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CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 11/04/1970

Linda Busch
MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 4 November 70
Presiding Officer: Kenneth Harsha, Chairman
Secretary: Linda Busch

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except Steve Fletcher and Mike Reid.


AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

Mr. Harsha asked that the proposed collective bargaining materials listed under Old Business be included instead in the Executive Committee report. There was no objection.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 7 and October 21 were approved.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

1. A letter from Robert Howser, dated October 2, 1970, stating that Eugene Kosy of the Business Education Dept. and Norman Phelps, Retirement and Insurance Officer, are now Central Washington State College's representatives on the Interinstitutional Ad Hoc Committee on Retirement and Benefits.

2. A memo from Rodney Converse, dated October 8, asking that Mr. Harsha correct the misunderstanding before the Faculty Senate that the proposal for a salary freeze contained in Mr. Converse's letter of October 5 is a device to obtain additional funds for the Educational Opportunities Program. According to Mr. Converse, the Educational Opportunities Program does not require any major infusion of money to fulfill its objective. There are, however, a number of areas that do require major commitments of new funds.

3. A letter from Jared Verner, dated October 14, stating that action should be taken by the Senate in the near future regarding the Pass-Fail option if the option is to be included in the 1971-72 catalog. The chairman stated that he has asked the Senate Curriculum and Student Affairs Committees to study this issue and present their recommendations to the Faculty Senate at its December 2 meeting.

4. A letter from Bernard Martin, dated October 27, stating that he had asked all Arts and Sciences departments to decide whether they wished to have a departmental personnel committee or not. He then listed the decisions of each department.
5. A letter from Beverly Heckart, dated October 13, requesting the Faculty Senate to express an opinion to Central's administration concerning a proposed withdrawal by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities of its endorsement of the AAUP 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

At this point in the meeting, the Chair recognized Beverly Heckart. She stated that the letter from the Executive Secretary of the national association (AAUP) plus the article and interpretive comments (copies of which had been sent to the Faculty Senate members) were self-explanatory. She did emphasize, however, that the complaints registered in the article of the Chronicle of Higher Education that the AAUP is becoming more and more like a trade union are fairly well dealt with in the interpretive comments and the AAUP Executive Committee's letter of October 19, 1970. She felt that the withdrawal of this statement at the present time could be interpreted not only by people in higher education but by the general public as a retreat of the AASCU from the principles expressed in the 1940 statement. This, she thought, could have grave implications for thousands of faculty members.

Mr. Brooks was called upon to state his view of the situation. He said that if this matter was to be debated, he would do this. The chairman felt this issue should be settled at this meeting, since the proposed withdrawal would be voted on by the AASCU at its annual meeting on November 15-17.

Jim Alexander then stated that he would like to present a motion on this issue. (Copies of the motion were distributed to Senators at this point in the meeting.) The reason for introducing this motion was that Mr. Alexander was concerned over a series of events, some of which had already been alluded to by Beverly Heckart. He stated that Mr. Brooks, himself, had told us for better than a year that Academia was going to be assaulted from several sides and that Mr. Brooks is now submitting ample evidence on campus in the form of certain pieces of legislation. Mr. Alexander felt that the academic faculty and students should stand together. He felt there may well be times in months to come when we will need to stand together on other issues as well. He would hate to see this nation show this kind of segmentation. He felt that the principles involved had gotten lost in the rhetoric. He would hate to see the AASCU take action directed at the negation of the laws of academic freedom. If it is on the basis of an underlying principle that the AASCU doesn't want to endorse anything, he felt this would be entirely different.

MOTION NO. 714: Mr. Alexander moved, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, that because of increasing encroachments on Academia in recent months, this Senate wishes to reaffirm its dedication to the basic principles of academic freedom by encouraging President Brooks to resist the recommendation of the Board of Directors of the AASCU to withdraw its endorsement of the AAUP 1940 statement on academic freedom. If President Brooks is not successful in this regard, the Senate asks him to temper the public impact of aforesaid AASCU action by introducing a motion that as a matter of principle the AASCU not endorse any but its own policy statements.

Mr. Brooks, who is a member of AASCU, then explained how this group was formed, and spoke of some of the reasons behind the AASCU's endorsement of the 1940
statement. He stated that AAUP had asked AASCU to help it revise some of its statements, because they were going out of date. AAUP wanted the AASCU to endorse some of its principles and then it would listen to more of what AASCU had to say. AASCU didn't endorse the first 24 statements by AAUP. It did form a committee to study the AAUP 1940 statement and made recommendations with the feeling that AAUP would use these suggestions. These suggestions, however, didn't get worked into the organization's statement of 1940, but came out as interpretive comments. AASCU was unhappy about this. Some antagonism built up over the years after AASCU made its first mistake of endorsing statements of other organizations. Mr. Brooks felt that is where the problem lies. He stated that some of the members of the AASCU at their coming meeting are going to try to get this issue straightened out and point out the problems that will arise if AASCU withdraws this endorsement. He stated that AASCU was not formed on AAUP principles; it just happened to endorse this statement. Mr. Brooks commented that he would question the seriousness of this issue if the AASCU's endorsement is withdrawn. He didn't think AASCU would withdraw support because of public pressure of riots, etc.; it is, instead, just an organizational matter. He said that he could see the implications, since AASCU did endorse the statement originally. He felt the basic issue is that AASCU shouldn't have endorsed statements of other associations.

Mr. Keller stated that what bothered him was that Mr. Brooks had made it clear that he was speaking only for himself and not for the college, but, nevertheless, the listing is of institutions and their presidents, and it seemed to him that if the statement was withdrawn, it would appear that state colleges in Washington were making the withdrawal. We're talking about presidents, not institutions. Mr. Keller didn't believe it would be at all clear to the public that Mr. Brooks was speaking only for himself.

Mr. Hammond asked if the purpose of AASCU, as well as tempering the political repercussions, would be achieved by a motion that would establish a principle that AASCU would not endorse any but its own policy statements.

Mr. Brooks felt it would, but it wouldn't be understood given the present climate and what had happened between the organizations. Mr. Brooks commented, however, that he liked the motion and could comply with it.

Motion No. 714 was then voted on and carried by a voice vote, with Mr. Brooks Abstaining.

REPORTS

A. Executive Committee--Mr. Hammond gave the following report:

The Executive Committee has met with President Brooks to discuss the formation of a faculty legislative committee. The committee could:

a. provide a sounding board for bills in the upcoming legislature,
b. act as liaison with the faculty,
c. meet with legislators to express faculty opinion.

If a legislative committee is approved by the Senate, the Executive Committee would request Senate advice as to membership and functions. We would recommend that one person be granted the necessary release
time to function effectively and that this individual be the Chairman of the Senate. We would recommend further that the Senate committees of Personnel, Budget and perhaps Student Affairs be represented. Non-Senators might be selected from names submitted by interested groups such as the AAUP.

The question at the moment is whether the Senate wishes a legislative committee for the upcoming legislative session. It might, at a later time, become permanent.

MOTION NO. 715: Mr. Hammond moved, seconded by Mr. Dillard, that the Senate approve the formation of a legislative committee, and the Executive Committee be authorized to solicit names and make appointments. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Hammond continued with the following announcements:

The Ad Hoc Committee on Conditions of Faculty Employment has been given a charge. Copies of this charge will be sent to the Faculty Senate members.

