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MINUTES: Continuation of Regular Senate Meeting, 13 November 1974, and held 14 November 1974.

Presiding Officer: Duncan McQuarrie, Chairperson

The meeting re-convened at 3:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except Lee Fisher, Darwin Goodey, Ramon Mercado, Patti Picha, and George Stillman.


The Chairperson called to order the last portion of the recessed meeting of November 13, 1974. He pointed out several pieces of material had been distributed to the Senators. From yesterday, there is a memorandum distributed by David Anderson in regard to the CFR Report; a report from the Budget Committee regarding the Committee of One Thousand; a letter from Robert Benton concerning the AAUP Resolution; and a letter from President Brooks concerning the AFT Resolution. Video taping and recording was being done by students from Roger Reynolds' communication class and without objection it was allowed. The chair also identified members of the press from the Campus Crier and Daily Record.

REPORTS

C. Standing Committees (continued)

6. CFR -- David Anderson presented a report on the Committee of 1000, and its progress to date. Mr. Habib and Mr. Harsha, CFR members, were also present to answer any questions that might be directed to them. He explained the memorandum distributed to the Senate which details information on the Committee of 1000. He said an executive committee has been named. The various campus groups are submitting ten names of people of this college who will be considered for appointment to a steering committee and later will be identifying a hundred or more names of other friends of the college who will be asked to serve on the Committee of 1000. They are also conducting solicitation of campaign funds which are necessary to get the committee started and which is explained in the memorandum distributed at this meeting. Their plans are to have the CFR members communicate with the various departments and try to meet with them to try to solicit their support. It was explained that the CFR is composed of three representatives from each of the six state four year institutions and that when CFR has a major proposal they come to the Senate for their ratification. In line with this the following was proposed to the Senate:
MOTION NO. 1136: David Anderson moved, seconded by Art Keith, the following:

RESOLVED: that the CWSC Faculty Senate endorse the solicitation of the faculty and administrators by the Council of Faculty Representatives for funds to support the Committee of 1000.

RESOLVED: that the CWSC Faculty Senate encourage the faculty and administrators to nominate citizens to the Council of Faculty Representatives for membership on the Committee of 1000.

Mr. Thelen spoke to the motion saying that the Senate Budget Committee had discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the Committee of 1000 and felt they preferred not to make any specific recommendations, but instead presented a list of the advantages and disadvantages as they view them. These are listed in the report distributed at the meeting. The Budget Committee's report concluded that at its best it might be the preferable and most acceptable solution to a critical problem; and at its worst, it might be an administrative public relations effort that would jeopardize the overall faculty voice on campus and might also weaken the drive toward strong collective bargaining.

Mr. Winters requested Mr. Anderson to go over the Senate Budget Committee's listed disadvantages point by point.

Mr. Anderson spoke to the listed disadvantages.

The question was asked as to where the money will come from to get higher salaries.

Mr. Anderson said this was discussed at the CFR meeting held November 2 at CWSC, and that the conclusion was that it was not within the province of the Committee of 1000 to make suggestions of this nature.

Mr. Winters pointed out that with respect to the Committee of 1000 detracting from the move for Collective Bargaining that the CFR will have a Collective Bargaining Bill before the legislature and the Committee of 1000 will not interfere with that effort.

Mr. Thelen said they are not really certain just what the working relation is between the CFR and the Council of Presidents. He questioned whether the CFR was purely representative of the faculty group or whether it was representative of the faculty and administration. The greatest concern of the Budget Committee was expressed as being Collective Bargaining. They expressed the feeling that if salary increases are put in the forefront such a move might weaken organizational efforts on campus. Any time you have problems on campus you can expect that collective bargaining efforts will proceed much more rapidly.

Mr. Anderson said some questions have been raised to the relationship between the CFR and the Council of Presidents or the administration. There might be reason for concern because people may think they have been working with the Council of Presidents on Collective Bargaining. The fact is the legislature has told the CFR that they would not consider a faculty bill unless supported
by the other groups, so the legislature forces the CFR, in order to have their bill considered, to work with the Council of Presidents.

On the item of salaries, Mr. Anderson referred to the CFR position as stated in a letter from Marvin Olmstead, chairman of the Council of Faculty Representatives. The position indicated in the letter is:

"We note complete agreement between the CFR and COP in terms of:

(a) general objectives of catchup and keepup at each institution with the average of the seven-state comparison group; and

(b) use of seven-state data as the basis for both requests and presentation of evidence to the legislature."

