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MINUTES: Regular Faculty Senate Meeting
March 9, 1983
Central Washington University

Presiding Officer: Lillian Canzler, Chair
Recording Secretary: Vicki Potts

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators present: All Senators and/or their Alternates were present except for Eickhoff, Fouts, Gries, Hawkins, Kaatz, Kerr or Pratz.

Visitors present: Ed Harrington, Don Schliesman, Dale Comstock, Helmi Habib, Barney Erickson, David Anderson

ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Canzler introduced and welcomed the student senators: David Faley, Jim Cassidy and Carol Lynn Fitzgerald.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

Communications will follow the presentation by Dr. Harrington.

GUEST SPEAKER

Dr. Ed Harrington, Vice President for Academic Affairs, addressed the issue of high technology by briefly beginning with an outline of the history of technology at Central. He indicated that the introduction of high technology at this time is an evolutionary process. T & I E has been moving toward the training of students in electronic technology, mechanical technology, civil engineering technology and nuclear technology with an increased emphasis on math, physics, chemistry - the basic sciences. There is a very real demand for well educated, well trained technologists.

The electronic technology degree was approved as a major on April 8, 1981 by the Senate and is now due on the agenda of the Council for Post Secondary Education on March 30, 1983. Current plans for the electronic technology program, when approved by CPE include $250,000 in the Governor's budget for implementation of the program for the Tri-Cities area.

The CPE would be interested in also putting a mechanical technology proposal on their 3/30/83 agenda.

A commission for high technology has been created and the Governor and Legislature are both convinced that if people can be trained and educated in high technology, it will be the boon that will provide employment, attract high tech industry, create revenue for the state and in general, solve the problems of the state.

The Office of Fiscal Management has $946,000 for the renovation of the Hebler building for technology purposes. There is a good possibility that in 10 to 15 years that the whole field of technology will advance beyond anything any of us are thinking about today and that they will need another building and the Hebler building will be available for something else.

In December, CWU was asked for a prospectus for the Legislature - what could we do in the field of high technology, if we were properly funded? A copy of that prospectus was distributed to Senators prior to the meeting. It is a not a curriculum proposal but a statement of what we are doing now and what we might do along with some illustrations.

The Governor has budgeted $400,000 for a nuclear technology program to be set up in the Tri-Cities. Although this money was originally budgeted to WSU, there is an agreement to work in concert with CWU to offer the program at Columbia Basin College.

CBC is currently completely redoing their curriculum and will be the lead community college in the state in technology, emphasizing physics, math, and chemistry. They have a two track system - engineering technology and engineering. Legislation would mandate that CWU work with the community colleges. CBC likes the mechanical technology proposal from CWU and a vacant facility has been located that would serve our needs. Because mechanical technology is not currently in the Governor's budget, the March 30th date is of primary concern. We would have to go to the Legislative staffers and get another line item for the mechanical technology in order to start the program in the Tri Cities and on campus.

High technology at Central would mean additional program capability of a very high level program that is accredited nationally by the accrediting board for engineering technology. The legislature is broadening our charter so we could be in these technology programs and does provide the financial support, would help with our enrollment and could bring in students from other universities in the state.

The intent with the high technology proposals is to turn out well-educated students who are trained in technology who can be employed in the state. Copies of the Senate Bill #3155, which deals with legislation mandating what the universities will offer in the fields of technology, were distributed to the senators.

COMMUNICATIONS

Kathleen Motris read the following correspondence:

1. 2/9/83 letter from Larry Lowther concerning the History department's position on variable credit.
2. 2/24/83 letter from Catherine Sands requesting, on behalf of the Anthropology department, an end to the state of financial exigency. Referred to the Senate Budget committee.
COMMUNICATIONS (Continued)

3. 3/2/83 letter from David Kaufman outlining the University Curriculum committee's action regarding approval of the B.S. in Mechanical Technology.
4. 3/1/83 letter from Dr. Harrington regarding the name changes for the STAR and Computer Sciences programs.
5. 3/1/83 letter from Leslie Mueller announcing the election of Wayne Fairburn, Senator and Ed Golden, Alternate, for Business Administration.
6. 2/18/83 letter from George Stillman, Art, responding to the Senate's action on the audit rule.
7. 2/15/83 letter from Dean Applegate on the Teacher Education Council issue of degree designation change from B.A. in Ed to B.S. or B. Music.
8. 2/15/83 letter from David Anderson with suggestions for programs in high technology. Referred to Academic Affairs committee.
9. 2/25/83 letter from Don Schliesman concerning the Undergraduate Council's recommendation on grade prerequisites for math courses. Referred to Academic Affairs committee.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