The Legislative Committees from Eastern and Western wish to meet with the committee at Central on November 12 to discuss common concerns. The Executive Committee plans to invite our district legislators to meet with it and our legislative committee prior to the 1971 legislative session. Senators will be invited.

Both the Curriculum and the Student Affairs Committees have been asked to give consideration to the evaluation of the Pass-Fail system at Central.

The proposal to allow a non-Senator to be chairman of a Senate committee has been assigned to the Code Committee.

The establishment of a Faculty Code of Conduct has been discussed. The Executive Committee was reluctant to establish still another committee, and in consideration of the task of code revision, reluctant to ask for a report from the Code Committee on the subject. The Personnel Committee was asked to assume the burden. The Personnel Committee members believe that the development of a Code of Conduct for faculty is outside their jurisdiction; that they only consider cases in light of existing rules and might well be required to judge on the basis of their own document. Mr. Hammond then asked for the advice of the Senate. Should we:

a. discontinue consideration of a Faculty Code of Conduct.
b. create an ad hoc committee.
c. assign the matter to a standing committee and, if necessary, expand its jurisdiction.

Mr. Keller asked if we had had extensive discussion on the need to have such a Code of Conduct. He felt we might not need such a Code.

Mr. Lawrence suggested an ad hoc committee be created and should be very carefully selected.

MOTION NO. 716: Mr. Lawrence moved, seconded by Mr. Hammond, that an ad hoc committee be formed to investigate the need for a Code of Conduct, and, if needed, to establish a Faculty Code of Conduct. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.
Mr. Hammond stated that the annual Symposium is once again being considered. The committee for 1971-1972 should be formed in the near future. The ASC has reduced its support from $4,000 to $1,500. It is possible that a decision on continuation of the event should be placed before the entire faculty for a vote. This could be done by a Senate decision to conduct a referendum or by a Senate decision on which a referendum is requested by 10% of the faculty.

Mr. McGehee asked if this matter was remanded to the Student Affairs Committee; was this committee charged with evaluating the Symposium? Mr. Harsha stated that the committee was asked to talk with students on this matter and solicit their opinions.

Mr. Hammond then commented on the collective bargaining material prepared by Mr. Harsha, containing a proposed ballot to be distributed to faculty members for a straw vote. This material, along with a Summary Comparison of the Professional Negotiations Law and the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act, prepared by C. Wayne Hall, Program Director for Higher Education, was distributed to Senate members at the meeting.

MOTION NO. 717: Mr. Hammond moved, seconded by Mr. Lewis, for approval of the form and content of the ballot.

The Chairman stated that an open meeting on collective bargaining would be held on November 16 (tentatively). Faculty members could ask questions at that meeting prior to filling out their ballots.

Mr. Keller asked if the Chairman had pursued the possibility of showing how the different legislations worked for four-year colleges and universities, so the faculty could make a real comparison. Mr. Harsha stated that this was attempted, but was difficult. He thought this could be answered at the meeting. Mr. Harsha stated that a notice of the meeting would be sent with the ballot and collective bargaining material.

Motion No. 717 was then voted on and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

B. Standing Committees

1. Budget Committee--Mr. Berry stated that there was a Budget Hearing in Olympia on October 30th, at which Mr. Brooks and Mr. Harsha were in attendance. He then asked Mr. Brooks to comment on the hearing.

   Mr. Brooks stated that he started out by explaining the concepts behind our budget. He said that Stan Bohne went through the programs with the people in attendance and tried to give them a view of how the budget was put together. The people in attendance from Central were ready to discuss various parts of its budget, but instead, were asked philosophical questions. Mr. Brooks stated that one of the main things that was discussed was what Central would do if its enrollment was limited for at least two years to what it is now. He commented that the general feeling was that the budget will have to be limited.

2. Code Committee--No report at this meeting.
3. Curriculum Committee--Mr. Glauert said that his committee had met last Friday, October 30, and prepared a memo for study by the Faculty Senate. This memo was distributed at the Senate meeting. It concerned a proposal for cutting paperwork and duplication in the development and review of curricula by the All-College Curriculum Committee and the Senate Curriculum Committee. Mr. Glauert stated that this matter required no debate or action at this time, but would be placed on December's agenda for consideration.

Mr. Glauert then introduced a second memo dealing with the ACCC proposals, pages 125-130. The Senate Curriculum Committee voted to recommend passage of the ACCC proposals, pages 125 through 130, withholding the section dealing with Bachelor's Degree credit requirements, p. 126-B, for further study. He stated that the section withheld would be brought to the Senate in December.

MOTION NO. 718: Mr. Glauert moved, seconded by Mr. Clark, to recommend passage of the ACCC proposals, pages 125 through 130, withholding, however, the section dealing with Bachelor's Degree credit requirements, p. 126-B, for further study.

A discussion followed, in which Senators and visitors expressed their opinions concerning the initiation of new minors and the additional faculty and staff needed to handle new courses. The main concern was over the Aerospace Minor. A lengthy discussion ensued explaining the program. Mr. Keller said that he seemed to recall that the Senate had voted against the formation of an Aerospace program a few years ago. Mr. Lawrence confirmed Mr. Keller's recollection and stated that the Senate had indeed rejected a similar Aerospace curriculum proposal some five years ago. Mr. McGehee expressed concern over whether or not the Aerospace program could stand on its own if the day ever arrived when AFROTC would be abolished on this campus. Supporters of the Aerospace proposal stated that Aerospace could survive without AFROTC.

Motion No. 718 was then voted on and passed by a voice vote, with Mr. Keller Opposing and Mr. Reed and Mr. Kallienke Abstaining.

4. Personnel Committee--No report at this meeting.

5. Student Affairs Committee--No report at this meeting.

C. Report from the Chair--No report from the Chair at this meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

The Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Departmental Chairmanships and Faculty Handbook, discussion on which had been deferred from the October Senate meeting, was opened for discussion at this time.

Mr. Lawrence asked if there was any progress being made on the Faculty Handbook. Mr. Jakubek stated that his committee had so far only dealt with the chairmanship portion of the committee’s charge.
Mr. Keller stated there was an implication in the report regarding recommendations for governance of the college as far as chairmen being elected or appointed. He felt this should be discussed sometime by the Senate. It might be that we would want to recommend that recommendations having to do with governance be put into the Faculty Code. There was no response to this.

Mr. Brooks stated that the Administration found the report very interesting and useful and used it as a guide in revising part of the Faculty Handbook.

Mr. Jakubek felt it might be advisable for the Senate to take some formal action in regard to accepting the document so there would be something in the record. This would permit the Ad Hoc Committee to pursue the second part of its charge--the Faculty Handbook.

MOTION NO. 719: Mr. Duncan moved, seconded by Mr. Carlson, to accept the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Departmental Chairmanships and Faculty Handbook. The motion was voted on and carried by a voice vote, with Mr. Nylander Abstaining.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.
AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
4 p.m., Wednesday, November 4, 1970
Room 123 - Hertz Hall

I. ROLL CALL

II. AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, October 7 and October 21, 1970

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

1. Letter from Bob Howser--Interinstitutional Ad Hoc Committee on Retirement and Benefits.
2. Memo from Rod Converse--Clarification of salary proposal.
3. Letter from Jared Verner--Pass-Fail Policy.
4. Letter from Bernard Martin--Departmental personnel committees in Arts and Sciences.
5. Letter from Beverly Heckart--AAUP 1940 Statement.

