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Roll Call
Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Arlt, Baath, Bowman, Myers, Nelson, Olivero, Romboy, Starbuck, Wirth and Yeh.
Visitors: Lori Sudermann, Russ Schultz, Libby Street, Carolyn Wells and Anne Denman.

Changes to Agenda
None

Approval of Minutes
*MOTION NO. 2955* Rob Perkins moved and Barry Donahue seconded a motion to approve the April 6, 1994, Faculty Senate meeting minutes as distributed. Motion passed.

Communications
-3/30/94 memo from Libby Street, Chair-Senate Personnel Committee, regarding Distinguished Faculty of the University and Shared Faculty Positions; referred to Executive Committee and Code Committee.
-4/1/94 letter from Beverly Heckart, Chair-Cede Committee, regarding 3/30/94 Personnel Committee report on Distinguished Faculty and Shared Faculty Positions; referred to 1994-95 Cede Committee.
-4/6/94 memo from Charles McGehee, Chair-Academic Affairs Committee, recommending service on Honors Convocation Planning Committee proposed by Provost; referred to Provost.
-4/6/94 letter from William Dunning, Art, regarding phased retirement; referred to Executive Committee and Code Committee.
-4/6/94 memo from President Ivory Nelson regarding Faculty Senate Budget Chair participation at Deans' Council; referred to Executive Committee and Budget Committee.
-4/11/94 memo from Charles McGehee, Chair-Academic Affairs Committee, regarding grade inflation; see Academic Affairs Committee report (below).
-4/14/94 report from Libby Street, Chair-Personnel Committee, regarding salary adjustment proposal; see Personnel Committee report (below).

Reports
1. **Chair**

   - Chair Nesselroad reported that the 1993-94 and 1994-95 Faculty Senate Executive Committees will meet on May 4 with the Provost and academic deans to consider faculty nominations to next year's university standing committees. There are vacant positions available on next year's Senate Personnel Committee and Senate Curriculum Committee (School of Business/Economics position).

   - Chair Nesselroad reminded the Senate that the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences will be split into two divisions in Fall 1994. Robert Brown will continue in the position of acting dean of the Social, Behavioral and Natural Sciences group. An internal search is under way for a dean of Arts and Humanities, with an application deadline of May 6 and appointment deadline of July 1, 1994 [Search Committee Membership: Gary Lewis, Dean of Library Services - CHAIR; John Brangwin, ASCWU/BOD - Student; James Brown, Political Science; Bobby Cummings, English; Cynthia Kriebel, Art; David Lygre, Chemistry; and Rosco Tolman, Foreign Languages]. The Chair referred Senators to a statement made by President Nelson at the March 9, 1994, Faculty Senate meeting in which he pointed out that "the division of CLAS into two more administratively manageable units is the first phase in a continuing process of study and discussion regarding the structural/functional configuration of CLAS and its constituent departments." Chair Nesselroad stated that the effectiveness and success of the initial CLAS reorganization as well as the course reorganization will take in the future will largely rest on an excellent pool of candidates applying for the dean's position. He recommended that Senators strongly encourage qualified applicants for the position.

   - Budget hearings have been scheduled on the following dates (details available from Office of Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs):
     - April 29 - Capital Budget 1995-2001; VP, Dean, Director presentations
     - May 4 - Capital Budget 1995-2001; VP recommendations
     - May 6 - Operating Budget 1994-95 and 1995-97; All area presentations
     - May 11 - 1994-95 and 1995-97; VP recommendations

   - The Chair reported that Deans' Council has recently adopted a "Policy for Centers and Institutes," drafted a Decanal [i.e., "deans"] Evaluation Instrument and process, and received a report on "Academic Program Planning" and its interface with the 6-year university Strategic Plan.
1. **CHAIR, continued**

Chair Nesselroad stated that Connie Roberts, Special Assistant to the Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment, received a request from Katrina Meyer of the Higher Education Coordinating (HEC) Board for information related to the Faculty Workload Study. Ms. Meyer requested "a short statement of progress made in your data collection effort" as well as "a short description of the process you intend to follow for developing policy recommendations for your campus." Dr. Roberts delivered a "talking paper" on this topic to Deans' Council for discussion on April 11, and Chair Nesselroad solicited responses to the "talking paper" from the chairs of the Senate Academic Affairs, Personnel and Code Committees. The Chair submitted an April 15 response to Dr. Roberts which included a recommendation to create a task force made up of three School/College deans, the Chair of Chairs, Faculty Senate Chair, member of Senate Personnel Committee, member of Code Committee, and Special Assistant to the Provost to 1) analyze the data, identify concerns, and define the problem; 2) review existing policies to determine if revision or enforcement is necessary, and 3) define what issues need to go to the Faculty Senate and what issues are addressed by the President's Cabinet, Deans' Council and Chairs' Group.

-Chair Nesselroad reported that the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC) requires that "in the fifth year of the ten year cycle, institutions are required to submit an interim report reflecting their responses to the recommendations of the previous evaluation team and the rationale therefor, a description of the major changes effected since the last evaluation, and a summary of significant changes contemplated for the future." The Chair reminded the Senate that, although the NASC team recognized the overall high quality of Central's instructional staff, it expressed concern regarding the faculty governance system, the faculty reward structure, and the curricular review and approval process. In response to criticisms of the governance structure, the Faculty Senate created an Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance [Members: Connie Roberts, Dean of Undergraduate Studies - CHAIR; Anne Denman, Associate Dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences; Charles McGehee, Faculty Senate Chair; Joan Mossbar, Assistant Dean of the School of Business and Economics; Russ Schultz, Chair of the Music Department; and John Silva, Psychology] which conducted a two year study on the subject and produced its "University Governance Final Report" in August 1992 [copies of report available from Faculty Senate office]. Chair Nesselroad stated that he is committed to strengthening the Faculty Senate's standing committee structure and membership to provide more continuity on long-term projects. The NASC team also noted in their report that "criteria for promotion, tenure, and merit salary increments seem unclear and inconsistently applied." Chair Nesselroad reported that the Senate Personnel Committee has worked for the past four years to develop a criteria-based approach to merit awards (see Personnel Committee Report below). The university's curriculum review and approval process has been reformed and streamlined, and the Senate Curriculum Committee is rewriting the "Curriculum Planning and Procedures" guide to reflect the changes. A Deans' Retreat has been scheduled for June 8 and 9 to review procedures for faculty promotion and tenure. The Senate Chair, current and incoming Senate Personnel Committee chairs will be invited to attend the Retreat; the Senate Chair is requesting that the Code Committee chair also be invited.

Senator Charles McGehee, Sociology, pointed out that, although recent changes in the Senate standing committee membership to allow non-Senators to serve have not proved completely successful, the changes were originally designed to enhance the committees' effectiveness and their workings with the Senate.

2. **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Academic Affairs Committee Chair Charles McGehee presented the committee's report on Grade Inflation:

**REPORT ON GRADE INFLATION**

On October 15, 1994, the Academic Affairs Committee was charged to review the grade distribution and make recommendations to the Senate. Following is our report.

The Committee's work was guided by the recommendation of last year's Academic Affairs Committee which called for:

1. collecting data on grade distribution at CWU,
2. studying the impact of withdrawals on grade distribution,
3. studying the impact of transfer students on GPA,
4. formulating possible university-wide grading policies,
5. holding small group faculty forums to discuss grading policy, and
6. developing university-wide grading policies for Senate action.

In response to these recommendations the Committee has done the following:

1. The Committee gathered data on grade distribution at CWU. As expected it shows a great range of grades between courses, departments, and schools. The Committee judged this to be an exercise in futility, however, in that in no way did it tell us how or whether the grades were justified. Merely observing a given level, regardless of how finely it is divided and subjected to statistical analysis, will tell us nothing about the validity of those grades as long as grading remains within the subjective judgement of individual faculty.

The very idea of "grade inflation" suggests that grades, as currency, have lost a value which they once had, a value which presumably was superior to that which they now possess. Since it is relativistic, however, the notion of "grade inflation" does not address the question of why earlier grades necessarily should be regarded as more valid.
2. **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, continued**

**REPORT ON GRADE INFLATION, continued**

than present ones. The simple observation that present grades are higher than earlier could be explained in many ways, many of which reflect value judgements. We wish to avoid the presumption of judgement simply based on our perceptions and values. Nor do we wish to judge the grading practices of others without regard to the conditions which produced them.

We were concerned to know the effect of withdrawals and incompletes on grade distribution. Information we obtained indicates that the number of hardship withdrawals varies with the specific person granting them. While one might be tempted to conclude that this suggests too many withdrawals, a differential, in and of itself, does not speak to the validity of either of the variables.

Beyond that, we did gather data on withdrawals and incompletes, but, again, it was not possible to determine their relationship to grades which might have been avoided or enhanced. Information is not and has never been recorded which would shed light on this question. Because of the relatively small number of cases and the difficulty of establishing motives reliably, the committee does not regard it useful to conduct a long-term study of the question.

We did not gather information on the impact of transfer students on the GPA at Central. The data we did gather on local grading indicated clearly that there is wide variation in grading. Separating out transfer students would not have given useful information to help understand this phenomenon. On the contrary, pursuing this line of inquiry would serve only to point a finger of blame elsewhere while allowing CWU's own high GPA's to go unquestioned.

We have formulated no university-wide grading policy. Again, in order to do so, we would have to understand and grasp the issues thoroughly and we do not. Indeed, we have concluded that no one has such a grasp, either. A recent article in the Seattle P-I (November 15, 1993) indicates that the U of W also has no grasp and articles in the Chronicle of Higher Education in recent years indicate that the concerns are nation-wide.

We did not hold small faculty group forums to discuss possible grading policies. Without a framework for such a discussion we judged that such would be yet another exercise in futility which would degenerate quickly into handwringing and finger pointing. In our view this would be pointless.

Accordingly, we bring no policy to the Senate for action, poor policy being worse than no policy at all.

