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MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 13 January 71
Presiding Officer: Kenneth Harsha, Chairman
Secretary: Linda Busch

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All senators or their alternates were present except John Allen and Mike Reid.


AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

Mr. Harsha announced that the following items were to be added under Communications:

A letter from Frank Carlson, dated December 30, 1970.

The chairman further stated that under the Executive Committee Report would be added a brief report from the chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Need for a Faculty Code of Conduct.

The order of the standing committee reports was changed so that the Personnel Committee would report first.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of December 2, 1970, were approved as printed and distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

1. A letter from Ralph D. Gustafson, dated December 2, 1970, giving a report on UGN contributions for 1970. He stated that a total of 316 persons at the college contributed $8,000.00.

2. A memo from John Green, dated December 4, stating that the only department under his jurisdiction which did not have a personnel committee was the Aerospace Department.

3. A letter from Joseph Panattoni, dated December 14, whereby Mr. Panattoni, in response to a letter written by Mr. Harsha, spoke for the Board of Trustees in saying that its members also looked forward to the joint Board-Senate meetings.

4. A letter from Robert A. Cockrell, Secretary of the Academic Senate, Berkeley Division, University of California, stating that there was no
formal code of faculty conduct at the University of California, but
that the matter was under review.

5. A letter from Albert Lewis, dated December 16, stating that he must
resign from the Ad Hoc Committee on Chairmanships and Faculty Handbook.

6. A letter from Eugene Kosy, chairman, Insurance and Retirement
Committee, dated December 16, concerning a quote attributed to
Mr. Harsha on faculty sick leave, which appeared in the December 4
issue of the Campus Crier. The chairman stated that this statement
was, hopefully, clarified in the Weekly Bulletin of January 1.

7. A letter from Bernard Martin, dated December 17, acknowledging
receipt of Mr. Harsha's letter of December 11 informing Dr. Martin
of the passage of Senate Motion #699 relative to the consideration
of tenure and faculty rank for Mr. Waymon Ware.

8. A letter from John Purcell, dated December 28, stating that the
Long-Range Planning Committee would like to meet with the Faculty
Senate prior to January 15, 1971. The chairman stated that such a
meeting was held on January 11, 1971.

9. A letter from James M. Furman, dated December 28, which was in
response to a letter written to him by the Faculty Senate Executive
Committee regarding reports submitted by the Council on Higher
Education on tuition and fees, and enrollments. Among numerous
other things, the Executive Committee had urged that faculty input
be secured before recommendations such as these were made. Mr. Furman
by-passed the meaning of the letter; therefore, the Executive Committee
was in the process of preparing another letter to be sent to Mr. Furman.

10. A letter from Franklin Carlson, dated December 30, stating that he
must resign from the Ad Hoc Committee on Conditions of Faculty
Employment. The chairman stated that a replacement was being sought
to fill this committee assignment.

REPORTS

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

1. The Executive Committee met with Dr. Frank Price and discussed the
question of rank and tenure for counselors. After additional
discussion with others, Dr. Price will present a recommendation
to the committee.

2. The Executive Committee has developed a charge for a standing senate
salary committee. This will be forwarded to the Code Committee for
its consideration. The proposed standing legislative committee is
still under consideration.

3. A memo soliciting faculty contributions to support our Legislative
Committee has been distributed to ranked faculty. If there is no
objection, the memo will also be sent to non-ranked, civil service
exempt employees. There was no objection. Funds will be deposited
in a separate bank account and two signatures (the secretary and
vice-chairman of the Senate) will be required for disbursement of checks.
4. Larry Lawrence, chairman of the Committee to Study the Need for a Faculty Code of Conduct, said that his committee had met twice thus far. The committee had little information to assist it, but the committee members have considered the material they do have. Mr. Lawrence stated that this was a very difficult matter and requested members of the Senate, academic committees and student members to contribute any material or information they have on this matter. The committee would be meeting again in about two weeks and would like to give a report to the Senate at the February meeting.

B. Standing Committees

1. Personnel Committee

Mr. Harsha announced that the Senate would at this time go into executive session to consider the Personnel Committee's recommendation regarding the employment status of Dr. Robert P. Barnes of the History Department. All non-senators were requested to leave the Senate room during the closed session.

In closed session, Mr. Collins, chairman of the Senate Personnel Committee, provided the Senate with background information on the case. The committee's recommendation was then discussed by the Senate. Non-senators were called back into the room, and the following recommendation was made by Mr. Collins on behalf of the Personnel Committee:

That the Faculty Senate recommend to the administration of Central Washington State College that the terms of Professor Robert P. Barnes' employment with this institution be changed from termination of employment at the end of the spring quarter of the academic year 1970-71 to reappointment for the fourth year with the stipulation that tenure is in no way assured by this reappointment.

MOTION NO. 726: Mr. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Alexander, that the Faculty Senate support the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee as stated by Mr. Collins. The motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

2. Budget Committee--Mr. Berry stated that his committee had met the day of the Senate meeting, but since there was no money, it would wait until the Governor's budget became available.

3. Code Committee--No report at this meeting.

4. Curriculum Committee--Mr. Glauert began his report with a matter that had been put aside for further study at a previous Senate meeting--a proposal to reduce the credit requirement for all baccalaureate degrees at Central from 192 credits to 180 credits plus physical education techniques. At the beginning of the meeting, the following proposal was distributed to Senate members:
With the endorsement of the Deans' Council, the Senate Curriculum Committee recommends the following revision of the ACCC proposal p. 126-B to replace the statement in the catalog (pp. 21, 22) under the heading "Requirements for Graduation."

1. A minimum of 180 quarter credits plus physical education techniques;* at least 60 quarter credits must be in upper division courses (courses numbered 300 and above); credits earned at Community Colleges will not meet this upper division requirement.

2. Residence study: at least one full year (thirty-six weeks with a minimum of 45 credits) including the final quarter preceding graduation.

