Meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Christie, Gleason, Hawkins, Medlar, Myers, Nethery, Roberts, Rubin, Sahlstrand and Uebelacker.
Visitors: Carolyn Wells, Beverly Heckart, Greg Alarid and Barbara Radke.

CHANGES TO AGENDA
Delete report from Faculty Legislative Representative; replace President's report with a report from the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs; move Council of Faculty Representatives' report to final report on agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
*MOTION NO. 2987 Dan Ramsdell moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the January 11, 1995, Faculty Senate meeting as distributed. Motion passed.

COMMUNICATIONS
None

REPORTS

1. CHAIR
Chair Nesselroad explained that there have been two recent resignations from Faculty Senate standing committees:
*MOTION NO. 2988 Thomas Yeh moved and Eric Roth seconded a motion to replace Gerard Hogan with Patrick Owens as the Library representative on the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. Motion passed.
*MOTION NO. 2989 Eric Roth moved and Thomas Yeh seconded a motion to replace Matt Chambers with George Carr as the student representative on the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee. Motion passed.

* The Ad Hoc Committee on Consensual Relationships [membership: Dale Comstock, Math (CLAS); Deborah Medlar, Accounting (SBE); Jim Ponzetti, Home Economics (CPS); Nancy Howard, Director of Affirmative Action; Anne Bulliung, Graduate Student (English Department)] will begin meeting on January 30. The Committee is charged with developing a policy and having it approved by the Faculty Senate and President's Cabinet before June 1995.

2. PROVOST/VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Provost Thomas Moore reported that the Senate Higher Education Committee received the Higher Education Coordinating (HEC) Board's Time-to-Degree Study at a hearing on January 31, 1995. He explained that the Time-to-Degree Study concerns issues related to the length of time it takes for college students in Washington to receive their degrees. Connie Roberts, Special Assistant to the Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment, represented Central at the hearing and reported that the study of the six state universities was well received by the legislative committee. Provost Moore stated that the pressures are great for increased student access to affordable state universities. The issues surrounding this topic are very complex, and there will be no easy solutions.

The Provost reported that he plans to attend the presentation of the HEC Board's Faculty Workload Study at a February 2, 1995, legislative hearing. Although Central's faculty reported high weekly workloads and Central's faculty/student ratio indicates increased productivity over the past few years, the
2. **PROVOST/VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, continued**

Provost expressed concern that faculty development may become unbalanced under demands for more faculty/student contact hours.

The Provost reported that several tuition bills have also been introduced during the current legislative session. Some of the bills provide for local tuition rate setting authority and carry-forward. Other legislation has been introduced concerning state and university responsibility for funding remedial education of college students.

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment conducted an Assessment Retreat on January 25, 1995. The Retreat was well attended by deans, associate deans, department chairs, and members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the chair of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee. The Provost reported that data was collected at the retreat so that assessment can be effectively linked to planning as well as to insure that programmatic concerns drive budget priorities. Connie Roberts and the Associate Deans plan to compile and distribute a report on the retreat by mid-February.

The Provost reported that he created an Ad Hoc Instructional Computing Committee during Fall quarter 1994 to develop funding guidelines and distribute $400,000 targeted directly to instructional computing needs.

Ezzat Mina (Director, Auditing and Control) wrote a memo on January 23, 1995, to Assistant Attorney General Teresa Kulik requesting a legal opinion and advice concerning use of university facilities and services (e.g., equipment, secretarial services, printing, phones) for the support of faculty research, publication, and consulting. Chair Nesselroad pointed out that similar concerns have been raised repeatedly in the past. He added that former Senate Chair Charles McGehee and the Deans' Council developed an internal policy draft addressing these issues in 1992. The proposed policy, which was based on policies at the other state universities, was submitted to the President's Council in 1992 but was not approved. Provost Moore stated that although professional development (e.g., research, publication, etc.) benefits individual faculty members, it is also a condition of faculty employment. Senator McGehee stated that in most cases it would be virtually impossible, as well as highly inefficient, to separate out and document elements of individual gain vs. those of university gain.