The Committee concludes that the issue cannot be resolved simply by identifying departments and programs which give "too high" grades. "Too high" is meaningful only with respect to some standard, and there is no standard for grading. Complaints about grading practices, in our experience, come, not-infrequently, from one or more segments of the university which regard themselves as the heart or custodian of the enterprise.

While this is not intended as a criticism, it is to point out that judgments about grading come from a perspective and are relative to some sort of a standard of goodness.

Unfortunately, the standard published in the University catalogue does not shed much light on the matter. It reads:

A "C" grade indicates that a student has made substantial progress toward meeting the objectives of the course and has fulfilled the requirements of the course. The grades above "C" are used for those students who have demonstrated some degree of superiority. The highest grade, "A", is reserved for those students who have excelled in every phase of the course. The "B" grade is for students whose work is superior but does not warrant the special distinctiveness of the "A". The "D" is a grade for those students who have made progress toward meeting the objectives of the course but who have fulfilled the requirements only in a substandard manner. The "F" is reserved for students who have failed to meet or have accomplished so few of the requirements of the course that they are not entitled to credit. (1991/93 CWU Undergraduate Catalogue, p. 31.)

By linking grades to fulfillment of course requirements, it leaves open the question of what those course requirements are. Requirements may be few or many, tough or easy, Important or trivial, and any grade reflecting their fulfillment necessarily reflects the value placed the underlying requirement. Indeed, we have concluded that no policy on grading is possible until a consensus on the use of grades has been developed. Toward such an end we have identified some 31 uses of grades many of which deviate from the university policy.

**Uses of Grades:**

1. Assessment of degree of fulfillment of course objectives. (University policy)
2. Assessment of degree of fulfillment of course requirements. (University policy combines this with item no. 1, though the two are not necessarily the same.)
3. Assessment of degree of command of subject matter.
4. Assessment of job-related competency as determined by faculty.
5. Assessment of job-related competency as determined by outside interests.
6. Assessment of extent of labor expended in course.
7. Reward for labor expended.
8. Punishment for lack of labor expended.
9. Incentive for future labor expended.
2. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, continued

REPORT ON GRADE INFLATION, continued

2. Deterrence for future lack of labor expended.
3. Reward for fulfillment of course objectives.
4. Punishment for lack of fulfillment of course objectives.
5. Incentive for future fulfillment of course objectives.
6. Deterrence for future lack of fulfillment of course objectives.
7. Reward for conformity to instructor's views and values.
8. Punishment for lack of conformity to instructor's view and values.
10. Means for avoidance of harm to students' self-esteem and affirmation.
11. Means to influence students' view of instructor relative to interpersonal relations with instructor.
12. Means to influence colleagues' view of instructor relative to interpersonal relations with instructor.
14. Means to influence students' view of instructor relative to instructional evaluations.
15. Means for influencing prospective employers on behalf of students.
16. Means for establishing or legitimating reputation of instructor.
17. Means for legitimating course requirements.
18. Means for influencing prospective graduate schools on behalf of students.
19. Means for expressing instructor's view of CWU.
21. Means for expressing instructor's view of CWU.
23. Means for expressing instructor's view of CWU.
27. Means for avoiding personal evaluations of students.
29. Means for avoiding personal evaluations of students.
31. Means for avoiding personal evaluations of students.

There are no doubt other reasons which could be added to this list. The point, however, is this: The question of grading practices cannot be discussed meaningfully unless and until one of two things comes about: (1) a consensus is established about the meaning and function of grades, or (2) the need for a consensus is eliminated, which is to say, the need for grades is eliminated.

The task is not impossible, the evidence for which is that schools such as The Evergreen State College have eliminated grades. Evergreen was new when that occurred and did so with a hand-selected faculty which was chosen because they were already committed to eliminating grades. Furthermore, the experiment was carried out on students who were also sympathetic to the idea. In the case of schools such as CWU, one has to contend with a large, tenured faculty which is by and large committed to principles of grading. At that, it was many years before Evergreen was taken seriously by the outside world, and for many it still is anathema.

Still, on the assumption that grades are "too high" (leaving open the question of what that means) it may be possible to lower grades overall by introduction of certain untested measures:

1. Reduce or eliminate Withdrawals. No data exist nor is it likely possible to generate any concerning the use of W's to avoid poor grades. Nevertheless, there is speculation that it is frequently the case, and reducing or eliminating peremptory Withdrawals (non-hardship) would reduce or eliminate this possible factor. It would also reduce or eliminate any other value of the W's while doing nothing to curb the high number of A's being given.

2. Reduce or eliminate Incompletes. Again, no data exist nor is it likely possible to generate any concerning the use of I's to avoid poor grades. Nevertheless, there is speculation that it is frequently the case, and reducing or eliminating Incompletes would reduce or eliminate this factor. It would also reduce or eliminate any other value of I's.

3. Bring administrative pressure to bear on faculty to reduce grades. This would leave the question of the meaning of grades up to administrators and put them in the position of replacing faculty judgement and dictating academic policy. Depending on the level of fear induced in faculty it might drive grades down but at the cost of limiting the faculty's academic judgement.

4. Distribute grades throughout the faculty for general review and comment. The motivating mechanism here is humiliation and ridicule. For this to be effective, however, departments and faculty must have closer communication and be influenced by each other's opinion. In our judgement, there is little interpersonal communication on campus and a great deal of indifference toward the opinions of others.

5. Conduct department/school meetings/workshops on grading philosophy and practices. Experience suggests that such sessions result in handwringing or preaching to the choir, that is, they produce little new of benefit. Given the many possible uses of grades, such a mechanism is unlikely to produce any consensus.

6. Institute administrative talks with high schools and community colleges about grading practices. While this may be of value relative to the preparation of graduates who enter CWU, it assumes that the problem would be eliminated if the grades of entering students were "genuine." It does not address the question of why a student who received an undeserved A in high school or community college also may receive an equally undeserved A at Central. In other words, it is not clear how questionable grading practices elsewhere explain questionable grading practices here.

7. Request the HEC Board develop a policy on grading. While this may establish uniformity of grading, it would be academically costly in that grading would be removed from the faculty to be guided by the values of a political bureaucracy.
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8. Eliminate GPA criteria for entrance into or retention in or graduation from a program. This would reduce the possibility of grades being given to avoid losing, gaining or keeping students. On the other hand, it would also mean substituting other criteria for assessment, such as performance review.

9. Eliminate extra credit work which simply substitutes for earlier, poor performance. Extra credit work to replace earlier poor performance give the illusion of substance without the reality. While this may seem an intrusion on faculty judgment, faculty subverting their own standards in such a way to alter their own judgement may be a topic for discussion.

10. Record average class grade next to student's grade on the transcript. This, presumably, will give anyone viewing the grade a basis for assessing its validity. It does not lower the general GPA, but merely puts the reader on notice that what is presented needs to be interpreted. The viewer is left to judge the meaning of the grade, however, without adequate information, such as the N, standard deviation, or the nature of the class.

11. Convert skill/performance/activity credits to S/U. Some classroom/laboratory activities or other courses are better reflected on the transcript as S/U. To the extent that there are courses which produce high letter grades when it is virtually impossible to get anything but high grades, departments -- under the leadership of the deans -- should examine changing their designation commensurate with university curriculum policy and the requirements of accrediting agencies. We have no evidence that this proposal would have any great impact on the overall question of grades. Philosophically, though, it does speak to the perception that grades from some courses are less defensible than others.

To the extent that employers do not place a great deal of faith in grades, relying instead on performance based criteria for judging the adequacy of prospective employees, "grade inflation" would seem to be largely of concern only to academics. If performance is indeed the measure of choice in the outside world, we should be trying to insure that our students can perform up to the level our grades say they can rather than trying to bring grades down to the level of actual student performance.

The day that students can read, write, calculate and reason effectively, that is the day talk of grade inflation will cease.

The Academic Affairs Committee knows no other means for dealing with the matter. End of report.

* * * *

In response to questions from Senators, committee chair McGehee stated that the Academic Affairs Committee had access to grading data and acknowledged major differences in grade distribution by discipline. Nevertheless, the Committee was unable to draw any conclusions from this data and found no apparent consistency in how or why individual faculty utilize grades. Registrar Carolyn Wells responded to questions concerning the credit/no credit option by stating that students may not elect the credit/no credit option for courses in basic requirements, majors or minors or the professional education sequence; credit/no credit courses must be selected from breadth requirements and free electives, with a maximum of one course per quarter and a total of 15 credits earned under this option toward the 180 required for the bachelor's degree. Senators suggested further discussion on the topic of grading, including review of "infinite scale" systems such as that used at the University of Washington (e.g., a grade point system based on 10ths rather than letter grades) as well as comparative systems such as those used in Canada (e.g., comprehensive transcript evaluation based on more data, such as number of students in the class plus grades plus standard deviation, etc.). Senator Charles Rubin, Geology, stated that his experience has been that prospective employers and graduate schools rely heavily on student grades to make hiring/recruitment/admission decisions.

3. **BUDGET COMMITTEE**

Budget Committee chair Barry Donahue reported that the Committee is working to encourage more faculty involvement in the budgeting process. The Committee is more clearly defining its role in order to become more effective earlier in the budgeting process and has asked the Provost for Budget Committee representation on Deans' Council.

4. **CODE COMMITTEE**

No report.