V. REPORTS

A. Executive Committee

1. Report by Vice Chairman

B. Standing Committees

1. Budget
2. Code
3. Curriculum
4. Personnel
5. Student Affairs

C. Report from the Chair

VI. OLD BUSINESS

1. Proposed collective bargaining materials for faculty straw vote.
2. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Departmental Chairmanships and Faculty Handbook.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
ROLL CALL

Alexander, James
Allen, John
Anderson, David
Berry, Kenneth
Brooks, James
Carlson, Frank
Clark, Glen
Collins, Frank
Dillard, David
Doll, Richard
Douce, Pearl
Duncan, L. C.
Easterling, Ilda
Fletcher, Steve
Glauert, Earl
Hammond, Kenneth
Harsha, Kenneth
Jakubek, Doris
Jones, Robert
Keller, Chester
Ladd, Arthur
Lawrence, Larry
Leavitt, Gordon
Lewis, Albert
McGehee, Charles
Nylander, James
Odell, Elwyn
Purcell, John
Putnam, Jean
Reed, Gerald
Reid, Mike
Ringe, Don
Shadle, Owen
Sparks, Larry
Williams, Harold
Wright, Cheryl
Marco Bicchieri
Robert Harris
Frederick Lister
Alan Bergstrom
Edward Harrington
Sheldon Johnson
Robert Benton
App Legg
James Sahlstrand
Wesley Adams
Ted Bowen
Gerhard Kallienke
Kent Richards
Joel Andress
Earl Synnes
Charles Vlcek
Jay Bachrach
Bryon Gore
Donald King
John DeMerchant
Katherine Egan
Frank Sessions
Betty Hileman
Robert Yee
Don Wise
Everett Irish
James Klahn
Steven Farkas
Gerald Brunner
Max Zwanziger
Gordon Galbraith
Mr. Kenneth K. Harsha  
Chairman, Faculty Senate  
Campus  

Dear Mr. Harsha:

Thank you for your copy of the letter to Melvin G. Davidson dated September 23, 1970.

Since the formation of the Retirement Insurance Office and the hiring of Mr. Norman Phelps as the Retirement and Insurance Officer, Dr. Eugene Kosy of the Business Education Office and Mr. Norman Phelps are now Central Washington State College's representatives on the Interinstitutional Ad Hoc Committee on Retirement and Benefits. Communications with respect to the Ad Hoc Committee should be directed to these two gentlemen.

Sincerely yours,

Robert Howser  
Director of Staff Personnel  

RH/mt  
cc: Norm Phelps  
    Dr. Eugene Kosy  
    Dr. Melvin G. Davidson
MEMORANDUM

TO: Ken Harsha, Chairman  
      Faculty Senate

FROM: Rodney E. Converse, Director  
      Educational Opportunities Program

DATE: October 8, 1970

It has come to my attention that the proposal for a salary freeze contained in my letter of October 5th, is being interpreted as a device to obtain additional funds for the Educational Opportunities Program. This is not my intention. The Educational Opportunities Program does not require any major infusion of money to fulfill its objections. There are, however, a number of areas, such as those I delineated in my letter, that do require major commitments of new funds.

Would you please correct this misunderstanding before the Faculty Senate.
Dr. Kenneth Harsha  
Chairman, Faculty Senate  
C W S C

Dear Ken:

The General Education Committee wishes to take this early opportunity to review Senate action on the Pass-Fail option and to remind you that further action by the Senate will be required in the near future if that option is to be included in the 1971-72 catalog.

From the Senate minutes, 10 January 1968, p. 4:

"MOTION NO. 388: Mr. Williams moved, seconded by Mr. Hertz, that each student be allowed to designate courses up to a total of fifteen credits in the Breadth Requirements and in free electives for a pass-fail grade; the student must designate a pass-fail grade at a specified time; this pass-fail program would be experimental for three years, and during the period the program would be evaluated. The motion passed by a vote of 26 Ayes, 1 Nay and 2 Abstentions."

"The following points were discussed and clarified prior to voting on Motion No. 388:

1. 15 credits may be taken in this program during the student's undergraduate years.
2. Pass is anything above an E and fail is different from an E in that the credits are not counted in computing the G. P. A.
3. Free electives are courses selected outside of major, minor, professional, and general education program.
4. Instructor will not be informed which students are enrolled on a pass-fail status.
5. Motion is deliberately vague on some points, for it is designed to leave certain details open for administrative decision and implementation."
From the Senate minutes, 1 May 1968, p. 2:

"6. The Pass-Fail policy will be in the 1968-69 catalog. The following guidelines will be observed: the grades will be recorded "S" or "U"; no more than one pass-fail course may be taken per quarter; the course may not count in a major or minor except if a student changes his major and then only if a course previously taken pass-fail is approved by the department."

If Senate action this year extends the time period for the Pass-Fail option, the General Education Committee recommends that past application of the policy be reviewed within the framework of the above excerpts from Senate minutes. For example, the guidelines indicate that this is an option available to undergraduates, though the option is not explicitly denied to graduate students. We believe the records will show that graduate students have applied pass-fail credits toward their graduate degrees.

Respectfully yours,

Jared Verner, Chairman
General Education Committee

jm

cc: Dr. Harrington
    Dr. Canedo
Dr. Kenneth Harsha, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
Campus  

Dear Dr. Harsha:

As set forth in Section III, D, 3, b, I have asked all Arts and Sciences departments to decide whether they wish to have a departmental personnel committee or not. The departments have made their decisions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Entire department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>R. D. Gaines, T. B. Bowen, W. W. Newschwander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Business Ad.</td>
<td>P. R. O'Shaughnessy, H. S. Williams, G. N. Galbraith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>R. Benton, T. Blanton, D. King, K. Zink, M. Mathewson (K. Rinehart and M. Anderson are ex-officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>C. Martin, A. Pleasance, I. Easterling, E. M. Carne, J. R. Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Entire department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Entire department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Entire department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Entire department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech &amp; Drama</td>
<td>A. Lewis, H. Dunnington, R. Garrett, J. Hoglin, J. Johnson, R. Reynolds, B. Wensley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sincerely,

BLM:p  

Bernard L. Martin  
Dean of Arts and Sciences  

cc: Dr. Harrington
Kenneth Harsha, President  
Faculty Senate  
CWSC

Dear Mr. Harsha:

Recently, the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors received a memorandum from the executive secretary of the national organization informing it that the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, of which Central is a member, will vote on a proposal to withdraw its endorsement of the AAUP 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure at its annual meeting on November 15-17. If the proposal wins a majority of the AASCU, it could have grave implications for the freedom and security of the faculty across the nation and at Central. It could also affect the current deliberations over the revision of the Faculty Code. The AAUP Executive Committee therefore requests the privilege of informing the Faculty Senate of this new development at its meeting on October 21, 1970 so that it may express an opinion to Central's administration before the annual meeting of the AASCU in November.

Respectfully yours,

Beverly Heckart

Acting President

AAUP, CWSC Chapter
TO: Faculty Senate

DATE: October 19, 1970

Recently, the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors received a memorandum from the executive secretary of the national organization informing it that the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, of which Central is a member, will vote on a proposal to withdraw its endorsement of the AAUP 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure at its annual meeting on November 15-17. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education, May 18, 1970, the leaders of the AASCU have proposed this action because of their concern about:

1) The recent tendency of the AAUP toward trade unionism;
2) The increasing militancy of the AAUP;
3) Recent statements of the AAUP regarding rights of non-tenured faculty;
4) The concern of the AAUP for rights rather than responsibilities;
5) "Equal protection" of college administrators against AAUP investigating teams.