The letter goes on to say:

"We also note that the CFR has agreed to this point for purely pragmatic reasons and with full recognition that achievement of this goal will not make Washington institutions competitive in a national context, nor guarantee continuing high quality education nor protect against continued inflation."

A roll call vote was taken on Motion No. 1136:


Nay: None

Abstain: David Canzler, Derek Sandison, Kent Richards, Thomas Thelen.

Motion passed 26 Aye, 0 Nay, and 4 Abstentions.

NEW BUSINESS

The chair recognized Helmi Habib for the purpose of making a motion.

MOTION NO. 1137: Mr. Habib moved, seconded by Mr. Richards, the following:

RESOLVED: The Faculty Senate will conduct a faculty referendum (excluding adjunct faculty) on the following question:

"Considering the interest of the faculty in all areas affecting them, do you approve or disapprove the actions of the President and his administration relative to those interests."
Mr. Habib explained two reasons for making the motion: (1) He feels the president needs to know how he stands with the faculty and the faculty needs to know where it stands itself relative to the administration. The faculty should have a chance to vote on this and if they approve of the actions of the administration in those areas which are of faculty interest, then the protests should cease. If there is a vote to disapprove of the actions of the administration, he would hope that the president would feel constrained to come to the faculty and meet with the faculty in small groups and hopefully discuss the problems of concern on these facts so as to find out what the problems are. (2) He firmly believes in the process of constructive evaluation. He would like to see the evaluation extended beyond the teaching faculty. It should go also to the administrative faculty.

There were many comments in regard to the motion.

Mr. Purcell commented he didn't see how the faculty could hold the president responsible. They need to know what areas the president has command over and should delete some of the things from the list the AFT listed, such as budget. He said he does not see how the president can be held responsible for the fact that the legislature cuts the college's budget. Also, how he can be held personally responsible for a RIF Policy that was mandated by the Legislature. They were given a deadline time to have that in for their approval and CWSC's was not stringent enough to suit them but they finally settled for it anyway, but none of these things does the President have any control over. A list of things which are within the purview of the president should be distributed instead.

Mr. Anderson spoke against the motion, saying he agrees with the faculty's interest in having some sort of an evaluation of the problems, but he disagrees with the procedure of having the referendum. He pointed out that he had a pending motion which he would be offering to the Senate. He suggested that his pending motion would deal with the issue of evaluation of the president.

MOTION NO. 1138: Mr. Hansen moved, seconded by Mr. Vifian, to amend the motion by changing the date of the referendum to read "March 10, 1975." The amendment was voted on and failed with a majority nay voice vote, with abstentions from Mr. Novos and Mr. Purcell.

Discussion continued on the main motion.

Mr. Applegate spoke against the motion, saying that the vote of confidence issue has gotten entirely out of proportion and suggested that the pending motion, which would provide an opportunity for evaluation of the administration based on
the idea of the improvement of the administration, would be a much better way to go. The idea that a committee perhaps composed of faculty, administration and Board members to work together to develop a list of expectations for the president of the institution would lead to eventual improvement.

The chair called upon Mr. Lewis to speak on the motion.

Mr. Keith objected and called for a point of order, saying the senators should have precedence over visitors.

The chair ruled that Mr. Keith was out of order.

Mr. Keith questioned the decision of the chair.

MOTION NO. 1139: Should the decision of the chair be sustained? The chair ruled the motion passed by voice vote.

Mr. Jakubek called for a division of the house. A hand vote was conducted and the motion passed with 16 Aye, 11 Nay, and 4 abstentions.

Mr. Lewis then spoke in favor of the motion.

Roll call vote was taken on Motion No. 1137.


Abstentions: None

Motion No. 1137 failed with 8 Aye, 23 Nay, 0 Abstentions.

MOTION NO. 1140: Mr. Anderson moved, seconded by Mr. Jakubek, the following motion:

RESOLVED: An ad hoc committee shall be appointed by the Senate Executive Committee to be ratified by the Faculty Senate.

FURTHER: The ad hoc committee shall be charged to:

1) review the role of the presidency with the President and the Board of Trustees, providing a faculty view of his proper responsibilities and rights;

2) develop a regular procedure with the Board of Trustees through which a president may be evaluated at regular intervals according to a specific description of his responsibilities and rights; further
4) this procedure shall include definite and appropriate means of involving the faculty in the evaluation.

