planning takes place as Central evaluates the impact of tuition revenue projections for the upcoming fiscal year. Self-support unit budget planning and review is conducted during February and March.

The State of Washington provides operational resources to the university through a biennial legislative appropriation with annual supplemental appropriations or decreases. In the past, the state legislature has set maximum increases on resident undergraduate tuition rates. With the passage of Initiative 960, all new or increased state taxes and fees, which has been defined to include tuition, class fees, and many other university fees, require legislative approval. The state appropriation and student tuition are the major sources of funding for Central’s operating budget. Total university resources, as shown in

**Standard 7 – 74**
Figure 7.2, include tuition and fees, state operating and capital appropriations, grants and contracts, sales, services, and auxiliaries.

Usually by April, the state has approved the operating appropriation level and authorized any tuition increase. The budget office under the direction of the Board of Trustees, president, and the cabinet utilize the information to establish the operating budget and to identify available operating funds. The president and cabinet members review the operating budget prepared by the Budget Office and determine how to best utilize available resources. The President’s Cabinet approves a budget that is forwarded to the Budget Advisory Committee for approval, generally in mid-April. The Budget Advisory Committee’s members, listed in Exhibit 7.E.6, provide broad university representation, and the committee meeting is open to the public, Exhibit 7.E.7. The Budget Advisory Committee’s approved operating budget is forwarded to the Board of Trustees as an information item in May to collect feedback on the proposed plan from the board. The final published summary budget document goes to the board for approval in June.

After the summary budget is approved by the Board of Trustees, the university’s vice presidents work within their departments and division to establish priorities, identify detail needs, and make base and one time funding requests. All vice presidential base and one time funding requests, with support justification, are submitted to the president generally before June 30. The president reviews the funding requests, and allocates the available resources to the vice presidents to best meet the university’s needs and strategic plan. The distribution of expenditures for the last fiscal year is shown in Figure 7.3. After the budget is approved and finalized by the president and the vice presidents, the Budget Office works with the vice presidents to implement approved budget changes. In addition, the Budget Office distributes a detail budget initial allocation book each fall (7.A.3) (Exhibit 7.E.8).

The capital budget planning process begins with the university’s Capital Facilities Master Plan and plans for required changes in facilities for a ten year planning cycle (Exhibit 8.E.37). These plans outline priority projects as they sequence through the request stages for pre-planning, design, and construction funds. Each biennium, the university requests capital funds to meet the next step in the Ten-Year Plan and the Capital Master Plan. Also, the university may annually request funds for emergent needs through the supplement budget process. This process allows for making changes that meet short-term needs and the changing education market, while not losing sight of the long-term goals and direction of the university. Capital and operating budget appropriations are tracked to insure internal compliance with state requirements.
A solicitation letter is sent to all departments on campus in September of every even fiscal year, requesting information on capital needs. Departments submit requests electronically by mid-October to the academic facilities planning officer. All projects are forwarded to Facilities Planning and Construction Services where they are logged and categorized, and initial cost estimates are completed by January. Projects are submitted to the appropriate vice president for prioritization and returned to Facilities Planning and Construction Services, which prepares an initial draft array for the Capital Budget Committee, chaired by the budget director, by the end of January. The Capital Budget Committee, Exhibit 7.E.9, provides input from a variety of perspectives: budget, information technology, adherence to master planning, and programmatic and preservation needs. The committee presents the draft ten-year array to the President’s Cabinet for its input in February.

Following the same timeline as the capital budget process, the president, vice presidents, and the President’s Advisory Council seek input across the university to develop a draft list of potential operating budget request items. As discussed above, the budget director presents the draft capital budget along with the operations budget request to the campus community at a Budget Advisory Committee meeting by mid-April. The budget director presents the requests to the Board of Trustees in May for its review and input, and for approval in June. The annual budget (Exhibit 7.E.8) is distributed, both in hardcopy and on the university website, to the Board of Trustees, president, and vice presidents, deans, principal budget administrators, the Faculty Senate office, the library reserve desk, and any department wishing a copy (7.A.3).

In September of each year the state Office of Financial Management (OFM) asks universities to prepare a supplemental budget. This budget is organized as a group of enhancement package requests, representing emergent items that are not able to be absorbed in the current budget. The university's supplemental budget requests for fiscal years 2008 and 2007 appear in Exhibits 7.E.10 and 7.E.11.

The state’s economy has followed the national trend, which has placed a burden on the state legislature to anticipate an estimated 6.8 billion dollar shortfall during the 2009–2011 biennium (Exhibit 7.E.12). The university’s administration evaluated all options to prepare for fiscal year 2009 cuts, as well as preparing for additional cuts in the FY 2010 and 2011 general fund operating appropriations. The governor’s budget proposal authorizes the university to increase resident undergraduate tuition up to 7% for 2010 and another 7% for 2011. However, the 2009–2011 operating budget approved by the state legislature included significant budget reductions and authorized a 14% tuition increase for both fiscal years. This follows the trend identified in Figure 7.1, which shows the shift of higher education funding from the state to the students attending CWU.

The university provides annual financial reports (Exhibits 7.E.13, 7.E.14, and 7.E.15). A detailed footnote on long term debt (7.A.4) is included in each year’s financial report. There are two components included in the debt amounts:

1) State Bonded Debt: These bonds are issued to accommodate the needs for state capital construction funding and are a result of the legislative process. Currently the repayment of this debt is not an obligation of the university, since they are considered and reported as general obligation bonds and are secured by an unconditional pledge of full faith and credit by the state. The university reimburses the state treasurer for the principal and interest payments from the tuition and fees received.

2) University Revenue Bonded Debt: At this time the university has three major capital debt obligations that are financed by local university operating revenue sources. The series 2002 bonds were issued to finance the remodel of Kamola Hall. The series 2004 bonds were issued to finance the remodel of Sue Lombard Hall and to construct the new Student Union and Recreation Center. In June 2008, the university issued its series 2008 bonds to construct the student housing project.
Wendell Hill Hall to be completed in August 2009. Wendell Hill Hall will house approximately 480 students, replacing Courson and Muzzall Halls, which were demolished in the summer of 2008.

In 2008, the university received a bond rating A2 stable from Moody’s Investor Services (Exhibit 7.E.16). This rating is consistent with the rating received during the 2004 series bond issuance (Exhibit 7.E.17), which demonstrates the financial stability of the university as reviewed by an independent source. In June of 2004, the Board of Trustees approved a university debt policy which includes issuance criteria and debt monitoring guidelines (Exhibit 7.E.18). All issuances and prospective issuances of long term debt are carefully scrutinized and reviewed by university’s management and must all ultimately be approved by the Board of Trustees (7.A.4).

Appraisal of 7.A

The attempt was made over the last decade to make the overall financial planning process more homogeneous and to integrate university priorities and the budget process across all divisions. The Campus Site and Development and Master Planning Committee has initiated a revision of the Campus Facilities Master Plan. Divisions and units are also establishing their own planning processes across the university including academic program review. These processes will incorporate the university’s priorities and goals. Interdivisional workgroups such as Information Technology, Capital Planning, and Enrollment Management have been established to plan for initiatives that cross divisional lines.

Planning processes and major initiatives such as a marketing plan to improve the university’s visibility and other initiatives outlined in Standards 1 and 3 were developed to increase student headcount and increase state funding. Planning is now more integrated across the university; all division funding requests are tied to university strategic goals, subsidiary goals, and management objectives. Divisions are encouraged to redirect resources, fund new initiatives, and discontinue certain programs or operations as necessary to more clearly meet divisional and university plans. It remains difficult to reallocate resources and to reach consensus about new directions. The tendency to maintain the status quo is compounded by the fact that the majority of departmental budgets are fixed costs.

Annual cabinet summer retreats provide an opportunity to review progress on planning and performance. The university administration strives for broad participation in budgeting, planning, and decision making processes. The university anticipates that the budget process will come under greater scrutiny as the recent downturn in both the state’s and national economies reduces available resources. These processes have become more transparent, open, and informative. Yet, some individuals do not feel they have an opportunity to participate and feel disconnected from the budget development process. With budget approval and adoption being completed very close to the start of each fiscal year, some departments find it difficult to effectively develop goals and actions plans based on accurate budget allocations. The late budget approval and adoption process delays detailed internal budget allocations, and some departments find it difficult to effectively manage operations when accurate budget information is not posted to accounts until as late as November of each fiscal year.

The complexity of the university’s financial planning and budget development process has not been well understood across the university. Following the state of Washington’s biennial budget process, CWU’s planning and budget process has consisted of biennial planning to develop and adopt an annual budget. With the change in administration and the current economic situation, the university is reevaluating its financial planning and budget development processes and is seeking to establish a five-year budget projection model. The administration seeks to establish a budget process that is open, participative, and better understood across the university.
The five-year strategic planning cycle established under President McIntyre was scheduled to begin again in 2010. Yet, the current context of public higher education is changing so quickly that President Gaudino has recommended a more aggressive schedule with an intensive planning cycle beginning in fall 2009. A university forum will begin the process with discussion about the best way to achieve an inclusive and productive process that is truly integrative and seamless.

**Standard 7.B – Adequacy of Financial Resources**

**Historical Perspective**

Various actions over the past decade have contributed to the adequacy of financial resources for the university. For state funded FTE students, the state’s allocation has increased every year since 2003. However, the cost of tuition and fees for all students, both state funded and non-state funded, has increased at a higher rate, as shown in Figure 7.1. This follows the general trend of Washington higher education institutions to place increasing responsibility on students for the cost of their education.

The legislature and the governor allow college and university boards of trustees to raise tuition rates annually up to an authorized limit. Over the last decade, CWU has increased tuition and fee rates each year. Over the last ten years, the average increase in the resident undergraduates was 6.75% and the average increase for nonresident undergraduates was 5.13% (Exhibit 7.E.19). The university has needed to increase tuition and fee rates due to the decreasing level of state support and increased service demands resulting from growth and increased operating costs.

Revenues from non-state sources have continued to increase to provide students with the variety and level of services desired. These non-state resources include grants and contracts, educational sales and services, auxiliary services, and CWU Foundation support. One major increase in non-state revenues was the establishment of a student fee for the new Student Union and Recreation Center building, which was fully operational by spring quarter 2006.

**Current Situation**

Adequate resources are maintained to fulfill the university’s mission, and funding needs continue to grow across the university. Available resources are prioritized and allocated across university divisions and programs consistent with the university’s goals, strategic planning objectives, and assessment results. A comprehensive university-wide enrollment management plan provides additional guidance for funding allocations. While increased revenues have allowed the university to bolster salaries that lagged behind peer institutions and to strengthen technology and infrastructure support, the trend for students to carry a higher share of the costs of their education continues (Figure 7.1). The university recognizes that there are limits to the amount students are willing or able to pay for their education.

With the current economic forecasts and imminent state budget cuts, a change in this trend is not projected. The university continues its efforts to increase efficiency, improve technology, and use multiple methods for delivery of instructional programs. *Through dedicated efforts of faculty and staff, the development of funding opportunities from a variety of sources continues (7.B.1).* For example, funding opportunities have been developed through interagency agreements for specific degree programs, increased 2+2 and other articulation agreements with community colleges, and high demand program proposals (See Standard 2.A). With new facilities at the six university centers, the university continues to cultivate enrollment at each of the centers.
CWU utilizes operating and capital state appropriations, tuition and fees, local dedicated fees, grants, and enterprise-generated revenues to support the educational, research, administrative, and general operations of the university. The university also continues to actively seek increases in the amount of funding received from federal, state and private grants and contracts for scholarships, fellowships, endowments and sponsored programs that support the mission and goals of the institution (7.B.1). In addition, the university has increased resources through sales and user fees for goods and services.

The university has established the CWU Research Foundation (CWURF; Exhibit 1.E.45). The primary goal and mission of the CWURF is to encourage and assist CWU’s faculty, staff and students to serve as an intellectual resource that enables central Washington, the state, and the region to solve human and environmental problems through economic development. CWURF supports the transformation of intellectual inquiry into applications that facilitate economic development.

Central Washington University maintains adequate available resources to meet its debt service requirements. Current and future debt service requirements are reviewed as part of the financial statement preparation process and disclosed as an appendix in the annual financial report (7.A.2) (Exhibits 7.E.13, 7.E.14, and 7.E.15). Central takes a conservative approach when deciding to issue long-term debt and does not issue either short- or long-term debt to finance operations. The long-term debt issued by the university is typically issued by its auxiliary enterprises and is backed by revenues generated from the capital projects and auxiliary operations. In compliance with its debt service policy, Exhibit 7.E.18, the university has agreed to produce net revenues, in each fiscal year, of at least 100% of the maximum debt service, which ensures adequate reserves to pay the current portion of university revenue bonds when they become due (7.B.2).

The university has enjoyed a steady increase in its financial position over the ten years as evidenced by the steady increase in net assets as shown in Figure 7.4. The university’s administration has effectively planned, monitored, and reallocated resources to ensure financial stability (7.B.3).