3. Extension and correspondence study: not more than 45 quarter credits may be earned by extension and correspondence study. Credits earned by correspondence or in extension classes do not count toward meeting the residence requirement.

4. Cumulative grade point average: 2.00 with a grade point average of at least 2.00 for the last three quarters preceding graduation. A 2.25 must be earned in the major field. Not more than 15 quarter credits of pass-fail grade may be counted toward the degree.

5. Transfer students must take at least 10 quarter credits in their major and 5 in their minor at this college.

*Physical education and music activities credits must not exceed 12 quarter credits.

Mr. Glauert explained that the recommendations in this proposal were those that were received from Deans' Council and which the Senate Curriculum Committee had attempted to revise. Suggested changes were sent to Vice President Harrington, chairman of Deans' Council. Mr. Glauert received a letter from Vice President Harrington, dated January 6, notifying him of the Deans' Council's response to Mr. Glauert's letter of November 24. The Deans' Council was in agreement that the proposed catalog copy was an excellent summation of the general requirements for bachelor degrees. The only change suggested by Deans' Council was in #1 of the proposal. The Curriculum Committee's letter stated #1 as follows: A minimum of 180 quarter credits plus physical education techniques;* at least 60 quarter credits must be in upper division courses (courses numbered from 300 through 499). Since some seniors take 500 level courses, Deans' Council requested that this be changed to read: (courses numbered 300 and above). This change was made.

MOTION NO. 727: Mr. Glauert moved, seconded by Mr. Hammond, that the Faculty Senate adopt the recommendation as presented by the Senate Curriculum Committee (shown above) regarding requirements for graduation.

Mr. Purcell asked if this would go into effect for students presently enrolled at Central, or if it would effect only new students. Mr. Glauert
stated that his committee didn't discuss this. He thought the committee probably felt this was a matter for the administration to interpret.

Mr. Lawrence asked what would change as far as P.E. requirements. Were P.E. techniques equivalent to P.E. requirements? Mr. Glauert said this was currently undergoing revision. Some action had already been taken. This was the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee. He stated that the committee was aware that this was not a very clear statement. What it meant was 180 credits plus 6 credits in P.E.

Mr. Lawrence asked if the revision meant that 500 level courses were not accepted in the 180 credits. Mr. Comstock stated that it included 300, 400 and 500 level courses.

Mr. Nylander stated that he agreed with the spirit of the P.E. part of the proposal, but wondered why it didn't just say 186 credits, instead of 180 credits plus P.E. credits. Mr. Nylander also questioned the term "techniques" and wondered where the term came from. Dean Martin said that it was his understanding that the Physical Education Department preferred the term "techniques" rather than "activities."

It was stated that it had been rumored for years that P.E. credits would possibly be reduced. The suggested 180 plus six P.E. credits was made because this would permit an easier catalog change if the P.E. requirement was reduced.

Miss Putnam disagreed, stating that a change in P.E. requirements would make it necessary to eliminate the phrase "plus P.E." A change would need to go through the Senate anyway, so no steps would be eliminated. She felt that the basic issue was the number of credits reduced from the graduation requirement and what the remaining credits should be. If the Senate felt that 186 credits should be the number required for graduation, then that was the decision to be made, but that the Senate should be aware of the problems involved before voting on the matter.

Mr. Leavitt asked if the original letter from the Deans' Council included the asterisk. Mr. Glauert said that it did. Mr. Leavitt said he would like to go along with 186 credits and ask why the music activities credit isn't changed at the same time. What are Music activities? He asked if Mr. Glauert had discussed this with his committee. Mr. Glauert stated that the whole question was that the relationship of activities courses to curriculum was not entirely clear. There were many courses being introduced which were activities courses. It was difficult to come up with a definitive statement that would be satisfactory. Mr. Glauert suggested that if anyone wished to make an amendment to the phrase or any other section, they should do so. He stated that he would stand by the committee's original recommendation and would like to move ahead to other business.

Mr. Alexander asked when the deadline was for catalog copy. Dean Martin thought it was January 28 or 30. Mr. Alexander then asked what would happen if the motion was tabled for clarification purposes?

Vice President Harrington said he thought the deadline was January 28. He further stated that this matter had been discussed several times in different
committees, and the same questions had been raised. He suggested that the ACCC, SCC, Deans' Council, and General Education Committee should meet and return to the Senate at its February meeting with another proposal.

MOTION NO. 728: Mr. Alexander moved, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to table Motion No. 727. The motion carried, with Mr. Glauert Opposed and Mr. Lewis Abstaining.

Mr. Brooks stated that he would urge the group to come up with 180 credits for graduation. The Council of Presidents agreed that it would be in the best financial and political interests to require 180 credits for graduation on the quarter system. The P.E. course requirement had been eliminated in some places. The President was pleased to see the 180 credits, but was confused with the 186 total.