The proposal of the AASCU stems from dissatisfaction with the reaffirmation of the 1940 AAUP Statement made in nine "Interpretive Comments" passed at the annual meeting of the AAUP in spring, 1970. Prior to the 1970 spring meeting, the AAUP considered suggestions of the AASCU relative to the 1940 Statement, but those suggestions were not included in the "Interpretive Comments" for fear of "shifting the focus" of the Statement. In addition, many AASCU proposals are contained in other AAUP Policy Statements. Further, three of the nine Interpretive Comments stress faculty responsibilities.

If the AASCU withdraws its endorsement of the AAUP 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, it will be the first organization to do so. However, since its membership includes many public institutions across the nation, a vote for withdrawal could have grave implications for thousands of faculty members. More immediately, it could affect the current deliberations of Central's Faculty Code. For this reason, the local chapter of the AAUP hopes that the Faculty Senate will join it in voicing opposition to the AASCU's withdrawal of endorsement.
MOTION

to the Faculty Senate
by Jim Alexander
November 4, 1970

Because of increasing encroachments on Academia in recent months, this Senate wishes to reaffirm its dedication to the basic principles of academic freedom by encouraging President Brooks to resist the recommendation of the Board of Directors of the AASCU to withdraw its endorsement of the AAUP 1940 statement on academic freedom. If President Brooks is not successful in this regard, the Senate asks him to temper the public impact of aforesaid AASCU action by introducing a motion that as a matter of principle the AASCU not endorse any but its own policy statements.
FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

1. The Executive Committee has met with President Brooks to discuss the formation of a faculty legislative committee. The committee could:
   a. provide a sounding board for bills in the upcoming legislature.
   b. act as liaison with the faculty.
   c. meet with legislators to express faculty opinion.

If a legislative committee is approved by the Senate, the Executive Committee would request Senate advice as to membership and functions. We would recommend that one person be granted the necessary release time to function effectively and that this individual be the Chairman of the Senate. We would recommend further that the Senate Committees on Personnel, Budget and perhaps Student Affairs be represented. Non-Senators might be selected from names submitted by interested groups such as the AAUP.

The question at the moment is whether the Senate wishes a legislative committee for the upcoming legislative session. It might, at a later time, become permanent. At this time I move that the Senate approve the formation of a legislative committee and the Executive Committee be authorized to solicit names and make appointments.

2. The Legislative Committees from Eastern and Western wish to meet with the committee at Central on November 12 to discuss common concerns. The Executive Committee plans to invite our district legislators to meet with us and our legislative committee prior to the 1971 legislative session. Senators will be invited.

3. Both the Curriculum and the Student Affairs Committees have been asked to give consideration to the evaluation of the Pass-Fail system at Central.
4. The proposal to allow a non-Senator to be chairman of a Senate committee has been assigned to the Code Committee.

5. The establishment of a Faculty Code of Conduct has been discussed. The Executive Committee was reluctant to establish still another committee and in consideration of the task of code revision reluctant to ask for a report from the Code Committee on the subject. The Personnel Committee was asked to assume the burden. The Personnel Committee believes that the development of a Code of Conduct for faculty is outside their jurisdiction; that they only consider cases in light of existing rules and might well be required to judge on the basis of their own document. The Executive Committee needs the advice of the Senate. Should we:
   a. discontinue consideration of a Faculty Code of Conduct;
   b. create an ad hoc committee;
   c. assign the matter to a standing committee and, if necessary, expand their jurisdiction.

6. The annual symposium is once again being considered. The Committee for 1971-1972 should be formed in the near future. The ASC has reduced its support from $4,000.00 to $1,500.00. It is possible that a decision on continuation of the event should be placed before the entire faculty for a vote. This could be done by a Senate decision to conduct a referendum or by a Senate decision on which a referendum is requested by 10% of the faculty.

7. Material is being assembled on collective bargaining. Some has been distributed and more will be available in department offices. In accord with the decision at the special Senate meeting, a sample ballot for a straw vote has been prepared for your consideration. At this time I move approval of the form and content of the ballot.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee

DATE: November 2, 1970

RE: Procedure for curriculum changes which are administrative in character

In an effort to cut paper work and duplication in the development and review of curricula by the All-College Curriculum Committee (ACCC) and the Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC), and in view of the fact that numerous changes in curricula appear to be largely administrative, the ACCC and the Senate Curriculum Committee have discussed the following modification in present procedure as presented in John Shrader's letter of September 25.

The SCC would like to present the following proposal for your consideration before it appears on a Senate agenda: that curricula changes which are administrative in character be directly forwarded to the appropriate deans for their approval, with copies forwarded to the ACCC master catalogue file and other concerned parties, without necessarily requiring ACCC action, and without requiring SCC action or Senate approval.

1) Course deletion - provided the course does not affect appreciably any other department than the one making the proposal.

2) Course credit change - unless the credit change will affect programs in other departments or cause an increase in credits in a departmental program beyond the 'allowed' maximum.

3) Change in course title - provided the course does not affect appreciably any other department than the one making the proposal.

4) Change in course description - provided the course does not affect appreciably any other department than the one making the proposal.

5) Changes in Pre-Professional Programs.

6) Change in course number - unless the change in course level is going to have an appreciable affect on programs (graduate).
CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY ALL-COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

GEOGRAPHY

COURSE ADDITION

Geography 399. Seminar. 1-5 credits.

ALL BACCALAUREATE DEGREES

PROGRAM CHANGE

Reduce Bachelor's Degree credit requirements. It establishes the minimum number of credits required as 180 plus physical education techniques.

ACCC RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Graduation requirements are to include a statement that a student must complete 180 credits plus basic requirements in Physical Education, (6 credits at present)

2. The ACCC endorses the reduction in graduation credits and at the same time urges that the implementation of this reduction be held until the Fall of 1971, at which time the policy would be applicable to all students.

3. If the policy is not applicable to all students it would seem likely that many students would attempt to change catalogs, which would result in a chaotic situation. It is also hoped that the residence requirement of 48 credits would be reduced to 45 credits.

ALL-COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
John S. Shrader, Chairman

AEROSPACE STUDIES

PROGRAM INITIATION

(A/S) AEROSPACE MINOR

Minor (20 to 30 credits) Credits

AS 251 Intro. to Aeronautics . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4
AS 261 Intro. to Astronautics . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4
AS 427 Aerospace Science . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4
Approved electives in Aerospace Studies . . . . . . . . . . . 8-18

20-30

(T/Ed) AEROSPACE MINOR

Minor (20 credits) Credits

AS 251 Intro. to Aeronautics . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4
AS 261 Intro. to Astronautics . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4
AS 437 Aerospace Education . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3
Approved electives in Aerospace Studies . . . . . . . . . . . 9
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AEROSPACE STUDIES (CONTINUED)

COURSE CHANGE

DESCRIPTION AND TITLE

AS 437. Aerospace Education. 3 credits. Curriculum methods and materials for Aerospace (Aviation/Space) Education. Aerospace (region beyond the earth's surface) affairs and their impacts on man. (Ed. 437 and AS 437 are the same course. Students may not receive credits in both.)