Auxiliary/Enterprise operations are required to maintain surpluses to meet bond covenant requirements and to also provide for future capital and operating needs. State-funded areas are allocated a fiscal year budget and are not allowed to deficit spend. All are monitored on a monthly basis. The university has never been in a position of being unable to perform or fulfill its core educational mission due to inadequate financial resources.

The university complies with all regulations regarding mandatory and non-mandatory transfers in its accounting records and published annual financial report (7.B.4). The university limits the amount of inter-fund borrowing and requires plans to pay off any amounts owed to other funds within a reasonable time. Inter-fund borrowing is never allowed with state appropriated funds; only self-support funds are allowed to borrow or loan funds. Currently, the university does not have a policy that addresses inter-fund loan/borrowing.

The university demonstrates adequate financial resources for the support of all of its offerings, including specialized occupational, technical and professional programs (7.B.5). Budget
documentation summarizes state appropriations, funding from interagency agreements with community colleges, and grant funding received for each instructional area. During the annual budget process the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs reviews the offerings of all academic departments, along with their enrollment patterns, and the university enrollment management plan (7.B.1). The deans and academic affairs administrators provide information on projected changes in enrollment, curriculum changes, and program development in the budget discussions and the enrollment management planning process. All allocations are driven by the priorities identified by departmental budget/funding requests tied to their missions and goals, their strategic plan, and their program review indicators.

In the self-evaluation process, departments have expressed concern for limited resources despite the continued growth in student FTE. Departments seek alternative resources through grants, increased fees, summer school, and other sources to meet operational needs. Several departments report depending on summer school revenues to fund year-round departmental operations. Having a large portion of non-tenure track positions and program support funded with one-time monies makes planning from one quarter to the next extremely difficult. Departments also expressed the need for additional base funding to address salaries, work load, additional faculty and staff positions, professional development, classroom supplies, and equipment.

At the same time departments are identifying unmet financial needs, the university had adequate financial resources to support all of its offerings and operations and to fund several Spheres of Distinction programs—innovative and resourceful approaches to academic, student, and campus life, giving regional, national, or international prominence to CWU. The university has substantial resources. The question about adequate resources is a judgment about the distribution of those resources which includes decisions about priorities, allocations, quality, and the ability to meet the growing demand for educational and operational services. The 2008–09 budget included resources for educational and operational services, and it also provided funding for Spheres of Distinction. All Spheres of Distinction funding requests must tie to unit or division goals, which align with institutional goals. Funding was also allocated during the past year for the development of the Center for the Teacher-Scholar, which provided coordination of professional development efforts.

The Financial Aid Office identifies the sources of its student financial aid for current enrollments and provides evidence of planning for future financial aid in light of projected enrollments (7.B.6). Central’s students have a variety of financial aid sources available to them. Governmental programs, either state or federal, provide the majority of financial aid awarded to students. Over three percent of the university’s tuition revenues are placed in a student loan fund. Central is authorized by state statute to provide aid in the form of state-supported tuition waivers and is required to dedicate a percentage of its tuition revenue to need-based aid. During the 2007 legislative session, the percentage of tuition waivers for which Central receives state reimbursement was increased from 8 to 10 percent. Endowment earnings continue to provide a source of financial aid, and annual private sources also constitute a share of financial aid available to students. The sources of financial aid are identified in Exhibit 7.E.20. See Standard 3.D for a more detailed discussion of financial aid.

Over the past ten years, the university has effectively managed its state general fund appropriations and the revenue from tuition and fees to enhance the overall stability of the institution. The university analyzes both the current situation and also future years in an attempt to identify potential revenue decreases or significant expense increases. The university strives to maintain adequate fund balances to offset any setbacks (7.B.7). During the last five years, the unrestricted fund balance has increased by approximately 10.5 million dollars. However, the current national and state economic condition has impacted the university and the CWU Foundation. As directed by the state, the university has reduced expenditures for employment, personal service contracts, equipment, and out-of-state travel.
the first few months of 2009, the university solicited budget savings ideas from the university community and the ideas were included in the 2009–10 budget process (Exhibit 7.E.21). Due to the economic constraints, the university reevaluated all department, operational activities, services, personnel, and goods and services as part of the 2009–10 budget process.

The university recognizes the importance of its auxiliary operations and their contribution to the overall financial stability of the institution. Central does not use auxiliary revenues or surpluses to fund educational or general operations. Likewise, the institution does not use general operation surpluses to fund any auxiliary activities. As required by state law and bond covenants, the university separates general and education operations from auxiliary enterprise services (7.B.8). All auxiliary enterprises are operated as self-supporting entities, and each enterprise activity pays its own related expenses. Auxiliary enterprise revenues and expenses are reviewed by individual managers, and operations are modified as appropriate. All revenue sources are monitored collectively by senior level administrators for adequacy and stability and when necessary appropriate actions are initiated to take action to address funding issues. Auxiliary operations are required to maintain sufficient surpluses to meet all debt service requirements and to provide for future capital and operating needs.

The financial status of all auxiliary enterprises is reported annually to the Board of Trustees. In the spring of each year, an auxiliary services business plan is presented to the board for information and approval, and to authorize rate increases (Exhibits 7.E.22, 7.E.23, and 7.E.24). The university’s financial statements reflect the practice of separately disclosing the operations of the auxiliaries in the segment information footnote of the university’s annual financial report (Exhibits 7.E.13, 7.E.14, and 7.E.15). In addition, the university prepares a separate auxiliary service financial report that is audited by the state of Washington each year (Exhibits 7.E.25, 7.E.26, and 7.E.27).

The intercollegiate athletic sports program has experienced financial pressure due to increased costs, scheduling difficulties as a result of NCAA league changes, and resource limitations over the last few years. In July 2004, President McIntyre formed the CWU Blue Ribbon Commission on Athletics, an interdepartmental team to recommend a long-range plan for intercollegiate competition. The 20-member panel released a 30-page final report (Exhibit 7.E.28). One of the recommendations stated that the Athletic Department must increase funding or resources to cover the athletic costs. Based on the recommendations, the former director of public relations and marketing was reassigned as an athletic development director to increase resources. Although Athletic Department resources have increased, the Washington State Auditor’s Office (SAO) financial report shows that expenditures have exceeded revenues over the last three years (Exhibits 7.E.29, 7.E.30, and 7.E.31). During the 2008 spring term, CWU students voted down a proposal to increase the fixed quarterly athletic fee by $18 with an inflation factor for future years. Another proposal to increase the quarterly athletic fee from $35 to $42 was presented and approved by students during the 2009 spring term. The increased student fee will help, but it will not fill all of the Athletic Department’s current needs. The Athletic Department and the university need to establish a stable and consistent funding source that meets the growing needs of the student athletics and programs authorized by the university.

**Appraisal of 7.B**

The university has identified and maintains resources adequate to fulfill its missions. The university’s diagnostic and performance measures partly provide evidence of progress on important goals (Exhibit 1.E.25) and program assessment activities discussed in Standard 2.B. provide indicators regarding the adequacy of resources. However, the university recognizes the challenges of maintaining the diversity of funding sources and balancing tuition dollars with the imminent decline in state appropriations while staying competitive during a time of uncertain student enrollments. To address these challenges, plans include continuing to communicate with the legislature about the economic stimulus value of higher
education, the need to receive the current level of increased state appropriations, and the impact on students of increasing tuition rates. The Academic Affairs Division will continue to develop interdisciplinary programs and efforts to take full advantage of state “high demand” or other targeted allocations. All activities across the university will be analyzed for cost savings and efficiencies. The adequacy of base budgets will continue to be a challenge for units across the university. Efforts to identify additional opportunities for developing diverse funding options will continue.

While faculty salaries have improved, the university continues to recognize that competitive salaries are critical to efforts to recruit and retain faculty of the highest quality. The current commitment to providing competitive salaries is evident in the faculty collective bargaining agreement (Exhibit GE.7). One area of concern is the belief in some areas that the proportion of the university’s expenses dedicated to instruction has decreased over time and that resources have shifted away from the university’s core academic mission. As shown in Figure 7.5, instructional expenses have remained relatively stable as a percentage of the university’s total educational and general expenditures. With expenses aligned as guided by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) to complete the annual financial report and IPEDS report, a comparison of expense by function is shown in Exhibit 7.E.32. Instructional resources added over the last few years have centered more on funding adjunct and non-tenured track faculty than tenure-track faculty lines (Exhibit 7.E.33). The university remains committed to ensuring the level of instructional expenses necessary to achieve its core mission to provide the highest quality of education possible.

Some academic departments have also expressed concerns about the lack of funding to purchase and maintain specialized laboratory and other instructional equipment. Departments have researched the availability of alternative funding resources, and many departments have used summer session and grant revenues to maintain and upgrade instructional equipment. On three occasions over the past five years, the president, provost, and dean of graduate studies have created equipment funding pools that were distributed through a competitive proposal process. However, the university is being challenged to establish a routine process for acquiring and maintaining appropriate instructional equipment.

A large percentage of the allocations for Multimedia Technology and Instructional Support Services are comprised of one-time funding. In order to remain competitive and develop cost-effective programs without compromising academic quality, the university must establish a planning and budget process to facilitate the utilization of emerging technology. Increased usage of the web and multi-model instructional offerings provide opportunities to increase overall enrollment.

Governor Gregoire's Washington Learns initiative (Exhibit 7.E.34) and the HECB’s 2008 Strategic Master Plan (Exhibit 2.E.24) set new benchmarks for funding higher education, based on comparisons to a set of states now referred to as the Global Challenge States. The state has expressed an interest in improving funding per student to a level more commensurate with that of the other Global Challenge States, an interest that should promise improved salaries for faculty and other operating expenses. This commitment is a hopeful sign but the global recession puts progress out of reach for the near future. The university plans to remind the state of this goal and encourage the state to make this
funding a priority. The university’s goal will continue to be to insure funding for adequate academic offerings to meet the enrollment goals while maintaining its high academic standards.

Although the state has expressed interest in improving higher education funding, the 2009 session of the state legislature concluded in April after approving the deepest cuts to public higher education in the history of the state. The state capital budget holds better news for CWU with funding for the addition and renovation of the Hogue Technology Building. The two-year operating budget reduces state support for CWU by $36.9 million and drops state-funded student enrollment from 9,322 to 8,477 in 2009–2010 and 8,734 in 2010–2011. To offset the steep budget reductions, the legislature provided one-time federal stimulus funds and authorized the university to increase tuition by 14% for 2009–2010 and again in 2010–2011. Clearly, the state legislature expects the state’s four-year institutions to run more efficiently and to generate a larger share of their own revenues in the future than they have in the past. Despite the reduction in state resources, the university is committed to achieving its mission and providing quality educational services to a growing number of students.


**Historical Perspective**

Central Washington University historically has been a well-managed financial organization as evidenced by independent audit reports and no audit findings over the last decade (Exhibits 7.E.35, 7.E.36, and 7.E.37). The university has been committed to a reporting system that meets all state and national requirements and provides the management information needed to operate effectively. Control mechanisms are in place and are audited regularly. The university has an exemplary record of compliance with state and federal laws (Exhibits 7.E.38, 7.E.39, and 7.E.40).

**Current Situation**

During the last 7 years, PeopleSoft was implemented as the university’s new administrative data base system. Currently the university has three modules that are fully operational: human resources, financial management system, and student administration. These three modules are all integrated and ultimately provide data for financial reporting. Each module has gone through upgrades to newer versions. This has allowed the university to take advantage of greater efficiencies and improvements but places an ongoing demand on staff to test and implement patches, fixes, and upgrades (Exhibit 7.E.1).

*The Board of Trustees oversees all financial matters related to the operation of the university. The president provides periodic written and oral financial reports to the Board of Trustees, including at official board meetings (Exhibit 7.E.41) (7.C.1). In addition, the vice president of business and financial affairs and the vice president for university relations, who is also the executive director of the CWU Foundation, regularly meet with the Resource Development and Audit Subcommittee of the board of trustees to discuss the financial health of the institution. The university’s audited financial statements are presented annually at a public board meeting.*

Although some accounting activities have been decentralized over the last few years, the university’s financial functions are administered by the vice president for business and financial affairs, who reports directly to the president (7.C.2). All university resources and expenditures, regardless of source, are fully controlled by the institution and are included in regular planning, budgeting, accounting, and auditing procedures (7.C.3). Qualified professionals occupy positions responsible for accounting and financial affairs, budget preparation and monitoring, and auxiliary services (7.C.2).
Many individuals in these positions have business and accounting degrees and auditing experience, have worked in other institutions of higher education in business and finance, and some are certified public accountants. Organization charts for the President’s Division and the Business and Financial Affairs Division are included as Exhibits 7.E.42 and 7.E.43.

The institution, through its strategic planning and budgeting process, accounting system, and internal and external audit programs manages, monitors, and tracks all income and expenses. The complexity of the financial administration and accounting systems is commensurate with the complexity of the institution (7.C.2). Financial aid programs and resources are fully controlled and managed by the Financial Aid Office (7.C.3). As an agency of the state of Washington, the university follows mandated guidelines set by the state Office of Financial Management (OFM). OFM's authority derives from statutes in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW 43.88).