MOTION NO. 1141: Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Mr. Canzler, to amend the motion by adding the following as Item No. 4: that this committee also be appointed to study the feasibility of evaluating the actions of the Board of Trustees and if possible to develop procedures for faculty evaluation of the Board.

Discussion followed on the amendment.

Motion No. 1141 (amendment to Motion No. 1140) was voted on and failed with a majority nay voice vote.

Roll call vote taken on Motion No. 1140:


Nay: None

Abstentions: Edward Harrington.

Motion No. 1140 passed with 29 Aye, 0 Nay and 1 Abstention.

The chair announced there will be a special meeting November 20, 1974 to complete the processing of Sections 200-299 and also to process Sections 300-399.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
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ROLL CALL

SENATOR

Anderson, David
Applegate, Jim
Backrach, Jay
Bennett, Robert
Bovos, Louis
Brooks, James
Canzler, David
Douce', Pearl
Brunner, Gerard
Fisher, Lee
Garrett, Roger
Goodey, Darwin
Gregor, John
Gulezian, Allen
Hanson, Russell
Hileman, Betty
Jakubek, Otto
Jensen, J. Richard
Keith, Art
Kramer, Zolton
Lester, Nancy
Lygre, David
Makrig, Linda
McQuarrie, Duncan
Mercado, Ramon
Miller, Robert
Piccha, Patti
Purcell, John
Sandison, Derek
Smith, Milo
Stillman, George
Synnes, Earl
Thelen, Thomas
Vifian, John
Winters, Roger
Yeh, Thomas
Young, Madge

ALTERNATE

William Cutlip
Frank Carlson
Peter Burkholder
Robert Bentley
James Hollister
Edward Harrington
Richard Johnson
Joan Howe
Stanley Duda
Robert Cooper
Starla Drum
James Klahn
Bill Hillar
Don Cocheba
Charles McGeehee
Helen McCabe
Joel Andress
Bonalyn Bricker
George Grossman
Gordon Warren
Dieter Romboy
Helmi Habib
Clayton Deman
Owen Pratz
Wallace Webster
Kent Martin
A. James Hawkins
Christos Papadopoulos
Mike Madison
Glen Clark
Keith Ringhart
Robert Yee
William Craig
Robert Carlton
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Gordon Warren
Sara Comstock
Margaret Irish
Margaret Nelson
Frank M. Nelson
Tony Jindrich
David Webster
James Brennan
Lee Anne Schetz
Robert Benton
Walter Westman
Mr. Ferguson
Don Cawley
Fred Cutlip
Peg EL Stewart
Allene Wright
Victor Marx
Rob Tucker
Philip John
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lester, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dieter Romboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synnes, Earl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Bentley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backerch, Jay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purcell, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles McGehee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters, Roger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, Roger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applegate, Jim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Yee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvezian, Alphonso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Starla Drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villan, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Cocheba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisley, Darwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wallace Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado, Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Klahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picchia, Patti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hileman, Betty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Cutlip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Milo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevans, Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen McCabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, J. Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. James Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Hollister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakubek, Otto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonalyn Bricker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuarrie, Duncan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joel Andress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Madge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzler, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Pratz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregor, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Carlton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lygrep, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandison, Derek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Hillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, Stanley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramar, Zoltan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helmi Habib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelen, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerald Brunner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug, Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douce', Pearl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rex Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillman, George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glen Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Christos Papadopoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>AYE</td>
<td>NAY</td>
<td>ABSTAIN</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synnes, Earl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, Roger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Starla Drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovos, Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Hollister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, J. Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonalyn Bricker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilian, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hileman, Betty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen McCabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godey, Darwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Klahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Cutlip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakubek, Otto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joel Andress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wallace Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulezian, Ali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Cocheba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Milo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. James Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, Stanley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerald Brunner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichrach, Jay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters, Roger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Yee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramar, Zolton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douce', Pearl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Habib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applegate, Jim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillman, George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christos Papadopoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Bentley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klug, Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayton Deman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregor, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Hillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lygre, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helmi Habib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Madge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Carlton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzler, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuarrie, Duncan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Pratz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandison, Derek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glen Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theilen, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purcell, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles McGhee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado, Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer, Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, Patti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legler, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lester, Nancy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dieter Romboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Robert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Bentley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synnes, Earl</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backraf, Jay</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Burkhorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, Russell</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles McGehee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purcell, John</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters, Roger</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Yee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, Roger</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Starla Drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applegate, Jim</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulezian, Alan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Cocheba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Robert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wallace Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villian, John</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, James</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He, Darwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>James Klahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado, Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, David</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Cutlip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccha, Patti</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen McCabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileman, Betty</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. James Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Milo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Hollister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovos, Louis</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boralyn Bricker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, J. Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Lee</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joel Andress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakubek, Otto</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>George Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuarrie, Duncan</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Pratz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Madge</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Carlton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzler, David</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregor, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Hillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lygre, David</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandison, Derek</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helmi Hahih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, Stanley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerald Brunner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramar, Zolton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelen, Thomas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brad Rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lug, Linda</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glen Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douce, Pearl</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayton Denman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillman, George</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Howe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dear President McCann:

This memorandum constitutes the official response of the Council of Faculty Representatives to the salary position adopted by the Council of Presidents during their telephone conference of 13 September 1974 and in earlier meetings. Our response is based upon information provided to us through conversations with individual presidents, copies of your letter of 13 September 1974 to J. M. Furman and minutes of COP meetings. The position herein indicated was adopted by unanimous vote.

1. We note complete agreement between CFR and COP in terms of:

   (a) general objectives of catchup and keepup at each institution with the average of the seven-state comparison group; and

   (b) use of seven-state data as the basis for both requests and presentation of evidence to the legislature.

We also note that the CFR has agreed to this point for purely pragmatic reasons and with full recognition that achievement of this goal will not make Washington institutions competitive in a national context, nor guarantee continuing high quality education nor protect against continued inflation.

2. We note the following differences in catchup percentages between those used by COP and CFR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UW</th>
<th>WSU</th>
<th>CWSC</th>
<th>FWSC</th>
<th>TESC</th>
<th>WWSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CFR membership clearly understood that their data had not included adjustments attributable to funding of promotions, general increases granted, affirmative action adjustments and new hiring or retirements implemented for 1974-75. The revised figures are accepted.

3. The CFR expresses severe disappointment in the position of the COP in adopting 7% as the annual keepup factor rather than the modest 8.5% requested by the CFR. The CFR notes that industrial settlements are averaging close to
10%, that public school settlements tend to be above 7% (on top of incremental increases) and that the cost of living increases are projected by most economists at rates much in excess of the keepup figure proposed by CFR.

We note, however, that the COP has expressed concern that the requested 7% may be inadequate and understand from individual conversation that it will be presented as a minimum estimate with the possibility of upward revision.

In spite of the CFR desire to achieve a common position with COP vis-à-vis the legislature, the CFR cannot accept a keepup figure lower than the 8.5% previously indicated.

4. The CFR concurs fully with the strategy of seeking the catchup portion for implementation on January 1, 1975.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Marvin Olmstead, Chairman
Council of Faculty

cc: CFR membership
COP
Academic Vice Presidents
Bob Carr
MEMORANDUM

TO: THE FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION

FROM: David Anderson and Bill Lipsky, Co-chairman
CWSC Local Campaign

DATE: November 14, 1974

RE: COMMITTEE OF 1000, Solicitation of Campaign Funds

You have an opportunity to provide vital backing to the Committee of 1000, a citizen's effort to develop public understanding and support for significant increases in faculty salaries in the six state colleges and universities. We are asking for a contribution to help finance the committee, along with your assistance in recruiting citizen members to serve on the committee.

The Council of Faculty Representatives of the six state colleges and universities (CFR) consists of three representatives elected by each faculty senate. The CFR has been working to improve faculty working conditions in several areas. Faculty members have few spokesmen in the legislature; consequently, the CFR and other groups presenting college and university programs to the legislature find difficulty in obtaining full support for these programs. This can be changed, however. The CFR, in conjunction with the Council of Presidents, has developed the concept of the citizen committee. The presidents have announced that the highest priority in the institutional budgets will be salary increases for faculty.