5. **CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

Curriculum Committee member Steve Olson presented for discussion a Program Addition for Bachelor of Music/Music Business [vote to be held on May 18, 1994] :

**BACHELOR OF MUSIC — MUSIC BUSINESS** [full text printed on agenda]

- **Music Core:** 94 credits
- **Business Area:** 41 credits
- **General Studies:** 60-61 credits
- **Total Credits:** 194-196
5. **CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, continued**

Justification for the addition: "This program has been offered as an individual studies degree on the Bachelor of Music for the past seven years at Central. Indeed, the Bachelor of Music – Music Business program was accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music during the Music Department’s accreditation renewal in 1982 and reaccredited in the 1992 renewal. Therefore, this proposal is simply a request to formally acknowledge a program of study which already exists. The Music Department has experienced numerous problems when students attempt to apply for admission into this particular major. Formal acknowledgement of this program should remove these registration and application problems. There seems to be no documentation regarding the rationale for establishment of this program as an individual studies degree... As the classes required for this degree are currently being taught there is no burden placed on the university to offer new courses... The impact on departmental load is negligible... Since the program is currently in effect as an individual studies major, there should be no (or at the most, minimal) cost to placing this program formally in our curriculum... Current and projected student enrollment is 15." *Senator Olson stated that the Music Core plus Business Area credits equal 135, and the Senate Curriculum Committee voted by a margin of 9 to 1 to recommend the Program Addition. He referred Senators to the "Curriculum Planning and Procedures" guide (updated November 1991, pages 18-19), which states that "The Bachelor of Music (B.Mus.) degree designation is reserved for those undergraduate programs which are intended to prepare students for professional careers in music. They include the general education program, a specialization and free elective courses. Majors shall be limited according to the policy governing professional degrees (see below). The minimum number of credits required for the degree is 180. Other Bachelor’s degrees may be offered where extended professional instruction can be shown to be necessary to qualify students to engage in specific professional or occupational fields for which neither the Bachelor of Arts nor the Bachelor of Science designation is appropriate. No more than 110 credits beyond the General Education requirements may be specified in a program for such degrees. Although all of these credits may be in one department, programs of large size should draw as widely as possible from the resources of other departments. Exceptions to the credit limits for major concentrations for all undergraduate degrees may be granted by the University Curriculum Committee and the Senate upon a showing of necessity by the proposing department which shall include, but not be limited to, documentary evidence of the following: 1) Standards established by a national accrediting organization for the program. The accreditation process must accredit the program, not the student; 2) Programs of similar content and size offered at comparable institutions of higher education; 3) contemporary employment practices in the involved profession."

Senators were critical of the extent by which this major exceeds both the 110 credit guideline for undergraduate majors and the 123 credits required for other Bachelor of Music degrees. A Senator stated that the Bachelor of Music/Music Business major is, in effect, a double major and questioned how long it would take to complete the course of study. Music Department Chair Russ Schultz stated that students enter this program of study with full knowledge of its content, and it may take as long as six years to complete. It was pointed out that including some of the Business Area courses in the General Studies area could reduce the total number of credit hours required for the degree. Dr. Schultz stated that the course configuration within the major is largely a result of NASM accreditation standards. He added that this major is widely offered at other universities and provides students with the minimum skills they will need for future employment in the music industry. Senators stated that Business area skills are highly desirable as an adjunct to any area of study, and approval of this major would set a precedent for other disciplines to create similar majors which greatly exceed the 110 credit limit on undergraduate majors. Several Senators recommended that the School of Business and Economics work toward developing a Business Minor for non-Business majors to fill this apparent need.

6. **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

Personnel Committee Chair Libby Street delivered a report on the Salary Adjustment Proposal.

**REPORT ON SALARY ADJUSTMENT PROPOSAL**

You may recall that at its final meeting during academic year 1992-93, the Senate adopted four motions related to the Salary Adjustment Proposal:
- "Eligibility for salary adjustment will be determined in relation to a set of departmental criteria that the school dean certifies meet minimum university standards."
- "Two levels of salary adjustment will be specified in relation to established criteria at each level."
- "A level 1 salary increment shall be granted to all of those who meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service."
- "A level 2 salary increment shall be granted to all of those who meet the level 2 criteria in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service in any one area of teaching, scholarship, and service."

Additional motions had been sent forward for consideration by the Senate Personnel Committee but were held pending action by individual departments to refine the draft criteria that had been proposed by the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee now has feedback from all of the school and college deans indicating that departments have either adopted the criteria as proposed, refined the criteria in a form that is consistent with the spirit of the originally proposed criteria, or objected to the procedure and chosen not to address the criteria. The deans
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appear to have concluded that no further progress will be made by departments who have taken exception to the 
procedure.

So that it will be a matter of the record, I will summarize the concerns brought forward by departments 
and/or deans regarding the proposal:

1. There appeared to be some miscommunication about the level 1 criteria. Based on the feedback received from the 
faculty survey that began this process, an attempt was made to reinstate a salary increment for individuals who are 
performing acceptably to the university. Previously, this form of increment was called professional growth. It was 
eliminated because there was a sense that there were no criteria governing decisions to award it. Thus, the level 1 
criteria were included to ensure that individuals meeting minimum criteria of the university would be benefitted above 
those who are not meeting minimum criteria. When professional growth was eliminated, there was some sense that 
across the board raises would substitute for professional growth. However, the procedure failed to allow for greater 
salary enhancement for those who were contributing at a designated level in teaching, scholarship, and service than 
for those who were not.

2. Some individuals interpreted the criteria as being comparative. For example, one person indicated that the current 
criteria in scholarship lead one to believe that two presentations at regional meetings are equated with a Nobel Prize. 
This was, of course, not our intent. The criteria suggest thresholds only: the point above which individuals will be 
included in the salary adjustment pool and below which they will be excluded. Our committee has felt throughout that 
state salary allowances can never adequately compensate some of the more magnificent accomplishments of our 
faculty. It is noteworthy that our current system allows two individuals of extremely disparate accomplishment to 
benefit equally. e.g., the #1 and #2 ranked person in a given department may share no similarity in terms of 
accomplishment yet both may be awarded a salary increment. Further, the current system allows for one of two 
individuals with like accomplishments to receive a salary increment while the other does not. This newly proposed 
system attempts to establish cutoff points on the basis of acceptable criteria rather than arbitrarily or capriciously on 
the basis of money allocation.

3. We’ve heard both that the criteria are too tough and not tough enough. Some departments reported that their faculty 
could never meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas; others indicated that they would not retain a faculty member 
who could not meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas. It seemed impossible for our committee to resolve the 
disparate positions of these two groups. Thus, we have chosen to retain the criteria as proposed. Ideally, a trial run 
would help us to identify just how reasonable the criteria are. Departments that are particularly concerned might want 
to do a trial run during the remainder of this year and submit their findings to the Senate. Of course, if all members 
of a department are found to qualify at both level 1 and level 2, we would still need to determine whether the criteria 
are not sufficiently demanding or the department is exceedingly wonderful.

4. The criteria that were proposed did not address faculty who hold largely administrative positions. While administrative 
faculty are expected to contribute in service and scholarship in much the same way teaching faculty do, we were 
asked to consider additional criteria based on their administrative responsibilities to replace the teaching criteria 
applied to teaching faculty.

5. We received considerable feedback about the potential for inequitable financial gain across years. We have refined 
one of our motions to address this problem but very frankly were unable to solve what is essentially a funding 
problem of the university. Truly, the only way to avoid the problem raised by some faculty that one might “waste” 
contributions in a year of minimal funding is to give across the board increments to all faculty each year and eliminate 
performance-based increases of any kind. We are not recommending this approach.

Overall, the number of departments that have worked with the proposal and the criteria considerably 
ceeds the number who have not. While we respect the concerns that have been raised, we know of no way to 
resolve all the concerns of the objecting departments. Thus, the Personnel Committee now comes forward with the 
remaining motions from the original proposal. Two of the motions have been somewhat refined from those presented 
in the spring of last year.

We are now asking the Senate to take action on the following motions:

1. “Level 1 evaluations shall be based on performance since the last level 1 (or in the old system, merit) award and 
likewise, level 2 evaluations shall be based on performance since the last level 2 award.”
   
   Rationale: Faculty members should be able to accumulate service from one increment to another. Further 
accumulations should be specific to the level of the award that has been received.

2. “The draft criteria proposed by the Personnel Committee will act as the default criteria for all departments except 
those whose modifications have been approved by their school or college dean. Individual departmental criteria may 
be modified after consultation with and approval by the appropriate school or college dean and the provost.”
   
   Rationale: Each department had an opportunity to streamline the criteria in keeping with their departmental mission 
and unique characteristics. Departments that have not yet agreed on suitable criteria should be evaluated by a 
common set of criteria until such time as they and their dean agree to a more individualized set of criteria. Further, 
departments may find that their logical criteria do not work well in practice and should have an opportunity for further 
refinement in consultation with their dean.
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3. "Full-time department chairs will be evaluated using the default or their individual departmental criteria for scholarship and service and a set of administrative criteria that have been approved by the school or college dean and the provost."

**Rationale:** Full-time department chairs are not expected to be involved in teaching. They should be evaluated in relation to their job description. However, they, like all faculty members, are expected to maintain a record of scholarship and service.

4. "The amount of money available from the legislature for salary adjustment (less that necessary for promotion) shall be divided by the number of individuals eligible at level 1 plus the number of individuals eligible at level 2. The amount derived from this calculation shall establish the unit of increment except that units shall always represent a minimum of a nominal .5% (technically .4939) scale adjustment or a multiple of .5%. Available money between multiples of .5% and/or available money in excess of that necessary to ensure a full step (3%) increase for each level earned shall be distributed as a scale adjustment. Equity adjustments will not be deducted from the money available for salary adjustments until the criteria specified here have been met.

**Rationale:** After much discussion of the comments of faculty, the Personnel Committee modified this statement to ensure that the only way in which equity or scale adjustments would be possible is that each person eligible to receive an increment at either level has achieved a full step increase for each level. The .5% figure is viewed as a minimum only and would never function as the actual distribution per level except in those cases where the legislature’s award to the university for salary adjustment is in the neighborhood of a 1% increase overall. Let’s suppose that every person in the university met the minimum criteria at level 1 and that half met the criteria at level 2. If the group meeting the criteria at level 2 were equally distributed across the salary range, money would be diverted to salary and scale adjustment only when the amount from the legislature exceeded approximately 4.5% of current salaries for salary adjustment. The essential effect of this implementation is that each step will become a salary range instead of a fixed salary. Thus each step becomes a salary range with six possible salaries that are separated by 0.5%. So, for example, a person at step 19 who receives a 0.5% unit increase would be at step 19.1. Step 19.5 would represent a 2.5% increment after which an additional 0.5% unit would move the salary to step 20.