The SAO performs annual audits and provides audit reports and related management letters to the audit committee of the board of trustees (Exhibits 7.E.44, 7.E.45, and 7.E.46). The SAO also manages the Washington State Whistleblower Program as authorized in RCW 42.40, and investigates all reports of improper governmental action (Exhibit 7.E.47). After each investigation, the SAO issues a report to the state agency and posts it on the SAO website as a public record (Exhibits 7.E.48 and 7.E.49). The university's director of internal audit also has an audit plan that includes in-depth reviews of individual departments and reports to the Board of Trustees (7.C.11) (Exhibits 7.E.50, 7.E.51, and 7.E.52). All internal and external audit reports are publicly available and available to the NWCCU (7.C.13).

Central Washington University investments reflect the state’s guidelines for the investment of public funds as authorized by RCW 39.59 (7.C.4). Privately donated funds are invested in accordance with university guidelines (Exhibit 7.E.53) and generally follow the investment policy of the CWU Foundation (Exhibit 7.E.54). The vice president of business and financial affairs delegates responsibility for cash management and investment functions to the assistant vice president for financial affairs.

The university maintains a financial accounting system that properly records transactions to facilitate reporting of institutional financial reports in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (7.C.5). The staff responsible for financial recording and reporting is required to be fully knowledgeable of accounting principles. The university’s financial statements are audited annually by independent auditors. A summary of the university’s significant accounting policies are published in Note 1 of the footnotes of the annual financial report (Exhibits 7.E.13, 7.E.14, and 7.E.15).

The Washington State Auditor’s Office, a state agency with audit authority over state agencies (RCW 43.09.10), audits the university’s financial statements, system statements, athletic department statements, and completes an accountability report every year. NWCCU standards for independent or proprietary institutions (7.C.6, 7.C.7, and 7.C.8) do not apply to CWU. All audits completed by the SAO are a matter of public record and can be viewed on the state website. The SAO meets federal audit requirements by including all state agencies in the Single Audit Program. CWU Foundation funds are audited as a separate entity by an independent certified public accounting firm (7.C.9; 7.C.10) Central has chosen to disclose the foundation in its annual report as a blended component of the university per GASB 39. Independently audited financial statements of the foundation for the last 3 years are provided in Exhibits 7.E.55, 7.E.56, and 7.E.57. All transactions and expenditures in the university’s accounting system are subject to the annual state audit.

The CWU Office of Internal Audit serves the university by examining and evaluating operations and activities to provide independent risk assessment, analyses, appraisals, recommendations, counsel, information, and assistance (7.C.11). The internal auditor evaluates computer systems and accounting records for reconciliation and security controls, data integrity, programming documentation, and
archiving. A comprehensive audit plan is formulated by assigning a level of risk to each component of each unit or department across campus. This audit program is integrated with the requirements of the SAO and is designed to prevent the loss of university resources. The auditor’s activities comply with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing (Exhibit 7.E.58). The director of internal audit, who reports to the president and Board of Trustees, is responsible for managing and directing the institutional internal audit program, coordinating the university’s measurement and assessment of risk, and serving as liaison with state, federal, and other external auditors. The internal auditor has access to all transactions and records generated by the university. The internal auditor also coordinates the state whistleblower program and internal complaints.

The SAO formal audit report contains an opinion and any audit findings are publicly reported (Exhibits 7.E.7, 7.E.35, 7.E.36, and 7.E.37). The auditor also provides a management letter of issues that may be of concern or indicate system weaknesses (Exhibits 7.E.44, 7.E.45, and 7.E.46). The institution replies formally to any findings and informally reports on corrective action on management letter items. The institution’s annual financial statements are publicly distributed and contain an opinion letter from the state auditor. Both internal and the external auditors continue to report and follow up with management until all audit issues have been resolved (7.C.12).

_Appraisal of 7.C_

The university has maintained a rigorous system of auditing and responding to concerns raised by the audit process. The state audit system is thorough and contains management letters to which the university responds. The excellence of the university’s financial management system is a function of sound policies and well trained personnel. The university maintains a cadre of well qualified financial managers, and has not received an audit finding in the last decade.

The university’s relational database system, PeopleSoft, provides flexible reporting of financial, student, and human resources information in a variety of formats. It has enhanced the university’s control mechanisms while providing cross-functional reporting to improve decision-making. The university is committed to expanding its use of the software to further enhance its financial reporting, data analysis, and strategic planning processes. University staff are challenged to meet the continual demands imposed by system, operational, application, and other software upgrades (Exhibit 7.E.1).

The Division of Business and Financial Affairs responds to requests for information and analysis related to the university’s fiscal health. The increasing demands for data and analysis from internal units and external agencies tax the resources available to address these requests. It is becoming increasingly difficult to respond to all requests in a timely manner.

_Standard 7.D – Fundraising and Development_

_Historical Perspective_

Central Washington University’s Division of University Relations is responsible for fundraising, development, alumni relations, publications, CWU Foundation operations, and public relations and marketing (Exhibit 7.E.59). Each department plays a vital role in building sustainable external relations and in strengthening development efforts. Reflecting the need for private resources for scholarships, faculty support, and special programs, the university has seen rapid growth in the Division of University Relations and most dramatically in the Office of Development.
University Relations and the CWU Foundation fundraising activities are governed by institutional policies, comply with governmental requirements, and are conducted in a professional and ethical manner (7.D.1; Exhibit 7.E.60). Development officers comply with the code of ethics established by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE; Exhibit 7.E.61). The CWU Foundation Board of Directors adopted the code of ethics found in Exhibit 7.E.62, and each member completes an annual conflict of interest questionnaire each year (Exhibit 7.E.63).

The Office of Development is charged with securing, acknowledging, stewarding, and tracking contributions to support the university through annual, major, and planned gifts. It maintains donor records and coordinates fund-raising activities. Development efforts are conducted in concert with the non-profit CWU Foundation, which is led by a board of directors from across the nation. The vice president for university relations serves as the foundation’s executive director and manages the foundation’s operations (7.D.2).

The CWU Foundation, an independent, non-profit, charitable 501(c)(3) organization established in 1968, leads efforts to support and enhance programs at CWU by seeking gifts, grants, bequests, and other forms of financial support and, when secured, being a prudent steward of its resources and friendships. The foundation augments the basic needs of university programs, ensuring excellence in faculty and students. Members of a volunteer board of directors, who commit to seeking charitable gifts that support Central, govern it (7.D.2). The Foundation and university have a formalized agreement that provides guidance regarding fund-raising and use of funds (7.D.3; Exhibit 7.E.64). This agreement is reviewed by both parties every three to five years and will be next reviewed in FY 2009.

The CWU Foundation also provides investment services to the CWU Alumni Association, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation, which shares in the responsibility for keeping university alumni and friends informed and involved with the institution. Elected alumni serve on the volunteer board of directors, which is the policy-making group for the CWU Alumni Association. The director of the Office of Alumni Relations serves as the association’s executive director (7.D.2).

The first full-time director of development was hired in 1994. As the university’s development efforts took root, more focus was given to attracting major gifts. In the mid-1990s, a records manager position was added to the staff. Alumni and donor records were maintained in separate systems—one on a PC and the other a “home-grown” product maintained on a Macintosh. A users’ committee researched and subsequently purchased Raiser’s Edge, a comprehensive database system.

Once the conversion was completed, a systematic annual giving program was initiated in 1997. With increased gifts, a donor stewardship program was formally established in 1998. The annual giving officer led the effort to establish and operate an automated calling center on campus from 1998 to 2004. Based on cost effectiveness, a decision was made to contract with an outside vendor. No calling was conducted in 2006, and the number of donors decreased dramatically. Over the years, contracted services have shown varied outcomes from with the best results in 2008–2009. Many donors, however, would rather hear from students than from a vendor and have asked to be removed from the call list. Giving clubs were created. A two-day turnaround for gift acknowledgement, annual endowment reporting, and receptions for donors and scholarship recipients became established standards.

In preparation for a comprehensive gifts campaign, President Jerilyn S. McIntyre, placed development officers in each of the university’s four colleges and in the department of athletics. The development officers report to the assistant vice president for development, with a dotted-line relationship to their respective college deans or the athletic director.
CWU hired Campbell and Company in 2004 to conduct research and prepare a capital campaign feasibility study (Exhibit 7.E.65). The Transforming Lives campaign was embraced by the CWU Board of Trustees and the CWU Foundation Board (Exhibit 7.E.66). Major donor prospects were identified, new advisory boards were established, and case statements were prepared. Integrated communications, including logo design, publications, web, media, and advertising, were created specifically for the campaign by the Office of Public Relations and Marketing, collaborating with the Office of Development. The Transforming Lives premier publication, the case statement, received a regional design award (Exhibit 7.E.67).

A 5-year campaign goal of $18 million was established, focusing on four main themes: excellence, opportunity, innovation, and the personal touch. Transforming Lives began its silent phase in January 2005. Through the generosity of donors and the support and imagination of trustees, alumni, faculty, staff, administrators, parents, friends, and other volunteer leaders, the Transforming Lives campaign was highly successful. As shown in Exhibit 7.E.68, the campaign goal was increased to $21 million in July 2007 and actually amassed $21.7 million in gifts by June 2008, 3½ years after the campaign began. The campaign goals also included creating a culture of philanthropy, growing the donor base, instilling the message that a public institution needs private funds, increasing visibility, and improving the university’s image. These have also all been achieved to varying degrees.

Public Relations and Marketing continues to increase its services, breadth of capabilities, and focus in collaborating with University Relations departments and the entire university for strategic development and fund-raising communications strategies. In 2006, Public Relations and Marketing added a new communications and marketing coordinator, to focus on the need for increased marketing and other integrated communications demands. This position has played a key role in assisting with the promotion of the Transforming Lives campaign, college campaigns, and other fund-raising promotions.

In the mid-1990s, the Office of Alumni Relations transitioned from university operational support to revenue generated by “affinity partners,” companies that sold credit cards, insurance, loan consolidation, and other products to alumni. After a decade of substantial income, most of these contracts have been renegotiated and now generate significantly lower revenues. Like many other alumni offices, Central is returning to the traditional model of membership-driven support while also seeking increased institutional funding. This approach is unlikely to generate the level of income enjoyed during the peak affinity years, but it does promise to be more responsive to alumni and university needs.

**Current Situation**

The university and foundation are developing a new strategic fund raising plan for 2010–2015. Plans are being crafted to educate the university faculty and staff on how their friend raising, fund raising, and internal and external communication efforts can support the university. The plan addresses staff stability, following a high level of turnover in recent years, including the vice president, assistant vice president, development officers, office assistants, and assistant director of advancement services.

The Office of Publications was formed to aid CWU in communicating with alumni, community members, decision makers, donors, friends, and university employees. It develops, produces, and disseminates high-quality publications, including the Central Connections alumni magazine (Exhibit 7.E.69), the President’s Annual Report (Exhibit 7.E.70), Central Alumni, (Exhibit 7.E.71), Office of Development Rapport Newsletter (Exhibit 7.E.72), and the internal University Bulletin (Exhibit 7.E.73). These publications increase awareness, appreciation, and understanding of the accomplishments of CWU students, faculty, alumni, and programs, as a way to enhance the university’s regional and national reputations in conjunction with its fund-raising endeavors.
CWU Foundation investments are managed by U.S. Bank. It and the foundation’s Investment and Finance Committee conduct performance oversight (7.D.2). Foundation investment returns during the past five years have averaged 6.5 percent (Exhibit 7.E.74). Although the university is pleased with U.S. Bank’s performance, investment returns sharply plunged and have shown losses since 2008. In keeping with the foundation’s 5-year policy to review investment management services, the foundation plans to request proposals for investment services in 2010.

Since the stock market downturn in 2007 and 2008, the foundation’s investments have lost value—down 3.95 percent as of June 30, 2008, and another 18.99 percent by November 30, 2008. At its December 2008 meeting, the foundation board established a zero percent endowment-spending rate for 2009–2010, but authorized a 2.74 percent spending rate for funds with sufficient historical earnings. With a reduced spending rate and many funds with unrealized losses, the number of scholarships will be limited. Since Central has traditionally attracted a relatively large proportion of first-generation students and those students needing financial aid, it is feared that many will not be able to continue their education.

When state funds are available, the CWU Foundation provides resources to obtain state matching dollars for graduate fellowships and distinguished professorship endowments. As these endowments include state resources, they are required to be held by the university and are managed by the vice president for business and financial affairs. CWU endowment funds have experienced a decline in investment income similar to the CWU Foundation investments (Exhibit 7.E.75). Endowment reports are presented to the CWU Board of Trustees semi-annually (Exhibits 7.E.76, 7.E.77, and 7.E.78).

During the audit of the 2007–2008 CWU Foundation statements, a difference was identified in components of the internal financial statements and the audited financial statements for the previous five or six years, although the total net assets matched. Forensic research detailed the discrepancies, and the audited financial statements have been adjusted accordingly.