Don Black said that the Senate Curriculum committee had met with Dr. Beed, TIE, regarding the Mechanical Technology degree proposal and the committee approved the program in concept, but did have some concerns with some of the courses. They also discussed the credit hour limitations and made the following recommendation:

The Faculty Senate Curriculum committee does not recommend that any changes be made in current University policy for the number of credit hours for both the B.S. and B.A. degrees. We recommend that the credit hour limitations for both the B.S. and B.A. degrees as indicated in the University Curriculum guide, page 12, be adhered to by all committees involved in approving curricula at CWU.

The Senate had received a number of requests this year from programs where the major exceeded the limitations in their degree. Dr. Beed returned the Mechanical Technology proposal to the committee with the 110 credit limit, shortened from the 125 credit proposal previously submitted to the University Curriculum committee and included in their minutes of 2/28/83.

**MOTION NO. 2170:** Don Black moved that the Senate accept all course additions and program deletions on pages 640 through 643 of the University Curriculum committee minutes, which includes the Mechanical Technology courses for the Mechanical Technology program. Seconded by Wayne Klemm.

**MOTION NO. 2171:** Bob Dean moved, Clint Duncan seconded, a motion to amend the motion to the following effect. Move the Senate approve the B.S. in Mechanical Technology major subject to the following condition. Contingent upon the acceptance of this major by the Council for Post Secondary Education, an interdisciplinary committee consisting of representatives from TIE, Physics, Mathematics and Chemistry departments will be appointed by the vice president for academic affairs to review the involved courses and their prerequisites, and if, or when, necessary to make recommendations for changes to the University Curriculum committee and the Faculty Senate.

Don Schliesman suggested that the Senate might want to take action similar to that of the University curriculum committee, as outlined in the 3/2/83 letter from David Kaufman, of approving the B.S in Mechanical Technology but withhold implementation until any problem with policies is resolved.

**MOTION NO. 2172:** John Vifian moved and Catherine Sands seconded a motion to table the amendment and the main motion until the next meeting (March 16). Motion carried.

A course outline of the mechanical technology degree showing 110 credits will be circulated to all Senators and Alternates by Thursday, March 30th, for consideration at the special meeting on March 16th.

**MOTION NO. 2173:** Don Black moved that the University Curriculum committee minutes, pages 640 and 641 and Math 120 only on page 642, be approved. Seconded by Bob Dean. Motion carried unanimously.

- Pg. 640 - Course Addition: Math 595, Graduate Research
- Pg. 641 - Program Deletion: B.A. Education - Speech Minor - Secondary
- Pg. 642 - Course Addition: Math 120, Technical Mathematics

REPORTS

CHAIR: The past weeks have been dominated by the discussion of high technology.

The 3/1/83 letter from Dr. Harrington was in response to a letter from Dr. Canzler regarding the process used in changing the names of the STAR and Computer Science programs.

Waymon Ware has had his complaint resolved to his satisfaction. G. Refai and G. Warren have been given contracts for Spring Quarter, extending their notice time.

Chester Keller is improving but still not strong enough to teach and serve on the Senate Personnel Committee. Libby Nesselroad has been elected to serve as chair of that committee in his place.

Proposed changes in the faculty code layoff policy will be out to all faculty by Thursday, March 11th. A hearing is scheduled for Wednesday, April 13th.

Nominations are due for distinguished professors in the areas of research, public service and teaching, to Dr. Harrington. The deadline is March 16th.

The Executive committee is accepting recommendations and volunteers to serve on the Senate Executive committee for next year.
REPORTS (Continued)

CODE: Tom Yeh announced that their committee will be meeting with Assistant Attorney General, Fritz Clarke, on Friday to review the proposed changes to the layoff plan.

CFR: Barney Erickson outlined the 2/20 meeting with Phil Rockefeller, Governor’s office associated with budget, when they discussed House Bill #248 which deals with the tuition surcharge and the keeping of funds within the institution rather than sending them to Olympia.

They also met with Rep. King (Chair, House Labor committee) and Senator Rinehart (member, Senate Higher Education committee) discussing the bills before them. A bill is being drafted that will make faculty immune from civil action for damages that may be occurring from types of committees like the Senate Executive committee. Currently there is no place in the WAC code that allows faculty immunity.