5. "Each faculty member will be independently evaluated by the department chair, a departmental personnel committee, and the school dean using common criteria; any disagreements will be resolved in a meeting between the chair, the personnel committee, and the dean.

**Rationale:** Concurrence by several parties helps to ensure the validity of the process. Because the recommended system requires only a checklist and documentation, evaluation of files should be relatively speedy and not an undue burden on individual faculty members. In the previous ranking system, some departments as large as 22 FTE asked each department member to review the files of all other department members. Thus, “a personnel committee” may be interpreted as a committee of the whole. The meeting to resolve disagreements ensures that interpretations of data and documentation can be shared to the benefit of individual faculty members and of the university.

6. "A University Wide Appeals Committee comprising eight members, two each elected by the faculty from each school or college, will hear grievances regarding salary adjustment decisions."

**Rationale:** An appeals committee assures that each faculty member will have an opportunity to present a case for reconsideration should an application for salary adjustment be denied. Election of members from each school or college ensures that the group is representative of the University and is a group of individuals with whom the majority of faculty feel comfortable.

* * * *

**MOTION NO. 2956** Libby Street moved that Level 1 evaluations be based on performance since the last Level 1 (or in the old system, merit) award and likewise, Level 2 evaluations shall be based on performance since the last Level 2 award.

**MOTION NO. 2957** Rob Perkins moved and John Brangwin seconded a motion to table the six proposed motions of the Personnel Committee related to the Salary Adjustment Proposal until the May 18, 1994, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion defeated (12 yes, 13 no).

Senators stated that faculty require more time to discuss the implications of the Salary Adjustment motions at department meetings. Chair Nesselroad pointed out that the six motions proposed by the Personnel Committee were originally presented to the Faculty Senate on June 2, 1993.

Senator Barry Donahue, Computer Science, requested that a vote on all Personnel Committee motions related to the Salary Adjustment Proposal be delayed until the May 18, 1994, Faculty Senate meeting, citing section VI.B. (Conduct of Business) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws: "Formal motions rising from committee reports or included on the printed agenda will be acted upon at the meeting at which they are introduced. Motions rising from the floor can be acted upon immediately. However, whenever possible, substantive motions should be presented in written form; and, at the request of any Senator, action on any motion will be delayed until the subsequent meeting." Vote on the motions was delayed, but further discussion was allowed.
6. **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE, continued**

   Senator Charles McGehee, Sociology, stated that the proposed default criteria do not encourage fair comparisons across disciplines and departments and allow activities as disparate as a "bake sale" and "publication of a book" to receive equal consideration. Dr. Street stated that the existing merit award system is not more fair than the one being proposed regarding the standards of individual departments and disciplines, but the Personnel Committee was unable to devise any easy solution to this problem. Senators discussed the limitations imposed by the legislature on distribution of funds earmarked for merit awards and agreed that not enough monies are usually involved to create a true merit incentive system. Senators recommended that all grievances regarding merit awards be settled before distribution of any monies from the merit pot to allow for adjustment regarding cases in which an appeal is upheld. Dr. Street agreed that settlement of grievances before the distribution of monies was an excellent idea and stated that this would be incorporated into the motions when they were returned to the Senate on May 18, 1994.

7. **PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

   No report

**OLD BUSINESS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS**

Senator Charles McGehee, Sociology, stated that all departments recently received a notice from Library Services that purchase of serials are to be prioritized, and he asked that the Dean of Library Services provide faculty with more information concerning purging of the stacks and the plan for dissemination of old, bound volumes. Russ Schultz, Chair of the Academic Department Chairs' Organization (ADCO) stated that Gary Lewis, Dean of Library Services, is scheduled to meet with ADCO on Monday, May 2, 1994, to discuss these issues.

***NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: May 18, 1994***
I. ROLL CALL
II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 6, 1994

IV. COMMUNICATIONS
-3/30/94 memo from Libby Street, Chair-Senate Personnel Committee, regarding Distinguished Faculty of the University and Shared Faculty Positions; referred to Executive Committee and Code Committee.
-4/1/94 letter from Beverly Heckart, Chair-Code Committee, re. 3/30/94 Personnel Committee report on Distinguished Faculty and Shared Faculty Positions; referred to 1994-95 Code Committee.
-4/6/94 memo from Charles McGehee, Chair-Academic Affairs Committee, recommending service on Honors Convocation Planning Committee proposed by Provost; referred to Provost.
-4/6/94 letter from William Dunning, Art, re. phased retirement; referred to Executive Committee.
-4/8/94 memo from President Ivory Nelson re. Faculty Senate Budget Chair participation at Dean's Council; referred to Executive Committee.
-4/11/94 memo from Charles McGehee, Chair-Academic Affairs Committee, re. grade inflation; see Academic Affairs Committee report (below).
-4/14/94 report from Libby Street, Chair-Personnel Committee, re. salary adjustment proposal; see Personnel Committee report (below).

V. REPORTS
1. CHAIR
   -Deans' Council Update
2. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
   -Grade Inflation [report attached]
3. BUDGET COMMITTEE
4. CODE COMMITTEE
5. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
   -Bachelor of Music/Music Business - New Program [discussion only - text attached]
6. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
   -Salary Adjustment Proposal [report and motions attached]
7. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

VI. OLD BUSINESS
VII. NEW BUSINESS

*** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: May 18, 1994 ***
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

[DISCUSSION ONLY -- FOR VOTE ON MAY 18, 1994]

BACHELOR OF MUSIC—MUSIC BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUSIC CORE</th>
<th>BUSINESS AREA</th>
<th>GENERAL STUDIES</th>
<th>TOTAL CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94 Credits</td>
<td>41 Credits</td>
<td>60-61 Credits</td>
<td>195-196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Music Core
- MUS 104 Intro. to Musical Studies 3
- MUS 144-146 Theory 9
- MUS 244-246 Theory 9
- MUS 280-282 Music History 12
- MUS 341-342 Conducting 6
- MUS 154 Class Piano 3
- MUS 164-664 Applied Study 18

Outside Field-Business Area
- ECON 201 Principles of Economics Micro 5
- BUS 241 Business Law 5
- ACCT 251 Principles of Acct. I 5
- ACCT 253 Managerial Acct. 5
- MGT 380 Managerial Acct. Anal. 5
- MGT 380 Organizational Mgt. 4
- MKT 360 Principles of Marketing 4
- MKT 380 Human Resources 3

Total Outside Area 61 credits

General Studies
- I. Basic Requirement-16
  - Writing-ENG 101/102/201 9
  - Reasoning-PHL 201 or MATH 130.1 5
  - Physical Education 2
- II. Breadth Requirements-44-45
  - Arts and Humanities-14-15
    - Literary Backgrounds 4-5
    - Other Arts and Humanities 10
    - Social and Behavioral Sciences-15
    - Historical/Political Backgrounds 5
    - Other Social and Behav. Sciences 10
  - Natural Sciences and Mathematics-15
  - Biological Sciences 5
  - Physical Sciences 5
  - Mathematics 5

Total General Studies 60-61 credits

Undergraduate Degrees

The General Education program must be completed by all Bachelor's degree recipients. General Education courses outside of the major department that are specified in the degree program may be used to satisfy these General Education requirements as well.

The Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree designation is reserved for those undergraduate programs which consist primarily of liberal arts study. They include approximately one-third study of general education, one-third study in a specialization and one-third study in free electives. Majors may not exceed 75 quarter credits and the minimum number of credits required for the degree is 180.

The Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree designation is reserved for those undergraduate programs which emphasize the study of science, or a technical or professional field. They include the general education program, a specialization and free elective courses. Majors may not exceed 110 quarter credits. Usually the recipient of the B.S. is ready for immediate entrance into a career in the field of specialization. The minimum number of credits required for the degree is 180.

The Bachelor of Arts in Education (B.A.Ed.) degree designation is reserved for those undergraduate programs which are intended to prepare teachers (Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education and Special Education). They include the general education program, professional specialization not to exceed 65 quarter credits, professional education study and free elective courses. The minimum number of credits required for the degree is 180.

The Bachelor of Music (B.Mus.) degree designation is reserved for those undergraduate programs which are intended to prepare students for professional careers in music. They include the general education program, a specialization and free elective courses. Majors shall be limited according to the policy governing professional degrees (see below). The minimum number of credits required for the degree is 180.

Other Bachelor's degrees may be offered where extended professional instruction can be shown to be necessary to qualify students to engage in specific professional or occupational fields for which neither the Bachelor of Arts nor the Bachelor of Science designation is appropriate. No more than 110 credits beyond the General Education requirements may be specified in a program for such degrees. Although all of these credits may be in one department, programs of large size should draw as widely as possible from the resources of other departments.

(continued)
BACHELOR OF MUSIC -- MUSIC BUSINESS (Program Addition)

In the future, as the nature of music business evolves, there will be a need to eliminate some courses in this program to make way for others dealing with modern technology and its effect on the industry. These adjustments to the program will make use of existing faculty and will present no major shift in departmental load.

Justification for the addition (including what program will be deleted as the result of this new program).

This program has been offered as an individual studies degree on the Bachelor of Music for the past seven years at Central. Indeed, the Bachelor of Music—Music Business program was accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music during the Music Department's accreditation renewal in 1982 and reaccredited in the 1992 renewal. Therefore, this proposal is simply a request to formally acknowledge a program of study which already exists. The Music Department has experienced numerous problems when students attempt to apply for admission into this particular major. Formal acknowledgement of this program should remove these registration and application problems. There seems to be no documentation regarding the rational for establishment of this program as an individual studies degree.

Since this program has been offered for the past seven years, there is no need to delete another program to make room for it. As the classes required for this degree are currently being taught there is no burden placed on the university to offer new courses.