The Committee of 1000 will consist of prominent citizens who will support higher education before the public and the legislature. It will include many individuals who are well known and highly respected throughout the state. We are fortunate that Wendell J. Satre, president of the Washington Water Power Company, Spokane; and Lloyd W. Nordstrom, co-chairman of the Board for the Seattle-based Nordstrom department store chain, are heading the Committee of 1000. The committee will utilize materials produced by a public relations firm, Jay Rockey Public Relations, Inc., Seattle. The campaign will stress the social and economic benefits to the state derived from maintaining high quality four-year public institutions. The campaign also will clearly indicate that our salaries are falling well behind the salaries of faculty in comparable states. A special case for significant salary increases beyond the average for all state employees currently is being made to the Governor and the legislature—but citizen, as well as faculty support, is absolutely necessary. The committee will give us strong support in restoring salaries to proper levels in the upcoming biennium.

Campaign plans are to raise approximately $40,000 to support the following activities:

1) producing a brochure for statewide distribution,
2) obtaining endorsements from a broad cross-section of the state population,
3) producing a special brochure for distribution to the legislature,
4) providing newsletters for the Committee of 1000 in order to facilitate coordination of the committee's efforts,
5) developing and paying for media releases,
6) producing a slide program to be used in community relations, and
7) making direct contact with legislators.
The citizen members of the Committee of 1000 will contribute $25 or more in addition to their personal efforts. We ask you to contribute $10, $15, or more. Your support is needed now to implement the campaign.

CFR members David Anderson, Helmi Habib, and Ken Harsha, along with Bill Lipsky (president of the Association of Administrators) and Rod Lalley (Alumni Director) are coordinating the solicitation of funds from the faculty and administrators at CWSC. Please feel free to contact them if you have any questions about the Committee of 1000 or the campaign.

(This letter was prepared and distributed at no expense to the state)

--------------------------Detach and return with your contribution--------------------------

Please make all contributions by check and payable to:

    CWSC-Committee of 1000

Your contribution should be mailed to:

    Helmi Habib, Treasurer
    CWSC-Committee of 1000
    Route 5, Box 136
    Ellensburg, Wa. 98926

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please Note: State law (Initiative 276) requires that the names of contributors to a political cause must be filed with the Public Disclosure Agency. The Committee of 1000 will file the names of all contributors to the campaign).

In addition, please suggest the names and addresses of those citizens that you would like to have serve on the Committee of 1000. Such citizens should not be state employees or their spouses. Suggested citizens will be contacted by the Committee of 1000 staff for possible participation in the campaign.

Suggested Committee Members and Addresses: (list below) Thank you.
Report of Senate Budget Committee in respect to the committee of 1000

We make no specific recommendations, but simply list the advantages and disadvantages as we view them.

Possible advantages:
1. If operated in good faith it will have positive effect on legislative thinking and action.
2. It will gain additional friends and support for higher education.
3. It will improve the working relationship between faculty and administration.
4. It will rally public opinion in support of University and College faculty.

Conclusion: At its best, it might be the preferable and most acceptable solution to a critical problem.

Possible disadvantages:
1. It would weaken organizational efforts and collective bargaining on each campus by diverting faculty focus from campus to outside the campus.
2. It would distort the salary problem at the expense of myriads of other faculty concerns.
3. It is a 'quick-shot' affair and would hamper faculty gains over the long haul.
4. It is unfairly financed in that the lowest paid faculty is expected to contribute the same as the highest paid.

Conclusion: At its worst, it might be an administrative public relations effort that would jeopardize the overall faculty voice on campus and might also weaken the drive toward strong collective bargaining.
MOTION (submitted by David Anderson)

RESOLVED; that the CWSC Faculty Senate endorse the solicitation of the faculty and administrators by the Council of Faculty Representatives for funds to support the Committee of 1000.

RESOLVED; that the CWSC Faculty Senate encourage the faculty and administrators to nominate citizens to the Council of Faculty Representatives for membership on the Committee of 1000.
Motion by Habib Richardson

Resolved: the Faculty Senate will conduct a faculty referendum (excluding adjunct faculty) on the following question:

"Considering the interests of the faculty in all means affecting them, do you approve or disapprove the actions of the President and his administration relative to those interests."

--- approve

--- disapprove

This referendum will be conducted no later than December 14, 1974.
MOTION

RESOLVED; An ad hoc committee shall be appointed by the Senate Executive Committee to be ratified by the Faculty Senate.