The CFR will meet again March 11th, with Carl Trembler, head of the Council for Post Secondary Education, and hope to get his philosophy regarding CPE. The duplication study is out and the six-year study is now in published form and they hope to have Mr. Trembler tell them what he perceives in these two directions.

Collective bargaining bill did pass the Senate and is now in the House Labor committee and has not been scheduled for a hearing as yet.

NEW BUSINESS

* MOTION NO. 2174: Catherine Sands moved and Kathleen Morris seconded her motion to approve the circulated motion presented by the Department of Anthropology as follows:

> WHEREAS: CWU is an institution of Higher Education.
> Tenure must constitute a protection against philosophical shifts.
> Present fiscal difficulties do not qualify as an emergency.

> BE IT MOVED THAT:
> Education in the liberal arts and sciences be clearly/explicitly reaffirmed as the primary role/mission of Central Washington University.
> The principle of tenure as a protection from extemporaneous/expedient administrative shifts in educational philosophy be reaffirmed.
> The state of fiscal exigency be rescinded immediately and before further consideration is given to revision of lay-off policy and/or new programs.

Dr. Sands said that if we agree with some of the proposed changes to the Code, we could find this institution going more toward technological kinds of things than liberal arts kinds of things and find liberal arts departments being eliminated.

* MOTION NO. 2175: John Vifian moved and Nancy Lester seconded a motion to table consideration of this motion until the next meeting on March 16th to allow time to consider the implications of such a motion.

Motion to table carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.
REGULAR SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, March 9, 1983
SUB 204-205

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - February 2, 1983

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. GUEST SPEAKER - Dr. Ed Harrington, Vice President for Academic Affairs

VI. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
University Curriculum Proposals: Pages
640: Course Addition - Math 595
641: Program Deletion - BA Ed Speech Minor - Secondary
642: Course Addition - Math 120
MET 211    MET 315
MET 212    MET 411
MET 213    MET 412
MET 314

643: Course Addition - MET 418    MET 423
MET 419    TIE 375
Program Addition: BS - Mechanical Technology

VII. REPORTS
A. Chair
B. Standing Committees: Executive
   Academic Affairs
   Budget
   Code
   Curriculum
   Personnel
C. CFR
D. President's Report

VIII. OLD BUSINESS
IX. NEW BUSINESS
X. ADJOURNMENT

**Note**
March 16 Special Faculty Senate Meeting
3:10 SUB 204-5
April 13 Code Hearing
3:10 SUB 204-5
Wednesday, February 16, 1983
Regular Faculty Senate Meeting
has been cancelled

The next regular meeting is March 9th.

There will be a number of items ready from committees for that meeting. It should be a very busy meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John AGARS</td>
<td>Gary CALBRAITH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil BACKLUND</td>
<td>John FOSTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don BLACK</td>
<td>Cal GREATSINGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken BRIGGS</td>
<td>Karen JENISON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry BRUNNER</td>
<td>Bob WEIKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David CANZLER</td>
<td>Mark HALPERIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian CANZLER</td>
<td>Larry WALD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim CASSIDY</td>
<td>Barney ERICKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert DEAN</td>
<td>David KAUFMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John DUGAN</td>
<td>John MEANY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint DUNCAN</td>
<td>Ray WHEELER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry EICKHOFF</td>
<td>Ed GOLDEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne FAIRBURN</td>
<td>Larry SPARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David FALEY</td>
<td>Sidney NESSELROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Lynn FITZGERAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert FOUTS</td>
<td>David SHORR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter GRIES</td>
<td>Richard MACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George GROSSMAN</td>
<td>Betty EVANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry GUNN</td>
<td>Don RINGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James HAWKINS</td>
<td>Stan SORENSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James HINTHORNE</td>
<td>Joel ANDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert IRVING</td>
<td>Jay BACHRACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin KAATZ</td>
<td>Robert JACOBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester KELLER</td>
<td>Charles GUATNEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom KERR</td>
<td>John CARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne KLEMIN</td>
<td>Wells MC INELLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob LAPEN</td>
<td>Max ZWANZIGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen MORRIS</td>
<td>Larry LOWTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen PRATZ</td>
<td>Marco BICCHIERI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel RAMSDELL</td>
<td>David Gee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine SANDS</td>
<td>Patrick O'SHAUGHNESSY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn SCHACTLER</td>
<td>Nancy Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric THURSTON</td>
<td>Thomas BLANTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosco TOLMAN</td>
<td>William CARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John VIFIAN</td>
<td>Ann DONOVAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles VLCEK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom YEH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David Anderson
Dr. Harrington
Vlad Schuman
Dale Comstock
Selma Sabib
Barney Erickson
Bob Wieking
I move that the Senate approve the B.S. Mechanical Technology major subject to the following condition. Contingent upon the acceptance of this major by the Council for Post-Secondary Education, an interdisciplinary committee consisting of representatives from the T & IE, Physics, Mathematics, and Chemistry Departments will be appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs to review the involved courses and their prerequisites, and if or when necessary to make recommendations for changes to the University Curriculum committee and the Faculty Senate.
MOTION  Submitted by Department of Anthropology and Ethnic Studies Program for action at Faculty Senate Meeting of March 9, 1983