Impact on departmental load, including what faculty resources will be reassigned or reallocated and additional faculty to be hired during the first three years to support the new program.

The impact on departmental load is negligible. Professors needed to teach the courses are currently teaching them. Therefore, no additional faculty will be needed or current faculty reassigned.

Projected non-staffing needs to support the program.

None other than the resources currently allocated to the music department.

Projected student enrollment for each quarter over the next three years and special additional costs (fees) students will be required to pay.

Current and Projected student enrollment is 15. The only additional costs incurred by the students will be the cost of food and housing during the internship (MUS 490).

Projected space needs to support the program (office, classrooms, laboratory).

None other than the resources currently allocated to the music department.

Related proposals that will follow as a result of this program.

None needed

Unique time elements involved in completing the revised program. (It is presumed a major can be completed in six quarters of upper division of work and a master's degree can be acquired in a minimum of three quarters.)

The unique time element in this program is the MUS 490 course which will be an internship experience and therefore will be somewhat dependant upon the scheduling of opportunities in the field of music business. Businesses which have participated or expressed interest in this degree include Ted Brown Music Inc., The Yakima Symphony, The Seattle Opera, and Triad Studios.

If this proposal is for an interdisciplinary program, departments that are involved.

Departments involved are Music, Economics, Accounting, Marketing, and Business.

Departments/programs affected by the new program. (attach approval letters from each department chair/program director.)

Departments involved are Music, Economics, Accounting, Marketing, and Business.
To: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair  
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From: Libby Street, Chair  
Faculty Senate Personnel Committee

Re: Salary Adjustment Proposal

April 14, 1994

You may recall that at its final meeting during academic year 1992-93, the Senate adopted four motions related to the Salary Adjustment Proposal:

1. Eligibility for salary adjustment will be determined in relation to a set of departmental criteria that the school dean certifies meet minimum university standards.

2. Two levels of salary adjustment will be specified in relation to established criteria at each level.

3. A level 1 salary increment shall be granted to all of those who meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

4. A level 2 salary increment shall be granted to all of those who meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and who, in addition, meet the level 2 criteria in any one area of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Additional motions had been sent forward for consideration by the Senate Personnel Committee but were held pending action by individual departments to refine the draft criteria that had been proposed by the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee now has feedback from all of the school and college deans indicating that departments had either adopted the criteria as proposed, refined the criteria in a form that is consistent with the spirit of the originally proposed criteria, or objected to the procedure and chosen not to address the criteria. The deans appear to have concluded that no further progress will be made by departments who have taken exception to the procedure.

So that it will be a matter of the record, I will summarize the concerns brought forward by departments and/or deans regarding the proposal:

1. There appeared to be some miscommunication about the level 1 criteria. Based on the feedback received from the faculty survey that began this process, an attempt was made to restate the salary increment for individuals who are performing acceptably to the university. Previously, this form of increment was called professional growth. It was eliminated because there was a sense that there were no criteria governing decisions to award it. Thus, the level 1 criteria were included to ensure that individuals meeting minimum criteria of the university would be benefited above those who are not meeting minimum criteria. When professional growth was eliminated, there was some sense that across the board raises would substitute for professional growth. However, the procedure failed to allow for greater salary enhancement for those who were contributing at a designated level in teaching, scholarship, and service than for those who were not.

2. Some individuals interpreted the criteria as being comparative. For example, one person indicated that the current criteria in scholarship lead one to believe that two presentations at regional meetings are equated with a Nobel Prize. This was, of course, not our intent. The criteria suggest thresholds only: the point above which individuals will be included in the salary adjustment pool and below which they will be excluded. Our committee has felt throughout that state salary allowances can never adequately compensate some of the more magnificent accomplishments of our faculty. It is noteworthy that our current system allows two individuals of extremely disparate accomplishment to benefit equally, e.g., the #1 and #2 ranked person in a given department may share no similarity in terms of accomplishment yet both may be awarded a salary increment. Further, the current system allows for one of two individuals with like accomplishments to receive a salary increment while the other does not. This newly proposed system attempts to establish cutoff points on the basis of acceptable criteria rather than arbitrarily or capriciously on the basis of money allocation.

3. We've heard both that the criteria are too tough and not tough enough. Some departments reported that their faculty could never meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas; others indicated that they would not retain a faculty member who could not meet the level 1 criteria in all three areas. It seemed impossible for our committee to resolve the disparate positions of these two groups. Thus, we have chosen to retain the criteria as proposed. Ideally, a trial run would help us to identify just how reasonable the criteria are. Departments that are particularly concerned might want to do a trial run during the remainder of this year and submit their findings to the Senate. Of course, if all members of a department are found to qualify at both level 1 and level 2, we would still need to determine whether the criteria are not sufficiently demanding or the department is exceedingly wonderful.

4. The criteria that were proposed did not address faculty who hold largely administrative positions. While administrative faculty are expected to contribute in service and scholarship in much the same way teaching faculty do, we were asked to consider additional criteria based on their administrative responsibilities to replace the teaching criteria applied to teaching faculty.

5. We received considerable feedback about the potential for inequitable financial gain across years. We have refined one of our motions to address this problem but very frankly were unable to solve what is essentially a funding problem of the university. Truly, the only way to avoid the problem raised by some faculty that one might "waste" contributions in a year of minimal funding is to give across the board increments to all faculty each year and eliminate performance-based increases of any kind. We are not recommending this approach.

Overall, the number of departments that have worked with the proposal and the criteria considerably exceeds the number who have not. While we respect the concerns that have been raised, we know of no way to resolve all of the concerns of the objecting departments. Thus, the Personnel Committee now comes forward with the remaining motions from the original proposal. Two of the motions have been somewhat refined from those presented in the spring of last year.

We are now asking the Senate to take action on the following motions.
1. "Level 1 evaluations shall be based on performance since the last level 1 (or in the old system, merit) award and likewise, level 2 evaluations shall be based on performance since the last level 2 award."

Rationale: Faculty members should be able to accumulate service from one increment to another. Further accumulations should be specific to the level of the award that has been received.

2. "The draft criteria proposed by the Personnel Committee will act as the default criteria for all departments except those whose modifications have been approved by their school or college dean. Individual departmental criteria may be modified after consultation with and approval by the appropriate school or college dean and the provost."

Rationale: Each department had an opportunity to streamline the criteria in keeping with their departmental mission and unique characteristics. Departments that have not yet agreed on suitable criteria should be evaluated by a common set of criteria until such time as they and their dean agree to a more individualized set of criteria. Further, departments may find that their logical criteria do not work well in practice and should have an opportunity for further refinement in consultation with their dean.

3. "Full-time department chairs will be evaluated using the default or their individual departmental criteria for scholarship and service and a set of administrative criteria that have been approved by the school or college dean and the provost."

Rationale: Full-time department chairs are not expected to be involved in teaching. They should be evaluated in relation to their job description. However, they, like all faculty members, are expected to maintain a record of scholarship and service.

4. "The amount of money available from the legislature for salary adjustment (less that necessary for promotion) shall be divided by the number of individuals eligible at level 1 plus the number of individuals eligible at level 2 except that units shall always represent a minimum of a nominal .5% (technically .4859) scale adjustment or a multiple of .5%. Available money between multiples of .5% and/or available money in excess of that necessary to ensure a full step (3%) increase for each level earned shall be distributed as a scale adjustment. Equity adjustments will not be deducted from the money available for salary adjustments until the criteria specified here have been met."

Rationale: After much discussion of the comments of faculty, the Personnel Committee modified this statement to ensure that the only way in which equity or scale adjustments would be possible is that each person eligible to receive an increment at either level has achieved a full step increase for each level. The .5% figure is viewed as a minimum only and would never function as the actual distribution per level except in those cases where the legislature's award to the university for salary adjustment is in the neighborhood of a 1% increase overall. Let's suppose that every person in the university met the minimum criteria at level 1 and that half met the criteria at level 2. If the group meeting the criteria at level 2 were equally distributed across the salary range, money would be diverted to salary and scale adjustment only when the amount from the legislature exceeded approximately 4.5% of current salaries for salary adjustment. The essential effect of this implementation is that each step will become a salary range instead of a fixed salary. Thus one could be at step 19, 19.1 up to step 19.5.

5. "Each faculty member will be independently evaluated by the department chair, a departmental personnel committee, and the school dean using common criteria; any disagreements will be resolved in a meeting between the chair, the personnel committee, and the dean."

Rationale: Concurrence by several parties helps to ensure the validity of the process. Because the recommended system requires only a checklist and documentation, evaluation of files should be relatively speedy and not an undue burden on individual faculty members. In the previous ranking system, some departments as large as 22 PTE asked each department member to review the files of all other department members. Thus, "a personnel committee" may be interpreted as a committee of the whole. The meeting to resolve disagreements ensures that interpretations of data and documentation can be shared to the benefit of individual faculty members and of the university.

6. "A University Wide Appeals Committee comprised of six members, two each elected by the faculty from each school, will hear grievances regarding salary adjustment decisions."

Rationale: An appeals committee ensures that each faculty member will have an opportunity to present a case for reconsideration should an application for salary adjustment be denied. Election of members from each school or college ensures that the group is representative of the University and is a group of individuals with whom the majority of faculty feel comfortable.
MEMO

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee
Charles McGhee, Chair

DATE: April 11, 1994

RE: Report on Grade Inflation

On October 15, 1994, the Academic Affairs Committee was charged to review the grade distribution and make recommendations to the Senate. Following is our report.

The Committee's work was guided by the recommendation of last year's Academic Affairs Committee which called for:

1. collecting data on grade distribution at CWU,
2. studying the impact of withdrawals on grade distribution,
3. studying the impact of transfer students on GPA,
4. formulating possible university-wide grading policies,
5. holding small group faculty forums to discuss grading policy, and
6. developing university-wide grading policies for Senate action.

