The Faculty Senate was called to order by Greg Hooks, Chair on Thursday, February 15, 1996, in FSHN, T101, at 3:40 p.m. Sixty (60) members were present, twenty-one (21) members were absent with one (1) vacancies. There were eight (8) non-voting members present.

Approval of Minutes of December 7 1995, Meeting (Exhibit A from 1-25-96). Notes from the Senate meeting of January 25, 1996 are in new Exhibit A. These are notes since there was no quorum.

Announcements (Information Items)

1. Faculty Senate officers and administrators met in a joint meeting on January 30, 1996.

2. Editorial changes to wording related to promotional adjustment in the Faculty Manual are in Exhibit B as follows:

January 26, 1996
MEMORANDUM
TO: Tom George, Provost
FROM: Gus Plumb, Faculty Affairs Committee
SUBJECT: Editorial changes to wording related to promotional adjustment

The editorial changes, which you recommended, to the working on the policy related to promotional adjustment (attached) were discussed and approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee on January 19, 1996. These changes will be submitted to the Faculty Senate as an informational item.

cc: FAC
R.W. Crain, Jr.

DRAFT
January 18, 1996
TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS:
SUBJECT: Revision to 1995 Faculty Manual
PROPOSED: That, effective immediately, the WSU Board of Regents approve the following revision to the Faculty Manual, Section IV, Faculty Personnel Policies, Employment, Salary, Promotional Adjustment, page 42 (deletions are struck through):

Promotional Adjustment
When a faculty member is promoted, their salaries will be increased by no less than four percent of their annual salary, or two percent of the average WSU faculty salary, whichever is greater, starting with the effective date of the promotion. All promotional increases are to be uniform across the University. This adjustment will be made regardless of the level of funding for salary
increases and will be in addition to any other adjustments made to the faculty members’ salary (merit, equity, marketplace, cost-of-living, etc.).

SUBMITTED BY: Thomas F. George

SUPPORTING INFORMATION: The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed the language related to promotional adjustments and agreed that the wording was internally inconsistent in that raises based on a percentage could not be uniform across the University. The first sentence establishes a minimum for promotional adjustments above the minimum to be based on a percentage of the salary that is non-uniform across the University. This revision is essentially an editorial revision. The promotional adjustment is to pay for a promotion. If more than the minimum for promotions were allowed, it would be possible for individuals going from associate to full professor to get different percentages of their salaries under this policy.

* * * * *

3. The Nominating Committee for Faculty Senate Officers for 1996-1997 are as follows: Doug Baker, Chair, John Kicza, KNona Liddell, Fran McSweeney and Wes Leid. If you have any suggestions for nominations to a Senate office please contact a member of the committee. This year elections will be for chair, vice chair and on campus legislative representative.

4. Faculty Senate Standing Committees reported committee consideration on the following issues (agenda and previously reported items not included) at the February 8, 1996, Steering Committee meeting:

**Faculty Affairs Committee:** Access to Student Evaluations.

**Planning Review Committee:** Enrollment Management Plan.

**Research and Arts Committee:** Review of Centers.

Announcements (Reports).

1. Remarks by the Chair.—G. Hooks

Hooks announced that the next Senate agenda would not be mailed until the Monday before the next meeting. The agenda will be faxed to off campus faculty. Hooks also stated that branch campus faculty would receive a report on access in the mail. Hooks announced that Fran McSweeney, Ken Casavant and himself are working on a proposal for a faculty club. If faculty have any concerns or suggestions please contact one of these people.
2. Report from President Sam Smith.