Mr. Glauert then proceeded to his second memo, dealing with ACCC proposals--The Senate Curriculum Committee at its last meeting voted to recommend passage of ACCC proposals, pages 140-169, with the following modifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCC Proposals</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 140 Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Revise last sentence to read: Students may not receive credit for both Bio. Sci. 111-112, and Botany 211-Zoology 211.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio. Sci. 110, 111, 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 141 Psychology Number and Description Change</td>
<td>Change title to read: &quot;Advanced Evaluative Techniques&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy. 556. Special Diagnostic Techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 150 (A/S) Computer Science Minor</td>
<td>A note should be added calling attention to the prerequisites: Math 271.2 and Physics 163 are prerequisites to Comp. Sci. 383.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art 320. Glassblowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art 321. Glassblowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 154 Foreign Language Course Additions:</td>
<td>The SCC recommends that these courses also be listed (i.e., cross-listed) in the catalog on p. 94 under the Humanities Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French 203; French 204; French 493; German 205; German 301; Spanish 201; Spanish 202.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACCC Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 163 (T/Ed) Home Economics Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Ec. 420, Methods in Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add an asterisk after &quot;Economics&quot; and the following prerequisite footnote after course and credit description of the major: &quot;Students enrolling in H. Ec. 420 must have completed Ed. 314.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 164 (T/Ed) Home Economics Major (Broad Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Ec. 433, Methods and Curriculum in Family Life Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add an asterisk after &quot;Family Life Ed.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ec. 420, Methods in Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add an asterisk after &quot;Methods in Home Economics&quot; and the following prerequisite footnote: &quot;Students enrolling in H. Ec. 420 or 433 must have completed Ed. 314.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 167 Home Economics Description change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Ec. 391, Consumer Buying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SCC recommends withholding this description change until the Dean of Education and the chairmen of the Home Economics Dept. and Business Education Dept. consider the possibility of combining H. Ec. 391 and 381 and cross-listing this course with Bus. Ed. 375 for 5 credits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ec. 381, Family Finance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTION NO. 729: Mr. Glauert moved, seconded by Mr. Lewis, adoption of the ACCC proposals, pages 140-169, with the above modifications. The motion carried with Mr. Ringe, Mr. Alexander, and Mr. McGehee Opposed.

The chairman then stated that both the Curriculum Committee and the Student Affairs Committee had reports on Pass-Fail. He stated that if there was no objection, these would be combined. There was no objection.

Mr. Glauert stated that there seemed to be quite a few proposals on Pass-Fail. His committee received them too late for ample consideration. He did state, however, that the Senate Curriculum Committee would like to see the program continued for another year. The committee did not wish to recommend a modification
at this time except to support the continuation of the Pass-Fail option in its present form for the coming year.

MOTION NO. 730: Mr. Glauert moved, seconded by Mr. Williams, that the Pass-Fail option be continued in its present form for the coming year and that the Senate use this as a point of departure for discussing possible modifications in the program.

Mr. Purcell stated that there was another report by a committee on Pass-Fail to hear first.

Mr. Gore offered the interpretation that the motion should be withdrawn in order to hear the other report first.

Mr. Glauert stated that the motion should be changed to read, "The Senate Curriculum Committee moves the continuation of the Pass-Fail option." He withdrew his first motion. The new motion was seconded.

Mr. McGehee presented the Student Affairs Committee's recommendations regarding modifications of the Pass-Fail program. He stated that the recommendations were self-explanatory. In reaching these recommendations, the committee utilized data provided by Mr. Purcell's office. His committee recommended initially that the Pass-Fail option should be retained. The Student Affairs Committee offered the following recommendations:

The Pass-Fail option should be retained and should continue to be administered through the Registrar's office. Instructors should not be informed which students are taking courses on Pass-Fail. The Pass-Fail option should continue to apply only to courses taken for Breadth Requirements.

The Pass-Fail option was favored by a large majority of both faculty and students who responded to the questionnaire. Not informing the instructor which students are taking a course for Pass-Fail is recommended as a means of protecting a student from an instructor who may oppose the option and use a double marking standard. The Committee did not feel that it had enough information at this time to make recommendations to expand the P/F option.

The following modifications of the option are recommended:

1. The student may change a Pass-Fail designation to the earned grade in a course at any time up to graduation. The student arranges for this change through the Registrar's office. The earned grade may not later be changed back to P/F. If the student chooses to take the earned grade, the P/F notation would be removed from his record. There will be no restriction to the number of times a student may register for P/F. However, he will be allowed only a total of 15 hours of P/F credit on his transcript.

The Committee believes this change will help to alleviate the problem of low motivation and incentive to students taking courses for P/F. Knowing that he may take the earned grade if he does well should encourage a better quality of work than is now the case. This recommendation would also aid the student who later finds that
a course taken for P/F is required in his major. This is a problem for students who change majors who are undecided on a major early in their college careers.

2. The student may be allowed a total of 15 hours of P/F credit on his transcript, rather than 15 hours based on initial registration. (See recommendation #1)

3. The P/F designation should be changed to Credit/No Credit.

This recommendation reflects the feeling that non-completion of course requirements is not the same as failure. Also, the Registrar's office needs a separate designation to distinguish between certain other courses for which letter grades are not given and Pass-Fail courses.

MOTION NO. 731: Mr. McGehee introduced the above document as an amendment to Mr. Glauert's motion. Mrs. Jakubek seconded the motion to amend.

Mr. Hammond asked if a student could have many more than 15 hours of P/F credit, but only be able to count 15 later. If this were the case, he would like to take all of his Breadth and elective requirements P/F. Mr. McGehee said the student couldn't do this because he must maintain his GPA.

Mr. Carlson asked if the Registrar's office would keep track of the student's GPA. If someone took one course, this could establish a GPA and every other class could be P/F. Mr. McGehee stated that the Registrar's office could keep track. The student should get a statement from the Registrar which included his GPA.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. McGehee if he had checked this with the Registrar's office. He stated that the logistics of this would seem to cause problems. How much of a problem would it be to go back and change the grades and keep track of what had been changed and what couldn't be changed again?

Mr. McGehee stated that the principle of changing grades already existed. This would add more, of course. His committee felt that the administrative procedures should be adapted to the needs of the academic scene. The difference was not sufficient to cause any grave problems.

Mrs. Jakubek commented that one of the committee's reasons was to do something about low motivation. If a student had the opportunity to change from P/F to a grade, he would do better.

Mr. McGehee stated that once a student has committed himself, he would still have the benefit of going into courses which he would otherwise be afraid to attempt.

Mr. Ladd suggested that the committee's proposal be modified to state that a change from Pass-Fail to a grade be made on the same basis as an incomplete is changed to a grade. In other words, by the end of the following quarter in residence.

Following considerable discussion by members of the Senate, Mr. McGehee modified the amendment to read: The student may change a Pass-Fail designation to the earned grade in a course at any time up to the end of the next quarter in residence. Mrs. Jakubek seconded.
Mr. Anderson stated that this changed the idea behind the notion of Pass-Fail. The student would realize that other students were doing this on a broad scale, so to protect himself, he would take all of his courses under the Pass-Fail system, building up a backlog of Pass-Fails, only changing them to a grade if they were good.