As shown in Figure 7.6, the CWU Foundation experienced consistent growth in the number of endowments from 2004 through 2008. During the Transforming Lives campaign, significant emphasis was given to secure endowments and major gift pledges. Planned gifts increased more than $13 million, with much of the expected revenue going to scholarships. Major gift pledges rose from $356,223 in FY 2004 to $849,809 in FY 2008. These endowments and major gift pledges provide a steady stream of funds to pursue CWU’s strategic goals and objectives.

In late 2007, it was determined that one employee inappropriately used a CWU Foundation credit card. Immediately upon being notified, the president initiated an investigation. All funds have been repaid, and an oversight task force tightened and improved the foundation’s policies and procedures. The Division of University Relations recently completed a risk assessment analysis (Exhibit 7.E.79), identifying risks and mitigation measures. Cycles of risk assessment will continue each year to identify risks, list and implement mitigations, and complete assigned tasks. To comply with new audit regulations, strengthen internal controls, and provide financial statement preparation and oversight, the foundation may contract for accounting consulting services when funds become available.
Appraisal of 7.D

Although the current economic slowdown has dampened donations, the university and the CWU Foundation want to build on the highly successful Transforming Lives campaign that generated over $21 million in just over three years. The university's favorable state and national recognition on several fronts and the arrival of a new university president open new opportunities to connect and reconnect with alumni and donors, strengthen government relationships, and prepare for the next campaign.

After analyzing the results of the Transforming Lives campaign, staff will make any reporting and accounting changes that may be needed in the future. A policy and procedures manual will be written for reporting, counting, and valuing planned gifts—both revocable and irrevocable—and will be reviewed and updated as needed. The university will be scheduling meetings with volunteers from the CWU Board of Trustees, the CWU Foundation, the CWU Alumni Association, university administration leaders, and university relations to discuss strategies, timelines, goals, and expectations for the next campaign.

Efforts are underway to begin a new strategic planning process for 2009–2014. The foundation staff is exploring alternatives to improve organization structure, and plans are being created to educate and involve university staff. In anticipation of the next capital campaign, it will be important to hire additional development officers and retain productive development staff. It is essential to replace a history of part-time grant writers with a full-time corporation and foundation grant specialist or director.

Standard 7 Summary

CWU has received adequate resources to achieve the university’s mission and vision, including expanding services at the CWU centers and funding spheres of distinction. The university has expanded programs and services and has grown in student diversity. CWU has experienced strong legislative support and positive financial ratings resulting in construction of educational facilities at the centers and on the main Ellensburg campus, remodeling two historic residence halls, and constructing the new Student Union and Recreation Center. There are open and realistic processes for the operational and capital budgets, and progress has been made to integrate financial planning more clearly into the strategic plan to achieve the university’s mission and goals. The CWU Foundation found strong support and exceeded expectations with the highly successful Transforming Lives campaign. Areas of funding challenges include academic instructional equipment and athletics.

Because the university depends on state funding, its record of success and positive achievements will be jeopardized by the downturn in the economy. A clear shift in resources is shown in Figure 7.1: state operational support has remained relatively flat while student tuition and fee revenues have steadily increased. This trend will continue at least over the next two years when tuition is expected to increase by seven percent each year and state operational funds are expected to decrease. The economic downturn also is significantly reducing student scholarship and program support resources.

The university has been and will continue to be challenged with shifting resources and greater reliance on tuition and user fees, the need to find added resources, competition for resources due to the economic downturn, increased state controls over revenue, and ongoing demand for resources to maintain and expand programs. The university will continue conscientiously to expend funds to best meet student and university needs for greater instructional support, student support, administrative service, and facility enhancements while providing even greater public accountability.

CWU has included the university's IPEDS reports for the last three years as Exhibits 7.E.80, 7.E.81, and 7.E.82. The most current Department of Education loan default report for the university is included as Exhibit 7.E.83.
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Central Washington University’s response to Standard 8 considers instructional and support facilities, equipment, and physical resource planning. It highlights the significant renovation and construction of instructional facilities over the past ten years and the development of planning processes that will keep physical facilities, equipment, and sustainable practices in step with the mission of the university.

The instructional program needs of the academic community were the catalyst for the renovation and construction projects of the last ten years. On the Ellensburg campus, a new science building and an education center were completed. A new music facility was constructed. The physical education pavilion facility has completed multiple phases of renovation and a former natural science facility underwent a major renovation to house anthropology, geography, and resource management. All new facilities have been constructed at the six university center sites in cooperation with their partner community colleges. CWU has renovated two residence halls, constructed a new residence hall complex, and demolished two nine-story residence halls. A new student union and recreation center has been constructed with new dining and bookstore facilities. Plans are under way for a new industrial engineering and technology center and another demolition and subsequent replacement of a residence hall.

CWU has become a leader in the state of Washington for energy conservation and carbon reduction. Infrastructure improvements have resulted in substantial savings in energy and earned for the university the governor’s award for energy conservation. CWU also is at the forefront for preservation of its buildings and has received commendations for its efforts. The condition of CWU instructional buildings is rated at the top of public higher education institutions throughout the state.

**Standard 8.A - Instructional and Support Facilities**

--- **Historical Perspective**

Central Washington University offers degree programs at the residential campus in Ellensburg, at six centers located Des Moines, Moses Lake, Lynnwood, Pierce County, Yakima, and Wenatchee, and at three teaching sites on host community colleges in Kent, Everett, and Mount Vernon. The Facilities Management Department (FMD) is responsible for the construction and maintenance of the buildings, grounds, and infrastructure of the Ellensburg campus (Appendix 8.A.1). Since each of the centers is housed in newly constructed, shared facilities on a community college campus, inter-agency agreements make each community college responsible for the maintenance of its center’s buildings, grounds, and infrastructure. The teaching sites are also maintained by the host community colleges.

With thoughtful, inclusive planning, CWU continues to be successful at upgrading and constructing facilities to meet the anticipated instructional, research, and service requirements of departments and programs. In the past, land acquisition had been the key element in the long range planning process. Over the last 10 years, construction and renovation projects on the Ellensburg campus and at the university centers have been the main focus of the short-term and long-term planning process.

The university owns 380 acres of land on the Ellensburg campus of which 255 acres are developed. There are 62 non-residential facilities (2,107,527 gross square feet) and 27 residential facilities (891,096 gross square feet) (Appendix 8.A.2). Historically, the university centers, some of which have been in existence for more than three decades, have been housed in leased facilities. In the last ten years, CWU has terminated the lease arrangements, formed joint occupancy agreements with six
community colleges, and constructed new buildings at the university centers (Figure 8.1, Appendix 8.A.3). The teaching sites have similar operating agreements aligned with the programmatic needs of the university. Two teaching sites are contract programs with our community college partners and have no lease costs. The third site is space leased from Green River Community College at Kent.

**Current Situation**

A mission of CWU is to provide a safe and attractive physical campus environment for the University community that is conducive to learning, living, and working (Exhibit GE.1). CWU’s instructional facilities are sufficient to achieve the institution’s mission and goals (8.A.1). Providing appropriate physical resources to meet instructional and research needs has been and will continue to be a high priority of CWU. Table 8.1 details the physical resources that have been provided for the university centers. Interagency agreements with the six centers (Exhibit 8.E.1) provide for enhanced future physical resource planning for CWU and its partner community colleges. Table 8.2 details the renovated and new construction physical resources provided for the Ellensburg campus over the past ten years. Exhibit 8.E.2 provides a synopsis of each of the renovation and new construction projects. CWU plans ahead to meet the appropriate physical resources for instruction, research, residence, and support needs, and attends and responds to historical preservation needs. In May 2006, the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation presented its 2006 State Historic Preservation Officer’s Award for Stewardship to Central Washington University stating, “The University has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to historic preservation and has a proven track record as one of the state’s best stewards of significant historic properties.”

**Table 8.1. CWU Centers Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Community College Campus</th>
<th>Name of Building</th>
<th>Date Opened</th>
<th>Gross Sq Ft</th>
<th>CWU Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynnwood, WA</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>Snoqualmie Hall</td>
<td>Fall, 2002</td>
<td>51,247</td>
<td>$16,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima, WA</td>
<td>Yakima Valley</td>
<td>Deccio Higher Ed Center</td>
<td>Fall, 2003</td>
<td>65,920</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County, WA</td>
<td>Pierce College - Steilacoom</td>
<td>Olympic Building</td>
<td>Winter, 2004</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake, WA</td>
<td>Big Bend</td>
<td>Grant County Advanced Technology Ctr</td>
<td>Winter, 2005</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, WA</td>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Higher Education Center</td>
<td>Spring, 2005</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee, WA</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>CWU-Higher Ed Center</td>
<td>Fall, 2006</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>$2,516,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.2. CWU - Ellensburg Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Academic, Residential, or Student</th>
<th>Renovation or New Construction</th>
<th>Name of Building</th>
<th>Date Opened</th>
<th>Gross Sq Ft</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg, WA</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>Kamola Hall</td>
<td>Spring, 2003</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg, WA</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>Sue Lombard Hall</td>
<td>Fall, 2003</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg, WA</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Music Education Building</td>
<td>Fall, 2004</td>
<td>68,920</td>
<td>$29,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg, WA</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>McConnell Hall Theater</td>
<td>Fall, 2003</td>
<td>79,095</td>
<td>$2,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg, WA</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>Nicholson Pavilion Title IX</td>
<td>Winter, 2005</td>
<td>64,900</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg, WA</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>Nicholson Pavilion IAQ/Abatement and Renovation</td>
<td>Fall, 2006</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>$4,996,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg, WA</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>Nicholson Pavilion Renovation - Phase III</td>
<td>Fall, 2008</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg, WA</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Student Union &amp; Recreation Center (SURC)</td>
<td>Winter/ Spring 2006</td>
<td>228,261</td>
<td>$61,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg, WA</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>Dean Hall</td>
<td>Fall, 2008</td>
<td>79,095</td>
<td>$30,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg, WA</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Student Village South</td>
<td>Fall, 2009</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>$37,242,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infrastructure. Over the past ten years, infrastructure improvements and energy conservation have been major focuses of FMD. Part of providing physical resources is to provide modern energy efficient methods of electricity generation and natural gas usage. Additional aspects are to study alternative, green heating systems and water/sewer and storm water management systems. CWU has pursued innovative methods, such as the ESCO projects described below, to achieve these infrastructure improvements.

State of Washington Energy Service Company (ESCO) Projects. Since 2000, CWU has completed major energy infrastructure upgrades to the main steam system, chilled water system, and building energy systems to improve their reliability and reduce their energy consumption. The majority of the campus is heated and cooled from a central heating and cooling plant consisting of multiple boilers and chillers whose steam and chilled water are distributed to buildings via an underground pipe system. Replacement of old poorly insulated and leaking pipes with new well-insulated pipes and some satellite boilers is an ongoing multi-biennia capital improvement project with an expected completion during the 2015–2017 biennium. Additionally, integration of the building energy system controls and metering of all energy consumption into a computer-networked energy management system has been implemented to allow consistent management of both the central plant and all building systems. These major capital improvements have been performed under the State of Washington Energy Service Company (ESCO) requirements with budget and on-site project management by the university. Since 2000, there have been reductions in annual energy consumption of 13% for natural gas and 14% for electricity. During this same period, 280,000 square feet in new building additions have been added to the campus. Exhibits 8.E.3 and 8.E.4 respectively show graphs of natural gas and electricity, costs and consumption, by month, from July 1998, through June 2008. In 2004, CWU was awarded the Governor’s Award for Excellence in Energy Management (Exhibit 8.E.5) for its efforts in operating a successful energy management program.

Parking. In 1999, the university had approximately 3,782 spaces available for parking on the Ellensburg campus. That number has improved to approximately 4,243 spaces. The increase has occurred as a result of capital development of existing property, as well as the purchase of a former trailer park on the east side of campus. Additionally, the university systematically has upgraded lots throughout the years. In 1998, only 1,200 spaces were paved. Currently there are 4,073 spaces paved. Pursuant to NWCCU Standards 8.A and 8.B, CWU’s progressive ability to provide adequate parking meets the goal for sufficient physical resources and equipment to achieve the university’s mission.

Nevertheless, individuals searching for a parking space complain there is not adequate parking. Parking chronically receives the lowest ratings on graduating senior surveys. Students may actually be saying is that there is not a parking space close to their destination. CWU has adequate parking spaces available for the number of permits sold. The earliest patrons get the closest spaces and others may have to park farther away. CWU sells 1.03 permits for every stall. The industry average is 1.4 parking
permits per stall (Exhibit 8.E.6). CWU continues to address patron parking issues and with the new construction projects, more nearby parking areas are major design goals. For instance, with the construction of the newest residence hall CWU added 240 more parking spaces to its parking inventory.

The university centers are located on community college campuses, where parking availability varies. Because these facilities are not under the control of CWU, the university is dependent on its inter-agency agreements to achieve adequate parking for its students. Exhibit 8.E.7 is a summary of the parking services at the six university centers.