WHEREAS:

CWU is an institution of Higher Education

Tenure must constitute a protection against philosophical shifts.

Present fiscal difficulties do not qualify as an emergency.

BE IT MOVED THAT:

Education in the liberal arts and sciences be clearly/explicitly reaffirmed as the primary role/mission of Central Washington University.

The principle of tenure as a protection from extemporaneous/expedient administrative shifts in educational philosophy, be reaffirmed.

The state of fiscal exigency be rescinded immediately and before further consideration is given to revision of lay-off policy and/or new programs.

Passed by unanimous vote of the faculty at the March 9, 1983 meeting of the Department of Anthropology and Ethnic Studies Program.
February 7, 1983

Lillian Canzler, Chairperson
Faculty Senate
CWU Campus

Dear Lillian,

I understand that the Faculty Senate has been discussing the variable credit option. In this letter I would like to set forth the position of the History Department on this issue.

We are a department using the 5-credit module for most of our course offerings, and we believe this module to be the most desirable for general use. It enables us to develop in our course offerings historical topics to the optimum depth. This is not to say that other credit modules are not viable. One may be able to cover in a 3-credit course essential topics in sufficient depth to make a viable course. The difference between the 3-credit and 5-credit course would be found in the breadth or depth of coverage. In the 3-credit option, desirable, though not essential, topics may be dropped out and/or certain necessary topics may not be explored to the same degree of depth as in the 5-credit version. An analogy might be one-volume synthesis of a two volume work. The existence of one does not invalidate the usefulness of the other. Each has value in its own right. The advantage of the 3-credit course to the student is that it enables him/her to include more courses, hence more historical subject areas, in the major. In other words, it provides greater breadth in historical study. The advantage of the 5-credit course is that it provides more depth, hence a greater degree of mastery, of a given historical topic. The choice is between breadth and depth.

Among historians there is considerable debate (as there apparently is in the Faculty Senate) as to which value—breadth or depth—should govern the historical program of study. It is a judgment call. This department has come down on the side of depth, but we recognize that the other position has considerable merit. This recognition that both positions are defensible makes variable credit acceptable to us. Its administrative convenience tips the scale in what would otherwise be a very closely balanced philosophical debate.

And, in the final analysis, it is convenience that recommends variable credit to us. At present, there are three situations in which it becomes useful: Off-Campus, summer session, and filling out the 36-credit teaching requirement during the regular on-campus session. (1) The convenience of the 3-credit module for professors who commute from campus to an off-campus center is readily apparent. It necessitates only one trip per week off-campus. Some have suggested teaching a 5-credit course in one night stands. We think that would be counter productive. It is simply too exhausting for both professor and students. (2) The 3-credit module also enables us to
provide greater variety of courses from which summer students may choose. On our current skimpy summer budget we must choose between offering three 5-credit courses and five 3-credit courses. We find the latter more desirable. (3) In order to meet the 36-credit teaching requirement, some of our faculty prefer to teach two 13-credit and one 10-credit quarters rather than two 10-credit and one 15-credit quarters. When an off-campus assignment is not available, the 3 credits must be taught on campus.

As an illustration of the difference that is likely to result when a 5-credit course is pared down to 3-credits, I have enclosed syllabi for my American Revolution course (HIST 340.3). I have correlated the topics by using the numbers 1-10. I have provided asterisks by the topics that are either omitted or touched on lightly in the shorter course. One can see in the comparison that the major topics are present in both versions of the course but condensed somewhat in the 3-credit version. Some of the more specialized topics are either omitted entirely or dealt with in quick summary. The topics involving blacks and women in the Revolution are dealt with incidentally to the main narrative of the military phase. The two versions also vary in terms of term paper assignments.