3. **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Academic Affairs Committee Chair Charles McGehee reported that the Classroom Protocol Management Committee, chaired by Registrar Carolyn Wells, has developed a draft policy on "Classroom Scheduling Protocol." The Academic Affairs Committee was consulted during development of the policy draft. The formal charge to the Academic Affairs Committee concerning this matter would be a duplication of effort and will therefore be withdrawn by the Senate Executive Committee. Chair Nesselroad reported that the draft scheduling protocol will be presented to Deans' Council later this month, and the Senate Chair will recommend at that time that it be brought before the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval.

4. **BUDGET COMMITTEE**

Budget Committee chair Don Cocheba commented on the HEC Board's Faculty Workload Study, stating that although the collection process was based on faculty self-reporting and therefore did not yield valid, factual results, the results of the study are being widely distributed. He recommended that the results of the study be downplayed. Provost Thomas Moore replied that the data collected in the study is probably valid to some extent but is not extremely precise. He added that the study and its parameters were mandated by the HEC Board, and the university's ability to control the process was, and continues to be, minimal.

Dr. Cocheba reported that on January 19, 1995, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs Courtney Jones met with the Budget Committee and explained some of the differences between C.W.U.'s budget classifications and those recommended by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' (AICPA) "Industry Audit Guide: Audits of Colleges and Universities Classifications." The Budget Committee's main concern was that C.W.U. classifies some items as "instructional" that AICPA classifies as Student Services, Primary Support, or Institutional Support. This meeting with Vice President Jones was
4. **BUDGET COMMITTEE, continued**

   intended to help the Budget Committee learn more about C.W.U.'s budget category classifications. The Budget Committee expressed appreciation for Vice President Jones' willingness to meet with them and reported that he gave them the following information:
   - all state of Washington higher education institutions do not classify budget allocations identically;
   - three attempts over the past few years have been made by these institutions to standardize account classifications with no success;
   - historical precedent is one factor that has dictated how we classify accounts;
   - institutions have followed state budget practices and formulas in most cases;
   - AICPA guidelines have been used to some extent;
   - NACUBO guidelines have been widely used by all institutions;
   - C.W.U.'s audits based on AICPA guidelines have shown no major problems with how this university classifies its budgeted amounts;
   - account titles do not always accurately describe what is in the account;
   - the Provost and Deans have some discretion concerning program classifications within the checks and balances of accounting guidelines;
   - the National Association of College and University Budget Officers provide guidelines that most institutions follow.

   The Budget Committee plans to meet next with Provost Thomas Moore to discuss the same topic.

5. **CODE COMMITTEE**

   Code Committee Chair Beverly Heckart reported that the Code Committee is working on several issues, including a policy interpretation regarding faculty work outside the university.

6. **CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

   Curriculum Committee member Steve Olson presented the following proposed change to the General Education Program, as introduced for discussion at the January 11, 1995, Faculty Senate meeting (change proposed by Russ Schultz, Chair, Music Department; approved by General Education Committee on April 27, 1994; approved by Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee on January 5, 1995):

   **MOTION NO. 2990** Steve Olson moved deletion of MUS 144 (First Year Theory) from the Arts & Humanities section of the Breadth Requirements of the General Education Program (effective 1996-98 university catalog). Motion passed.

   Steve Olson reported that the Curriculum Committee conducted a public hearing on January 19, 1995, to discuss "Curriculum with Undescribed Content" (.91 workshops, .96 individual study, .98 special topics, .99 seminar, and other open-ended courses in the curriculum). The Committee estimated that the university is currently offering about 300 "special topics" (.98) courses, about one third of which are in the International Studies area. The Committee concluded that the content of these courses meets necessary standards and has been closely scrutinized during the curriculum process. But the overall number of courses being offered as special topics, workshops and seminars is too large, and the Committee has found that extensions are often granted beyond the three year approval period for these types of courses.

   Dr. Olson reminded faculty that the 1996-98 university catalog deadline will be in mid-December 1995, so departments should plan their curriculum changes well in advance to insure that they complete the review process by the deadline.