Mr. Clauert stated that he felt we should defer action on this matter, primarily for two reasons: 1) The kind of proposal in #1 of the memo involved the Registrar's office. Mr. Underwood should be present; and 2) The Senate needed to obtain an opinion on this from the Deans or other people who should be consulted. He didn't know if the Senate could intelligently vote on the matter at this meeting.

Mr. Harsha stated that the chair would accept a motion to either table the motion or recommit it to the standing committees involved for additional study.

Mr. Williams expressed concern that if the motion was tabled, there would be no Pass-Fail program next year.

Mr. Harsha commented that a special meeting of the Senate could be held on January 27 to again consider the matter. Action taken at that meeting would still be in time for catalog deadline.

Rather than table the motion, the general feeling of the Senate seemed to favor postponing action until the next Senate meeting. Mr. Harsha then declared a postponement of the question and called a special meeting of the Faculty Senate for January 27, 1971. The chairman announced that he would ask the Senate to consider all tabled or deferred curriculum matters at the January 27 special meeting, so that catalog deadline could be met.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:10 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Kenneth Harsha
       Chairman, Faculty Senate

DATE: December 30, 1970

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be on Wednesday, January 13 at 4:00 p.m. in Room 123, Hertz Hall. One major item of business will be Senate consideration and subsequent action on the Pass-Fail option. The Senate Curriculum and Student Affairs Committees have been studying the Pass-Fail option and should be ready with recommendations. Another important item that should come to the Senate at its January meeting is the proposed credit change in graduation requirements. The Senate Curriculum Committee has been reviewing this matter.

HAPPY NEW YEAR
AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
4 p.m., Wednesday, January 13, 1971
Room 123 - Hertz Hall

I. ROLL CALL
II. AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL
III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 2, 1970

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

1. Letter from Ralph Gustafson--UGN Results.
3. Letter from Joseph Panattoni--Joint Board-Senate Meeting.
4. Letter from Robert Cockrell, University of California, Berkeley--Code of Faculty Conduct.
5. Letter from Al Lewis--Committee resignation.
7. Letter from Bernard Martin--Senate Motion #699.
8. Letter from John Purcell--Long-Range Planning Committee Meeting with the Senate.

V. REPORTS

A. Executive Committee
   1. Report by Vice Chairman

B. Standing Committees
   1. Budget
   2. Code
   3. Curriculum
      a. Change in Graduation Requirements.
      b. Pass-Fail option.
      c. Honors Evaluation.
      d. Other
   4. Personnel
   5. Student Affairs
      a. Pass-Fail option (likely combined with Curriculum Committee report on Pass-Fail option)

C. Report from the Chair

VI. OLD BUSINESS

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
Doi, Richard
Douce, Pearl
Duncan, Leonard
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
Wise, Don
Wright, Cheryl

Marco Bicchieri
Robert Harris
Frederick Lister
Alan Bergstrom
Edward Harrington
Bill Floyd
Sheldon Johnson
Robert Benton
App Legg
James Sahlstrand
Wesley Adams
Ted Bowen
Gerhard Kallienke

Kent Richards
Joel Andress
Carl Symes
Jim Parsley
Charles Vlcek
Jay Bachrach
Bryan Gore
Donald King
John DeMerchant
Katherine Egan
Frank Sessions
Betty Hileman
Robert Yee

Everett Irish
James Klahn

Steven Tarbas
Gerald Brunner
Max Zwanziger
Gordon Galbraith
Howard Shuman
Faculty Senate Meeting
January 13, 1971

Robert J. Barnes - History
Burnie Heckard
Nelle Comstock
Bernard J. Martin
Bruce A. Clinton
Thomas Wellerman
Ed Harrington
Dorothy G. Chapman
Katherine Land
John Green
Y. L. Litherpoon
Bryan Lee
Donald Schigman
Bertton Williams
December 2, 1970

Dr. Kenneth Harsha, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Central Washington State College

Dear Ken,

It looks as though all the reports that will be coming in on UGN have arrived, so I'm making this report to you.

A total of 316 persons contributed $8,000.00

This compares very favorably with last year when 128 persons gave a total of $4,500.00.

The departmental and building representatives were encouraged to make personal contacts with each member in their given area. Those who did this, made the difference. Those who merely sent out written invitations as was done in the past two years, came up with approximately the same results as we have had in the past.

From the experience of the past three years in this position, I am led to believe that if we were to get the full cooperation of our workers, and each person on campus, faculty or civil service, was contacted individually, we could collect approximately $15,000. The real problem is to find the workers who would make the personal contacts.

The average donation last year was approximately $10.00 per person higher than this year. As I looked over the list, this was not true because a large number of persons gave less this year as might be expected in the present economic situation, but rather because a greater number contributed this year, and this larger number of smaller amounts brought the average down. As we compare the numbers giving at the college with those in the County of Kittitas as a whole, we find that they are quite similar in the percentage of givers.

I believe the workers and the donors at the college are to be congratulated on the improvement shown in the numbers giving this year.

Very sincerely,

[Signature]

RDG:el
TO: Dr. Harsha, Chairman, Faculty Senate
FROM: John A. Green, Dean of Education
DATE: December 4, 1970
RE: Faculty Code, Section 5., D., 3., b.,

The Aerospace Department has only one civilian department member. All of the other departments under my jurisdiction have personnel committees. The Department of T&IE has six faculty members and they are the committee.

bfm
Dr. Kenneth K. Harsha  
333 Art Building  
Central Washington State College  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Dear Ken:

I was happy to receive your letter of December 8 indicating that the Faculty Senate was pleased with our joint Board-Senate Meeting.