Another way of handling the problems which have given rise to the variable credit concept is to include in the catalog both versions (3-credit and 5-credit) as separate courses. We could do this, but the course titles and descriptions would have such slight variations, that the probable result would be confusion in the mind of the student. What, he/she would most likely ask, is the difference between these courses, other than credits? Since the answer is, very little difference, we thought it best to handle the problem as we have—a single course with credit options. This solution would also help to keep catalog litter at a minimum.

Perhaps this letter does not adequately address all of the questions that the senators have concerning this issue. If so, I would be happy to appear before the senate to discuss the matter further.

Sincerely,

Larry Lowther
Chairman

LL:ks
encl.
THREE-CREDITS

HISTORY 340.3
American Revolution

Dr. Lowther

TOPIC

1. Colonial Background to 1763

2. Reorganizing the Empire--Grenville and Townshend Programs

3. Colonial Resistance--From Boston Massacre to Boston Tea Party

4. Road to Revolution--Intolerable Acts and Continental Congress

5. From Lexington & Concord to the Declaration of Independence

ONE HOUR MID-TERM EXAM

6. Military Phase, 1776-1778

7. Military Phase, 1778-1783

8. The Political and Social Revolution

9. The Articles of Confederation

10. The Constitution

ONE HOUR FINAL EXAM

READING ASSIGNMENTS

Ferguson, Chs. 1 & 2
Cunliffe, Ch. 1

Ferguson, Ch. 3 (pp. 67-89)
Nelson, Ch. 1
Cunliffe, Ch. 2

Ferguson, Ch. 3 (pp. 89-93)
Nelson, Chs. 2, 3

Ferguson, Ch. 3 (pp. 93-103)

Nelson, Chs. 4-6

Ferguson, Ch. 4 (pp. 107-121)
Cunliffe, Ch. 3
Nelson, Ch. 7

Ferguson, Ch. 4 (pp. 121-131)
Ferguson, Ch. 5
Nelson, Ch. 8

Ferguson, Ch. 6 (pp. 157-170)
Nelson, Ch. 9

Ferguson, Ch. 6 (pp. 170-184)
Ferguson, Ch. 7

Ferguson, Ch. 8

Term Paper

Write an essay (1,500-2,500 words) on one of the following topics:

1. Most Americans were Reluctant Rebels.
2. The Constitution as the Fulfillment of the Revolution.
3. George Washington: Was he the Indispensable Man of the Revolution?
### Class Schedule

**REQUIRED TEXTS:**
- Wallace Brown, *The Good Americans: The Loyalists in the American Revolution*
- James T. Flexner, *Washington: The Indispensable Man*

#### TOPICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Introduction</th>
<th>READING ASSIGNMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonial Background to 1750</td>
<td>Flexner, Ch. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreshadowing of Things to Come, 1750-1763</td>
<td>Ferguson, Chs. 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexner, Chs. 2, 3-5, Ferguson, Chs. 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexner, Chs. 6-7, Ferguson, Ch. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexner, Ch. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Grenville Program, 1763-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Constitutional Debate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Townshend Program, 1767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Escalation of Violence: Boston Massacre</td>
<td>Brown, Chs. 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Period of Relative Calm, 1770-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston Tea Party, 1773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The Ministry Reacts: Coercive Acts, 1774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Continental Congress &amp; The Move Toward Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Colonial Agents and the Coming of the Revolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FIRST EXAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Military Phase: Prospects at the Outset</td>
<td>Flexner, Ch. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lexington and Concord</td>
<td>Flexner, Ch. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>Flexner, Ch. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Financing the War</td>
<td>Flexner, Ch. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saratoga Campaign</td>
<td>Flexner, Chs. 13, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diplomacy of the Revolution</td>
<td>Ferguson, Ch. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* The Iroquois in the Revolution</td>
<td>Flexner, Ch. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* War on the Sea</td>
<td>Flexner, Chs. 17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Traitors and Spies</td>
<td>Flexner, Ch. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* The Negro in the Revolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Women and the Revolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Prisoners of War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Loyalists</td>
<td>Brown, Chs. 3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>War in the South</td>
<td>Flexner, Ch. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partisan Warfare: Francis Marion</td>
<td>Ferguson, Ch. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yorktown</td>
<td>Flexner, Ch. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Treaty of Peace</td>
<td>Flexner, Chs. 22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SECOND EXAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Establishing State Governments</td>
<td>Ferguson, Ch. 8, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Nature of the Revolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOPICS

9. The Articles of Confederation
   Movement for Constitutional Change

10. Writing the Constitution
    * Interpretations of the Constitutional Movement
    * Ratification of the Constitution
    * The Continuing Revolution

FINAL EXAM

A 2,000-3,000 word paper is required in this course.