7. **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

   Personnel Committee member Rex Wirth reported that the Committee will meet with the Senate Code Committee on February 3, 1995, to discuss proposed revisions in the process for faculty promotion and tenure.
8. **PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**
   No report

9. **AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW FACULTY OPINION SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATORS**
   Chair Nesselroad reported that the Senate Executive Committee created the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators in February 1994 in response to concerns regarding the relevance of the survey instrument and its potential utilization by administrators and their supervisors. Jack Dugan, Sociology, and Agnes Canedo, Special Assistant to the President, are the remaining members of the committee. The Chair reported that although a large number of faculty members support the biennial survey, most faculty and administrators agree that the current instrument could be improved, and the return rate for the survey has been relatively low. The Chair reported that the Ad Hoc Committee reached no conclusions and has made no recommendations regarding the opinion survey, so it is likely that the current instrument would be used in a survey conducted this year. He explained that the Senate must decide by its February 22, 1995, meeting what course it will take. If the survey were to be suspended this year, it would require a Senate bylaws change and a suspension of the current Bylaws. Since amendment of the Senate's Bylaws cannot be voted on at the same meeting at which the change is introduced, the Chair introduced the following motion for consideration, but he emphasized that the motion is forwarded as a logistical concern and without any recommendation by the Executive Committee:

*MOTION NO. 2991* Charles McGehee moved and Robert Fordan seconded a motion to 1) change Faculty Senate Bylaws section IV.C.2.: “Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators: The Faculty Senate shall conduct faculty opinion surveys of academic administrators --- deans, provost and vice president for academic affairs, president of the university --- every two (2) years beginning in the academic year 1986-87. For purposes of devising and conducting the survey, the Senate shall appoint an ad hoc committee of members of the faculty.”; and to 2) suspend Faculty Senate Bylaws section IV.C.2. for the 1994-1995 academic year, and begin the next faculty opinion survey cycle during academic year 1995-96. (Motion to be voted on at 2/22/95 Faculty Senate meeting; passage requires 2/3 majority of those present and voting.)

Senator Charles McGehee stated that the survey of administrators as conducted in prior years is not a true "evaluation" and has yielded numbers that there is no way to interpret. He added that the return rate is very low, faculty are unable to provide knowledgeable answers to some questions, and many faculty view the survey mechanism as an opportunity to anonymously "vent spleen." Senator McGehee emphasized, however, that administrators should be constructively evaluated, but the current procedure has created hostility between administrators and faculty and should be entirely reworked in order to serve a valuable function to the university.

Senator Dan Ramsdell, History, stated that it is difficult to convince faculty members of the seriousness of the survey, and suspension of the survey this year would seem unlikely to yield an improved one next year.

Provost Thomas Moore reported that he met last quarter with Ad Hoc Committee Chair Jack Dugan to discuss the survey. The Provost stated that the most bothersome problem with the survey is the low return rate. Some survey questions would obviously be difficult for faculty to answer, and these should probably be deleted or replaced. He added that he perceives this survey as an "opinionnaire," and such exercises are potentially very valuable and provide faculty with a sense of participation. He commented that, although substantive decisions should not be made on the basis of such an "opinionnaire," individual and organizational problem areas are often indicated by the data, and the results should not be perceived as particularly damaging.

Senator Walter Arlt, PE, stated that other universities utilize similar administrative evaluations, and he spoke against suspending the survey this year.

Senator Ken Gamon, Math, supported the arguments of the Provost, agreeing that the perception of how administrators are functioning may be as important as how they are actually doing their jobs, but he
9. **AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW FACULTY OPINION SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATORS.**

   recognized the need for an improved survey instrument.
   
   Chair Nesselroad encouraged Senators to fully discuss this matter with their constituents before the February 22, 1995, vote on MOTION NO. 2991.

10. **COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES (CFR)**

    CFR member Ken Gamon reported on several items currently before the legislature. He stated that one tuition bill proposes tying personal income to state funding; there is low impetus for a faculty salary increase; some legislators are pushing for more faculty teaching/classroom hours; there is support for the HEC Board to eliminate one-of-a-kind programs not directly related to a university's mission; and college level remedial education is being reviewed forappropriateness and funding sources. Senator Gamon pointed out that further tax cuts are being proposed, and such cuts would further erode the revenue base utilized in the Initiative #601 formula. More guaranteed time-to-degree bills have been introduced, and although these bills would guarantee certain classes to students in pursuit of a degree, there would be no accompanying guarantee that the legislature would fund those classes. A bill has been introduced that would require students to pay the entire cost of their college credits after they attained a certain percentage over the number of credits required for degree. Senator Gamon commented that the current climate seems to be making it harder for middle class students to afford higher education.