NUMBER, TITLE AND DESCRIPTION

AS 427. Aerospace Science. 4 credits. (Add to present description the following) Not open to students who have taken AS 461.
Formerly AS 461

BUSINESS EDUCATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT

B.A. IN EDUCATION
PROGRAM INITIATION

(T/ED) DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION MAJOR
(BROAD AREA)

Qualifies for teaching and coordinating programs in secondary distributive education.
Endorsement for student teaching requires a minimum g.p.a. of 2.25 for the major as a whole.

Major (60 credits) Credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Econ. 251.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ. 252.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Ed. 331.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Ed. 346.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Admr. 366.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Admr. 461.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Admr. 367.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Ed. 445.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Admr. 468.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect from the following courses, including at least two areas</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Ed. 151.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math. 153.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Admr. 241.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Admr. 221.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
BUSINESS EDUCATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT

COURSE ADDITION

Bus. Ed. 331. Methods and Materials in Teaching Distributive Education. 5 credits.

TITLE AND DESCRIPTION CHANGE

Ed. Internship in Office and Distributive Occupations. 5 credits.

Part-time employment in an approved office and distributive position under departmental supervision and with departmental approval. Minimum of fifteen hours a week on the job and attendance at weekly group conferences.

ECO NOMICS AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

COURSE ADDITIONS

Bus. Adm. 367. Retail Merchandising. 5 credits. The problems of management in retail store operation, including organization, buying, stock control, personnel administration, and expense control.

Bus. Adm. 461. Advertising and Sales Management. 5 credits.

EDUCATION

CREDIT AND DESCRIPTION CHANGE

*Ed. 442K, P, I, U, J, or S. Student Teaching. 5-16 credits. (For experienced teachers, 5 credits during summer session; or variable credits by special arrangement during the academic year is possible upon the recommendation of the Director of Teacher Education and Advisement and approval of the Director of Clinical Studies.) Prerequisites: Ed. 307, admission to the Teacher Education Program, a minimum grade point average of 2.0, Psy. 309, Psy. 310, Ed. 314 and Ed. 341. Students must attend the seminar which accompanies the student teaching experience. The seminar will meet a total of 20 clock hours during the quarter, normally at a time other than school hours, and at a place designated by the college supervisor. All assignments for Student Teaching are made through the Student Teaching Office. In registering for this course, indicate the level of the assignment (K, P, I, U, J, S). A maximum of twenty-one hours of student teaching credits may be allowed for graduation. The grade for this course will be indicated with the letters "S" or "U" only.

*Students with recent successful teaching experience, certificated and under contract may apply to the Director of Teacher Education, Advisement and Certification.
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EDUCATION (CONTINUED)

TITLE AND DESCRIPTION CHANGE

Ed. 437. Aerospace Education. 3 credits. Curriculum, methods, and materials for aerospace (aviation/space) education. Aerospace (region beyond the earth's surface) affairs and their impacts upon man. (Ed. 437 and AS. 437 are the same course. Students may not earn credits in both.)

COURSE DELETION

Ed. 445. Student Teaching Seminar. 2 credits.

ENGLISH

COURSE ADDITIONS

Eng. 1300. Introduction to Black American Literature. 5 credits. Non-fiction, poetry, and fiction of black American writers to contemporary times.


Eng. 2350. Studies in Folklore. 5 credits. Analysis of the literature of oral folk traditions as recorded in tales, songs, fables, anecdotes, toasts and ballads.

Eng. 3300. The Black American Novel. 5 credits. An intensive study and analysis of novels written by Black Americans from the late 19th century to the present.

JOURNALISM

COURSE ADDITION

Journ. 399. Seminar. 1-5 credits.

HISTORY

COURSE ADDITION

Hist. 343. History of Black America Since 1865. 5 credits. A survey of the role of the Negro in American Society from 1865 to the present.

TITLE AND DESCRIPTION CHANGE

Hist. 342. History of Black America to 1865. 5 credits. A survey of the role of the Negro in American Society from colonial times to 1865.

NUMBER, TITLE AND DESCRIPTION CHANGE

Hist. 466. English Constitutional and Legal History. 5 credits.

(Add the following to the present description) Recommended for pre-law students. Not open to students who have taken Hist. 373. Formerly Hist. 373.

SPEECH AND DRAMA

(T/Ed) SPEECH AND DRAMA MAJOR-ELEMENTARY

PROGRAM CHANGE

Mainly correcting error - listed in catalog as Dr. 420 Directing and should be listed as Dr. 329 Directing and Producing the Play.
CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY ALL-COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

SPEECH AND DRAMA  (CONTINUED)

COURSE ADDITIONS

Dr. 200, 300, 400. Rehearsal and Performance. 1-2 credits. Open to all students participating in dramatic productions.

Dr. 498. Special Topics. 1-6 credits.

Sp. 256. Black Speakers. 5 credits. A study of black speakers in America from colonial times to the present.

DESCRIPTION CHANGE

Dr. 267. Technical Theatre II: Stagecraft. 4 credits. Construction, painting, and handling of scenery.
A REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE

BY THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMANSHIPS

AND FACULTY HANDBOOK

May 13, 1970

Background

On December 3, 1969, the Senate Executive Committee recommended that a special body be created to make two separate studies, one of departmental chairmanships, the other of the Faculty Handbook. Following Senate approval of the recommendation, Dr. Nylander appointed these persons to the ad hoc committee in letters dated December 10th:

Anthony Canedo (English), Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences

Ronald Frye (Technical and Industrial Education), Department Chairman

Kenneth Harsha (Business Education and Administrative Management), Senate Vice-Chairman

Otto Jakubek (Geography), member, Senate Code Committee

Donald Ringe (Geology), Chairman, Senate Code Committee

The letters of appointment also set out the two-fold nature of the committee's charge, providing several questions to be considered for each of the studies. This report deals only with the first task, that of studying the role of the department chairman in this college.

Procedure

Including its organizational meeting on December 12, the Committee met eight times. During the series of meetings, all present chairmen and all present deans and associate deans and President Brooks were interviewed, usually in informal group situations. In addition, the committee reviewed the college's operational guides (Faculty Code of
Personnel Policy and Procedure, Faculty Handbook and the 1969 accreditation report of the Northwest Association on CWSC. Also examined were recently issued letters of appointment of departmental chairmen, a memorandum to President Brooks from Mr. Thomas Dalglish regarding appointment and removal of faculty, a memorandum to members of the Deans' Council and President's Council from Dr. Hertz concerned principally with problems associated with periodic departmental review of chairmen and other recent literature dealing with college organizations.

After completing the information gathering listed above, and following the order of the sets of questions for committee consideration given in Dr. Nylander's appointment letters, committee members prepared their individual reports on findings. These, in compilation, are given as observations and recommendations following the questions below.

Findings

Each of the following groups of questions pertains to the department chairman in this college.

1. What is his present authority? What should it be?

Observations:

(a) The chairman's authority, defined either as the power to act or as the esteem due the position, is not spelled out clearly in documents or unwritten operating policy. (Both definitions appear to be important to the majority of chairmen.)

(b) For the most part, chairmen appear to believe that they have more decision-making latitude in areas of curriculum and staff hiring and retention than in budget making.