READING ASSIGNMENTS

Ferguson, Ch. 9
Ferguson, Ch. 10,
Flexner, Ch. 25
Flexner, Ch. 26
February 24, 1983

Lillian Canzler, Chairman
Senate Office - Edison
Campus

Dear Lillian,

The Department of Anthropology requests that you ask Dr. Donald Garrity, president of CWU, to declare a formal end to the state of financial exigency declared last year.

Sincerely,

Catherine J. Sands

cc
ts
MEMORANDUM

TO: Lillian Canzler, Chair
    Faculty Senate
FROM: David Kaufman, Chair
    University Curriculum Committee
DATE: March 2, 1983

The University Curriculum Committee voted to approve the Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Technology, but not recommend implementation until the Senate could review policies governing all BS degree programs, for the following reasons:

1) Several of the Math and Physical Science courses required of the major are included in the breadth list and might be used as dedicated general education requirements.

2) This program severely circumscribes the "free elective" option open to students that has been a strong liberal arts tradition of this institution.

3) Credit maximums outlined in the curriculum guide have been violated and no special rationale for this action has been forthcoming from its proposers.
Dear Lillian:

Thank you for your letter of February 10, 1983, regarding the status of the name changes for STAR and Computer Science. Since I was involved, along with Dean Williams, in asking the Academic Affairs Committee to review the proposed changes, I will take the liberty of responding. I am sure Dean Williams will wish to do so also.

The issue of review by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate rests in the statement in the Faculty Code, 1.40 Committees:

D. The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee shall be concerned with the study and improvement of academic standards and academic organizational structures. It shall make policy recommendations concerning admissions, registration, grading, withdrawal, the university calendar scheduling, and academic support systems such as the library and audio-visual division. It shall cooperate with other individuals, groups or committees in long-range planning, including the creation of new schools, departments, programs and academic posts. It shall do such other similar things as may be requested by or approved by the Senate Executive Committee.

In the past the Academic Affairs Committee has reviewed name changes and has reported to the Faculty Senate on the changes. Since most changes have been "cosmetic" no Senate action has, I believe, been taken.

In the present case, the change to Department of Computer Science and Department of Gerontology follows long standing University policy; that is, academic units of four or more faculty have traditionally been called "Departments"; units of less than four members, "Programs". There has been no consideration of "majors" or other factors since, as I understand it, this terminology was agreed upon in the '60's primarily for the purpose of establishing membership for the Faculty Senate. This practice was changed in the '70's to allow representation from programs but the tradition of size still remains.
E. Lillian Canzler  
Faculty Senate  
March 1, 1983  
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Since the proposed changes are to the benefit of the University and its students and faculty and do not involve questions of curriculum or budget (these matters have already been decided or are about to be decided), I believe the change of title should occur.

May we discuss this with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee once more, please?

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

jm

cc: Dr. Garrity  
    Dr. Williams  
    Dr. Schliesman  
    Chair, Academic Affairs Committee
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate Office

FROM: Leslie C. Mueller, Chairperson
      Department of Business Administration

DATE: March 1, 1983

RE: Senator and Alternate

As a result of an election held on February 25, 1983, Wayne Fairburn was elected as Senator and Ed Golden was elected as Alternate to the Faculty Senate.

LCM: b
February 18, 1983

TO: Lillian Canzler, Chair
    Faculty Senate

FROM: George Stillman
    Chairman

I believe with regard to your response on the audit rule, the
Executive Committee has missed the point. If you read our catalog
and those of other institutions such as the University of Washington,
WSU, Cal. Berkeley, Yale, Harvard, etc., you will note that we may
be one of the few, if not the only, institutions to say that "the
instructor may request of the School Dean that the auditor be officially
withdrawn from the course if these requirements are not met." This is
far from your observation "it could also be considered the sign of a
person who was wise enough to quit."

As you will note, there is no grade involved with an audit. It is
either an audit or a "W" so what is the point other than using the
above catalog entry as a club? I see little reasoning involved in your
answer to me.
Dr. Lillian Canzler, Chairperson  
Faculty Senate  
Campus  

Dear Dr. Canzler:

On February 9, 1983, the Teacher Education Council held an Open Hearing to receive testimony on the issue of the "degree designation change from B.A. in Ed. to B.S. or B. Music (given Senate Motion 2117)." During the Teacher Education Council meeting which followed the hearing, Council members approved the following motion:

The Teacher Education Council considers it appropriate to have programs leading to teacher certification in degree designations other than the B.A. Ed.