In response to these recommendations the Committee has done the following:

1. The Committee gathered data on grade distribution at CWU. As expected it shows a great range of grades between courses, departments, and schools. The Committee judged this to be an exercise in futility, however, in that in no way did it tell us how or whether the grades were justified. Merely observing a given level, regardless of how finely it is divided and subjected to statistical analysis, will tell us nothing about the validity of those grades as long as grading remains within the subjective judgement of individual faculty.

The very idea of "grade inflation" suggests that grades, as currency, have lost a value which they once had, a value which presumably was superior to that which they now possess. Since it is relativistic, however, the notion of "grade inflation" does not address the question of why earlier grades necessarily should be regarded as more valid than present ones. The simple observation that present grades are higher than earlier could be explained in many ways, many of which reflect value judgments.

We wish to avoid the presumption of judgement simply based on our perceptions and values. Nor do we wish to judge the grading practices of others without regard to the conditions which produced them.

2. We were concerned to know the effect of withdrawals and incomplete on grade distribution. Information we obtained indicates that the number of hardship withdrawals varies with the specific person granting them. While one might be tempted to conclude that this suggests too many withdrawals, a differential, in and of itself, does not speak to the validity of either the variable.

Beyond that, we did gather data on withdrawals and incomplete, but, again, it was not possible to determine their relationship to grades which might have been avoided or enhanced. Information is not and has never been recorded which would shed light on this question. Because of the relatively small number of cases and the difficulty of establishing motives reliably, the committee does not regard it useful to conduct a long-term study of the question.

3. We did not gather information on the impact of transfer students on the GPA at Central. The data did gather on local grading indicated clearly that there is wide variation in grading. Separating out transfer students would not have given useful information to help understand this phenomenon. On the contrary, pursuing this line of inquiry would serve only to point a finger of blame elsewhere while allowing CWU's own high GPA's to go unquestioned.

4. We have formulated no university-wide grading policy. Again, in order to do so, we would have to understand and grapple the issues thoroughly and we do not. Indeed, we have concluded that no one has such a grasp, either. A recent article in the Seattle P-I (November 15, 1993) indicates that the U of W also has no grasp and articles in the Chronicle of Higher Education in recent years indicate that the concerns are nation-wide.

5. We did not hold small faculty group forums to discuss possible grading policies. Without a framework for such a discussion we judged that such would be yet another exercise in futility which would degenerate quickly into handwringing and finger pointing. In our view this would be pointless.

6. Accordingly, we bring no policy to the Senate for action, poor policy being worse than no policy at all.

The Committee concludes that the issue cannot be resolved simply by identifying departments and programs which give "too high" grades. "Too high" is meaningful only with respect to some standard, and there is no standard for grading. Complaints about grading practices, in our experience, come, not infrequently, from one or more segments of the university which regard themselves as the heart or custodian of the enterprise. While this is not intended as a criticism, it is to point out that judgments about grading come from a perspective and are relative to some sort of a standard of goodness.

Unfortunately, the standard published in the University catalogue does not shed much light on the matter. It reads:

A "C" grade indicates that a student has made substantial progress toward meeting the objectives of the course and has fulfilled the requirements of the course. The grades above "C" are used for those students who have demonstrated some degree of superior. The highest grade, "A", is reserved for those students who have excelled in every phase of the course. The "B" grade is for students whose work is superior but does not warrant the special distinction of the "A". The "D" is for grades which are not sufficient to meet the objectives of the course but who have fulfilled the requirements only in a standard manner. The "P" is reserved for students who have not failed to meet or have accomplished so few of the requirements of the course that they are not entitled to credit. (1991/93 CWU Undergraduate Catalogue, p. 33.)

By linking grades to fulfillment of course requirements, it leaves open the question of what those course requirements are. Requirements may be few or many, tough or easy, important or trivial, and any grade reflecting their fulfillment necessarily reflects the value placed the underlying requirement. Indeed, we have concluded that no policy on grading is possible until a consensus on the use of grades has been developed. Toward such an end we have identified some 31 uses of grades many of which deviate from the university policy.

Uses of Grades:

1. Assessment of degree of fulfillment of course objectives. (University policy)
2. Assessment of degree of fulfillment of course requirements. (University policy combines this with item no. 1, though the two are not necessarily the same.)
3. Assessment of degree of command of subject matter.
4. Assessment of job-related competency as determined by faculty.
5. Assessment of job-related competency as determined by outside interests.
6. Assessment of extent of labor expended in course.
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7. Reward for labor expended.
8. Punishment for lack of labor expended.
9. Incentive for future labor expended.
10. Deterrence for future lack of labor expended.
11. Reward for fulfillment of course objectives.
12. Punishment for lack of fulfillment of course objectives.
13. Incentive for future fulfillment of course objectives.
14. Deterrence for future lack of fulfillment of course objectives.
15. Reward for conformity to instructor's views and values.
16. Punishment for lack of conformity to instructor's views and values.
17. Means for enhancement of students' self-esteem and affirmation.
18. Means for avoidance of harm to students' self-esteem and affirmation.
19. Means to influence students' view of instructor relative to instructor evaluation.
20. Means to influence students' view of instructor relative to interpersonal relations with instructor.
21. Means to influence colleagues' view of instructor relative to evaluations.
22. Means to influence colleagues' view of instructor relative to interpersonal relations with instructor.
23. Means to influence parents' view of instructor.
24. Means to avoid criticism of students, colleagues, parents, et al.
25. Means for influencing prospective graduate schools on behalf of students.
26. Means for influencing prospective employers on behalf of students.
27. Means for legitimizing course requirements.
28. Means for establishing or legitimizing reputation of instructor.
29. Means for expressing instructor's view of CWU.
31. Means for weeding out students.
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4. Distribute grades throughout the faculty for general review and comment. The motivating mechanism here is humiliation and ridicule. For this to be effective, however, departments and faculty must have closer communication and be influenced by each other's opinion. In our judgement, there is little interpersonual communication on campus and a great deal of indifference toward the opinions of others.
5. Conduct department/school meetings/workshops on grading philosophy and practices. Experience suggests that such sessions result in handwringing or preaching to the choir, that is, they produce little new of benefit. Given the many possible uses of grades, such a mechanism is unlikely to produce any consensus.
6. Institute administrative talks with high schools and community colleges about grading practices. While this may be of value relative to the preparation of graduates who enter CWU, it assumes that the problem would be eliminated if the grades of entering students were "grasine." It does not address the question of why a student who received an undeserved A in high school or community college also may receive an equally undeserved A at Central. In other words, it is not clear how questionable grading practices elsewhere explains questionable grading practices here.
7. Request the HEC Board develop a policy on grading.

While this may establish uniformity of grading, it would be academically costly in that grading would be removed from the faculty to be guided by the values of a political bureaucracy.
8. Eliminate GPA criteria for entrance into or retention in a graduation from a program. This would reduce the possibility of grades being given to avoid losing, gaining or keeping students. On the other hand, it would also mean substituting other criteria for assessment, such as performance review.
9. Eliminate extra credit work which simply substitutes for earlier, poor performance. Extra credit work to replace earlier poor performance give the illusion of substance without the reality.

4. Distribute grades throughout the faculty for general review and comment. The motivating mechanism here is humiliation and ridicule. For this to be effective, however, departments and faculty must have closer communication and be influenced by each other's opinion. In our judgement, there is little interpersonual communication on campus and a great deal of indifference toward the opinions of others.
5. Conduct department/school meetings/workshops on grading philosophy and practices. Experience suggests that such sessions result in handwringing or preaching to the choir, that is, they produce little new of benefit. Given the many possible uses of grades, such a mechanism is unlikely to produce any consensus.
6. Institute administrative talks with high schools and community colleges about grading practices. While this may be of value relative to the preparation of graduates who enter CWU, it assumes that the problem would be eliminated if the grades of entering students were "grasine." It does not address the question of why a student who received an undeserved A in high school or community college also may receive an equally undeserved A at Central. In other words, it is not clear how questionable grading practices elsewhere explains questionable grading practices here.
7. Request the HEC Board develop a policy on grading.

While this may establish uniformity of grading, it would be academically costly in that grading would be removed from the faculty to be guided by the values of a political bureaucracy.
8. Eliminate GPA criteria for entrance into or retention in a graduation from a program. This would reduce the possibility of grades being given to avoid losing, gaining or keeping students. On the other hand, it would also mean substituting other criteria for assessment, such as performance review.
9. Eliminate extra credit work which simply substitutes for earlier, poor performance. Extra credit work to replace earlier poor performance give the illusion of substance without the reality.

While this may seem an intrusion on faculty judgment, faculty subverting their own standards in such a way to alter their own judgement may be a topic for discussion.
10. Record average class grade next to student's grade on the transcript.

This, psychologically, will give anyone viewing the grade a basis for assessing its validity. It does not lower the general GPA, but merely puts the reader on notice that what is presented needs to be interpreted. The viewer is left to judge the meaning of the grade, however, without adequate information, such as the N, standard deviation, or the nature of the class.
11. Convert skill/performance/activity credits to S/U. Some classroom/laboratory activities or other courses are better reflected on the transcript as S/U. To the extent that there are courses which produce high letter grades where it is virtually impossible to get anything but high grades, the student and faculty should examine their designations and determine if these are commensurate with university curriculum policy and the requirements of accrediting agencies. We have no evidence that this proposal would have any great impact on the overall quality of grades. Philosophically, though, it does speak to the perception that grades from some courses are less defensible than others.

To the extent that employers do not place a great deal of faith in grades, relying instead on performance based criteria for judging the adequacy of prospective employees, "grade inflation" would seem to be largely of concern only to academics. If performance is indeed the measure of choice in the outside world, we should be trying to insure that our students can perform up to the level our graduates say they can rather than trying to bring grades down to the level of actual student performance.

The day that students can read, write, calculate and reason effectively, that is the day talk of grade inflation will cease.

The Academic Affairs Committee knows no other means for dealing with the matter.