    CFR has developed a nine point position paper on selected issues before the 1995 Legislature:
    
    - The Governor's recommendations for the expenditure of the 1.6+ billion dollars of increased revenue for the 95-97 biennium, providing as they do budget increases on the average of 9-10% for most major state agencies while providing essentially 0% for Higher Education, are incomprehensible. They are doubly so when at the same time Higher Education is proclaimed to be a high priority concern in the State and is expected to find ways to increase access to the educational system. The inconsistency is astonishing.
    - There must be no budget cuts for Higher Education that will further reduce faculty/student ratios. The 2.4% reduction presently under consideration must be avoided.
    - The CFR supports as absolutely minimal the recommended salary increases for higher education faculty and staff of 2.9 and 3.1% respectively in each year of the biennium.
    - The CFR opposes ear-marking increased tuition revenues for purposes of providing faculty salary increases. Such a proposal threatens to pit students against faculty in a way which is inimical to sound education.
    - As tuition is increased, ways must be found to increase amounts available for financial aid to students, so that access to higher education is not threatened for economic reasons.
    - Revenues generated by student tuition should be retained by the institution within which the revenue is generated.
    - Tuition increases should be indexed to some significant indicator, and should contribute to increased predictability and stability in institutional revenues.
    - There must be no diminution of GF-S appropriations in consequence of tuition increases.
    - The Legislature should seriously consider that expenditures for Higher Education have more the character of investments than costs, resulting as they do in a lessening of the need for social programs of the remedial sort.

    Senator Gamon reported that House Higher Education Committee chair Don Carlson (R) has stated that he believes faculty collective bargaining is essential for the survival of college faculty in this state, but Representative Carlson emphasizes that his is not the consensus opinion of the Republican caucus. Representative Carlson cited the administrations of the six state institutions of higher education as the main opponents to faculty collective bargaining legislation.

**OLD BUSINESS**

None
NEW BUSINESS
United Faculty of Central Washington University (AFT/NEA)

Chair Nesselroad reported that the Board of Trustees denied the Faculty Senate's recommendation (Faculty Senate Motion No. 2969, passed June 1, 1994) that the Board "agree to a collective bargaining election supervised by the Public Employment Relations Commission (PERC) and to collectively bargain with faculty if the majority of the faculty vote to do so." The following motion was made by Trustee Gwen Chaplin and was approved unanimously, and without discussion, by the Board at its January 27, 1995, meeting:

"I want to acknowledge the considerable effort that faculty has expended in organizing its members toward the goal of voting on the issue of union representation for faculty members. I appreciate the presentation made to the Trustees at our December meeting and recognize that increased communication will benefit both parties.

The message the faculty group presented expressed a felt need for increased dialogue and cooperation between faculty and administration. Members of the Board are committed to having a role in accomplishing this goal. The arguments for introduction of union negotiation as a means to further communication, shared decision making and movement toward accomplishing the University's mission were, however, not persuasive.

Therefore, I move that the Board of Trustees of C.W.U. respectfully declines the request by the United Faculty of Central to join them in requesting that the Public Employment Relations Commission conduct an election for the purpose of initiating collective bargaining with the University."

The Chair stated that the Board's unanimous approval of a motion without any opportunity for discussion came as a surprise. He questioned how the Board could have come to such a sudden and unanimous decision unless prior discussion had occurred outside the venue of a public Board meeting.

The Chair briefly summarized the events leading up to Trustee Chaplin's January 27 motion, reminding Senators that the Faculty Senate supported a PERC election because a substantial majority of Central's faculty (over 60%) had clearly indicated their desire for such an election. Chair Nesselroad reported that he met with Board of Trustees chair Ron Dotzauer and the steering committee of United Faculty of Central during Fall quarter. Trustee Dotzauer expressed a desire for open communication between the faculty and the Board at that time and recommended that the United Faculty of Central work through the existing university governance structure in its pursuit of a dialogue on the issue of faculty collective bargaining. On November 21, 1994, Trustee Dotzauer sent a letter to United Faculty of Central notifying the group that a presentation by UFC would be placed on the Board's December 2, 1994, agenda, and requesting a position paper from UFC. In his letter, Trustee Dotzauer specified four questions to which UFC should respond in delineating its position on collective bargaining. UFC complied with the Board's request by drafting a position paper based solely upon the Board's four questions. A verbal presentation by UFC was allowed at the December 2, 1994, Board meeting, but neither public discussion nor supporting/opposing views were entertained.