Council members are debating the issue of the number of hours required for graduation within the degree designations.

Sincerely,

Jimmie R. Applegate, Dean  
School of Professional Studies

dh

cc  Dean Schliesman
Faculty Senate
February 15, 1983
David Anderson
Mathematics
Faculty Forum, February 14, 1983

Following the faculty forum on "High Tech", I have some concern about the efficacy of the program upon which we are embarking. The Senate may share my concern. I suggest that the Senate might usefully make proposals for developing an educational program as the governor and legislature seem to want. For my part, I recognize that there may be special circumstances at Central which should be taken into consideration.

As a suggestion which has an entirely different thrust from the existing proposal, consider the following:

1. Students in beginning English classes should be expected to routinely compose their reports on a computer terminal. The professor might then be expected to read their reports on his terminal. An editor program and word processing program would be an integral part of the student's education. It would be the most effective way of learning how to use the computer. I claim the student's work would be vastly improved, the student would take great pride in his work.

2. Students in beginning mathematics classes would use a nonprogramming language such as MINITAB, in which they can calculate and display graphs with the first session at the terminal. The computer usage would become natural to the students.

3. Social science students would have access to data bases for in depth study. Beginning students could use MINITAB nicely, progressing to more extensive programs as the need for studying larger data bases becomes evident.

4. Students in the humanities could have access to various library services on line, excerpting as necessary to incorporate into reports. The reports could emphasize the use of analysis, rather than note taking. The quality could well improve.
5. Spelling, a bugaboo with many students might improve drastically with the aid of a manual spelling checker, one which points out questionable words to the students—he must decide the correct spelling.

6. The hard sciences could use the simulations and databases which are available on the computer.

7. Business students would have intensive experience in the technology which is particularly appropriate to their discipline.

8. Students emphasizing education would have experiences with both the VAX and the microcomputers on campus to prepare them for appropriate use of the computers available in the school systems. We can even anticipate that when the schools begin to install minicomputers our students would have the expertise to participate in the selection and development of the systems.

This program is ambitious indeed. It may take several years to have substantive implementation. The first steps are in place, due to the vice president's encouragement of faculty to begin use of the university's computer. There is a remarkable cross-section of users on the campus. Undertaking the type of program outlined above would result in a nearly immediate upgrading of faculty skills in the computer area, and provide a completely natural learning experience for the students.

My support of the program outlined above is based on the belief that it is the most effective way in which Central could in the near term produce graduates with the abilities required to succeed in the later years of this decade. The factor which appeals to me is that the program would enhance each and every student, not a limited group who are drawn by special interest to one small program or another. The cost is large, but the cost of terminals might not be as large as required by starting up new programs. As well, the program would incorporate the existing faculty into the "high tech" program, in fact would not call for any recruitment of new faculty.
February 25, 1983

Lillian Canzler, Chair
Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Campus

Dear Dr. Canzler:

This is to report action taken by the Undergraduate Council during its meeting on February 10, 1983. Acting on a request from Dean Lygre, the Council considered and subsequently endorsed a proposal from Professor Cutlip and the faculty of mathematics, that to be admitted to any mathematics course, students must earn a grade of C- or higher in each listed prerequisites to that course. I recommend the Faculty Senate approve the proposal.

As you can see from the attached correspondence, there is a question as to whether or not the proposal constitutes a question of policy or simply a course description change. Because it is a significant departure from past and present practice, I believe the Senators should be aware of it and given an opportunity to respond to it.

I would be pleased to be available for questions, as I am sure is true of Drs. Lygre and Cutlip.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
February 7, 1983

Dr. Donald Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Campus

Dear Don:

I am enclosing a proposal from Fred Cutlip that admission to any Mathematics course should require a grade of C- or higher in each listed prerequisite to that course. After discussing the proposal with Fred and you, I think there is a policy question here that needs to be considered by the Undergraduate Council and then sent to the Senate for appropriate consideration.