President Smith reported that a number of people have been traveling around the state addressing the access crisis. Smith stated that the handout senators received at the door contained the data used by these people when addressing the issue. President Smith reported that both the House and Senate budgets were released on the same day and they are quite different. President Smith stated that he wanted to compliment Carolyn Clark in front of the Senate as she has established a level of credibility with the legislators that is quite phenomenal. Smith stated Clark is able to walk in and out of any of the legislators offices and visit with them and be listened to with a very good level of credibility. Smith thanked the Senate for having Clark as the Senate representative in Olympia. If the faculty representative is a strong independent person who has thought things through, then everything goes much better. Smith stated that a vote is expected on the supplemental operating budget by the Senate Friday. The House should vote on the supplemental budget on Monday. The Senate budget would increase the WSU base budget $7.7 million not including WHEN. The House budget would cut state government by $45 million next year. WSU would have an increase of $1.246 million. The legislature has made it very clear that any major increases in funding for operations would be in some manner tied with headcount. The Senate bill would give WSU 1,235 more FTEs fully funded. Broken down it would mean 850 for Pullman, 290 for extended degree programs, 50 for WSU Spokane and 45 for WSU Tri Cities. The House bill would give WSU 109 FTEs fully funded, 105 would be for the Pullman, 4 for Spokane, none for Tri Cities or the extended degree program. The Senate budget includes an additional sum of $80 per student FTE for technology. That is a $1.4 million dollar increase to purchase equipment needed and hire personnel. The Conference Committee numbers are the ones to watch for. For the WHEN system, the Senate proposes $34.7 million and the House $5 million. Both are talking about the University increasing their capabilities on WHETS. There are proposals in both House and Senate that could move the WHEN proposal forward with or without a supplemental budget. To greatly enlarge our capacity to deliver programs and not have the authority or funding to do so is not logical. The cooperative library project: the House proposal is $392, 000 and the Senate proposal $450,000. Student financial aid: the Senate proposes $32.5 million and the House recommends $12.6 million. The bill to increase undergraduate out of state tuition by 10% has passed the House and will probably pass the Senate. The technology transfer bill has passed both the House and the Senate. WSU is primarily watching the budget, legislation relative to tuition, and legislation relative to any indexing of cost and the technology transfer. With the access crisis, President Smith stated that his concern is for quality in both entering and exiting students.

3. Report from Legislative Representatives.--C. Clark, P. Chevalier

Clark reported that there is a substantial difference in the education budgets of the House and Senate for K-12 plus higher education. The House is prepared to spend $52 million and the Senate $202 million. The House has left a gap of $45 million purposely and they refer to it as the money that will be in play. Clark reported that this year legislators are much more aware of what the access problem means and they understand the funding issues that are ahead. The legislators report that most of their constituents are not aware of the access problem. There will be no money for faculty salaries this year,
either the catch up monies that were proposed for the librarians, counselors and professionals or the retention monies that had been proposed for faculty. Clark requested that faculty make her aware of colleagues that receive more attractive offers from other universities or leave to accept more attractive offers. This type of information is useful in making the case for more competitive salaries. Clark stated that the Four Year Degree Agreement is tremendously popular with the legislature. The University with this is viewed as a solution to the access problem. This presents an opportunity to help reduce the numbers in terms of time-to-degree and still produce a quality degree at the same time. WSU is going to be under pressure to reduce time-to-degree. The Governor’s task force is talking about tying WSU’s funding to its success with time-to-degree.

Additions or Changes to the Agenda.

There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

Agenda Items (Action Items).

1. Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for “Conditions of Program Residency for PhD Degrees.” Exhibit H from 1/25/96 Agenda is as follows:

MEMORANDUM
Date: January 15, 1996
To: Karen P. DePauw, Associate Dean Graduate School
Topic: Clarification of Faculty Senate Exhibit D 12/7/95 on Doctoral Residency

Through this memo, I will address the concerns and issues about the document entitled “Conditions of Program Residency for PhD. Degrees” raised at the Faculty Senate meeting held December 7, 1995.

I hope this narrative will provide the Faculty Senate with pertinent information so that senators can acquire a thorough understanding of the background for modifying the residency requirements, a clear delineation of current policy, and have a more concise articulation of proposed changes and their effects.