I am sure that I can speak for the Board of Trustees when I say that we too look forward to these meetings. The faculty and the Senate is the pulse of the institution and the Board is pleased with and wants to continue the direct dialog.

Very truly yours,

Joseph Panattoni  
Chairman, Board of Trustees  
Central Washington State College

JP:w
December 15, 1970

Professor K. K. Harsha, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Washington

Dear Professor Harsha:

Your letter of October 27 concerning a code for faculty conduct, which was addressed to the Chairman of the Faculty Senate, has been forwarded to me for reply.

At present there is no formal code of faculty conduct at the University of California. However, the matter is currently under review and it is expected that a proposal will be submitted to the consideration of the Academic Senate later in the academic year.

If you care to write again, preferably toward the end of the Spring Quarter, it is possible that we will have more information for you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

ROBERT A. COCKRELL, Secretary
Berkeley Division

R:ph
December 16, 1970

Professor Ken Harsha
Chairman of Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Office
Campus

Dear Ken:

Because I am Chairman of the screening committee for a new departmental chairman and because the major portion of the screening will be done in January and February, I find it necessary to resign from the Ad Hoc Committee on Chairmanships and Faculty Handbook. I believe the task of the Ad Hoc Committee to be extremely important and I simply do not have the time to be a constructive contributing member.

Cordially yours,

Albert Lewis
Associate Professor of
Rhetoric and Public Address

AL: jd
December 16, 1970

Dr. Kenneth Harsha, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Ken:

You are quoted in the December 4 issue of the Campus Crier as saying that the faculty sick leave is being cut back—sorry I don't have the exact wording before me.

As Chairman of the Insurance and Retirement Committee, I would like to register a protest if this is true since it reflects a violation of the Faculty Code and neither the Insurance and Retirement Committee nor the Insurance and Retirement Officer have been made aware of any discussion concerning this issue.

If you are quoted correctly and this is fact, please advise me immediately so that we may initiate necessary action on the issue.

Sincerely yours,

Eugene J. Kosy, Chairman
Insurance and Retirement Committee

cc: Stan Bohne
Norm Phelps
Dear Dr. Harsha:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 11, 1970, informing me of the passage by the Faculty Senate in June, 1970, of Motion #699 relative to the consideration of tenure and faculty rank for Mr. Waymon Ware.

This matter will come before the Deans' Committee on Promotions, Tenure, Special Increments, and Reappointment at the appropriate time during this academic year and an appropriate recommendation will be forthcoming. The recommendation, of course, will be dependent upon the action and thinking of the Committee.

Sincerely yours,

Bernard L. Martin
Dean of Arts and Sciences
Dr. Kenneth Harsha  
Chairman of the Faculty Senate  
Central Washington State College

Dear Dr. Harsha,

The Long-Range Planning Committee would like to request a meeting with the Faculty Senate sometime prior to January 15, 1971.

This meeting would be for the purpose of discussing a tentative statement of goals and objectives which we are about to disseminate to the College Community. We wish, also, to discuss the steps to be taken in the future including possible methods of involving all of the members of the College Community, who are willing to be involved, in review, revision and the eventual writing of a better statement of goals and objectives.

We would anticipate that approximately two hours will be needed for this meeting. I would be most happy to discuss arrangements with you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

John Purcell, Chairman  
Long-Range Planning Committee

JLP/pb
December 28, 1970

Mr. Kenneth Harsha, Chairman
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Dear Mr. Harsha:

This is to acknowledge your letter of December 11, regarding your concern about the reports of the Council on Higher Education on tuition and fees, and enrollments. These reports have been discussed at length by the Council and with President Brooks in attendance at these various meetings. In addition, a number of staff memoranda and letters have been exchanged between President Brooks and the Council. I assume that all of this material has been made available to you. I would prefer that your immediate concerns be directed through President Brooks as a member of the Council on Higher Education, rather than for me dealing directly with you and in effect by-passing the president of the institution and your institutional representative on the Council.

I am not ignoring your arguments by any means, and indeed, you make a number of persuasive points. I think the task of the Council must be to weigh your concerns in a much broader context which includes overall state-wide needs and recognizes the differing interests of various segments of higher education.

Sincerely,

James M. Furman
Executive Coordinator

JMF:jj
Dr. Ken Harsha, President  
CWSC Faculty Senate  

Dear Ken,

I am going to have to give up all my responsibilities beyond the department. I said "yes" too many times. At the beginning of the year, it seemed possible to remain active in the Senate, and I remember that you and the officers were anxious to have someone from off-campus involved. It looks a little less possible as the year progresses.

There is no point in being selective, so I am resigning from all three:

- the Legislative Committee
- the Conditions of Faculty Employment Committee
- the Faculty Senate

I will, of course, do whatever I can to help the two committees during the rest of the year. The Employment Committee has had two meetings and does have a start on recommendations regarding the contract letter. L. C. Duncan is the Senator remaining on the committee.

I probably will be involved in some kinds of legislative activity during the session and will keep in communication with the Legislative Committee.

I think you know that I hate to give all these things up, but it just doesn't work to schedule in the blocks of time necessary. I would rather be all the way out than be a member in name only.

I was an at-large senator; as near as I can tell, the alternate has not been replaced since last quarter. Would it be possible for the Education Department to fill both of those positions? There is a year-and-a-half to go for both.

Sincerely,

Franklin D. Carlson  
Education Department
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee

DATE: January 11, 1971

RE: Deans' Council proposal to reduce the credit requirement for all baccalaureate degrees at Central from 192 credits to 180 credits plus physical education techniques (See ACCC proposals p. 126-B).

With the endorsement of the Deans' Council, the Senate Curriculum Committee recommends the following revision of the ACCC proposal p. 126-B to replace the statement in the catalog (pp. 21, 22) under the heading "Requirements for Graduation."

1. A minimum of 180 quarter credits plus physical education techniques;* at least 60 quarter credits must be in upper division courses (courses numbered 300 and above); credits earned at City Colleges will not meet this upper division requirement.

