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MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 2 February 1972  
Presiding Officer: E. Gordon Leavitt, Chairman  
Recording Secretary: Esther Johnston

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All senators or their alternates were present except Robert Carlton, Robert Jacobs, Ron Johnson, and Kent Richards.


AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman announced that the following items would be added under "Communications."

1. Memorandum from William V. Dunning, regarding counter proposals to the Proposed Grading System.

2. Letter from Tom Dudley requesting that the motion regarding the new grading system proposal remain tabled and a special meeting called at a later date.

3. Memorandum from Ted Cooper regarding Procedures for Review and Approval of Proposals for the Establishment, Continuation or Termination of Graduate Programs.

The chairman asked if there were any further changes. There being none, the Agenda with changes was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 12, 1972 were approved as printed and distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

1. A letter from Florence E. Chapman, dated January 24, 1972, requesting the Faculty Senate to once again review the termination of her employment. She requested an additional hearing to submit further evidence. The chairman said that the Personnel Committee will be charged to review the matter and determine whether further action should be taken.
2. A letter from Robert C. Jacobs, dated January 24, 1972, requesting the Senate accept his resignation from the Senate Budget Committee. The chairman announced that this will be covered under the report of the Vice Chairman.

3. A letter from Beverly Heckart, dated January 20, 1972, recommending that in lieu of the immediate presentation of the entire Revised Code to the faculty, Sections 1.105-1.120 and 3.00-3.120 be brought to a vote of the faculty within the month of February. Mr. Leavitt reported that the Executive Committee had taken no action on the letter, pending a report on the progress of the Code Committee on the Code revision.

4. A memorandum from William V. Dunning, dated January 27, 1972, submitting counter proposals to the proposed grading system of the Ad Hoc Committee. The Executive Committee is not recommending action, pending further consideration at a later date.

5. A letter from Tom Dudley, dated February 1, 1972, requesting that the grading motion that is presently tabled, remain tabled and a special meeting be called the following week to discuss the matter concerning faculty and students alike. The Chairman said the letter was received only today and the Executive Committee has not acted on it; however, the Executive Committee is likewise suggesting that discussion on the grading proposal be delayed to a later meeting.

6. A memorandum from Ted Cooper, dated January 31, 1972, stating that the faculty committees of the Department of Education were not aware, to his knowledge, of the preparation of the proposal regarding Procedures for Review and Approval of Proposal for the Establishment, Continuation, or Termination of Graduate Programs. The chairman announced that since the memorandum was just received, no action from the Executive Committee had been taken.

Mr. Comstock commented that a memorandum on the Graduate Council was submitted to the Education Department. Also, there is a member of that department on the Graduate Council. The first distribution on it was made approximately a year ago and circulated to all departments.

REPORTS

A. Executive Committee--Jean Putnam gave the following report:

1. Human Rights Commission--The Senate Chairman asked the Executive Committee to help him select two faculty members to serve on the Human Rights Commission. Robert Yee and Edward Klucking were suggested and both have agreed to represent the faculty on the Commission.

2. Budget Committee--Robert Jacobs notified the Executive Committee that he must resign from the Senate Budget Committee. Jann Carpenter has been contacted and agrees to serve.
MOTION NO. 819: Jean Putnam moved, seconded by Larry Lawrence, to accept the appointment of Jann Carpenter to the Senate Budget Committee to replace Robert Jacobs who has resigned. The motion was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

3. College Governance--Larry Lawrence reported to the Executive Committee on the progress of the Committee to Study Reorganization of College Governance. He informed us that he had gotten considerable feedback and the prevailing sentiment favors the unicameral system. Several of the basic concerns were: (1) the selection of faculty representatives on the council by schools rather than departments; (2) the structure and function of several committees; (3) the lack of some avenue for appeal, a way to challenge decisions made by the council. Mr. Lawrence will give his committee report at the Senate meeting in March.

4. Sabbatical Leaves--Mr. Harrington informed the Executive Committee that he would like to know the feeling of the Faculty Senate concerning Sabbaticals. After the Executive Committee spent considerable time in several meetings discussing the Legislative mandate of unfunded Sabbaticals--the "break-even" policy, they felt that they must continue to support all aspects of the Faculty Code concerning Sabbaticals. A position statement to that effect has been distributed at this meeting for Senate action. The Executive Committee recommends the endorsement of this statement to represent the feeling of the Faculty Senate toward Sabbaticals.

The statement was then read to the Senate by the Chairman:

Position Statement for the Granting of Sabbatical Leaves For 1972-73

We recognize the long range value of the Sabbatical Program to both the individual faculty member and the college. We re-affirm the Sabbatical Leave Program as described in the Faculty Code, Section XI, including the statement which reads "Granting of leave shall not add to the duties of other department members."