I. Current Policy


“The period of study for the Doctor of Philosophy degree is at least three years (six semesters) beyond the baccalaureate degree. At least two of these three years shall be in residence at Washington State University, including a minimum of four semesters, two of which must be continuous, when the student is enrolled full time and present on the Pullman campus. Full time enrollment for three summer sessions may be substituted for two academic year semesters. Summer session cannot be substituted for the two continuous semester requirement for the doctoral degree.”
II. Background Information for Proposed Change

The “Conditions of Program Residency for PhD Degrees” document emanates from concerns raised initially by the campus deans and represents the collective efforts of a GSC subcommittee and ultimately, the Graduate Studies Committee. Initial discussions focused on whether or not residency for doctoral degrees should be allowed beyond the Pullman campus. The subcommittee finally agreed that residency could be “extended” to campuses other than Pullman if certain conditions (criteria) were met. The subcommittee’s recommendations regarding doctoral residency were reviewed and modified by the GSC during Spring 1995 and finally approved by GSC during Fall 1995.

Please note that HEC Board regulations prohibit offering doctoral degrees beyond the Pullman campus. The only exception granted was to WSU to offer a professional doctorate -- the Doctor of Pharmacy degree (PharmD) -- at WSU Spokane. Although the offering of doctoral degrees at locations other than Pullman is subject to approval by the HEC Board, the GSC feels that satisfying doctoral residency requirements is well within the authority (and responsibility) of WSU. Thus, a proposal that specifies the criteria a degree-granting unit must meet in order to grant residency to doctoral (PhD) students is within the purview of WSU.

III. Summary of Proposed Changes contained in “Conditions of Program Residency for PhD Degrees” (revised document)

a. Changes wording of paragraphs describing residence requirements for PhD students. (Discussions are currently underway regarding residency requirements for EdD students.)

b. Changes two years (four academic semesters) in residence at WSU for doctoral degree to one year (two academic semesters) in residence for students with master’s degree. (Note: students without master’s degree must satisfy two years of full time study in residence at WSU).

c. Specifies the criteria that a degree granting unit must meet in order to grant residency to doctoral students.

d. Specifies the review and approval process for extending residency.

IV. Rationale

This proposal does not extend the granting of doctoral degrees to branch campuses (extension of degrees requires a separate review and approval process specified by HECB), but would allow WSU to function more like a multicampus university. Specifically, such a change would:

a. Allow faculty at branch locations to work with doctoral students

b. Allow programs/departments (system-wide) with autonomy to make decisions regarding residency

c. Align practice and policy with philosophy of a multicampus university system.
Conditions of Program Residency for Doctor of Philosophy Degrees (1/15/96 revision)

Residency requirements: Residency requirements for doctoral degrees shall be at least three years beyond the baccalaureate degree. For students without a master’s degree, at least two years shall be in residence at Washington State University (enrolled full time and present on a campus where a given program has received approval to grant residency). For students with a master’s degree, at least one year shall be in residence at Washington State University (enrolled full time and present on a campus where a given program has received approval to grant residency). [this paragraph to replace current paragraph on Residency Requirements: Doctoral Degrees in Graduate School Policies & Procedures]

Program Criteria: The following criteria apply to doctoral degrees offered by Washington State University and are not directed toward a specific campus. These criteria are considered the minimum necessary to offer doctoral program residency and apply to doctoral program at WSU Pullman initially (the currently approved location for doctoral degrees) and, as appropriate, may be extended to other campuses (approved alternative sites). The right to grant such residency is subject to approval by the degree-granting unit, the Graduate Studies Committee, and the Graduate School. (*formalized agreements)

1. Critical mass of graduate faculty engaged in research and scholarly productivity. (Critical mass [n+3] in a single or related programs at a campus, minimum of 5 Graduate Faculty system wide, availability of additional graduate faculty [including adjunct] in related disciplines). The critical mass (n=3) refers to three full time Graduate Faculty members constituting 3.0 FTE. Related programs are defined as programs approved as “related” by the degree-granting unit.

2. Graduate research library. (Access to discipline-specific research collections [adequate to the degree] in library facilities on campus and at other institutions).*

3. Critical mass of students pursing PhD degrees. (Average of 3 doctoral students/per year enrolled full time at one campus in the same program.) Regular contact with other doctoral students (in other programs and other locations).