2. Residence study: at least one full year (thirty-six weeks with a minimum of 45 credits) including the final quarter preceding graduation.

3. Extension and correspondence study: not more than 45 quarter credits may be earned by extension and correspondence study. Credits earned by correspondence or in extension classes do not count toward meeting the residence requirement.

4. Cumulative grade point average: 2.00 with a grade point average of at least 2.00 for the last three quarters preceding graduation. A 2.25 must be earned in the major field. Not more than 15 quarter credits of pass-fail grade may be counted toward the degree.

5. Transfer students must take at least 10 quarter credits in their major and 5 in their minor at this college.

*Physical education and music activities credits must not exceed 12 quarter credits.
FROM: Personnel Committee of the Faculty Senate.

TO: Faculty Senate of Central Washington State College.

At its meeting on January 11, 1971, the Personnel Committee of the Faculty Senate passed the following motion, to be presented to the Senate for its approval or disapproval:

That the Faculty Senate recommend to the administration of Central Washington State College that the terms of Professor Robert P. Barnes's employment with this institution be changed from termination of employment at the end of the spring quarter of the academic year 1970-71 to reappointment for the fourth year with the stipulation that tenure is in no way assured by this reappointment.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee

DATE: January 12, 1971

RE: ACCC proposals, pp. 140-169.

The Senate Curriculum Committee at its last meeting voted to recommend passage of ACCC proposals, pages 140-169, with the following modifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCC Proposals</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| p. 140 Biological Sciences | **Description change**  
| Bio. Sci. 110, 111, 112 | **Revise last sentence to read:**  
| | Students may not receive credit for both Bio. Sci. 111-112, and Botany 211-Zoology 211. |
| p. 141 Psychology Number and Description change | **Psy. 556, Special Diagnostic Techniques**  
| | **Change title to read:** "Advanced Evaluative Techniques" |
| p. 150 (A/S) Computer Science Minor | **A note should be added calling attention to the prerequisites:**  
| | Math 271.2 and Physics 163 are prerequisites to Comp. Sci. 383. |
| p. 153 Art Course Additions: | **After "Art 320-Glassblowing" add "I".**  
| Art 320. Glassblowing |  
| Art 321. Glassblowing | **After "Art 321-Glassblowing" add "II".** |
| p. 154 Foreign Language Course Additions: | **The SCC recommends that these courses also be listed (i.e., cross-listed) in the catalog on p. 94 under the Humanities Program.**  
| French 203; French 204; French 493; German 205; German 301; Spanish 201; Spanish 202. |
p. 163 (T/Ed) Home Economics
Major

H. Ec. 420, Methods in Home Economics

Add an asterisk after "Economics" and the following prerequisite footnote after course and credit description of the major:
"Students enrolling in H. Ec. 420 must have completed Ed. 314."

p. 164 (T/Ed) Home Economics
Major (Broad Area)

H. Ec. 433, Methods and Curriculum in Family Life Ed.

Add an asterisk after "Family Life Ed".

H. Ec. 420, Methods in Home Economics

Add an asterisk after "Methods in Home Economics" and the following prerequisite footnote:
"Students enrolling in H. Ec. 420 or 433 must have completed Ed. 314.

p. 167 Home Economics
Description change

H. Ec. 391, Consumer Buying

The SCC recommends withholding this description change until the Dean of Education and the chairman of the Home Economics Dept. and Business Education Dept. consider the possibility of combining H. Ec. 391 and 381 and cross-listing this course with Bus. Ed. 375 for 5 credits.

H. Ec. 381, Family Finance

3 credits. Fundamentals of family money management; budgeting, credit buying, insurance, investments, home buying, taxes (not open to students who have completed Bus. Ed. 375 or 480.)
TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Student Affairs Committee

DATE: January 12, 1971

RE: Recommendations regarding Pass/Fail option

The Pass/Fail option should be retained and should continue to be administered through the Registrar’s office. Instructors should not be informed which students are taking courses on Pass/Fail. The Pass/Fail option should continue to apply only to courses taken for Breadth Requirements.

The Pass/Fail option was favored by a large majority of both faculty and students who responded to the questionnaire. Not informing the instructor which students are taking a course for Pass/Fail is recommended as a means of protecting a student from an instructor who may oppose the option and use a double marking standard. The Committee did not feel that it had enough information at this time to make recommendations to expand the P/F option.

The following modifications of the option are recommended:

1. The student may change a Pass/Fail designation to the earned grade in a course at any time up to graduation. The student arranges for this change through the Registrar’s office. The earned grade may not later be changed back to P/F. If the student chooses to take the earned grade, the P/F notation would be removed from his record. There will be no restriction to the number of times a student may register for P/F. However, he will be allowed only a total of 15 hours of P/F credit on his transcript.

The Committee believes this change will help to alleviate the problem of low motivation and incentive to students taking courses for P/F. Knowing that he may take the earned grade if he does well should encourage a better quality of work than is now the case. This recommendation would also aid the student who later finds that a course taken for P/F is required in his major. This is a problem for students who change majors who are undecided on a major early in their college careers.

2. The student may be allowed a total of 15 hours of P/F credit on his transcript, rather than 15 hours based on initial registration. (See recommendation #1)
3. The P/F designation should be changed to Credit/No Credit.

This recommendation reflects the feeling that non-completion of course requirements is not the same as failure. Also, the Registrar's office needs a separate designation to distinguish between certain other courses for which letter grades are not given and Pass/Fail courses.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee
DATE: January 12, 1971
RE: The Pass-Fail option

The Senate Curriculum Committee has not as yet examined thoroughly the proposals which appeared after the receipt of the "Report on Pass-Fail" and David Lygre's letter (November 19, 1970). This reference is to Enos Underwood's memorandum (December 14, 1970), the Questionnaire of the Office of Institutional Studies, and the memorandum of Charles McGehee to the Student Affairs Committee (December 18, 1970). Therefore, the Committee does not wish to recommend any modification at this time, except to support the continuation of the Pass-Fail option in its present form for the coming year.
The minutes of the Faculty Senate, 10 January 1969, include Motion No. 383 which reads:

Mr. Williams moved, seconded by Mr. Herr, 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 at a specified time; this pass-fail program would be experimental for three years, and during the period the program would be evaluated.