Mr. Harrington said departments have been asked how they would cover the granting of a Sabbatical from their department. One department feels they cannot pick up the load. Mr. Harrington plans to recommend to President Brooks that he grant seven sabbatical leaves for next year and the names will be presented to the Board of Trustees at their meeting on Friday.

Mr. Brooks said it is a difficult problem. Sabbatical leaves may be awarded if the guidelines are followed. All other schools are following the guidelines.

Mr. Keller said that we can go another route and say we can't fund Sabbaticals this year.
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The chairman said this had been suggested by some.

MOTION NO. 820: Mr. Nylander moved, seconded by Mr. McGehee, to endorse the position statement for the granting of sabbatical leaves for 1972-73. The motion was voted on and passed with abstentions from Mr. Brooks, Mr. Wise, Mr. Purcell, and Mr. Ladd.

B. Budget Committee--No report at this meeting.

C. Code Committee--Don Ringe reported that the final revisions to the Code will be ready to send to the Senate office next week. They will get errata sets indicating changes. One more hearing will probably be necessary before the vote in the Senate.

D. Curriculum Committee--Gerald Reed reported that a memorandum covering the ACCC proposals and changes, pp. 219-220, had been handed out with the Agenda.

MOTION NO. 821: Mr. Reed moved, seconded by Jim Maloney, for the approval of the proposed curricular changes, pp. 219-220. The motion was voted on and passed with one abstention from Ken Berry.

E. Personnel Committee--Mr. Kallienke reported that the Personnel Committee had met with Mr. Sperry as well as his AAUP representative and arrived at the following conclusions:

Since the existing Code is very vague and only states that "tenure may be deferred" (Section IX, C4), the Committee could find no violation. However, considering the extreme uncertainty involved in this case, we suggest that the appropriate channel of inquiry would be through the departmental chairman who could request an interview with President Brooks. The Committee believes it would be of great help to Mr. Sperry to know whether the deferral took place only because of the uncertain financial future this college is facing.

Mr. Kallienke also reported that the Personnel Committee had considered the letter of Michael Whitley concerning the termination of his appointment. After meeting with him as well as with his AAUP representative, they arrived at the following conclusions:

Mr. Whitley stated in his letter that his qualifications had not been considered and that AAUP standards as well as the Faculty Code had been violated. The Committee feels that its function is neither the consideration of professional qualifications nor a concern with AAUP standards.

As far as Code violations are concerned, the Committee would like to point out that, until actual acceptance of the new Code revisions, all findings will have to be based on the existing Code. The Committee could not find any provisions of the Code which had been violated.
F. Student Affairs Committee--Mr. McGehee asked that the report on Academic Fairness Grievance Procedure, which was referred to the Code Committee, be given back to the Student Affairs Committee.

MOTION NO. 822: Mr. McGehee moved, seconded by Don Wise, that Motion No. 788, of the meeting of October 6, 1971, to receive the report from the Student Affairs Committee and refer it to the Code Committee to make recommendations on it be reconsidered. The motion was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 823: Mr. McGehee moved, seconded by Eino Kallioinen, that the report of the Student Affairs Committee submitted on October 6, 1971 regarding Academic Fairness be returned to the Student Affairs Committee. The motion was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS

The chairman announced that President Brooks and Vice President Harrington were both present to report and discuss with the Senate the academic reorganization. It was presented to the Board of Trustees at their last meeting and the Board of Trustees tabled it until their next meeting a week from Friday night.

Mr. Brooks said he didn't have anything new to report. Mr. Frank had asked for additional information on salaries. He said the Board asked for salaries of not only the administrators, but of all employees groups of the college, going back for five years. Mr. Brooks said the figures are tentative, but in total man years they show a decrease of all seven employee groups of the college.

The question of how the Deans will be selected was asked.

Mr. Harrington said a Selection Committee will be set up. This Committee will determine appointments. It is possible they could move into it by Spring quarter.

Mr. Brooks said at a later date he would like to make a report on the Legislative sessions. He said the next session of Legislature will be difficult.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 o'clock.
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Last person signing -
Please return to Faculty Senate Secretary.
Professor Gordon Leavitt
Chairman, Faculty Senate
Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Wash.

Dear Professor Leavitt,

Because it is no longer possible for me to attend meetings of the President's Council and Budget Planning Committee, I must resign from these two committees.

I believe my resignation ought to be accepted in good spirit, in order that my successor be given as much opportunity as possible to bring to the position what he has.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to work with you in this capacity. I regret that it could not have been longer.