4. Sufficient laboratories and research facilities, including computer facilities. (Combination of WSU facilities and access to other facilities is necessary.)*

5. Availability of financial support for full time study (e.g., TA’s/RA’s). (Implies student’s primary commitment is to graduate study.)

6. Opportunity for doctoral students to teach and to conduct research with Graduate Faculty.

7. Access to and interaction with chair and members of the doctoral committee on a regular basis; contact with other graduate faculty.
8. **Access to all required core courses and doctoral-level course work** (e.g., face-to-face instruction through WHETS [WHENS]).

9. **Access to and participation in both formal and informal seminars and colloquia** (WSU and non-WSU sponsored activities).

10. **Adequate support services**, including a Graduate Coordinator, a Graduate Secretary, admissions, advising, etc., at the location of residency.

* * * * *

Questions were raised about library capabilities and access at the branch campuses and the drain of funding for the Pullman library.

Motion failed.

2. **Recommendation from Organization and Structure Committee for Ex-Officio Members of Steering Committee.** *Exhibit I* from 1/25/96 agenda is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

TO: Richard Crain, Executive Secretary

FROM: Edward Udd, Chair, Organization and Structure Committee

DATE: December 4, 1995

RE: Listing Legislative Representatives as Ex-Officio Members of Steering Committee

Motion: Add to Composition of Steering Committee

The two Legislative/Council of Faculty Representatives shall be ex-officio members.

Rationale: These individuals report regularly to the Steering Committee. This change recognizes their contributions to the functioning of the Steering Committee without altering the present voting structure of the Steering Committee.

* * * * *

Motion carried.

3. **Recommendation from Organization and Structure Committee for Eliminating Membership on Budget Committee.** *Exhibit J* from 1/25/96 Agenda is as follows:

Memorandum

Date: December 4, 1995

To: Dick Crain, Executive Secretary, Faculty Senate

From: Edward Udd, Chair, Organization and Structure Committee

Re: Liaison Person between Budget Committee and Planning Review Committee
Motion: Eliminate the representative from the Planning Review Committee on the Budget Committee.

Rationale: A member of the Budget Committee is already appointed as a liaison to the Planning Review Committee. Presently, the Planning Review Committee also appoints another person from its committee to act as a liaison. This is redundant since there only needs to be one liaison between the two committees. The Budget Committee was chosen as the appointing Committee as it was felt that the Budget Committee meets a bit more regularly and, hence, would have a bit less of lag time in acting as liaison between the two committees. Apparently only one person has traditionally acted as liaison between these two committees in the past as well in spite of what is required. This formalizes that practice. In short, funding enough people to fill committee work is tough enough without creating more duties than necessary.

* * * * *

Motion carried.

4. Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for “PhD in Education subspecialization in Educational Psychology”. Exhibit L from 1/25/96 Agenda is as follows:

January 17, 1996

MEMORANDUM
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Lynda Carey, for Graduate Studies Committee
SUBJECT: PhD in Education Subspecialization in Educational Psychology

At its meeting on December 12, 1995, the Graduate Studies Committee recommended approval of the proposal to reinstate the Doctor of Philosophy in Education subspecialization in educational psychology.

cc: Karen P. DePauw, Associate Dean, Graduate School
    Diane Sylvester, Chair, Graduate Studies Committee

* * * * *

Motion carried.

5. Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for “Curricular Changes for American Studies Program”. Exhibit M from 1/25/96 Agenda is as follows:

January 17, 1996

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Lynda Carey, for Graduate Studies Committee
SUBJECT: Curricula Changes for American Studies Program
At its meeting on December 12, 1995, the Graduate Studies Committee reviewed the proposed changes to the program for American Studies which includes a) updating degree requirements by incorporating courses with the new American Studies prefix, b) expanding the areas of specialization, and c) adding a thesis option for the MA degree.