End of report.
ROLL CALL 1993-94

Walter ARLT
Linda BEATH
Andrea BOWMAN
John BRANGWIN
Peter BURKHOLDER
Minerva CAPLES
Robert CARBAUGH
David CARNS
Bobby CUMMINGS
Barry DONAHUE
Ken GAMON
Mary GOSSAGE
Charles MCGEHEE
Deborah MEDLAR
Robert MYERS
Ivory NELSON
Connie NOTT
Sidney NESSELROAD
Vince NETHERY
Michael OLIVERO
Steve OLSON
Rob PERKINS
Dan RAMSDELL
Dieter ROMBOY
Sharon ROSELL
Eric ROTH
Charles RUBIN
James SAHLSTRAND
Carolyn SCHACTLER
Hugh SPALL
Kristan STARBUCK
Stephanie STEIN
Alan TAYLOR
Thomas THELEN
Morris UEBELACKER
Lisa WEYANDT [pron. Y'-ANT]
Rex WIRTH
Thomas YEH
Mark ZETTERBERG

Stephen JEFFERIES
Dan FENNERTY
Madalon LALLEY
Kris HENRY
Jay BACHRACH
Susan DONAHOE
David HEDRICK
Walt KAMINSKI

George TOWN
James HARPER
Jeff OLESEN
David KAUFMAN
Gary HEESACKER
Patrick OWENS
Thomas MOORE

Andrew SPENCER
Robert GREGSON

Cathy BerTELSON
Beverly HECKART
Stella MORENO
Michael BRAUNSTEIN
Geoffrey BOERS
James HINTHORNE
Margaret SAHLSTRAND
Carolyn THOMAS

Shawn CHRISTIE
Stephen SCHEPMAN
Robert GARRETT
John CARR
John ALWIN
Roger FOUTS

Jerry HOGAN
Wesley VAN TASSEL

[ROSTERS] ROLL CALL 93, April 6, 1994]
Date

April 27, 1994

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.
Relative to your request concerning the participation of the Faculty Senate Budget Chair at the Dean’s Council when budgetary issues are discussed. Please be advised that the Faculty Senate Chair is a member of the Dean’s Council. The interworkings of how the Faculty Senate Chair and the Senate Budget Chair wishes to work with the Dean’s Council should be worked out between the Provost and Faculty Senate Chair. If you recall according to my January 20, 1994 memo there will be formal presentations on the budget request to the Budget Advisory Committee during the month of May. Additionally, budget development is taking place at the Dean’s level with departmental involvement. I believe that the Senate will have to reexamine how it would like to have Budget participation under our present scheme for budget development.
Sidney, the faculty at Evergreen has voted to go to a Semester System beginning 1996-97. The item will be placed on their Trustee's Agenda at their next Board Meeting. By the way the University of Washington is also looking at the possibility of a semester system. How do we proceed here at Central knowing the history of this effort.

Ivory v. Nelson
TO:                  Don Schliesman  
                                  Special Assistant to the Provost 

FROM:                Sidney Nesselroad, Chair  
                                  Faculty Senate 

DATE:                April 8, 1994 

RE:                  COMMITTEE TO COORDINATE HONORS CEREMONIES 

In response to your March 14, 1994, letter requesting two faculty nominations to a committee to coordinate honors, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is pleased to nominate the following individuals: 

Bob Carbaugh, Economics (general faculty representative)  
Jeff Snedeker, Music (Academic Affairs Committee representative) 

Both faculty members have been contacted by the Senate Office and have agreed to serve. 

[c:\wpdocs\committe\4-8-94.hon]
April 8, 1994

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Barry Donahue  
    Dr. Sidney Nesselroad

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Budget Chair Participation at Dean's Council

In response to your April 1 request concerning participation of the Faculty Senate Budget Chair at Dean's Council meetings for discussion of budgetary issues, be advised that the Faculty Senate Chair is a member of the Dean's Council. The interworkings of how the Faculty Senate Chair and the Senate Budget Chair wish to work with the Dean's Council should be determined by the Provost and Faculty Senate Chair.

As outlined in my January 20, 1994 memo, formal budget requests will be presented to the Budget Advisory Committee in May. Additionally, budget development is taking place at the dean's level with departmental involvement.

The Senate will have to reexamine how it would like to participate under our present scheme for budget development. Attached is a copy of the presentation format the Budget Advisory Committee.

Very truly yours,

Ivory V. Nelson  
President

Attachment

c: Tom Moore

Barge 314 • 400 E. 8th Avenue • Ellensburg, WA 98926-7501 • 509-963-2111 • FAX 509-963-3206
FACULTY FORUM

SPONSORED BY THE
FACULTY SENATE

GUEST:  Dr. Thomas D. Moore
Provost/V.P. for Academic Affairs

TOPIC:  The State of Academic Affairs

Thursday, May 26, 1994
3:00 p.m.
SUB Theatre
To: University Community - PLEASE POST

From: Dr. Gary A. Lewis, Chair
      Search Committee for the Acting Dean of Arts and Humanities

Date: May 17, 1994

Subject: Announcement of Candidates Selected for Interview

Provost Moore has authorized me to announce that the following individuals, listed in alphabetical order, have been selected to be interviewed for the position of Acting Dean of Arts and Humanities.

Barry Donahue
Linda Marra
Charles McGehee

These individuals will go through an interview process consisting of the following elements:

Interview with Search Committee
Interview with Provost
Interview with Acting Dean of CLAS
Dialog with Faculty
Dialog with Students
Dialog with CLAS Department Chairs

All meetings will be scheduled before the end of the spring quarter. Announcements of exact times and dates of the open dialog meetings will be forthcoming.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Thomas Moore, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
   James Pappas, Dean, Academic Services
   Robert Brown, Acting Dean, College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
   Joan Mosebar, Acting Dean, Continuing Education
   Gerald Stacy, Dean, Graduate Studies and Research
   Connie Roberts, Special Assistant to the Provost, Institutional Research
   David Hedrick, Interim Director, International Programs
   Gary Lewis, Dean, Library Services
   David Dauwalder, Dean, School of Business and Economics
   Linda Murphy, Dean, School of Professional Studies
   Courtney Jones, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
   Richard Corona, Business Manager
   Joe Antonich, Controller
   James Haskett, Director, Information Resources
   Gregory Trujillo, Vice President for Student Affairs
   Jeff Zenisek, Interim Director, Athletics
   B. Dean Owens, Director, Career Planning and Placement
   Thomas Broberg, Director, Cooperative Education
   Donna Croft, Director, Financial Aid
   Mark Young, Vice President for University Advancement

SUBJECT: Budget and Capital Presentations to President's Budget Advisory Committee

As you plan for the 1994-95 Operating Budget (state and self-support), 1995-97 Biennial Budget, and the 1995-97 Capital Budget, please be prepared to do the following at various Budget Committee meetings scheduled in May:
A. General Details

1. Each dean/director reporting to a vice president or the Provost will present his/her respective budget or capital proposals.

2. Each dean/director should be prepared to answer questions from Budget Committee members and the attending audience.

3. The Provost and the Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs will prepare a recommendation for tuition waivers.

B. Specific Details

Each presentation before the Budget Advisory Committee will employ the following format:

1. The Provost and each vice president will give a general overview of his area with a summary handout to include planning priorities submitted to the Strategic Planning Committee, details of major area reallocations, and a current organizational chart. The Provost and vice presidents must indicate use of funds allocated from new student enrollment for the 1994-95 year.

2. Each dean/director will make a unit presentation (state and self-support) providing the following summary information for the 1994-95 Budget, and where appropriate, summary information for the 1995-97 Biennial Budget. Handouts will be prepared which will:
   - Provide an organizational chart for your unit
   - Delinate priorities submitted to the Strategic Planning Committee
   - Show funding allocations within the unit to meet Strategic Plan priorities
   - Explain reallocations within the unit to meet Strategic Plan priorities
   - Indicate distribution of new funds (funds above 1993-94 budget) for Strategic Plan priorities
   - Compare funding priorities for 1994-95 within the unit with Strategic Plan funding priorities of the unit for 1993-94
• Compare the number of permanent employees (staff/faculty) by area for 1994-95 with 1993-94, include FTE and individual count

• Compare the average number of part-time faculty (adjunct, nontenure track) by individual, by FTE, and by department for 1994-95 compared to 1993-94 (academic deans)

• Compare departmental secretarial/office staff for 1994-95 and 1993-94 (academic deans)

• Compare average number of part-time employees by individual, by FTE, and by department for 1994-95 compared to 1993-94 (directors)

• Compare travel allocations for 1994-95 with travel allocations for 1993-94

• Compare goods and services allocations for 1994-95 with goods and services for 1993-94

• Identify equipment funds allocated for 1994-95

• Provide a one-page summary of 1993-94 accomplishments

We hope to establish a process whereby our budget presentations will provide enough detail for decision making. Your cooperation in this effort will help assure our success.

Thank you.

Ivy V. Nelson
President

jm
MEMO

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee
Charles McGehee, Chair

DATE: April 11, 1994

RE: Report on Grade Inflation

On October 15, 1994, the Academic Affairs Committee was charged to review the grade distribution and make recommendations to the Senate. Following is our report.

The Committee's work was guided by the recommendation of last year's Academic Affairs Committee which called for:
1. collecting data on grade distribution at CWU,
2. studying the impact of withdrawals on grade distribution,
3. studying the impact of transfer students on GPA,
4. formulating possible university-wide grading policies,
5. holding small group faculty forums to discuss grading policy, and
6. developing university-wide grading policies for Senate action.

In response to these recommendations the Committee has done the following:
1. The Committee gathered data on grade distribution at CWU. As expected it shows a great range of grades between courses, departments, and schools. The Committee judged this to be an exercise in futility, however, in that in no way did it tell us how or whether the grades were justified. Merely observing a given level, regardless of how finely it is divided and subjected to statistical analysis, will tell us nothing about the validity of those grades as long as grading remains within the subjective judgement of individual faculty.