Chair Nesselroad pointed out that Trustee Chaplin's motion states that "the arguments for introduction of union negotiation as a means to further communication... were... not persuasive," but Trustee Chaplin provides no explanation for this statement and does not acknowledge that the December presentation by UFC was a response channeled within the specific parameters outlined by the Board's four questions. The Chair stated that President Ivory Nelson has remarked that the Faculty Senate should oppose faculty collective bargaining because this strengthens the Senate's position as sole representative of Central's faculty. Chair Nesselroad questioned how seriously the role of the Senate is taken by the university's administration and Board when a Faculty Senate resolution can be summarily dismissed by the Board without opportunity for discussion.

Senator Walter Arlt, PE, spoke on behalf of the steering committee of UFC. He stated that President Nelson had specifically recommended that UFC work through the Faculty Senate in pursuing its goals, and UFC had complied. Senator Arlt reported that UFC needs strengthening through grassroots faculty support and involvement.

Several Senators commented that the Board's motion was condescending in tone and that the Board had treated Central's faculty and its Faculty Senate with contempt by refusing to entertain discussion on an issue of importance to the faculty.
NEW BUSINESS, continued
United Faculty of Central Washington University (AFT/NEA), continued

*MOTION NO. 2992* Dan Ramsdell moved and Terry De Vietti seconded a resolution that:
WHEREAS the Board of Trustees of Central Washington University unanimously rejected the request of United Faculty of Central to hold an election for collective bargaining without offering any explanation and
WHEREAS 65% of the faculty at Central expressed the desire to have such an election and
WHEREAS the Faculty Senate of Central Washington University has several times voted unanimously in favor of enabling legislation for collective bargaining and
WHEREAS the rejection of the principle of collective bargaining runs counter to the spirit of democracy and shared governance and
WHEREAS higher education faces a nationwide crisis which calls for cooperation and collaboration among faculty, administration and Board,
The Faculty Senate of Central Washington University hereby votes to censure the Board of Trustees and expresses non-confidence in its members as the governing body of this institution.

*MOTION NO. 2993* Charles McGehee moved and Bob Fordan seconded a motion to table Motion No. 2992 until the February 22, 1995, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed.

It was recommended that the text of MOTION NO. 2992 be distributed as quickly as possible to all Senators so that it could be discussed within departments.

* * * * NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: February 22, 1995 * * * *
I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 11, 1995

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. REPORTS

1. CHAIR
   -MOTION: Patrick Owens, Library, replaces Gerard Hogan on Curriculum Committee
   -MOTION: George Carr, Student, replaces Matt Chambers on Academic Affairs Committee
   -Ad Hoc Committee on Consensual Relationships (membership attached)

2. PRESIDENT

3. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE - Frank Carlson

4. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES - Ken Gannon

5. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Charles McGehee, Chair

6. BUDGET COMMITTEE - Don Cocheba, Chair

7. CODE COMMITTEE - Beverly Heckart, Chair

8. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - Clara Baker, Chair
   -MOTION: Delete MUS 144 from General Education Program (attached)

9. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Blaine Wilson, Chair

10. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Bobby Cummings, Chair

11. AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW FACULTY OPINION SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATORS - Jack Dugan

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

*** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: February 22, 1995 ***
CHAIR
The Ad Hoc Committee on Consensual Relationships will begin meeting on January 30. The Committee is charged with developing a policy and having it approved by the Faculty Senate and President's Cabinet before June 1995.