**Carbon Reduction/Sustainability.** CWU’s mission includes a commitment that “Faculty, staff, students, and alumni serve as an intellectual resource to assist central Washington, the state, and the region in solving human and environmental problems” (Exhibit GE.1). In pursuit of that mission, CWU’s president joined with the presidents of other institutions of higher education in signing the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment (Exhibit 8.E.8). This agreement binds CWU to pursuing climate neutrality. We are committed to reaching this goal by identifying areas of energy conservation and efficiency, including alternative means to power the campus, while integrating all aspects of this work into the curriculum. Two programs which support CWU’s commitment to climate neutrality—Carbon Reduction and Sustainability Coordination—received CWU Spheres of Distinction funding.

**Carbon Reduction.** An Interdisciplinary Task Force on Carbon Reduction has been set up to develop carbon reduction projects. Members consist of four faculty (Chemistry, Industrial and Engineering Technology, Environmental Studies, and Economics) and staff from Facilities Management. Graduate and undergraduate students will play an integral part of the work performed by this group. Exhibit 8.E.8 depicts a preliminary work plan that initiates action in urgent areas such as baseline monitoring, while the task force develops the details of a comprehensive plan. Exhibit 8.E.9 is a summary of the latest CWU Carbon Reduction Report.

**Sustainability Coordination.** The World Commission on Environment and Development defines a sustainable society as one that “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” Sustainability requires using renewable resources no faster than they are replenished, using nonrenewable resources no faster than renewable substitutes can be found, and releasing pollutants no faster than the earth can process them to make them harmless.

CWU is proactively developing methods to meet the needs of the present, support the development of a sustainable world, and not compromise the future. Exhibit 8.E.10 is a copy of a presentation on climate commitment presented to the CWU Board of Trustees on March 7, 2008. Exhibit 8.E.11 is a later “Greening the Curriculum” presentation.

In 2007 a Sustainability Program was developed. The purpose of the program is to facilitate environmental studies and sustainability practices that identify opportunities for environmental improvements and programs of study. The program has developed two academic minors—Environmental Studies and Energy Systems—within the Department of Industrial and Engineering Technology under the theme of “Greening the Curriculum.” The two minor programs are

- **Environmental Studies Minor**
  - ENST 201, Earth as an Ecosystem
  - ENST 202, Ecosystems, Resources, Population, and Culture
  - ENST 303, Environmental Management
  - ENST 444, Environmental Policy Formulation

---

**Standard 8 - 95**
• Energy Systems Minor
  o IET 210, Energy Sources and Power
  o GEOG 343, Energy Resource Alternatives
  o PHYS 111, Phys 111.1, Intro Physics and Lab
  o GEOG 443, Energy Policy
  o ECON 462, Economics of Energy, Resources & Environment
  o MET 412, Alternate Energy Systems

**Instructional Facilities.** CWU’s highest physical facilities priority is that instructional facilities, including new distance education (DE) and technologically “smart” classrooms, provide leading edge facilities for educational purposes. *The university’s instructional facilities are more than sufficient to achieve the institution’s mission and goals (8.A.1).* Academic department NWCCU self studies, academic program review self studies, and college self studies (see department binders and Standard 2) all evaluate the university’s instructional facilities. Some noteworthy recent facilities improvements include:

- A $29-million, 70,000 square foot music performance center and music education facility that opened in 2004.
- $30 million dollars invested in renovations to Dean Hall to accommodate the Museum of Culture and Environment, the College of the Sciences Dean’s Suite, the department of Geography & Land Studies, GIS Laboratory and the interdisciplinary Resource Management Program. Dean Hall was remodeled to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) silver standards and reopened in winter 2009.
- New instructional space and new simulators for the Aviation Department (fall 2009).
- The renovation of Nicholson Pavilion in 2008, providing new classrooms and a variety of instructional spaces for the Physical Education Department.
- A new Industrial and Engineering Technology (IET) building proposed for the 2009–2011 biennium that will provide major upgrades to instructional equipment, labs, and classrooms.
- The six CWU centers, over the past ten years, have moved to newly constructed facilities with excellent, modernized instructional and office space.

While not an instructional space issue per se, one area of concern has been the amount and configuration of office space for faculty and graduate research students. Some academic departments, such as Geology, are somewhat fragmented in different buildings; others have outgrown their office facilities. With the renovation of Dean Hall (79,095 sq ft) in fall 2008, the departments of Anthropology and Museum Studies, Geography and Land Studies, and the Resource Management program were housed together. This move centralized these departments, provided adequate faculty office space, and freed up vacated office space for the Law and Justice department, which was inadequately housed.

*Generally the facilities assigned to the departments are adequately matched to their instructional and teaching needs and the operation of their respective disciplines (8.A.2).* Some departments request additional labs and other technical instructional spaces as their particular disciplines grow. Following are some of the responses from academic department self studies:

- Political Science: “The classroom facilities with technology appear to be adequate.”
- Music: “The department is blessed with one of the finest music buildings in the country today.”
- Accounting: “The physical facilities are excellent – very inviting overall.”
- Computer Science: “Physical facilities and equipment are generally considered adequate.”
- Economics: “Adequate.”
- Education: “The physical facilities for programs at all campuses are excellent.”
Software for efficiently scheduling appropriate instructional space has been upgraded during the study period. In 1999 CWU was utilizing a legacy system to schedule classrooms, laboratories, distance education facilities, university center rooms, and the student union building and to create the quarterly schedule. To provide better security, access, reporting, and to automate scheduling processes, Central purchased Schedule25 (S25) and Resource25 (R25). S25 schedules space based on the best utilization, priorities, and fit defined by the academic departments and the space planning office. R25 is event management software for calendaring and scheduling academic and non-academic events. Both are compatible with the university’s Oracle PeopleSoft data management system. S25 was implemented in 2001 and R25 was implemented in fall 2004. The Facilities Management Department is exploring the possibility of using the software to schedule rooms for optimal energy consumption.

An academic room scheduling committee meets several times throughout the year to review scheduling procedures. This committee has representatives from each college, distance education, scheduling, and university center staff. A scheduling protocol (Exhibit 8.E.12) has been designed to ensure that quarterly course offerings are scheduled in a manner that promotes their availability to students, faculty have reasonable scheduling flexibility for classes that cannot conform to “normal” room scheduling practices, and regularly scheduled laboratory and lecture courses have suitable facilities.

Facilities at CWU are furnished adequately for work, study, and research by students, faculty, and staff (8.A.3). CWU furnishes its facilities according to the guidelines in the State of Washington Facilities Evaluation and Planning Guide (Exhibit 8.E.13) and program requirements. Over the past four years, CWU has received state capital funds to assist with updating classroom, lab, and office furnishings. Additionally, CWU is continually refurnishing outdated facilities and planning for new furnishings in renovation or new construction projects. Exhibit 8.E.14 is the Classroom Furnishings Master List for the Ellensburg campus.

CWU is in the second biennium of a three-biennium project to upgrade classroom furnishings in facilities that are not scheduled for major capital upgrades. In the first biennium of the project, CWU provided the following:

- 106 Steelcase Ergonomic stools for classroom lecterns
- Window covering replacements for L&L and Hebeler classrooms
- Repair and recover 40 classroom seat units repair in Shaw-Smyser
- Replace 35 task chairs on a cost share basis with ITS for Shaw-Smyser 218 Lab
- Infrastructure for 18 multimedia classroom installations
- Replacement projection screens in 9 classrooms
- Completion of program to install ADA student tables in all classrooms
- Replaced 119 classroom tables
- Replaced 378 classroom chairs for students
- Replaced 11 instructor demonstration tables
- Replaced 179 tablet arm chairs for classrooms
- Acoustic panels in Flight Tech., Hebeler 112 & 121, and Michaelsen 203 & 204
- Replace 78 whiteboards (Bouillon, L&L, Shaw-Smyser and Psychology)
- Provided 2 mobile chalkboards for use as needed.
- Replaced 16 table lecterns

In the next phase, 27 additional classrooms will be similarly upgraded.
The management, maintenance, and operation of instructional facilities are adequate to ensure their continuing quality and safety necessary to support the educational programs and support services of the institution (8.A.4). Exhibits 8.E.15 and 8.E.16 are Facilities Condition Indexes (FCI) of the status of all of the state and non-state buildings of CWU. Figure 8.4 is a synopsis of the overall ratings of the state buildings at the Ellensburg campus. The FCI are completed every two years and began in 2002 as a facilities preservation study by the State of Washington Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) (Exhibit 8.E.17). The state Higher Education Coordinating Board initiated a new JLARC Study in 2008, resulting in a comparative estimate of maintenance and repair backlog for each public higher education institution. Figures 8.5 and 8.6 compare CWU to other public institutions in the State of Washington. Lower scores reflect less preservation backlog (Figure 8.5) and fewer building deficiencies (Figure 8.6). Exhibit 8.E.18 is the Comparable Framework Study for 2008. CWU uses this independent scientific data to determine safety, quality, and preservation of its buildings. University centers FCI are also completed every two years (Exhibit 8.E.19).

Figure 8.4. Facility Condition Index State Buildings, 2008
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Figure 8.5. CWU Preservation Backlog Compared to Other Institutions

Figure 8.6. CWU FCI Building Deficiencies Compared to Other Institutions

Safety. CWU places a high priority on building safety and access for the physically disabled (8.A.5; 8.C.3). The CWU Office of Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) has three primary areas of responsibility: industrial health and safety, compliance with environmental regulations, and compensation claims. The office ensures compliance with the Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act (WISHA). Currently, CWU submits between 40 and 60 Labor and Industry claims per year. The majority of the claims result from tripping while going down stairs, tripping or slipping on sidewalks (especially in the winter), cuts to hands and fingers, and straining backs while moving objects. EH&S maintains a Laboratory Chemical Hygiene Plan (Exhibit 8.E.20), Hazardous Waste Disposal Procedures (Exhibit 8.E.21), and Summaries of Work-Related Injuries and Illnesses (Exhibit 8.E.22).

CWU is also responsible for routine testing for line leaks in fuel tanks and testing for leaks in underground fuel storage tanks pursuant to Department of Ecology regulations (Exhibits 8.E.23 and

Standard 8 - 98
8.E.24). CWU is required to monitor usage of natural gas used in boilers for determining emissions from the boiler stacks (Exhibits 8.E.25 and 8.E.26). CWU is in compliance with its Synthetic Minor Order No. 95AQ-E122, First Revision, limiting potential NOx emissions to under 100 tons per year.

Figure 8.7. Blue Light Phone

For student and visitor protection, CWU has 25 strategically located code-blue pedestal light emergency phones on the Ellensburg campus. There are also 41 emergency response phones located at entrances to residence halls (Exhibit 8.E.27).

CWU has a centralized lock shop for distribution of all keys and key cards. Exhibit 8.E.28 describes its procedures. The lock shop is also the control center for power controlled doors and other electronic access and alarm systems.

**Disability Support Services.** For more than 30 years, the CWU Office of Disability Support Services has made accommodations and access to campus available to students with disabilities, including priority course registration, alternative examinations, print materials in alternative formats such as Braille, large print, and audio cassettes, sign language interpreters, “live” readers, scribes, note takers, priority snow removal, special classroom furniture, and elevator outage response systems. Computer laboratories feature computers and work station furniture to accommodate individuals with special needs. All renovations and new construction projects are coordinated through and approved by the Office of Disability Support Services prior to starting the final design documents. CWU facilitates special accommodations for approximately 475 students per quarter. See Standards 2 and 3 for other disability support services.

**University Centers.** CWU, in the last ten years, has placed a high priority on constructing physical facilities off the primary campus that meet the instructional needs of the university centers (8.A.6). During the 1990s, CWU operated off-campus programs in leased facilities. Between 2002 and 2006, cooperative capital projects between six community college campuses and CWU provided new facilities for CWU to operate its programs. Table 8.1 and Exhibit 8.E.2 summarize the construction projects at the six centers. The three teaching sites do not include multi-institutional capital projects. Two of the sites are contracted programs with the host community college (Everett and Mount Vernon). The third teaching site is leased space with Green River Community College at Kent. All teaching sites are equipped with state of the art technology.

University centers are co-located on community college campuses to maximize space and resource sharing between institutions. Through joint capital projects, all six sites are located in buildings with dedicated, shared, and joint space as stated in each partnership’s terms of agreement and operating guidelines (Exhibit 8.E.1). This space is determined by CWU program needs and coordinated with the community college so that both institutions occupy space, with CWU needs as first priority. Appendix 2.A.4 lists the current majors, minors, and certificates offered at the centers.

As stated in each partnership’s terms of agreement and operating guidelines, upon completion of the construction of the co-located facility, the building is owned and operated by the community college. **CWU works with the community college for any necessary building upgrades and recommendations for needed enhancements as they arise and ensures that standards of operation meet core CWU standards (8.A.7).** CWU centers ensure their facilities maintain aesthetic and functionality standards.
Appraisal of 8.A

Faculty, students, administrators, and staff are all partners with regard to CWU physical resources. The amount of space for instructional purposes is more than adequate to achieve the university’s mission and goals. Efficient use of space is monitored and evaluated quarterly.