FURTHER; The ad hoc committee shall be charged to:

1) review the role of the presidency with the Board of Trustees, providing a faculty view of his proper responsibilities and rights,

2) develop a regular procedure with the Board of Trustees through which a president may be evaluated at regular intervals according to a specific description of his responsibilities and rights, further

3) this procedure shall include definite and appropriate means of involving the faculty in the evaluation.
To: Faculty Senate
From: Jim Brooks
Re: Request of CWSC-FT

I wish to request that the senate vote to approve or disapprove the request of the CWSC-FT and not table the motion or delay the vote until March 10, 1975, or some other date.

At question is the president's record to date. The CWSC-FT has raised questions about that record and I have provided answers. I doubt if a delay by the senate would suit the CWSC-FT, and I do not favor it. A delay would leave the request unanswered and would impair my position in representing the college in the crucial months ahead.

The members of the senate have been elected to serve as uninstructed representatives of their constituents—they are free to vote on matters according to their own reasoned judgments. Enough time has elapsed since the CWSC-FT submitted its proposal; if the senate is to maintain its credibility, it should take action.

I would welcome the development of criteria and procedures for the systematic evaluation of the president and his administration. In addition, it would be a great help to me to have the responsibilities of my office clearly identified and a priority order established with regard to these responsibilities. At present it is simply impossible for me to meet all of the expectations that are associated with my position.
The Referendum
November 13, 1974

The only question being asked the Faculty Senate today is, "Given the conditions facing C USC faculty members is it appropriate to ask about the leadership of President Brooks?" The Senate is not being asked to pass a vote of confidence or no confidence, but rather to hold a referendum so the total faculty can express its collective opinion. If the problems facing faculty members are serious ones then a vote of confidence/no confidence on President Brooks is legitimate.

Briefly, the well-known problems are these:

According to President Brooks September 20 memorandum and speech, faculty salaries at C USC are 13.50% below the seven-state comparison group and last among the state colleges and universities in Washington in estimated average faculty salaries for 1974-75 at a figure of $14,592. These figures are even more discouraging when you realize that roughly 9% of the last 15% in salary increases have occurred at the expense of travel, equipment, operating, and other support budgets. In other words, our salaries have increased only because working conditions deteriorated. As scale adjustments have become smaller and fewer, promotions have apparently been put on a "quota" system or some rationale other than those stated in the code.

As faculty members we find ourselves faced with a proposed code carrying conditions of employment that can be changed without our consent.

Departmental budgets for travel, equipment, and operations have been reduced or become non-existent. As these budgets have been reduced, control over what money has been put into these categories has been shifted from department to the Administration.

Last year, "financial exigence" was declared despite the fact that the state's revenues were increasing and running ahead of projections. As a result, we had a R-I-F policy not only drawn up but actually implemented; an implementation that later proved to be unnecessary. The damage the R-I-F policy did to faculty morale simply cannot be estimated but department was set against department and even faculty member against faculty member.

Sabbatical leaves now come from the instructional budget of a department.

Finally, the faculty is operating under an administration that can restructure the school without seriously consulting the faculty (e.g. The creation of three new schools since 1972) and can increase its own
numbers by 30% while faculty numbers decreased by 17.6% and students by 19%.

The above statements are factual and have not been denied by the administration. Neither Dr. Oehme's letter of October 24, 1974, nor President Brooks' memorandum of November 7, 1974, deny that these conditions exist, but rather offer their views as administrators, of why these circumstances have occurred.

Clearly the plight of CWSC's faculty has worsened markedly over the past few years. Given these conditions, it seems reasonable to ask to what extent has President Brooks' leadership or lack of leadership contributed to that state of affairs. Obviously President Brooks is not totally responsible for the plight of the faculty; external circumstances have been adverse (as is pointed out in the November 7 memorandum). Equally apparent however, is the fact that an institution can respond to adversity in numerous ways. The response is set and coordinated by the leadership of the institution, which at CWSC is led by James Brooks. Because faculty interest have forayed boldly and because CWSC might have responded differently to the difficulties of the 1970's, one can appropriately ask how well has President Brooks represented faculty interests and concerns over the past few years?

The Faculty Senate can respond in several ways to a call for this referendum:

1. It can postpone or table the motion until after the vote on the code and leave itself open to a charge of "parliamentary blackmail;"

2. By various parliamentary maneuvers, the Senate could refuse to take a stand on the referendum by postponing indefinitely etc. and thus deny the faculty a chance to express its collective opinion and perhaps have the action interpreted as a vote of confidence for President Brooks;

3. It could vote to hold the referendum and allow the faculty to express its confidence or lack of confidence in the President; or

4. Vote the notion down and indicate the plight of the faculty is not serious and/or that President Brooks has provided good leadership on faculty matters.