Following the motion and the report of the roll call vote, the minutes show that "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 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."

In a letter dated 5 March 1968, Charles McCann, the Dean of Faculty, asked the Dean of Students to serve as chairman of a committee to clarify administrative details and understandings as to implementation.

Four students and two faculty members were appointed as a committee which met as long as needed to accomplish its initial charge. The program has proceeded under the general supervision of the Registrar since that time.

Dr. Hylander, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, asked for a report on the pass-fail program, with the intent that changes, if needed, could be decided upon and placed in the 1971-1972 college catalog. It is the purpose of this revised report to provide the basic data that will allow decisions to be made about the pass-fail program. This report includes data from the 1968-69 and 1969-70 academic years.

*Materials compiled by Dr. John W. cell and Dr. Y. T. Witherspoon
The data presented in this section was compiled from two sources. The summary of grade report, which comes out quarterly provides a g.p.a. for each class, each department and for the colleges at home. This g.p.a. is calculated only on letter grades and excludes pass-fail. Since the professors theoretically do not know which students are receiving pass-fail grades and consequently turn in letter grades for those students, it is important to examine those grades. Consequently, the summary of grade report computer program was modified to provide a new program which would do two things. First, a new report was generated which considered only the grades turned in by professors which were later changed to pass-fail. The g.p.a. derived from these grades will be found in the table of this report, under the column labeled Pass-Fail Only. Secondly, the program prepared a new summary of grade reports calculated from all the grades turned in by the professors for all students including the original grades turned in that were later changed to pass-fail. This g.p.a. will be found in the column labeled All Grades Including P-F.

The following tables summarize this information for the pass-fail program for the 1968-69 and the 1969-70 academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Excluding Pass-Fail</th>
<th>Pass-Fail Only</th>
<th>All Grades Including P-F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>G.P.A.</td>
<td>Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Qtr. 1968</td>
<td>26,189</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wtr. Qtr. 1969</td>
<td>25,260</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr. Qtr. 1969</td>
<td>24,751</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Qtr. 1969</td>
<td>27,174</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wtr. Qtr. 1970</td>
<td>26,865</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr. Qtr. 1970</td>
<td>25,401</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this table it seems clear that the use of the pass-fail option has indeed increased over the past two years. It also seems clear that students achieved much lower grades in pass-fail courses than in their other courses. Two hypotheses occur immediately, although others are certainly possible. First, it is hoped that the lower grades indicate that students are indeed taking courses in areas that are difficult for them, or courses that are in areas in which they have little or no academic background. If this is so, the pass-fail program is accomplishing its primary purpose. A second hypothesis comes to mind along with the first. Perhaps the low grades are a reflection of a lack of motivation resulting partially from the fact that a "D" results in a "Pass" just as an "A" does.
The distribution of grades earned in pass-fail classes during the three quarters of the 1968-69 academic year are presented below.

### Pass-Fail Statistics, Fall, 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>409</strong></td>
<td><strong>371</strong></td>
<td><strong>780</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Passed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>394</strong></td>
<td><strong>353</strong></td>
<td><strong>747</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Failed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pass-Fail Statistics, Winter, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>680</strong></td>
<td><strong>542</strong></td>
<td><strong>1222</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Passed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>592</strong></td>
<td><strong>476</strong></td>
<td><strong>1068</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Failed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>647</strong></td>
<td><strong>515</strong></td>
<td><strong>1162</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The percent of "E's" awarded was lowest at 6.1% in the Fall quarter; next lowest at 8.0% in the Winter quarter; and highest at 8.3% in the Spring quarter. It is doubtful if these differences are of real significance.

The average grade point average by class for the 1969-70 academic year was computed as a part of another study. It is reproduced here because it does include the average g.p.a. for pass-fail, the average g.p.a. for classes including pass-fail, and the average g.p.a. for classes excluding pass-fail for freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors.

AVERAGE G.P.A. BY CLASS
FALL QUARTER, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>GPA PASS-FAIL</th>
<th>GPA INCL. P-F</th>
<th>GPA EXCL. P-F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRESHMAN</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GPA by Class

**FRESHMAN**
- **PASS-FAIL** GPA: 1.52
- **INCL P-F** GPA: 2.22
- **EXCL P-F** GPA: 2.24

**SOPHOMORE**
- **PASS-FAIL** GPA: 1.58
- **INCL P-F** GPA: 2.47
- **EXCL P-F** GPA: 2.53

**JUNIOR**
- **PASS-FAIL** GPA: 1.65
- **INCL P-F** GPA: 2.49
- **EXCL P-F** GPA: 2.54

**SENIOR**
- **PASS-FAIL** GPA: 1.93
- **INCL P-F** GPA: 2.66
- **EXCL P-F** GPA: 2.72
### AVERAGE G.P.A. BY CLASS

**SPRING QUARTER, 1973**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GPA PASS-FAIL</th>
<th>GPA INCL P-F</th>
<th>GPA EXCL P-F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRESHMAN</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPHOMORE</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the most interesting bit of information to be gleaned from the above table is the fact that the average g.p.a. for classes taken on pass-fail is far below that achieved in any quarter of the preceding academic year. The table also demonstrates that students make better grades in pass-fail as they progress through their college careers.

### INFORMATION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT OPINIONS

The information included in this section was gathered through the use of survey instruments. One questionnaire was mailed to faculty and another was given to students with their packets at pre-registration. Both students and faculty were asked to give advantages and disadvantages of pass-fail, indicate whether they felt the pass-fail system should be retained or discontinued, and suggest any modifications that should be incorporated if pass-fail is retained. One hundred fifty two faculty responses and 2,949 student responses were returned to the Office of Institutional Studies.
It is assumed that those who felt strongly responded and that most people who did not respond either had no opinion at all or were not sufficiently concerned to make their opinions known.