   The very idea of "grade inflation" suggests that grades, as currency, have lost a value which they once had, a value which presumably was superior to that which they now possess. Since it is relativistic, however, the notion of "grade inflation" does not address the question of why earlier grades necessarily should be regarded as more valid than present ones. The simple observation that present grades are higher than earlier could be explained in many ways, many of which reflect value judgements. We wish to avoid the presumption of judgement simply based on our perceptions and values. Nor do we wish to judge the grading practices of others without regard to the conditions which produced them.

2. We were concerned to know the effect of withdrawals and incompletes on grade distribution. Information we obtained indicates that the number of hardship withdrawals varies with the specific person granting them. While one might be tempted to conclude that this suggests too many withdrawals, a differential, in and of itself, does not speak to the validity of either of the variables.

   Beyond that, we did gather data on withdrawals and incompletes, but, again, it was not possible to determine their relationship to grades which might have been avoided or enhanced. Information is not and has never been recorded which would shed light on this question. Because of the relatively small number of cases and the difficulty of establishing motives reliably, the committee does not regard it useful to conduct a long-term study of the question.
3. We did not gather information on the impact of transfer students on the GPA at Central. The data did
gather on local grading indicated clearly that there is wide variation in grading. Separating out transfer
students would not have given useful information to help understand this phenomenon. On the
contrary, pursuing this line of inquiry would serve only to point a finger of blame elsewhere while
allowing CWU's own high GPA's to go unquestioned.

4. We have formulated no university-wide grading policy. Again, in order to do so, we would have to
understand and grasp the issues thoroughly and we do not. Indeed, we have concluded that no one
has such a grasp, either. A recent article in the Seattle P-I (November 15, 1993) indicates that the
U of W also has no grasp and articles in the Chronicle of Higher Education in recent years indicate
that the concerns are nation-wide.

5. We did not hold small faculty group forums to discuss possible grading policies. Without a
framework for such a discussion we judged that such would be yet another exercise in futility which
would degenerate quickly into handwringing and finger pointing. In our view this would be pointless.

6. Accordingly, we bring no policy to the Senate for action, poor policy being worse than no policy at
all.

The Committee concludes that the issue cannot be resolved simply by identifying departments and programs
which give "too high" grades. "Too high" is meaningful only with respect to some standard, and there is no
standard for grading. Complaints about grading practices, in our experience, come, not-infrequently, from
one or more segments of the university which regard themselves as the heart or custodian of the enterprise.
While this is not intended as a criticism, it is to point out that judgments about grading come from a
perspective and are relative to some sort of a standard of goodness.

Unfortunately, the standard published in the University catalogue does not shed much light on the matter. It
reads:

A "C" grade indicates that a student has made substantial progress toward meeting the
objectives of the course and has fulfilled the requirements of the course. The grades
above "C" are used for those students who have demonstrated some degree of
superiority. The highest grade, "A", is reserved for those students who have excelled
in every phase of the course. The "B" grade is for students whose work is superior but
does not warrant the special distinctiveness of the "A". The "D" is a grade for those
students who have made progress toward meeting the objectives of the course but who
have fulfilled the requirements only in a substandard manner. The "F" is reserved for
students who have failed to meet or have accomplished so few of the requirements of
the course that they are not entitled to credit. (1991/93 CWU Undergraduate
Catalogue, p. 31.)

By linking grades to fulfillment of course requirements, it leaves open the question of what those course
requirements are. Requirements may be few or many, tough or easy, important or trivial, and any grade
reflecting their fulfillment necessarily reflects the value placed the underlying requirement. Indeed, we have
concluded that no policy on grading is possible until a consensus on the use of grades has been developed.
Toward such an end we have identified some 31 uses of grades many of which deviate from the university
policy.

Uses of Grades:
1. Assessment of degree of fulfillment of course objectives. (University policy)
2. Assessment of degree of fulfillment of course requirements. (University policy combines this with
item no. 1, though the two are not necessarily the same.)
3. Assessment of degree of command of subject matter.
4. Assessment of job-related competency as determined by faculty.
5. Assessment of job-related competency as determined by outside interests.
6. Assessment of extent of labor expended in course.
7. Reward for labor expended.
8. Punishment for lack of labor expended.
9. Incentive for future labor expended.
10. Deterrence for future lack of labor expended.
11. Reward for fulfillment of course objectives.
12. Punishment for lack of fulfillment of course objectives.
13. Incentive for future fulfillment of course objectives.
14. Deterrence for future lack of fulfillment of course objectives.
15. Reward for conformity to instructor's views and values.
16. Punishment for lack of conformity to instructor's view and values.
17. Means for enhancement of students' self-esteem and affirmation.
18. Means for avoidance of harm to students' self-esteem and affirmation.
19. Means to influence students' view of instructor relative to instructor evaluation.
20. Means to influence students' view of instructor relative to interpersonal relations with instructor.
21. Means to influence colleagues' view of instructor relative to evaluations.
22. Means to influence colleagues' view of instructor relative to interpersonal relations with instructor.
23. Means to influence parents' view of instructor.
24. Means to avoid criticism of students, colleagues, parents, et al.
25. Means for influencing prospective graduate schools on behalf of students.
26. Means for influencing prospective employers on behalf of students.
27. Means for legitimating course requirements.
28. Means for establishing or legitimating reputation of instructor.
29. Means for expressing instructor's view of CWU.
31. Means for weeding out students.

There are no doubt other reasons which could be added to this list. The point, however, is this: The question of grading practices cannot be discussed meaningfully unless and until one of two things comes about: (1) a consensus is established about the meaning and function of grades, or (2) the need for a consensus is eliminated, which is to say, the need for grades is eliminated.

The task is not impossible, the evidence for which is that schools such as The Evergreen State College have eliminated grades. Evergreen was new when that occurred and did so with a hand-selected faculty which was chosen because they were already committed to eliminating grades. Furthermore, the experiment was carried out on students who were also sympathetic to the idea. In the case of schools such as CWU, one has to contend with a large, tenured faculty which is by and large committed to principles of grading. At that, it was many years before Evergreen was taken seriously by the outside world, and for many it still is anathema.

Still, on the assumption that grades are "too high" (leaving open the question of what that means) it may be possible to lower grades overall by introduction of certain untested measures:

1. Reduce or eliminate Withdrawals. No data exist nor is it likely possible to generate any concerning the use of W's to avoid poor grades. Nevertheless, there is speculation that it is frequently the case, and reducing or eliminating peremptory Withdrawals (non-hardship) would reduce or eliminate this possible factor. It would also reduce or eliminate any other value of the W's while doing nothing to curb the high number of A's being given.

2. Reduce or eliminate Incompletes. Again, no data exist nor is it likely possible to generate any concerning the use of I's to avoid poor grades. Nevertheless, there is speculation that it is frequently the case, and reducing or eliminating Incompletes would reduce or eliminate this factor. It would also reduce or eliminate any other value of I's.

3. Bring administrative pressure to bear on faculty to reduce grades. This would leave the question of the meaning of grades up to administrators and put them in the position of replacing faculty judgement and dictating academic policy. Depending on the level of fear induced in faculty it might drive grades down but at the cost of limiting the faculty's academic judgement.
4. Distribute grades throughout the faculty for general review and comment. The motivating mechanism here is humiliation and ridicule. For this to be effective, however, departments and faculty must have closer communication and be influenced by each other's opinion. In our judgement, there is little interpersonal communication on campus and a great deal of indifference toward the opinions of others.

5. Conduct department/school meetings/workshops on grading philosophy and practices. Experience suggests that such sessions result in handwringing or preaching to the choir, that is, they produce little new of benefit. Given the many possible uses of grades, such a mechanism is unlikely to produce any consensus.

6. Institute administrative talks with high schools and community colleges about grading practices. While this may be of value relative to the preparation of graduates who enter CWU, it assumes that the problem would be eliminated if the grades of entering students were "genuine."

   It does not address the question of why a student who received an undeserved A in high school or community college also may receive an equally undeserved A at Central. In other words, it is not clear how questionable grading practices elsewhere explain questionable grading practices here.

7. Request the HEC Board develop a policy on grading.

   While this may establish uniformity of grading, it would be academically costly in that grading would be removed from the faculty to be guided by the values of a political bureaucracy.

8. Eliminate GPA criteria for entrance into or retention in or graduation from a program. This would reduce the possibility of grades being given to avoid losing, gaining or keeping students. On the other hand, it would also mean substituting other criteria for assessment, such as performance review.

9. Eliminate extra credit work which simply substitutes for earlier, poor performance. Extra credit work to replace earlier poor performance give the illusion of substance without the reality.

   While this may seem an intrusion on faculty judgment, faculty subverting their own standards in such a way to alter their own judgement may be a topic for discussion.

10. Record average class grade next to student's grade on the transcript. This, presumably, will give anyone viewing the grade a basis for assessing its validity. It does not lower the general GPA, but merely puts the reader on notice that what is presented needs to be interpreted. The viewer is left to judge the meaning of the grade, however, without adequate information, such as the N, standard deviation, or the nature of the class.

11. Convert skill/performance/activity credits to S/U. Some classroom/laboratory activities or other courses are better reflected on the transcript as S/U. To the extent that there are courses which produce high letter grades when it is virtually impossible to get anything but high grades, departments -- under the leadership of the deans -- should examine changing their designation commensurate with university curriculum policy and the requirements of accrediting agencies. We have no evidence that this proposal would have any great impact on the overall question of grades. Philosophically, though, it does speak to the perception that grades from some courses are less defensible than others.

To the extent that employers do not place a great deal of faith in grades, relying instead on performance based criteria for judging the adequacy of prospective employees, "grade inflation" would seem to be largely of concern only to academics. If performance is indeed the measure of choice in the outside world, we should be trying to insure that our students can perform up to the level our grades say they can rather than trying to bring grades down to the level of actual student performance.

The day that students can read, write, calculate and reason effectively, that is the day talk of grade inflation will cease.

The Academic Affairs Committee knows no other means for dealing with the matter.

End of report.