Very sincerely yours,

Robert D. Sanders
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C.

January 30, 1975

Mr. Walter H. McAllister
President
Washington State College

Dear Mr. McAllister,

I am in receipt of your letter dated March 7, 1975, concerning the report, 'The Impact of the National Science Foundation's Support of Science Faculty Salary Costs on the Washington State College Academic Unit.'

I appreciate the detailed information provided in your letter and the opportunity to discuss this important issue. It is evident that the report has been utilized in the development of the budget proposal for the next fiscal year.

The report's findings indicate that the science faculty salary costs have increased significantly over the past few years. The budget proposal reflects these increases and includes recommendations for addressing the financial challenges.

I would like to express my gratitude for the hard work and dedication of the science faculty in providing quality academic programs. It is my hope that we can continue to work together to ensure the future success of the science programs at Washington State College.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Position]
[Institution]
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee
DATE: January 26, 1972
RE: ACCC proposals, pp. 219-220

The Senate Curriculum Committee discussed and voted to recommend approval by the Senate these proposed curricular changes with changes as indicated below:

**Additions:**
- H. Ec. 309.3 Applicable Theories in Child Development
  *(Delete "Prerequisite, H. Ec. 309.1")*

**Course Changes:**
- H. Ec. 309.1 Comparative Child Development
- H. Ec. 438 The Nursery School

**Deletion:**
- H. Ec. 309.0 Child Development I

**Program Change:**
- A/S Zoology Major—(Number of credits changed from (48-60) to (45-60).)
  *Insert following Electives...: "by advisement"

**Additions:**
- Zool. 375 Warm-Blooded Vertebrates
- Zool. 509 Advanced Mammalology
- Zool. 510 Advanced Ornithology

**Deletions:**
- Zool. 345 Ornithology
- Zool. 435 Mammalology

**Program Additions** *(The following courses are double listed with H. Ec. 309.1 and H. Ec. 309.3 and are thus also being recommended for approval. The remainder of the ECE proposals are still under study.):*
- ECE 309.1 Comparative Child Development
- ECE 309.3 Applicable Theories in Child Development
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: William V. Basinger

DATE: January 27, 1974

RE: Counter Proposals to the Proposed Grading System from the
Ad Hoc Committee

I am happy with the current proposal for a new grading system, and
further that the Senate may find the integral parts of the proposal
to be so interlocked and related as to make any doctoring or amending
of it confusing and unsatisfactory. I feel that it may be simpler
to start by amending the present grading system that we have all
used for several years and are therefore much more accustomed to.
Further, that these new proposals, if approved by the Senate, be
offered in revised due form to the Faculty for their opinion and vote.

I. Pass/Fail system entirely—possibly with High Pass-Pass-Fail

II. Remain with the system we now have with the possible four
amendments to be voted on separately.

Amendment No. 1. Remove plus/minus grades on everything
below "B-" so grades will be given
"A" to "B-" then revert to straight
"A-" "B-" "C-".

Amendment No. 2. Change pass level within existing pass/no pass
category to "C" as recommended in Committee's
previous proposal.

Amendment No. 3. Extend number of credits to be taken on
pass/fail from 15 credits to 30 credits.

Amendment No. 4. That the Incomplete grade given by the
instructor should no longer reverse to "F".
This change was also recommended by the
Committee's previous proposal and would not
do harm to academic work.
February 1, 1972

Mr. Gordon Leavitt
Chairman, Faculty Senate
C.W.S.C.

Dear Mr. Leavitt:

We have been advised that the new grading system proposed by the Ad Hoc grading committee, which is now tabled in Faculty Senate, may be voted upon this Wednesday, February 2. A.E.C. and R.H.C. have re-printed this proposal and at this time we are distributing these to the students.

The time factor involved in re-printing 14,000 sheets of paper and distributing these to the students has not given us the needed time to collect enough feedback from the students so that we might present student opinion at that meeting. We realize that this Wednesday's agenda is very long and we feel that we can not be prepared to present a total student view on the proposed grading system. We respectfully request that this motion be tabled and a special meeting be called the following week to discuss this important matter concerning the students and the faculty alike.

Yours Respectfully,

Tom Dudley
A.S.C. President

Mark Betznerwarte
R.H.C. Chairman

TD, MS:rh
UNOFFICIAL POLL OF THE FACULTY SENATE
CONCERNING GRADING

1. All grading will be an A-B-C-D/no credit/no record basis (pluses and minuses may be used) unless a student elects to take a class under the credit/no credit option.

   All grading will be an A-B-C-D/no credit but record the attempt.