The following table shows the "vote" of respondents regarding retaining the pass-fail system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>FRESH.</th>
<th>SENIOR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Retain)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>2907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Do not retain)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>4101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many people listed advantages, disadvantages, and proposed modifications. The statements under each of these categories were listed and the lists were then consolidated by eliminating the duplications. Examination of the lists of statements will indicate that further consolidation would be possible but it seems desirable to leave them in their present form so that the reader can better sense the flavor of the responses made. The lists of advantages, disadvantages, and modifications follows with the number of respondents making each response shown.

**ADVANTAGES**

- Fulfill breadth requirements: 249
- Can concentrate on major studies: 97
- Concentrate on classes of more importance: 40
- Less worry: 85
- Takes the pressure off: 270
- Do not need to work as hard: 55
- Student can concentrate on learning rather than grade: 51
- More relaxing atmosphere: 24
- More freedom to enjoy the class: 28
- Can learn at your own rate: 30
- Requires self-discipline: 6
- More attention toward learning: 4
- Student is motivated: 5
- Creates interest: 15
- Student doesn't have to spend as much time on the class: 63
- Allows students more study time: 32
- Freedom to study or not study: 5
- Take more credits each quarter: 31
- Easy credits with little work: 6
- Carry heavier load: 48
### ADVANTAGES (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease a heavy load</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieves class load</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better attitude toward class and school</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves student-teacher relationships</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove undesirable motivation of working for grades</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not have to worry about a grade</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce competition</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are to some extent desensitized to grades</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore your interests without the worry of a grade</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't work against GPA if you fail</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades are foolish</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To see if you like it</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader education without stress on grades</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieves fear of non-major subjects</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widens student choice of classes</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident experience in a variety of disciplines</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows you to broaden general knowledge</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows investigation of interesting courses</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore new subjects without getting involved</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore other interests</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student takes class he wouldn't otherwise take</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden scope of learning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can take class for own personal reasons</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for experimentation for the student who is not sure of the major he wants</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore basic knowledge of unfamiliar courses</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can feel free to take a difficult class</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISADVANTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough interest</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy credit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too easy to get by with</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No incentive</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some only aim for a D-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It takes the competition out of the class</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too easy to pass</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In reality guarantees a pass if student stays with it</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of participation - dead weight</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No motivation</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relax too much</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower overall standards</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can take advantage of lack of grade pressure to &quot;drag through&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CooK off</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People seldom come to class</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse by students who want to get by on the easiest road possible</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't give course a chance and may gain nothing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DISADVANTAGES (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough effort put forth</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal understanding and learning</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No incentive during class</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It favors the smart student</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not fulfill its original intent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only can take 1 a quarter</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't go far enough</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more than 15 credits to be offered</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier for Prof to flunk students</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof try to fail students if they know they're P/F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA computation difficulties</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowers the curve</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might lower grade point</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may put you on probation where the grade system may not</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You never really know how you do</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't get credit for good grade</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be a cut-off date to change to a grade</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't take class in Major-Minor program</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change major and not be able to use P/F class</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly trouble with transferring credits</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MODIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 credits instead of 15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one P/F per quarter</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase limit to 30-45 credits</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All classes except Major and Minor P/F</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More classes should be P/F</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change human nature</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a C or more to pass</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D- should be an F</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used by those on Probation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/F open to first quarter freshmen</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend to Major and Minor fields</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory - Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be able to take an A instead of Pass</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All PE classes should be P/F</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All classes P/F</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 101 and 301 P/F</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of education sequence should be P/F</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should know who the pass-fail students are</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be able to change to letter grade</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MODIFICATIONS (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decide Mid-Term if you want to switch to P/F</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change cut-off date for pass-fail decisions</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis should be placed on learning</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less credit for Pass-Fail</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict to specific courses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required classes should not be P/F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce to 10 credits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCLUSION

It does not seem appropriate for the authors of this report to write conclusions based on the data at this point. Several groups must study the information and arrive at their own conclusions and recommendations regarding retention and possible modification of pass-fail.

There is a great deal of information to be sifted, however, and certain things seem apparent.

1. The original grades turned in by professors and later changed to pass-fail are somewhat lower, on the average, than other grades.
2. The faculty and students who responded are overwhelmingly in favor of the retention of pass-fail.
3. Those who were undecided tended to be freshmen and junior transfers who had had no experience with the system.
4. Respondents favoring pass-fail seem to be saying that the pass-fail system helps provide a more relaxed atmosphere with less anxiety and more possibilities for exploration and experimentation.
5. Those who do not like pass-fail seem to interpret it as making it too easy for the student and may believe that more anxiety is required for motivation.
6. Some of the students opposed to pass-fail suggest that faculty members are unfair and make it more difficult for students if they know they are taking the class pass-fail.
7. When the same things listed as advantages by some are listed as disadvantages by others, the problem is obviously philosophical. In this case, the prevailing philosophy may be the one held by most of the people involved.
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FROM: Kenneth K. Harsha  
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DATE: January 4, 1971

RE: Special Faculty Senate Meeting, Monday, January 11, 1971.

The Faculty Senate will meet in Special Session on January 11, 1971, 4:00 p.m. in Hertz Hall, Room 123. The Long-Range Planning Committee has requested this meeting with the Faculty Senate in order to discuss a tentative statement of goals and objectives for CWSC. You will receive copies of this statement prior to the meeting from the Office of Institutional Research.

In addition to the agenda items mentioned in the earlier memo, the Honors Evaluation Report may be discussed at the Regular Senate Meeting on January 13. Please read this report prior to the meeting. The report was sent to Senate members early in fall quarter.
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