Membership:
Dale Comstock, Math (CLAS)
Deborah Medlar, Accounting (SBE)
Jim Ponzetti, Home Economics (CPS)
Nancy Howard, Director of Affirmative Action
Anne Bulliung, Graduate Student (English Department)

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

MOTION: Proposed Change - General Education Program
Delete MUS 144 (First Year Theory) from the Arts & Humanities section of the Breadth Requirements of the General Education Program, as requested by Russ Schultz, Chair, Music Department

-Proposed deletion of MUS 144 approved by General Education Committee on 4/27/94
[transmitted to Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee on 11/1/94]
-Proposed deletion of MUS 144 approved by Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee on 1/5/95

If approved, the proposed change will become effective with the next university catalog (1996-98).
MOTIONS TO AMEND/SUSPEND THE FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS:

#1 Faculty Senate Bylaws section IV.C.2.: 
Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators
The Faculty Senate shall conduct faculty opinion surveys of academic administrators --- deans, provost and vice president for academic affairs, president of the university --- every two (2) years beginning in the academic year 1986-87. For purposes of devising and conducting the survey, the Senate shall appoint an ad hoc committee of members of the faculty.

#2 Move to suspend Faculty Senate Bylaws section IV.C.2. for the 1994-1995 academic year, and begin the next faculty opinion survey cycle during academic year 1995-96.
I want to acknowledge the considerable effort that faculty has expended organizing its members toward the goal of voting on the issue of union representation for faculty members. I appreciate the presentation made to the Trustees at our December meeting and recognize that increased communication will benefit both parties.

The message the faculty group presented expressed a felt need for increased dialogue and cooperation between faculty and administration. Members of the Board are committed to having a role in accomplishing this goal. The arguments for introduction of union negotiation as a means to further communication, shared decision making and movement toward accomplishing the University's mission were, however, not persuasive.

Therefore, I move that the Board of Trustees of CWU respectfully declines the request by the United Faculty of Central to join them in requesting that the Public Employment Relations Commission conduct an election for the purpose of initiating collective bargaining with the University.

Motion by Gwen Chaplin
Board of Trustees - CWU
January 27, 1995
ROLL CALL 1994-95

- Walter ARLT
- Linda BEATH
- Minerva CAPLES
- Robert CARBAUGH
- Matt CHAMBERS
- Shawn CHRISTIE
- Bobby CUMMINGS
- Terry DeVIEITI
- Susan DONAHOE
- Barry DONAHUE
- Robert FORDAN
- Ken GAMON
- Michael GLEASON
- Jim HAWKINS
- Webster HOOD
- Walter KAMINSKI
- Charles MCGEHEE
- Deborah MEDLAR
- Robert MYERS
- Ivory NELSON
- Connie NOTT
- Sidney NESSELROAD
- Vince NETHERY
- Steve OLSON
- Rob PERKINS
- Dan RAMSDELL
- Dieter ROMBOY
- James ROBERTS
- Sharon ROSELL
- Eric ROTH
- Charles RUBIN
- James SAHLSTRAND
- Carolyn SCHACTLER
- Hugh SPALL
- Kristan STARBUCK
- Morris UEBELACKER
- Lisa WEYANDT [pron. Y'-ANT]
- Rex WIRTH
- Thomas WIRTH
- Thomas YEH

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: February 1, 1995

- Stephen JEFFERIES
- Dan FENNERTY
- Carol BUTTERFIELD
- Don COCHEBA
- Greg CARLSON
- Roger FOUTS
- Dale OTTO
- George TOWN
- James HARPER
- Mark ZETTERBERG
- Peter BURKHOLDER
- Brucie BARNES
- David KAUFMAN
- Gary HEESACKER
- Patrick OWENS
- Thomas MOORE
- Andrew SPENCER
- Robert GREGSON
- Terry MARTIN
- Cathy BERTELSON
- Beverly HECKART
- Stella MORENO
- C. Wayne JOHNSTON
- Michael BRAUNSTEIN
- Geoffrey BOERS
- James HINTHORNE
- Margaret SAHLSTRAND
- Carolyn THOMAS
- John ALWIN
- Roger FOUTS
- Jerry HOGAN

(ROSTERS\ROLLCALL.94; February 1, 1995)
February 1, 1995

Date

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Carolyn Wells
Beverly Hackard
Amfiscoeba — For Bob Carbaugh
Greg Alford, United Faculty of Central AFT/NEA

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.