(c) Almost unanimously, chairmen expressed interest in having
the bases of their authority or power remain departmental rather than be changed to administrative. Being elected chairman was said to be preferable to being appointed head of a department by most. One chairman expressed a belief that chairmen (or heads) should be regarded as administrators, that is, integral parts of the administrative hierarchy--rather than as teaching faculty having some administrative duties.

(d) It appears that the authority held by a given chairman depends on many things, perhaps the most important being the nature of the chairman himself. One chairman put it this way, "I figure that I have as much authority as I want to take." Others seemed to see or sense constraints more than opportunities in their role-performance.

(c) Chairmen and deans alike seem to believe that the adoption of a statement of important, attainable goals for the college is vital to the goal determinations and operations of departments and to the performance and authority of chairmen. Several said that long-range (i.e., greater than budgetary biennial) planning for curricular and staff growth within departments was made difficult because the college itself appears not to be on a well-determined, purposeful course.

Recommendations

(a) The institution should set goals for itself regarding its general roles, specialized functions and growth, if only for departmental planning and chairmen's role-determination purposes.

(b) Because authority appears to rest, in part, upon performance of tasks, help in doing the chairman's job is necessary. Such help could be in the form of:

1) administrative assistants for chairmen of large departments;
2) upgraded departmental secretarial job descriptions, so that more of the daily, non-decision making tasks can be shifted to the secretaries.

(c) The administration should prepare a college operations handbook for (especially) chairmen's use, in which specific information is given regarding who is responsible for what, and how certain things can be done.

2. What procedures are used in evaluating his performance as chairman? What procedures should be used?

Observations:

(a) Evaluation of a chairman's performance is very difficult because neither the role nor the evaluation criteria has been described.

(b) The present system of periodic review of the chairman by the members of his department constitutes one kind of evaluation. Generally, this is not a satisfactory means of evaluation from the chairman's viewpoint, because he usually receives only negative feedback--if any--from it.

(c) Apparently, a chairman's dean individually and the Deans' Council together engage in some sort of continuous and necessarily subjective evaluation of that chairman. This has its result annually in the form of recommendations (or non-recommendations) for promotion and salary adjustments.

Recommendations

(a) Chairmen should devise means for evaluation of their performances if they want criticisms and suggestions for betterment. Whether formal or informal, such means should be developed with the goal in mind of improving performance. Different procedures might be used in gaining information from departmental staff than from deans.
(b) Staff members should feel free to discuss with their chairman either positive or negative actions or attitudes.

(c) Deans should hold evaluation conferences with chairmen (perhaps also with staff?) in order to stimulate and improve feedback.

3. What procedures are presently used in removing an ineffective chairman? What procedures should be used? Should these procedures be incorporated in the Faculty Code?

Observations:

(a) A chairman can be removed from his position as chairman following general procedures stated and implied on page 6 of the Faculty Handbook (1968-69 edition). Unfortunately, specific procedures for removal are not provided, nor are appeal mechanisms by which a chairman might seek to contest removal.

(b) Most chairmen believe that recent actions taken by the deans in removing chairmen were well done.

Recommendations

(a) A chairman should be removed if he cannot or will not perform adequately the tasks comprising his job.

(b) Procedures, including the formal statement of charges, hearings and rights and routes of appeal should be written into official college documents, probably the Faculty Handbook rather than the Code.

(No specific procedures are offered here. We leave this onerous task to those who write the Handbook.)

4. What is the relationship of his role as chairman and as faculty member holding professorial rank? Do we hire him as a professor and teacher first, and secondly as chairman? Is he contracted separately in those roles? Should he be?

Observations:

(a) It is very difficult to be chairman, teacher and scholar.
The many and sometimes trivial tasks of the chairmanship place time-use and emotional frustration burdens on a chairman which deny him the time both to prepare adequately for his classes and to engage in the scholarly activities for which his doctoral or other advanced degree program prepared him and his own research interests impel him.

(b) Present practices appear to indicate that persons from the "outside" hired to be chairmen indeed are employed on the basis of proven academic (i.e. scholarly and pedagogical) accomplishment, yet are placed in the dilemma described above.

(c) Chairmen themselves are split in their opinions on the issue of role. Some like being chairmen because of the psychic income derived from their feelings of being able to bring about improvement in curriculum and staff—a kind of creative sense. They appear to rank this kind of accomplishment above teaching and research. Others feel frustrated in not being able to do the things that they want to do as teachers and researchers.

(d) Recent contract letters indicate that some persons have been hired as professors and chairmen, others receiving separate appointments to the faculty and to chairmanships.

Recommendations

(a) Persons hired as professors and as chairmen should be given separate contracts for these positions, each stating the respective performance expectations.

(b) Chairmen, perhaps in concert with their respective departments and deans, should have greater leeway than they now possess in setting their own load-point allocations.
5. What is the view of the chairman's role by the administration? By the department members?

Observations:
(a) The deans tend to sympathize with chairmen, realizing that their lot is "not an 'appy one'."
(b) The deans appear to believe that a principal function of chairmen is that of leadership, including motivation of staff for improvement of teaching, research, constructive campus activity, as well as counseling and helping individuals.
(c) The deans agree that chairmen need assistance in the performance of their tasks.

(No formal sample of department members was made for the purposes of gathering opinion. Individual committee members have discussed these questions with their fellows. These responses, added to the committee members' own beliefs, are contained within the findings here.

6. Should chairmen be outsiders or elected from within if possible?

Observations:
(a) It is the unanimous opinion of all who were interviewed that no hard-and-fast policy in this regard should be adopted.

Recommendations
(a) Find the best person for the job.

7. Does the salary of chairmen correspond to their rank as required by the code? Should it? If not, how should it be determined?

Observations:
(a) As far as was determined, salary and rank correspond, although "outsiders" sometimes appear to be salaried higher within rank than do chairmen elected from "inside".
Chairmen were divided on the issue of their being paid some extra amount of money for their chairmanship roles.

Administrators believe that chairmen should receive extra pay.

**Recommendations**

(a) Persons holding chairmanships are deserving of extra pay because of the additional time and work burdens they carry beyond those borne by teaching staff.

(b) Such extra pay should be tied to the office or position of chairman, and should not be considered as a part of the regular professorial salary.

(c) The amount-fixed or some proportion of base salary should be determined by joint conferences of chairmen and administrators.

8. What is the current policy on date of elections for continuing chairmen? What should it be? Is present policy being uniformly applied?

**Observations:**

(a) The Handbook (page 6) states that chairmen serve for two or four years. In practice, the four-year term is applied generally to chairmen holding doctoral degrees, while non-doctorates face election at two-year intervals.

**Recommendations**

(a) If terms of office are to be stated and their use continued, then the term should be uniform for all departments, whether the chairmen hold terminal degrees or not.

Submitted for the Committee,

Otto F. Jakubek, Chairman
This is a sample of the collective bargaining information and the ballot that would be sent to the faculty at Central.

Please read the material as soon as you arrive at the meeting today.
Consideration of collective bargaining is a matter that the Faculty Senate deems vital to the faculty at Central Washington State College. Please read the data contained herein, and the additional informational material that will be placed at your disposal. After carefully reading this information, please respond by indicating how you feel about collective bargaining and the alternatives provided. A ballot is attached for this purpose. Please return it to the Faculty Senate Office by November 30, 1970. This is a straw vote and designed only to solicit faculty opinion regarding collective bargaining.