Continually updating and modernizing instructional furnishing is a high priority at CWU. Classrooms are inspected on a regular basis. Damaged or broken items are promptly removed from service and repaired or replaced. Where furnishings and equipment are identified as outdated or unsafe, limited funds are made available for replacement on a prioritized basis. Funding for replacement or repair of items is managed on a “pooled-risk basis” and decisions to repair or replace are considered case by case.

Maintenance, management, and operation of the facilities to ensure quality and safety are major priorities. CWU has one of the best FCI and one of the lowest preservation backlogs in the state of Washington. The FCI shows that CWU maintains the majority of its academic buildings in a superior or adequate condition. The low amount of preservation backlog indicates that CWU is using its capital and operating budgets to continually address programmatic and maintenance needs. The state’s response to the global recession is likely to jeopardize funds for all purposes. CWU’s investment in building maintenance places it at a relative advantage in this environment.

Construction and maintenance with regard for health and safety and access for the physically disabled, visitors, and other patrons continues to be at the forefront of construction projects and daily operations. For instance, CWU has a very small amount of annual work hours and number of cases that are related to on-the-job injuries. Additionally, construction projects all require code review by the Office of Disability Support Services.

Updated construction methods and codes enable CWU to build and maintain its physical facilities with a decreasing carbon footprint. CWU has proven over the decade that it can manage its buildings and infrastructure with less energy even though its square footage of space has increased by over 280,000 square feet.

The challenge for CWU is to continue to obtain funding for modern instructional facilities, either through timely renovations or construction of new facilities. CWU competes with other higher education institutions in the state of Washington for renovation and construction dollars.

Standard 8.B - Equipment and Materials

Overall, CWU has very good equipment for the instructional and support divisions at the Ellensburg campus and at the centers. Each of the centers has new facilities with all new, leading-edge instructional equipment. Most CWU equipment is maintained and upgraded as funds become available either through new construction funds or planned expenditures, such as the three-year cycle for upgrading of computers. Upgrading specific non-computer instructional equipment, such as scientific laboratory equipment, however, has become a challenge. Annual state funding may not be readily available. Thus, other funding sources, such as grants and endowments, have become part of the equipment funding process.
**Historical Perspective**

CWU, through its planning process, has been renovating or constructing new buildings across college disciplines. New equipment, furnishings, materials, and technology are part of each renovation or construction project. With Science Phase I (1997–1999), Biology and Chemistry departments received modernized laboratories, lab equipment, new instrumentation equipment, and associated software. The Education Department received modernized instructional technology with the renovation and construction of Black Hall (1997–1999). The Music Department received new instruments, practice rooms, and recital halls with the new Music Education Building which opened in the fall of 2004. With Title IX funding and other deferred maintenance/capital funding, the Physical Education and Athletics departments have received new locker rooms and associated instructional training equipment. With the Dean Hall renovation (2006–2008), Anthropology and Museum Studies, Geography and Land Studies, and the interdisciplinary Resource Management program received new state-of-the-art instructional classrooms, new equipment, and new labs and laboratory equipment. The new $61 million 228,000 square foot Student Union and Recreational Center, completed in 2006, has revitalized the student living experience on the Ellensburg campus.

**Current Situation**

* CWU maintains its buildings and infrastructure to amply carry out the programmatic and environmental mission of the university. It also provides suitable and accessible equipment appropriate to the programmatic and environmental mission (8.B.1). Furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FFE) is a major portion of construction and renovation projects. All instructional construction and renovation projects include new equipment, including laboratory and computing equipment, appropriate to the academic disciplines they will house. CWU is in the design stage for a new building for the Industrial and Engineering Technology Department. A portion of the project budget has been dedicated to FFE.

* Funds are generally available to replace or upgrade equipment as needed (8.B.2). Although not ideal, instructional departments replace existing outdated equipment with their goods and services operating budgets and summer school budgets. These funds are augmented by competitive equipment grants awarded by colleges, the graduate studies office, and external agencies. With increasing costs for all goods and services, equipment funding at the program level is becoming quite difficult. For some types of equipment, such as instructional computing equipment, funds have been pooled at the university level to provide consistent modernization throughout the university, including the centers. “Smart” classroom technology funding is an example of a pooled resource for consistent modernization.

The new Science Building and renovated Black Hall provided “smart” classrooms which contained a computer, a DVD/VCR combination deck, a ceiling mounted projector, a sound system, and a teaching station. Some rooms were provided with a wireless microphone system, a hearing assist system, and document cameras for displaying illustrations, printed material, or three dimensional objects. These classrooms set a standard for upgrade requests for the rest of the campus. From 2002 to 2008, CWU upgraded nearly all of its instructional areas to “smart” classrooms. Close to 200 rooms, 97% of all classrooms, now have been upgraded (Exhibit 8.E.29).

Instructional computing support for the academic departments is another example of a pooled funding priority. The growth in the amount of technologically assisted instruction and the expanding variety of formats is discussed in Standard 2.G and 2.H. The academic and facilities divisions of the university have collaborated to provide equipment, training, and technical personnel to support this growth. Exhibit 8.E.30 presents detailed evidence on the growth of distance education, and Exhibit 8.E.31
reports the level of technology in CWU classrooms in 2008. CWU has multiple distance education (DE) classrooms at the Ellensburg site and at the university centers. Exhibit 2.E.23 shows the capacities of classrooms at all sites, including DE classrooms, and Exhibits 2.E.127 and 2.E.132 show the classes supported by the equipment available in these specialized classrooms. CWU also has several public-access computer labs for students and faculty. Ninety-two percent of all computer labs have equipment that is less than 4 years old. Exhibit 8.E.32 is a schedule of the availability of the computer labs.

**CWU Television Studio.**
The CWU television studio space, housed in Bouillon Hall, is an interdisciplinary facility managed by the Multimedia Technology and Instructional Support (MTIS) Department. The TV studio facility serves as a central laboratory for the Broadcast Journalism curriculum of the Communication Department, the interdisciplinary Film and Video Studies program, and courses in acting for film and television within the Theatre Arts Department. It also serves as the production space for the MTIS Video Production Group. The facility was created in 1978 during a remodel of Bouillon Hall and has been utilized continuously since. Students learning in this facility work in an environment and with equipment equivalent to what they would find in many small-to-medium market commercial television stations and production studios. Exhibit 8.E.34 is the policy statement on the use of television studio.

**Hazardous Materials.** Use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials are in accordance with the institution’s prescribed procedures and local, state, and federal ordinances (8.B.3). CWU has in place hazardous waste disposal procedures (Exhibit 8.E.21) and is regulated by the Washington State Department of Ecology. A hazardous waste report (Exhibit 8.E.35) is electronically submitted to the Department of Ecology each year. Information in the report includes types of chemicals, source of the chemicals, hazard classes, quantities, dates, where shipped, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hazardous Waste (lbs)</th>
<th>Fluorescent Lamp Tubes (lbs)</th>
<th>CRTs (# of units)</th>
<th>Batteries (lbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10,776</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7,037</td>
<td>5,224</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,489</td>
<td>4,129</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>4,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,445</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>21,085</td>
<td>5,702</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1,912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.3 summarizes the disposal quantities of hazardous waste and universal waste (fluorescent lamp tubes, batteries, and CRTs, such as computer monitors and televisions) beginning in 2002, when we began disposing of universal waste. In general, hazardous wastes are chemicals that have toxic, reactive, flammable or corrosive characteristics as defined by various regulatory agencies. The Facilities Management Department and the science departments are the primary generators of hazardous waste at CWU. The Environmental Health and Safety Department (EH&S) trains and works with these departments and ultimately collects and stores the waste in our hazardous waste storage facility and coordinates the transportation and disposal of the waste through various hazardous waste disposal companies. The wastes are disposed of primarily through recycling and incineration with a very small amount of material occasionally going to special landfills. The increased quantity of hazardous waste generated in 2007 was primarily due to materials removed for the Dean Hall renovation, including lead shielding from a radioactive materials storage vault and ballasts containing PCB from old fluorescent lamp fixtures. CWU has been safely and appropriately managing hazardous waste for more than 20 years. Past inspections by the Department of Ecology and the Environmental Protection Agency have found CWU to be in significant compliance with all aspects of the regulations. Exhibit 8.E.36 defines some waste categories.


Figures 8.10. CWU Hazardous Material Collection and Storage Site

---

**Appraisal of 8.B**

Equipment is a major component of renovation or new construction projects. As a result, most of the university’s laboratory equipment is less than ten years old. The new science facility for the Biology and Chemistry Departments was completed in 1998–1999. Geography and Land Studies, Anthropology and Museum Studies, and the interdisciplinary Resource Management programs gained new equipment in the 2008 renovation of Dean Hall. In 2004 a new music facility provided new concert halls, practice rooms, and musical instruments. Industrial Engineering and Technology will be receiving new equipment and laboratories with the construction of a new technology building in 2010–2011.

There is an inventory of all equipment at CWU annually. There are applicable policies and procedures in place for the inventory process, as well as the related procedures for disposing of any surplus property. Health and safety procedures are also in place for handling any toxins or hazardous wastes.

A challenge for CWU is to plan for required upgrades of specialized equipment in fields where the technology changes frequently. Due to the high demand for goods and services funds, some instructional equipment in laboratories and other specialized areas are not planned expenditures. Thus, some departments rely on grant and other funding sources for upgrades to specialized equipment.

**Standard 8.C - Physical Resources Planning**
**Historical Perspective**

CWU bases its physical resource planning on its mission and goals and the programmatic and support needs of the CWU community. In the last decade, CWU integrated its facilities planning for the Ellensburg campus and the centers with campus-wide strategic planning. In 2005 CWU developed a new Campus Facilities Master Plan (CFMP; Exhibit 8.E.37) that guides the future development of the university as a whole, and the Ellensburg campus in particular (also see Standard 1). The CFMP determines how the university will grow and change physically over the next two decades and beyond. It proposes merging the varied needs of the campus community into common solutions.

**Current Situation**

The master plan for campus physical development is consistent with the mission and the long-range educational plan of the institution, and is updated periodically (8.C.1). The CFMP implements the vision expressed in the university mission (Exhibit GE.1) and university strategic plan (Exhibit GE.5). The mission observes that academic success is supported by a safe, attractive physical environment that is conducive to learning. The CFMP interprets this vision into tangible aspects of physical development. The CFMP is updated every 4 years. The next draft will include academic programming and planning currently underway which will incorporate an element for the university centers and teaching sites.

The Campus Site and Development and Master Planning Committee is a standing committee of the university that reports to the Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs. The committee recommends revisions to the CFMP, reviews project compliance with State Environmental Policy Act requirements, communicates with and solicits input from the campus and community about capital projects and campus master planning, and considers the impact of capital projects on the aesthetic beauty of the campus.

**10-Year Capital Improvement Plan.** CWU maintains a 10-year capital improvement plan for academic (state-funded) facilities, as well as a capital improvement plan for facilities in each of its auxiliary systems. Physical facilities development and major renovation planning include plans for the acquisition or allocation of the required capital and operating funds (8.C.2). Development of the capital improvement plan is a cyclical process. As soon as CWU has received its state capital budget for a biennium, the planning for the next biennium starts. The CWU community is asked to submit requests for present and future instructional requirements. These requests are reviewed by the appropriate administrators and submitted for code requirement reviews and cost estimates by the appropriate engineers or architects. Draft capital budget requests are subsequently submitted to the appropriate budget personnel and vice-presidents. The compiled capital budget request is submitted to the Capital Budget Committee and the Budget Advisory Committee, which are both instrumental in the development of the plan.

Governing board members and affected constituent groups are involved, as appropriate, in planning physical facilities (8.C.4). Final local approval of the capital budget request rests with the Board of Trustees which exercises ultimate control of the university and its property, except as otherwise provided by state law. Subsequent approvals are required from the state legislature for state capital projects and from the Board of Trustees and Auxiliary Services personnel for non-state projects. Pursuant to WAC 7-2.1.2.1.4 (Exhibit 8.E.38), building committees are organized and serve to develop written programs for proposed new or remodeled facilities and as the representatives of building occupants during the design process. These building committees are supported by various affected parties, such as information technology personnel, ADA and security personnel, and facilities operating and maintenance personnel. The current capital improvement plan for academic facilities (Table 8.4) extends through 2019.
CWU continually plans its resources for the physical requirements of the Ellensburg campus. In addition to the planning processes described above, the university conducts focused studies to assist in planning for the future. For instance, Exhibit 8.E.39 is a study of buildings and functions in the historic core of the Ellensburg campus, the South Neighborhood. Two major goals of the study included exploring options for the future use of the now-vacant Samuelson Building and establishing a one-stop student services center (see Standard 3.A). The study revealed that accomplishing these goals will necessitate the study of future functions of Barge, Bouillon, Lind, Mitchell and Hertz Halls and the possibility of a Technology Center in the Samuelson Building.