A referendum would not only allow the faculty a chance to express itself but would also inform President Brooks how he stands with the faculty. Most of the people in this room have probably been at social gatherings where strong criticism has been leveled against President Brooks and his leadership. Is that serious discontent or mere faculty "grumbling?" The referendum would answer the question and clear the air.
Redesignation of State Colleges as Universities

Why should the state legislature change the names of Washington's state colleges?

In the United States today, the term "college" is increasingly being reserved for two types of institutions: the specialized or single function undergraduate schools, such as colleges of mines, technology or education, and the two year schools that serve local areas, the community colleges. Other states have been applying the university title to former state colleges that have become multipurpose schools, offering graduate and undergraduate work, many degrees and programs and serving large geographical or political entities.

The change in name is seldom accompanied by a change in institutional function. It simply acknowledges the new level of complexity that the institutions have achieved. The institutions no longer resemble "colleges", but fit the mold of "regional universities", as now commonly thought of in this country. They have become major components in regional educational patterns.

Universities are now generally defined as four year institutions of reasonable size having competent faculties, good physical facilities and instructional resources, many degree programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, technical and career courses, and several schools, each reporting to a dean. Such institutions are multipurpose in nature, and emphasize teaching balanced with public service and research according to the needs of their service areas. Doctoral level work is not a requirement for the title, nor is the presence of medical schools, law schools, etc. Accreditation agencies throughout the United States have recognized the title for such four year schools.

Central, Eastern and Western were created by the state in 1890. They have gone through a progression of changes since that time, increasingly becoming multipurpose in nature. Similar to many other institutions in America, their names have been changed from normal school to college of education to state college--and in each case the name change reflected, rather than caused, a change in the complexity and function of the institutions.

Each of the state colleges in Washington has reached a size and a level of organization which demands that it be called a university. Each school offers a variety of pre-professional programs, grants many undergraduate degrees in the arts and sciences as well as in education, provides career and technical education, and offers graduate work in several areas leading to the degrees of Master of Arts, Master of Education, and Master of Science. Each institution is organized administratively into schools. Each institution emphasizes teaching, public service and research at the undergraduate and graduate level. The change
in name from college to university would reflect the actual status of each institution as it exists today, and would not in any way indicate a change in function or academic allocation for any of the institutions.

Changing the titles of the present state colleges to universities would in no way be an attempt to "sell" a college degree with a university title. The academic programs currently provided at Central, Eastern and Western are just as good as they are any place in the state or nation where university titles are used. The credits and degrees transfer to all other institutions and the programs are accredited by the same agencies. In addition, in terms of academic preparation and experience, the faculty is far better qualified than those found at many comparable schools that were designated "university" years ago, and the range of the academic offerings in many cases is far broader.

There is a need to clarify the current roles of Central, Eastern and Western. These three schools should be clearly identified as different from the two year schools. Many of the two year schools, such as Centralia College, Clark College, Olympic College, no longer include the words "community" or "junior" in their titles. It is more difficult for the general public to differentiate between the two year schools and institutions offering graduate work in addition to four years of undergraduate work, when all of the schools are named "colleges." The title of "university" for the senior schools would serve to clarify the differences in the public mind. There is also the problem of clarification between the state colleges and Washington's smaller private institutions that have long used the university title without academic programs, faculty, and resources that are more impressive than the state colleges.

Central, Eastern and Western maintain competent faculties. In hiring, competition for the best faculty members is still keen, and recruitment takes place throughout the United States. The three Washington schools, which are not well known in all areas of the country, must compete for staff with similar institutions that bear the university name. Many prospective candidates for positions in Washington find it difficult to understand why Central, Eastern and Western are still named "state colleges." Obviously, they are aware of the current use of the university title. Presidents of institutions which have had their names changed from college to university in Wisconsin, Tennessee, Colorado, Indiana and Texas, have indicated that recruitment of the best faculty members has been facilitated by the change in name at their respective institutions. Clearly, the name "university" now designates to prospective faculty members an institution with multiple purposes, graduate and undergraduate programs and research and public service.