The Committee recommends approval of the new requirements with the addition of the following statement (3rd paragraph): . . . Foreign language competence is expected at a basic level of knowledge for scholarly pursuit.

cc: Karen DePauw, Associate Dean, Graduate School
    Diane Sylvester, Chair, Graduate Studies Committee.

* * * * *

Motion carried.

6. Resolution from the Library Committee “Library Shortfalls”. Exhibit N from 1/25/96 agenda is as follows:

TO: The Faculty Senate
FR: The Faculty Senate Library Committee
    Elizabeth Mejia/Kenneth Kardong Co-chairs
RE: Library Shortfalls
DA: January 18, 1996

The Faculty Senate Library Committee has just received confirmation that the serials budget for major collections in the Libraries will be short by about $412,000.00 (25%) to compensate for unfavorable currency exchanges with European publishers, where many of these journals are published. Such a shortfall follows a decade of frequent and deep cuts in funding for the Libraries. As a consequence of this long-term collapse of funding, the WSU libraries have plunged 30 points in our ranking in the Association of Research Libraries, dropping us close to the very bottom of this list. Vital holdings have disappeared as 18% of the entire journal collection has been cut in the past four years. Reliable access to current research has been compromised in many disciplines and the libraries are now in a position where they are becoming unable to meet even the minimal needs of the university community. The current, new cuts in serials is, therefore, only the most recent blow in this long term slide in Library funding.

Although the Libraries serve the entire University, they lack a focused, well-defined clientele who could and should speak up in opposition to the long-standing budget problems and these current cuts. The University regularly seeks supplemental monies, and the needs of the Libraries should be among those most vigorously promoted in requests for such funds. We therefore ask that the Faculty Senate make its views known to the Administration and we recommend that the Faculty Senate be asked to vote on the following resolution:

Given that the current shortfall of monies to the Libraries especially threaten the integrity of the Libraries and endanger its ability to adequately support the teaching, research and service mission of the University, we find the resultant cuts in vital serials unacceptable and recommend the administrative officers of WSU both find a way to
cover all these costs through supplemental funding and to find a long-term solution to
the funding of the Libraries so as to return the Libraries to a level of support of the
university community required by a major teaching and research institution.

* * * * *

The Committee recommends editorially changing the word “direct” to “recommend”.

Motion carried.

Agenda Items (Discussion Items).

1. Recommendation from Research and Arts Committee on “Procedures for Name Change
   for an Institute, Center or Laboratory” (Exhibit C).—K. Liddell

   There was no discussion of this item.

2. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for “Guaranteed 4 Year Degree”
   (Exhibit D).—J. Washburn

   Questions were raised about funding of any additional semesters or whatever it takes for
   a student to finish their degree; would advising be centralized; would reinstatement
   policies be tightened; would control be tightened on repeating courses. This proposal is
   in principal only and these details will be worked out. It was pointed out that the
   students need to understand that in high school they will have needed to have taken the
   appropriate courses and that they must follow the advice and plan of their advisor. It
   was stated that in almost all cases it is the student’s fault that they do not make it through
   a program in the time designed.

   [There meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m. because WHETS signed off.]

3. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for a “BA in English at WSU
   Vancouver” (Exhibit E).—J. Washburn

4. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for “Repeal of Rule 30” (Exhibit
   F).—J. Washburn

5. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for a “Program in Hotel and
   Restaurant Administration in Switzerland: (Exhibit G).—J. Washburn

6. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for “Undergraduate Major Change
   Bulletin 8” (Exhibit H).—J. Washburn

7. Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for “Graduate Major Change
   Bulletin 3” (Exhibit I).—D. Sylvester

8. Recommendation from Planning Review Committee for “The Academic and University
   Cores of WSU” (Exhibit J).—G. Hooks
9. Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for “Graduate Course and Graduate Credit” (Exhibit K from 1/25/96 agenda and new Exhibit K).—Diane Sylvester

Constituents' Concerns.

Adjournment.

Richard W. Crain, Jr.
Executive Secretary