Table 8.4. Central Washington University 10-Year Capital Plan In Priority Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Biennium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minor Works Preservation-Infrastructure Preservation</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor Works Preservation-Facility Preservation</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hogue Hall Addition/Renovation</td>
<td>47,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pre Design, Design, Construction: New Science Phase II</td>
<td>300,000, 3,000,000, 60,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Minor Works-Program</td>
<td>10,000,000, 10,000,000, 10,000,000, 10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Utilities Upgrades</td>
<td>8,000,000, 6,000,000, 6,000,000, 4,000,000, 4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Health Center Renovation</td>
<td>4,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pre Design - Major Renovation of Samuelson</td>
<td>150,000, 2,200,000, 22,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pre Design - New Facility Arts/Humanities</td>
<td>250,000, 3,000,000, 50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pre Design - New Facility for Children &amp; Families</td>
<td>150,000, 3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>78,450,000, 32,300,000, 91,600,000, 52,300,000, 80,150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWU also continuously plans its resources for the physical requirements of the university centers. The university is now developing a Statewide Centers Self-Study to address facilities needs for the six centers, three teaching sites, and other prospective satellite locations within the State.

Figure 8.11. Housing Physical Planning
The Auxiliary Services Housing Division conducted a Comprehensive Housing Master Planning Study in 2004 which included facility audits of existing residence halls and apartments and a review of the financial condition of Auxiliary Services. The Housing Master Plan (Exhibit 3.E.49) included data collected from focus groups, surveys of on- and off-campus students, and a market study that included information provided from local off-campus housing agencies. The plan was coordinated with the CFMP and presented to the Board of Trustees in 2005. The plan proposes full renovation and construction plans through the year 2021. It also proposed a new residence hall by 2009 and the result, Wendell Hill Hall, is now nearing completion. Figure 8.11 summarizes future housing planning through August, 2028. The CFMP (Exhibit 8.E.37) is a mature, comprehensive statement of how the university’s goals are approached by the natural and built environment of the campus. It extends its scope to include such details as

- security planning (B.C.3), to provide a safe, attractive, pedestrian-oriented campus consistent with the university’s core values;
- access to all users, including those with physical handicaps (B.C.3), assured by a program of retrofitting older buildings that has been complete for several years and incorporating standard accessibility features in all new construction. CWU is in the process of implementing a comprehensive wayfinding and signage system that will brand and identify the university and also provide a guide that will assist vehicular and pedestrian traffic circulation. The plan includes ADA accessibility signage, information kiosks, visitor vehicular/pedestrian signage, and directional signage. Exhibit 8.E.40 is a draft of the CWU Signage Design and Standard Guidelines;
- the role of the physical environment in building favorable community relations,
- and planning for the appearance of parking lots, including landscaping and natural walking paths to balance safety and security concerns with those of aesthetics and environmental quality.

FMD is planning to develop methods of obtaining and burning alternative fuels, including local agricultural and forestry waste, for heating and maintaining the Ellensburg campus (Exhibit 8.E.10).  

**Appraisal of 8.C**

The physical resource planning process has evolved and greatly improved over the last ten years. The process involves all constituencies of CWU. For a proposed renovation or new construction project, the affected academic disciplines are major contributors on a preliminary study committee. Program requirements are analyzed first to determine the appropriate scope of the projects. Other members of the CWU community that become involved are representatives from throughout the university.

University centers physical resource planning involves all constituencies of CWU as well as the parties at the center locations, including the partner community college and the respective city, county, and other local authority districts.

The condition of the buildings and preservation backlogs are also factors in future planning. As buildings and their related infrastructure become outdated, replacement planning goes beyond facility replacement. Future planning also encompasses carbon reduction and sustainability issues, alternative energy sources, and community wide concerns.
Standard 8 Summary

Overall, CWU has more than ample physical facilities for its instructional functions. These facilities are well maintained and are inventoried for their facility condition and ability to meet instructional requirements every two years. CWU also maintains a physical campus environment that has a varied and attractive landscape. Trees and green spaces are plentiful, and the urban forest is growing.

Faculty and students are pleased with their instructional equipment, especially with the “smart” classrooms, DE facilities, and efficient labs. CWU needs to maintain its commitment to updating equipment every 3 to 10 years, depending on the type of equipment and funding resources.

Planning for future instructional and support facilities and associated equipment is a major emphasis of CWU. FMD works with CWU governing boards and state legislative officials on a continuous basis to take best advantage of the policies that govern the award of capital construction funds.

Carbon reduction and sustainable practices are major focuses of CWU. Even though CWU is a leader in energy conservation, reducing the carbon footprint of CWU will require significant planning. A major focus is to develop the policies and procedures for future energy savings.
Standard 8 - Appendices and Exhibits

Appendices

8.A.1 Map of CWU (Ellensburg Campus)
8.A.2 Non-Residential and Residential Gross and Assignable Sq Ft (Ellensburg Campus)
8.A.3 Maps of Centers (Des Moines, Moses Lake, Lynnwood, Pierce County, Yakima, Wenatchee)

Exhibits

GE.1 University Mission, Vision and Values
GE.3 University Policies Manual
GE.5 Strategic Plans and Goals 2006-2011
8.E.1 University Center Agreements
8.E.2 Renovation and New Construction Synopsis
8.E.3 Natural Gas Consumption and Cost 1998-2008
8.E.4 Electricity Consumption and Cost 1998-2008
8.E.5 Energy Management Award to CWU
8.E.6 Parking Standards
8.E.7 Centers 2008 – Parking
8.E.8 Climate Commitment
8.E.10 BOT Climate Commitment /Alternative Fuels
8.E.11 Greening the Curriculum Poster
8.E.12 Course Scheduling Procedures 2009
8.E.13 State of Washington Planning and Evaluation Guidelines
8.E.14 Winter 2009 Master Classroom List
8.E.15 Facilities Condition Index – CWU Non Residential Buildings
8.E.16 Facilities Condition Index – Residential Buildings and Student Union Building
8.E.19 Centers Facilities Condition Index 2007
8.E.20 Laboratory Chemical Hygiene Plan
8.E.21 Hazardous Waste Disposal Procedures
8.E.22 Summary of Work-Related Injuries and Illnesses
8.E.23 Line and Tank Testing – Underground Storage Tanks
8.E.24 Groundwater Monitoring for Leaks in Underground Storage Tanks
8.E.25 Department of Ecology Air Quality Compliance Inspection
8.E.26 Department of Ecology Air Quality Compliance Inspection Reporting
8.E.27 Residence Halls Lobby and Entry Telephone Numbers
8.E.28 Procedures for Unlock/Lock of Academic Buildings
8.E.29 List of “Smart “Classrooms
8.E.31 Level of Technology in Classrooms 2008
8.E.32 Computer Laboratory Hours Spring 2008
8.E.33 Computer Lab Equipment Inventory and Replacement Schedule
8.E.34 Television Studio Use Policy
8.E.36 Waste Categories
8.E.37 Campus Facilities Master Plan (CFMP)
8.E.38 Building Committee Authorization
8.E.39 South Neighborhood Planning Study
8.E.40 CWU Signage Design and Standard Guideline
Standard 9 – Institutional Integrity

Standard 9 requires that an institution adhere to the highest ethical standards in all its activities. Central Washington University’s strong commitment to this principle is reflected in its dealings with internal and external constituencies, including regulatory and accrediting agencies; in its teaching, scholarship, and service; and in its treatment of students, faculty, and staff.

**Historical Perspective**

Central Washington University has established clear criteria for the conduct and treatment of students, faculty, and staff. Through the orientation process and revised University 101 course, students are provided the tools they need to understand their rights and obligations related to intellectual property and peer-to-peer file sharing software that enables persons to swap music, video, and other files over the Internet. Faculty professional responsibilities and conflict of interest are clearly delineated in the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the university and the United Faculty of Central. A revised and strengthened university ethics policy is explained to new staff during their orientation period, and ethics training is routinely available to all employees. Financial management of the university is excellent, with clean audits of university accounts over the past ten years.

**Current Situation**

Central Washington University, including its governing board members, administrators, faculty, and staff, subscribes to, exemplifies, and advocates high ethical standards in the management and operations and in all of its dealings with students, the public, organizations, and external agencies (9.A.1). Preparing students for responsible citizenship is an important part of the university’s mission (Exhibit GE.5). Commitment to “a supportive university community,” identified in the core values, is supported by a goal “to build inclusive and diverse campus communities that promote intellectual inquiry and encourage civility, mutual respect, and cooperation.” Within that goal, the university seeks to “embrace diversity, equity and social justice across the university, promote effective communication and an atmosphere of civility and respect, and ensure that all members of the university community are provided equitable opportunities. . . .”

In that spirit, policies and procedures have been created to endorse integrity and ethics as key values that are systematically addressed and exercised across all university divisions. In addition, the university community can openly exchange information via the CWU Intranet and email and the community can address workplace issues through the Ombuds Office (Exhibit GE.3–2-30-140), while still being accountable to the ethical responsibilities outlined by the Washington Administrative Code and the Revised Code of Washington.

As state employees, all CWU personnel (administrators, faculty, and staff), as well as the Board of Trustees, are subject to RCW 42.52, Ethics in Public Service. Details of how CWU applies elements of RCW 42.52 are summarized in the university’s Code of Ethics (Exhibit GE.3–2-40-
Ethics questions are referred to the internal auditor who fills an advisory role as the university’s ethics officer.

All new employees receive training from the Department of Human Resources (HR) to become familiar with expectations for ethical conduct and use of university and state resources. Employees have the option for further training from HR through the supervisor’s manual (Exhibit 9.E.1) and from the internal auditor through the employee ethics guide (Exhibit 9.E.2); however, for new supervisors, ethics training is mandatory within six months of hire (Exhibit GE.3–2-30-260). New faculty who participate in fall faculty day and new faculty orientation also receive ethics training. Ethics training is offered to all employees once per quarter by the internal auditor and is coordinated through HR. Since 2006, over 175 employees have attended ethics training. These efforts have produced an ethics-sensitive campus community as evidenced by limited Executive Ethics Board investigations (Exhibit 9.E.3).

The Office for Equal Opportunity (OEO) also plays a role promoting ethics, civility, and responsibility on campus by addressing issues of diversity and discrimination and by assisting in the development of appropriate policies on topics such as AIDS (GE.3–2-40-020) and nondiscrimination (GE.3–2-40-130). The Equal Opportunity Committee and Equal Opportunity Grievance Committee have been established to assist in developing and enforcing policy and process (Exhibit GE.3–2-60-090 and 2-60-095).

Beyond the expectations of state and university policies, the ethical conduct of faculty has been described in the CBA, adopted in March 2006 (Exhibit GE.7). Two articles—Article 11: Professional Responsibilities and Article 12: Conflicts of Interest—address ethical issues particular to the faculty. In addition, the university’s conflict of interest policy focuses heavily on potential faculty conflicts of interest (Exhibit GE.3–2-40-070).

Many faculty and staff are expected to adhere to codes of ethics specific to their disciplines or professions. Ethical standards of individual academic departments and programs are described in the self-studies prepared for this review and in their five-year program review reports, available in department binders in the exhibit room. Faculty involved in grant-funded research are subject to federal conflict of interest regulations. Discipline-specific accreditation reviews invariably require adherence to standards of ethical behavior. Some examples include the ethical standards of the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (University Relations); the National Collegiate Athletic Association (Athletics); the National Council of University Business Officers (Business and Financial Affairs), and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (academic programs for professional educators; Exhibit 9.E.4 and 2.E.15).

The Student Conduct Code addresses general student behavior and academic integrity issues and is found in the Washington Administrative Code 106-120 and in Part 9 of the CWU Policies Manual (Exhibits 9.E.5 and GE.3–Part 9; also see Standard 3).

Federal and state regulations, as well as CWU policy, require that any use of human participants in research be reviewed and approved by an Institutional Review Board (IRB). The Human Subjects Review Committee (HSRC) serves as the institutional review board for Central
Washington University. The university's human protections administrator coordinates the work of the HSRC (Exhibit GE.3–2-40-160). CWU also takes very seriously the ethical treatment of animals, as demonstrated by its Use of Animals in Research and Teaching policy (Exhibit GE.3–2-40-040). The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee approves all experiments or procedures involving live vertebrate animals, inspects animal care facilities semiannually, and has authority to suspend activity involving animals.

CWU protects data, records, and information of students and staff and other technology-related resources through a policy regulating the ethical use of university information technology resources (Exhibit GE.3–2-40-010). All university faculty, administrators, staff, and students, by virtue of their use of Central Washington University information technology resources, accept the responsibility of using these resources only for appropriate university activities. They are asked to respect the intended use of all information technology resources for learning, teaching, research, and university business purposes. Central Washington University has become a national model for effective control of peer-to-peer file sharing. In spring 2008, the university’s information technology department received the Hugi Excellence Award from the Northwest Academic Computing Consortium. This same department has also developed a security team to complete a periodic analysis of the university’s security environment in support of network security, virus protection, training and awareness, and protection of central data as well as theft prevention.