Better students often are attracted to an institution known as a "university." Such students usually stay at the institution through their graduation. Prospective students, like most of the public, have difficulty realizing that Central, Eastern and Western are now complex institutions offering a wide variety of programs. The title "university" would indicate to such prospective students the situation at these three schools as it already exists. An identical argument can be advanced for the recruitment of graduate students, particularly in situations where
the three institutions attempt to obtain graduate students who are products of schools outside of the Washington system.

Changing the names of the three institutions to universities should help them secure federal and private funds for research, scholarships, equipment grants, and grants for institutes. Granting agencies cannot be expected to be knowledgeable about each of the hundreds of institutions that apply to them for funds. Competition for such funds is keen. The title "university" would indicate to these agencies the true status of the three schools in Washington which are now competing for funds with the title of "state colleges."

Each of the three schools is interested in obtaining outside sources of funds. Each school has a faculty desirous of doing research appropriate to its educational mission and each school is anxious to increase scholarship funds for students. Experiences at schools throughout the country indicate that changing the name of a school to "university" enhances the possibilities of obtaining outside sources of funds. Private citizens, including alumni, appear more willing to contribute to an institution which is a "university" than they are to support a "college."

Eight years ago approximately forty percent of the institutions in this country similar to Central, Eastern and Western had already had their names changed to universities. Here are some of the comments made by their administrators at that time:

1. Perhaps in no area has our change of name had a greater impact than in the area of obtaining funds from federal and private sources. John E. Visser, Executive Assistant to the President, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

2. There is no question about the fact that people who are established scholars and who have earned the doctorate are more interested in establishing a connection with an institution that carries the word "University" in its title than those classed as "Colleges." James G. Gee, President, Texas State University, Commerce, Texas.

3. Relationships with the legislature, the public, the students, and prospective faculty have, in my judgment, been better because of this action than they would have been otherwise...W. E. Morgan, President, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

4. Our relationships with the alumni, students, and prospective faculty members has been greatly improved as a result of the change. Quill E. Cope, President, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.

5. Our alumni love it. I have never had so much favorable "fan mail." The student bodies of all the state universities are pleased with the new title. Our legislators like it and our appropriations have reflected their confidence in us. Faculty recruitment has been a bit easier. Our image has also been enhanced in the eyes of the federal government and especially regional foundations. E. H.
Kleinpell, President, Wisconsin State University--River Falls, River Falls, Wisconsin.

6. Some of our older graduates out of ancient habit still refer to us as the "Normal School" and find it difficult to call their school "State University." But I detect a real sense of pride which our alumni have in the University label, and I would like to think that alumni support, especially in the solicitation of funds for our foundation, has grown accordingly. K. W. Meyer, President, Wisconsin State University, Superior, Wisconsin.

7. I am new in this post, having assumed the Presidency only in September, but in my travels throughout the state, I have observed that the public has been very receptive to the broader concept of the institution as a university. William E. Davis, President, Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho.

8. We do think there is one influence that can be noted and that is that the American College Testing scores on our students have been going up more rapidly. It would appear that we are getting a little better selection of students than we were before. H. M. Briggs, President, South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota.

9. Some years ago when the resolution to change our name from "college" to "university" came before the Council of Presidents, I was the only person to vote against the resolution. My colleagues won by a vote of eight to one and some months later our Board of Regents made it official. Now, with a couple of years experience, I am convinced that my original position was an incorrect one. E. H. Kleinpell, President, Wisconsin State University--River Falls, River Falls, Wisconsin. (See also statement 5).

10. On the part of most students, there is a tremendous desire to graduate from a university...Being a university has been effective in keeping a large number of good students, upperclassmen, here through graduation. Burgin E. Dossett, President, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.

11. Size has made possible multiplicity of academic programs, has made possible the vast development of the liberal arts, has strengthened both teacher education and other programs. The name change has reflected this change more than caused it. Walker D. Wyman, President, Wisconsin State University, Whitewater, Wisconsin.

Central, Eastern and Western have reached a size and complexity to warrant changing their names to universities. The advantages of such a name change have already been realized by many similar institutions throughout the country. It must be emphasized that a change in name to university does not imply a desire on the part of the institutions to
change their functions or to add new high cost areas and professional schools such as medicine, law, etc. It is simply a desire to end the inconsistency between the existing functions of these institutions and their names. Proper recognition should be given to these institutions and their faculty, students and graduates, by application of the university title.