PROLOGUE

The matter under discussion and to be considered by the faculty at CWSC was prompted by the joint legislative Public Employees Collective Bargaining Committee's consideration of introducing legislation that would lift the "exempt" status of those public employees not included under the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967. The Collective Bargaining Committee conducted a hearing in Seattle on September 11, 1970, chaired by Representative Gary Grant of Renton. Testimony was solicited from various occupational groups not covered under the 1967 Act, including those in higher education (specifically exempted in the 1969 law). Since those individuals testifying from four-year state colleges and universities in Washington felt unequipped to answer on behalf of their respective faculties, it was decided by the committee that the campuses involved should be given time to discuss whether or not there was interest on the part of faculty members in having the "exemption" removed. This, briefly, explains why the Faculty Senate has chosen to bring the matter of collective bargaining to the entire faculty at CWSC.

The Faculty Senate wants faculty members to know precisely the implications inherent in the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967, and what alternatives there might be to this Act. The Professional Negotiations Law (PNL), written initially for K-12, and later extended to the community colleges, represents one possible alternative. At this moment, however, there has been no official consideration to bring four-year college faculty members under this particular law (PNL). In order to amplify the alternatives and, hopefully, to clarify the differences involved, the Professional Negotiations Law (PNL) will be examined along with the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967. The 1967 law was actually an amended version of the State Civil Service Law of 1961. The 1961 law was again amended in 1969. As to these laws--the Professional Negotiations Law, the State Civil Service Law of 1961 (Initiative 207), the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967 (Enacted House Bill 11, 46), and the 1969 law (Substitute House Bill 2530)--have been made available in your departmental office. You are urged to examine these laws as carefully as possible.
THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ACT OF 1967

The Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967 relates to labor relations and provides a uniform statutory basis for implementing the right of public employees to organize collectively and be represented by organizations of their own choice. This law amended Section 15, chapter 1, of the State Civil Service Law of 1961. Under the 1967 law, public employees assumed most of the same rights in collective bargaining afforded to those employed in private occupations. The law, however, forbade any public employee in the State of Washington to strike or refuse to perform his official duties. Otherwise, the rights were similar; due, essentially, to the fact that the 1961 and 1967 laws were extensions of a series of labor laws passed in the State of Washington, commencing in 1929. The 1961 law created a system of Civil Service in Washington, and the 1967 law (Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act) then permitted public employees to bargain collectively through representative associations, organizations, or unions. The 1969 law (Substitute House Bill No. 239) extended the privilege of collective bargaining to institutions of higher education (largely for civil service personnel) and established a system of personnel administration for these institutions. The 1969 law, however, included an "exempt" status for certain employment positions in institutions of higher education; including, members of the governing board of each institution and related boards, all presidents, vice presidents and their confidential secretaries, administrative and personal assistants, deans, directors, chairmen, academic personnel, executive heads of major administrative or academic divisions, and others (see Sec. 4, law of 1969).

As the above "exemptions" indicate, the provisions of both the 1967 and 1969 laws, as they related to institutions of higher education, largely applied to those employees with civil service classification. The Public Employees Collective Bargaining Committee is asking, "Do we want the stated 'exemptions' lifted?"

What is the law of 1967?

The Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967 (extended to employees in higher education by the law of 1969) permitted public employees in the State of Washington the right to bargain collectively. This meant that a particular employee group could elect some association, organization, or union to represent them in collective negotiations with the appropriate governing board. This gave public employees rights of negotiation consistent, for the most part, with those provided under the law to employees in the private sector. Essentially, this means that:

1) A public employee group can legally enlist the services of a bargaining agent to act on its behalf in collective negotiations.

2) Certain rules and regulations conducive to the best standards of personnel administration have been promulgated. They concern such items as provisions for dismissal, suspension, demotion, promotion, probationary periods, competitive examinations, appeals, and the like.

3) Once a bargaining representative (association, organization, or union) is agreed upon by a majority (51%) of the employee group, it becomes the bargaining agent for 100% of the employees in the affected group, including those who voted against the formalized collective bargaining.
arrangement. The association, organization, or union is considered the exclusive bargaining agent for all employees in the employee group. In such circumstances, the employer is compelled to bargain in good faith with the bargaining agent; including items involving wages, working conditions, and hours of employment. Collective bargaining does not necessarily mean unionism. The 1967 law refers only to bargaining "organizations" and does not stipulate restrictions on the kind of bargaining agent used. The bargaining agent could even be some type of internally constituted bargaining arrangement within the employee group itself.

4) No member of an employee group can be forced to join the bargaining unit, nor can any group of employees be required to affiliate with any outside bargaining agency. Under the law, no employee group is forced to exercise its right to organize or bargain collectively.

5) An employee-employer relationship would be created if an employee group chose to exercise its right to bargain collectively. According to bargaining laws, even in public sector employment, once collective bargaining is agreed upon, there is developed a bargaining team and a management team. Civil Service employees at CWSC, for example, are represented by the Washington Federation of State Employees AFL-CIO, and have formed a bargaining team comprised of employees and representatives of the union. The bargaining team negotiates with the Board of Trustees (management) on behalf of all civil service employees on campus.

By the year 1967, approximately 1,500,000 public employees in the United States belonged to various kinds of organized bargaining groups. The Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967 afforded public employees in the State of Washington the right to organize.

THE PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS LAW

The Professional Negotiations Law (PNL) was written originally to establish a system for administering personnel relations between certificated employees (any employee holding a regular teaching certificate in the state) and their school districts. The PNL was amended in 1969 to include the faculty and staff of the community colleges and vocational-technical institutes in the State of Washington.

What is PNL?

The Professional Negotiations Law gives certificated employees in the state's public schools and community colleges certain rights and privileges in negotiating for various items largely peculiar to education and educators, But, in terms of collectively organizing, the PNL and the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967 have some similarities. Essentially, though, the Professional Negotiations Law means that--

1) Any certificated employee group in the state's educational system, through the community college, can elect an association, organization, or union to act in its behalf regarding negotiations with the school district or appropriate board. The association, organization, or union becomes the "employee organization."
Negotiable items are, but not limited to, curriculum, textbook selection, in-service training, student teaching programs, personnel, hiring and assignment practices, leaves of absence, salaries and salary schedules, and noninstructional duties.

Any certificated employee can act on his own behalf on matters relating to his employment relations with the school district. He need not affiliate himself with the employee organization.

In the event that any matter being jointly considered by the employee organization and the board of directors of the school district is not settled by the means provided, either party, twenty-four hours after serving written notice of their intended action to the other party, may request the assistance and advice of a committee composed of educators and school directors appointed by the state superintendent of public instruction. This committee shall make a written report with recommendations to both parties within twenty calendar days of receipt of the request for assistance. Any recommendations of the committee shall be advisory only and not binding upon the board of directors or the employee organization.

All certificated employees in an employee group, except the college president in the case of community colleges and the chief administrative officer in the local school district, are eligible for inclusion into the employee organization.

SOME PRIMARY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ACT AND PNL

1) Negotiable items. The Professional Negotiations Law includes negotiable items that are more familiar to education; such as, curriculum matters, textbook selection, student teaching programs, etc. (as well as salaries). The Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967 deals primarily with wages, hours, and working conditions.

2) Employee-employer relations. The Collective Bargaining Act makes a more definite distinction between employee and employer. Under the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act, classroom teachers would probably be separated from most key administrators in regard to collective bargaining. The PNL allows the employee organization to include everyone but the president or chief administrative officer.