The State Ethics Board, State Whistleblower Program, internal auditor, Office for Equal Opportunity, and the faculty grievance procedure outlined in the CBA all respond at various levels to allegations of unethical conduct or misuse of university resources. The Ombuds, Internal Audit, Office for Equal Opportunity, the Office for Faculty Relations, and Human Resources have developed an informal work group, Resource Central, to address complex issues using a more holistic approach.

_The university regularly evaluates and revises as necessary its policies, procedures, and publications to ensure integrity throughout the university (9.A.2). In fact, the policies, procedures, publications, and website of the university are in an almost constant state of revision to remain current with emerging issues. Individual policies and procedures residing in the online policies and procedures manuals reflect dates of adoption or revision and which policy-making body took action. An internal policy review committee comprised of representatives from each division meets as needed to ensure policies and procedures remain current. Publications and website oversight are similarly monitored by Public Relations and Marketing and appropriately updated._

_CWU represents itself accurately and consistently to its constituencies, the public, and prospective students through its catalogs, publications, and official statements (9.A.3). By means of public relations, marketing, media, publications, and the web, the university strives to fulfill its outreach mission by communicating with all of its internal and external constituents. The Division of University Relations, Department of Public Relations and Marketing, ensures the integrity of the university through clear and consistent messages and images that adhere to the university’s graphics and editorial standards (Exhibit 9.E.6) and the university’s communication and emergency communication plans (Exhibit 9.E.7). Materials_
produced through the Campus Life Publicity Center adhere to university’s graphics and editorial standards. In addition, the university strives to fulfill its outreach mission by ensuring integrity in its marketing and advertising communications, and continuous improvement in its quality through needs assessment and program and publication evaluation (Exhibit 9.E.8). Also see the portion of Standard 3 regarding Policy 3.1.

**CWU policies define and prohibit conflict of interest on the part of governing board members, administrators, faculty, and staff (9.A.4; Exhibit GE.3–1-5 and 9-16).** University policies described in the policies manual and in the university catalog (Exhibits GE.3–1-5 and GE.2) follow the Ethics in Public Service Law (Exhibit 9.E.9, RCW 42.52) and the procedural rules outlined in WAC 292-100 (Exhibit 9.E.10). Also see Standard 6.

**Conflict of Interest.** The university’s code of ethics policy (Exhibit GE.3–2-40-050) includes conflict of interest guidelines regulating employees’ financial interests, acceptance of gifts, and outside employment. Guidelines regarding use of university resources for personal gain are outlined in the Use of State Property Policy (Exhibit GE.3–2-40-210). Faculty and staff attending new employee orientation are informed that university employees are subject to the state ethics law and university ethics policies including use of resources. Employees attending the ethics trainings offered by the internal auditor receive detailed information about the use of university resources and conflict of interest guidelines. Trustees, administrators, faculty, and staff are subject to this policy.

The American Council on Education’s Working Paper on Conflict of Interest (Exhibit 9.E.11) suggests that university policies at a minimum should require disclosure of financial interests in outside organizations that seek to do business with the institution or where the individual has influence over institutional decisions that may affect the organization, review of these disclosures, and procedures to address conflicts of interest. In addition, trustees and staff should be notified of the pertinent policy annually and a designated institutional representative should be available to respond to inquiries about the policy. Federal conflict of interest regulations applicable to grant funds outline university responsibilities to maintain a written, enforceable policy that includes a disclosure requirement and provides review and disposition of each disclosure and any interests identified. To bring the university into compliance with federal guidelines, the Resource Central work group is currently developing an appropriate policy and reporting and monitoring procedures.

**Faculty.** Article 12 of the CBA (Exhibit GE.7) defines and prohibits conflict of interest and binds faculty to the highest standards of ethics consistent with state statutes. Faculty are directed to report conflicts of interest in writing to the provost. There is no evidence of any conflicts of interest reported since ratification of the CBA. In addition, this section addresses the relationship faculty have with students. Faculty are obligated to disclose to their dean all students with whom they have a family or intimate relationship. Appendix B of the CWU catalog encourages respect and sensitivity by faculty in their roles and relationships with students (Exhibit GE.3–1-50).

**Governing Board (Board of Trustees) Conflict of Interest.** The Washington State Boards and Commissions Handbook (Exhibit 9.E.12) reminds university trustees that the state ethics law prohibits conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest. Examples of conflicts of
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interest include directing state contracts to a business in which one has a financial interest. The Board of Trustees Statement on Professional Ethics states that the board is subject to the laws of the state regarding ethical behavior including the receipt of gifts and compensation for outside activities (Exhibit GE.3–1.50). Other policy sections address ethics and appropriate use of state property (Exhibit GE.3–2-40-050 and 2-40-21). The Board of Trustees and the president complete an annual, state-mandated conflict of interest financial disclosure form. Financial disclosure is not required of other administrators, faculty, and staff. Board members are encouraged to be aware of these regulations, adhere to the restrictions, use good judgment, and be fair and equitable in decision-making.

The state auditors annually review university contracts with the Board of Trustees and upper level administrators. In 2006, using a competitive bid process, the university contracted with the law firm associated with a board member for consulting/legal services. The contract was reviewed by the assistant attorney general and was not considered a conflict of interest.

**Whistleblower.** The State Employee Whistleblower Program (Exhibit 9.E.13) provides a means by which university employees can confidentially report assertions of improper conduct and receive protection from the Human Rights Commission. Summaries of formal state whistleblower investigations show that few formal state whistleblower or executive ethics board complaints have been filed against the Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty, and staff since 2000 (Exhibits 9.E.3 and 9.E.14). Because they are outside the scope of the whistleblower law, complaints involving personnel or supervisory issues are investigated by the university’s internal auditor. In the past ten years, the state auditor’s office has investigated and substantiated only two whistleblower complaints against the university. Another is pending further investigation and one was dismissed for no cause. Unsubstantiated whistleblower complaints are not reported. In the spring of 2008, following a routine annual audit of the university, the state auditor relayed information to the university’s Board of Trustees concerning the management and treatment of faculty in academic departments. The information the board received was investigated and was found to be unsubstantiated (Exhibit 9.E.15).

The university’s internal auditor investigates all reported internal allegations and in most cases the issues are addressed and resolved. In a recent situation involving the CWU Foundation, the internal auditor investigated an allegation regarding inappropriate use of employee time and resources that resulted in personnel actions and revision of accounting practices within the unit.

Every employee receives an annual notice of procedures for reporting employee misconduct through the state auditor’s office. Many employees ask the internal auditor about ethics and compliance concerns, and about a dozen reports of allegations of misuse of university resources occur every year. These inquiries are investigated by the internal auditor and reported annually to the president and Board of Trustees (Exhibit 9.E.16).

In 2008, the president established an informal work group to clarify and coordinate grievance processes and channels for formal and informal complaints, whistleblower complaints, and grievances. The group recommended clarifying reporting venues for informal complaints and whistleblowers to provide more safety for the reporter and relieve the fear of retaliation.
**Academic Freedom.** The university’s commitment to the pursuit of knowledge and its communication to others is guarded by stated policies that assure the academic freedom and the right of free dissent to faculty and students (9.A.5; Policy 9.1). The University Policies Manual (Exhibit GE.3) establishes the right of academic freedom for both faculty and students (Section 1-40), delineates ethics expectations of faculty as scholars (Section 1-50-010); and assures the right of dissent for faculty and students (Section 1-30-020). In 2006, the Board of Trustees approved a comprehensive intellectual properties policy for faculty and employees (Exhibit GE.3–2-40-120). These policies and practices demonstrate the university’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge consistent with the institution’s mission and goals (Exhibit GE.5). In situations where there is some departure from accepted standards of scholarly integrity and honesty, the university has the responsibility to investigate and resolve alleged misconduct by faculty or administration.

Faculty and administration have encouraged the free expression of a wide variety of opinions on the CWU campus. Speaker series sponsored by the president, deans, and student affairs, as well as theatre productions, have provided opportunities for the campus community to experience multiple perspectives. Recent speakers have ranged from Salman Rushdie and Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. to Jim Gilchrist of the Minuteman Project. Campus discussion following Mr. Gilchrist’s presentation prompted an email message from the president of the university reiterating the value of listening to a variety of opinions even when the opinions differ from one’s own (Exhibit 9.E.17).

With the establishment of union representation of faculty at CWU, the right of academic freedom, rules governing intellectual property, and the grievance process were included in the CBA (Exhibit GE.7). Article 6 covers academic freedom, Appendix B details the rights to intellectual property, and Article 25 covers the grievance procedure. According to records filed in the office of the assistant vice president for faculty relations, no grievances have been filed alleging a violation of a faculty member’s right to academic freedom since the CBA was ratified in 2004. Prior to the CBA, only one faculty grievance was filed for an alleged violation of academic freedom, and that grievance was resolved.

Section I of the new faculty Academic Code also covers the rights and responsibilities of faculty, and includes a statement concerning academic freedom (Exhibit 9.E.18). Appendix A of the Academic Code repeats the Statement on Professional Ethics included in the CWU Policies Manual. It has been recognized that there are some situations where a faculty complaint may not be covered under the current CBA, the Academic Code, or the CWU Policies Manual. To address such unique situations, a new dispute resolution process was proposed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and approved by the Board of Trustees on June 6, 2008 (Exhibit 9.E.19).

**Appraisal of Standard 9**

Central Washington University has established clear criteria for the ethical conduct and treatment of students, faculty, and staff. Members of the campus community are committed to high standards of ethical conduct in policy and practice. While ethical infractions are rare, corrective actions are taken when they occur.
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The university demonstrates several strengths inherent in this standard, including clear and adequate policies on conduct regarding matters such as financial transactions, use of state property, conflict of interest, academic freedom, and the protection of human subjects and animals. While the university’s policy of educating employees who have behaved unethically is consistently applied, some employees repeat violations. Mechanisms are in place to disseminate information, provide advice, and respond to mistakes and violations in regard to ethical conduct. New employees benefit from a university-created ethics guide that is available online (Exhibit 9.E.2), and ethics training is mandatory for supervisors of classified staff as a component of their supervisory training requirements.

In the past eight years, there have been no significant formal Executive Ethics Board or state whistleblower investigations. However, to ensure that adequate processes are available to employees, a 2008 work team documented and analyzed the various reporting avenues for complaints, grievances, whistleblowers, and ethical infractions. As required by the state Public Disclosure Commission, university trustees and the president complete an annual conflict of interest form. The university’s administration also complies with the state whistleblower law, revised in 2008, which requires a reporting component at the agency level.

While ethics seminars are offered regularly, participation is not mandatory for faculty and administrators. State regulations stipulate that new supervisors must have ethics training within six months of hire, and most supervisors participate. In cases where violations of ethical standards occur, individuals involved receive one-on-one education. Recently, two incidents were reported of employees using the university’s email system to circulate messages in support of an outside organization. Neither employee had received ethics training; both agreed not to repeat the behavior. As more training is provided, employees will be in a better position to self-monitor their ethical behavior.

Development of an enforceable, mandatory training policy would ensure that all employees receive adequate training in ethical conduct, conflict of interest, and use of university resources. Adding an annual reporting requirement would encourage an awareness of the ethical environment within the university. Heightened awareness would encourage employees to practice ethical behavior and report ethical violations and misappropriation of university resources without fear of retaliation.

A review team is currently evaluating university practices regarding conflict of interest to ensure those practices meet minimum federal requirements or outside agency benchmark requirements (e.g., American Council on Education). Other helpful steps may include unifying and formalizing the conflict of interest notification, training, and reporting mechanism to include an annual disclosure form and review procedure. In addition, as part of an overall review of the policies manual during the 2008-09 academic year, potentially confusing redundancies were removed from policies governing ethics, conflict of interest, and use of state resources.

**Standard 9 Summary**

Building on a solid history of institutional integrity, the university continues to refine its policies and processes to ensure that students, faculty, and staff are aware of and adhere to the highest standards of ethical conduct in their dealings with internal and external constituencies and that ethical principles govern teaching, scholarship, and service. Through implementation of educational initiatives, careful monitoring, and remediation when necessary, the institution demonstrates its ongoing commitment to fair treatment of faculty, staff, and students and to high ethical standards in all its activities.
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Standard 9 – Exhibits

Exhibits

GE.2 University Catalog 2009-2010
GE.3 University Policies Manual
GE.5 Strategic Plans and Goals 2006-2011
GE.7 Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement

9.E.1 Supervisor Manual
9.E.2 Employee Ethics Guide
9.E.3 EEB Cases CWU 10 years
9.E.4 Ethics Information
9.E.5 Student Conduct Code
9.E.7 CWU Communication Plan 07
9.E.8 Print Copies Only of Various Publications
9.E.9 Ethics in Public Service Law
9.E.10 Ethics in Public Service Procedural Rules
9.E.11 ACE Conflict of Interest Working Paper
9.E.13 RCW 42.40 State Employee Whistleblower Protection
9.E.14 Summaries of Formal State Whistleblower Investigations
9.E.15 State Auditor Letter
9.E.17 McIntyre Memo re Gilchrist
9.E.19 Minutes of June 6, 2008 Board of Trustees Meeting