   YES _____ NO_____

2. Students may take up to 60 hours of credit under the credit/no credit option. These credits may come from any course with the exception of those within the major, minor, or professional education sequence.

   YES _____ NO_____

3. In the case of courses where it is extremely difficult to determine qualitative differences in student performance beyond a level of minimum acceptable competence, a department may designate the course as credit/no credit.

   This credit/no credit allowance will not affect the student's credit/no credit option under 2 above.

   YES _____ NO_____

4. Any student may elect, at least two weeks before the end of the quarter, to change an eligible course (outside the major, etc.) to a graded status or to a credit/no credit status.

   YES _____ NO_____

5. If a student desires to change majors and will need to receive grades for courses that had been graded previously as "F", he may do this at any time through the Registrar on presentation of evidence for the need.

   YES _____ NO_____

6. A student will decide during registration whether he wants the class under the (A-D/no credit) or credit/no credit system. This information will not be given to the instructor, but the appropriate mark will be transposed on the transcripts after the quarter's grades have been turned in.

   YES _____ NO_____

7. A student may repeat only once a course for which he received no credit or a grade which is unsatisfactory to him. The higher evaluation of the two will become the recorded evaluation.

   YES _____ NO_____

8. A student may withdraw from class at any time at least two weeks before the end of the quarter.

   YES _____ NO_____
In case of withdrawal, no credit will be given and no entry will be made on the student's transcript.  YES  NO

In case of withdrawal, no credit will be given but an entry of the attempt will be entered on the student's transcript.  YES  NO

9. To remain in good standing a student must maintain a satisfactory g.p.a. as defined by the college and complete satisfactorily an average of 2/3 of total credits attempted. A withdrawal after add/drop day is considered an attempt.  YES  NO

10. If the "I" is not converted to another grade during the time allotted for completion of the work:

A. It will be treated as an "E" or no credit and removed from the student's transcript.  YES  NO

B. The "Inc" will be recorded and shall appear on the transcript.  YES  NO
POSITION STATEMENT FOR THE GRANTING OF SABBATICAL LEAVES FOR 1972-73

We recognize the long range value of the Sabbatical Program to both the individual faculty member and the college. We re-affirm the Sabbatical Leave Program as described in the Faculty Code, Section XI, including the statement which reads "Granting of leave shall not add to the duties of other department members."
TO: Gordon Leavitt, Chairman
Faculty Senate

FROM: Ted Cooper, Chairman
Graduate Program Committee
Coordinator of Graduate Programs

RE: Procedures for Review and Approval of Proposals for the Establishment, Continuation, or Termination of Graduate Programs

Faculty Senate minutes of January 12 note the approval of the above named document.

The responsible faculty committees of the Department of Education were not aware, to my knowledge, that such a proposal was prepared. I find it peculiar that the Senate would approve such procedures for review and approval without the knowledge or participation of the Department that accounts for the majority of graduate degrees granted by the College.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of Senate Curriculum Committee recommendation IIIa.

It seems to me that this matter makes clear that the cumbersome machinery of this College seriously inhibits faculty governance, which I would suppose is the goal of a majority of the Faculty. I submit that no substantive college-wide proposal regarding curriculum and programs should receive Senate approval in the absence departmental review and response.
Dr. Gordon Leavitt, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Gordon:

The Personnel Committee has considered the letter of Willard Sperry concerning his deferral of tenure. The committee has met with Mr. Sperry as well as with his AAUP representative to clarify the exact nature of his grievance and arrived at the following conclusions:

Since the existing code is very vague and only states that "tenure may be deferred" (Section IX, C4), the committee could find no violation. However, considering the extreme uncertainty involved in this case, we suggest that the appropriate channel of inquiry would be through the departmental chairman who could request an interview with President Brooks. For instance, we believe it would be of great help to Mr. Sperry to know whether the deferral took place only because of the uncertain financial future this college is facing.

Sincerely,

Gerhard S. Kallienke, Chairman
Personnel Committee
Dr. Gordon Leavitt, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
Campus

Dear Gordon:

The Personnel Committee has considered the letter of Michael Whitley concerning the termination of his appointment. The committee has met with Mr. Whitley as well as with his AAUP representative to clarify the nature of his grievance and arrived at the following conclusions:

Mr. Whitley stated in his letter that his qualifications had not been considered and that AAUP standards as well as the Faculty Code had been violated. The committee feels that its function is neither the consideration of professional qualifications nor a concern with AAUP standards. An far as code violations are concerned, the committee would like to point out that, until actual acceptance of the new code revisions, all findings will have to be based on the existing code. The committee could not find any provisions of the code which had been violated.

Sincerely,

Gerhard S. Kallienke, Chairman  
Personnel Committee