3) Arbitration. The PNL establishes the use of an advisory committee in impasse situations between the employee organization and the appropriate board. The advisory committee's recommendations, however, are only advisory under the PNL, and not binding upon the employee organization or its board. In contrast, an arbitrated decision becomes binding to both parties under the Collective Bargaining Act.

It should be emphasized, however, that both the Professional Negotiations Law and the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act involve permissive legislation. That is, no employee or employee group can be forced into organizing collectively for bargaining purposes. Whether or not the employee group acquired organized representation would be left entirely to the discretion of that group. As well, no individual, under either law, would be required to join the employee group's employee organization should it choose in favor of collective bargaining. In addition, according to both laws, the choice of bargaining agents is left to the employee group and can be any association, organization, or union of its choosing.
THE ALTERNATIVES

What are the possible alternatives for CWSC faculty? The choices appear to be the following, although there is no assurance from any quarter (with one possible exception) that any of these are readily available to faculty members in four-year institutions of higher education.

The Alternatives:

1) Do nothing. Make no changes in our present ability to bargain.

2) Extend the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967 to include those people in higher education specifically "exempted" from this law.

3) Extend the Professional Negotiations Law to faculty members in four-year state colleges and universities in Washington.

4) Attempt to secure new legislation that would combine the best of both the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967 and the Professional Negotiations Law, plus additional provisions if needed, into one law suitable for faculty members in four-year state colleges and universities in Washington.

5) Strengthen the existing bargaining and negotiation mechanisms now available to CWSC faculty, including a more concerted effort to develop an internal organization representative of the entire faculty.

We would appreciate your response to the following questions. In order to assist you in this, the Faculty Senate is sponsoring an open meeting of the faculty on ___________. We will attempt to have people in attendance who are capable of answering questions concerning collective bargaining. Again, in addition, the State Civil Service Law of 1961, the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967, Substitute House Bill 239 (law of 1969), and the Professional Negotiations Law are available in your departmental office for examination and analysis. After careful consideration of the collective bargaining issue, please complete the attached ballot and return it to the Faculty Senate office by 1970. We would appreciate your answering both questions.
Please answer both questions.

1. Do you favor some form of legislation enabling collective bargaining for CWSC faculty?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Undecided

2. Of the bargaining options listed below, which do you favor? (Please check)
   a) Inclusion under the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967.
   b) Inclusion under the Professional Negotiations Law.
   c) New legislation written specifically for four-year state colleges and universities in Washington that would perhaps combine some elements of both the Collective Bargaining Act of 1967 and the Professional Negotiations Law, plus other possible provisions.
   d) A strengthening of internal bargaining possibilities—a stronger Faculty Senate or similar faculty organization in regard to faculty welfare and economic well being.
   e) Other: __________________________________________________________________________
   f) Do not understand the alternatives; more information is needed.
A SUMMARY COMPARISON OF THE

PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS LAW AND THE

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' COLLECTIVE BARGAINING LAW

Prepared at the request of the Executive Committee of the Central
Washington State College Faculty Senate

By: C. Wayne Hall

Program Director for Higher Education

NOTE: The following is a brief summary of the two laws noted above.

For details, one should study texts of these two legislative acts. (The underlines are used for emphasis.)

Copies of these two acts have been deposited with the
President of the Faculty Senate.
PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

TITLE

PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS LAW

RCW 28B.50.580

RCW 28A.72

YEAR ORIGINALLY ENACTED

1965

APPLICATION

To Public School Professional Staff, excluding the chief administrative officer.

To Public Community College Professional Staff, excluding the chief administrative officer.

PURPOSE

RCW 28A.72.010 Declaration of purpose. It is the purpose of this chapter to strengthen methods of administering employer-employee relations through the establishment of orderly methods of communication between certificated employees and the school districts by which they are employed.

ELECTION

Professional Negotiations group selected by secret ballot of the certificated employees in the school or community college district.

NEGOTIATING GROUP RIGHTS

To meet, confer, and negotiate.

NEGOTIABLE ITEMS

May negotiate policies, including but not limited to, curriculum textbook
selection, in-service training, student teaching programs, personnel, hiring and assignment practices, leaves of absence, salaries and salary schedules and noninstructional duties. RCW 28A.72.030, 28A.72.040.

AN INDIVIDUAL

RCW 28A.72.050 Certificated employee may appear in own behalf. Nothing in this chapter shall prohibit any certificated employee from appearing in his own behalf on matters relating to his employment relations with the school district.

IMPASSE

In the case of an impasse the State Superintendent (for public school districts) or the State Community College Director (for community college districts) shall appoint an impasse committee composed of educators and board representatives to study the problems and make a written report to both parties.

The report is advisory only.

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

No employee shall be discriminated against for exercising his rights under this act.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

The Boards shall adopt reasonable rules and regulations for the administration of this act.
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

TITLE

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' COLLECTIVE BARGAINING LAW

RCW 41.56.040

YEAR ORIGINALLY ENACTED

1967

APPLICATION

RCW 41.56.020 Application of chapter. This chapter shall apply to any county or municipal corporation, or any political subdivision of the state of Washington except as otherwise provided by RCW 47.64.030, 47.64.040, 54.04.180, 28.72.010 through 28.72.090, and chapter 53.18RCW. Excludes: Public school, public community college, college or university professional personnel.

PURPOSE

RCW 41.56.010 Declaration of Purpose. The intent and purpose of this chapter is to promote the continued improvement of the relationship between public employers and their employees by providing a uniform basis for implementing the right of public employees to join labor organizations of their own choosing and to be represented by such organizations in matters concerning their employment relations with public employers. (1967 1st ex.s.c. 108 1.)

ELECTION

The collective bargaining agent may be determined by:

1. Examination of organization membership rolls.
2. Comparison of signatures on organization bargaining authorization cards.
3. By conducting an election.
BARGAINING GROUP RIGHTS

To meet at reasonable times to confer and negotiate in good faith, and to execute a written agreement with respect to grievance procedures and collective negotiations.

BARGAINING ITEMS

Personnel matters, including wages, hours and working conditions.

IMPASSE

Upon the failure of the public employer and the exclusive bargaining representative to conclude a collective bargaining agreement, any matter in dispute may be submitted by either part to state mediation service of the department of labor and industries.

DUES

Upon written authorization of the employee monthly dues may be deducted.

THE STRIKE

The right to strike is not granted.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

The Department of Labor and Industries has the responsibility of preventing unfair labor practices.

REPLACEMENT - LEGISLATIVE SESSION

An employee who represents fifty percent or more of a bargaining unit or who represents a statewide bargaining group may be absent from work without pay to be present at the sessions of the State Legislature. The employee will hire a replacement for the period he is absent from work. The employee representing his group at the legislature will not suffer loss of employee benefits.
Summary Statement

The following should be noted:

1. Under the Professional Negotiations Law, all policies can be subject to negotiations. Under the Collective Bargaining Law, subjects for negotiation tend to be labor oriented, i.e., hours and working conditions.

2. The determination of the bargaining unit is established by election of those involved under the Professional Negotiations Law. Under the Collective Bargaining Act, there are three ways of establishing the bargaining unit - the Department of Labor and Industries has jurisdiction in this area.

3. An important difference between the two laws is that professional negotiations is educationally oriented. It is administered in conjunction with education agencies. The Collective Bargaining Law is labor oriented and is administered in conjunction with the Department of Labor and Industries.