So although the enclosed memo is addressed to the University Curriculum Committee, please consider it addressed to the Undergraduate Council instead and bring it to their attention for action as soon as possible.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

David G. Lygre
Professor of Chemistry and Assistant Dean

DGL: 1km
Enclosure
pc: Fred Cutlip
TO : University Curriculum Committee

FROM: W. Frederick Cutlip
   Chairman, Department of Mathematics

RE : Grade standards in prerequisites

DATE: 1 February 1983

Though most disciplines offer courses with specific prerequisites, mathematics courses are the most dependent upon mastery of material in sequential order. We witness every quarter the distress of students who have passed course after course with low grades, only to finally find themselves unable to handle material toward which their shaky foundations were intended to build. It is therefore in our students' interests that we propose to implement a standard which must be met in prerequisite courses in order to enroll in a given course. We wish to insert the following sentence on page 156 of the present catalog, just prior to the first course listing (Math 100):

NOTE WELL: ADMISSION TO ANY MATHEMATICS COURSE REQUIRES A GRADE OF C- OR BETTER IN EACH LISTED PREREQUISITE TO THAT COURSE.

Deletion of the references to high school mathematics in the present Mathematics 172.1-.2 course description will allow this new stipulation to apply unambiguously to all courses presently listed.

This may or may not be a matter which falls in the purview of the University Curriculum Committee. It has more to do with setting standards than with altering curriculum. The members of the Department are unanimous in their conviction that the student will be better served, and classes conducted at a more invigorating intellectual level, if only the better-prepared are allowed to proceed.

In our discussion of possible ways to implement this slightly raised standard, we considered two alternatives, both used in institutions with which we have had contact: the present proposal, and abandonment of the grade of D (including D+ and D-) in all courses which serve as prerequisites to other Mathematics courses. The latter alternative does not allow the "one-shot" student, who wants only credit in one of our courses without continuing in the sequence, to receive credit with a grade below C-. We therefore chose the former alternative.

The Department of Mathematics seeks your endorsement of this proposal.

Routing:

1. Dept. ____________________________ 6. University Curriculum Committee
2. School Dean __________________________
3. Graduate or Undergraduate Dean __________________________
4. Clerk __________________________
5. Graduate, Undergraduate or Teacher Education Council (required for program additions) __________________________
6. Senate __________________
7. To Catalog __________________
February 24, 1983
CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY THE
UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AND
FORWARDED TO THE SENATE

MATH 120, Technical Mathematics. (5) FWSp. Prerequisite, MATH 101 or permission. Treatment of topics from algebra and trigonometry especially pertinent to programs in engineering technology. No credit for those with credit in MATH 163.2 or equivalent.

TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION COURSE ADDITIONS

MET 211, Structural Systems I. (4). Prerequisite or corequisite, MATH 172.1. Statics and strength of materials. Stress and strain, equilibrium, tension structures and testing, compression structures and testing, shear elements and fasteners, trusses, torsion and shaped structures.

MET 212, Structural Systems II. (5). Prerequisite MET 211, and prerequisite or corequisite, MATH 172.2. Four hours lecture; two hours lab. Continuing studies of statics and strength of materials. Properties of cross sections, bending, bending deformation and buckling. Lab experiments in tension and compression testing, shear testing, hardness, torsion bending and buckling.

MET 213, Technical Dynamics. (5). Prerequisites MET 212, PHYS 111. Four hours lecture; two hours lab. Rotational kinematics, dynamic equilibrium, linear force systems, concurrent force systems, multibody systems, rotational inertia, and general planar force systems.

MET 314, Applied Thermodynamics. (5). Prerequisite, MET 213. Four hours lecture; two hours lab. First and second laws of thermodynamics, enthalpy and entropy, perfect gases, carnot cycle, steam cycles, refrigeration cycles.

MET 315, Fluid Dynamics. (5). Prerequisite, MET 314. Four hours lecture; two hours lab. Fluid statics, Bournoulli equation in linear flow, laminar and turbulent flow, Reynolds number, losses in pipes, losses in ducts, compressible flow, nozzles, supersonic flow.

MET 411, Energy Systems I. (5). Prerequisite, MET 315. Four hours lecture; two hours lab. Performance characteristics of reciprocating compressors, gasoline and diesel engines, gas turbines and compressors.

MET 412, Energy Systems II. (5). Prerequisite MET 411. Four hours lecture; two hours lab. Performance characteristics of vapor compression cycles, centrifugal pumps and fans, turbofans, psychrometry, ducts and humidity control.
February 10, 1983
CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AND FORWARDED TO THE SENATE
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CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AND FORWARDED TO THE SENATE

MATHEMATICS
COURSE ADDITION
MATH 595. Graduate Research. (1-10). Prerequisite, permission of advisor. Grade will be S or U. May be repeated for credit. A maximum of five (5) credits may count toward degree requirements.