

1-14-1987

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 01/14/1987

Sue Tirotta

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

---

### Recommended Citation

Tirotta, Sue, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 01/14/1987" (1987). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 780.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/780>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [pingfu@cwu.edu](mailto:pingfu@cwu.edu).

REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Central Washington University

January 14, 1987

Presiding Officer: Ken Gamon  
Recording Secretary: Sue Tirotta

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

ROLL CALL

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Garrison, Gierlasinski, Gookin, Hasbrouck, Hawkins, Hinthorne and Ressler.  
Visitors: Ed Harrington, Dave Storla, Jimmie Applegate.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

-Add a report on computer usage fees by Ed Harrington, Vice President for Academic Affairs, after the Chair's Report.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

\*MOTION NO. 2537 Libby Street moved and Clair Lillard seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the December 3, 1986 meeting as distributed. Motion passed.

COMMUNICATIONS

Connie Roberts reported the following correspondence:

-12/12/86 letter from Dean Don Schliesman, Undergraduate Studies, informing the Senate of Undergraduate Council approval for admissions criteria to the Communication Department (effective Fall 1987).

REPORTS

1. CHAIR

-Chair Gamon reported that the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) Advisory Committee on Finance, of which he is a member, met at Highline Community College on January 13, 1987 to make preliminary recommendations to the HEC Board.  
-John Carr has been elected chair of the 1986-87 Senate Personnel Committee.  
-As of 12/12/86, the C.W.U. Foundation reported a balance of \$2020 for the newly formed "Friends of the Senate Fund;" Chair Gamon thanked all those who have contributed.

2. VICE PRESIDENT HARRINGTON - COMPUTER USAGE FEE

Vice President for Academic Affairs Ed Harrington outlined a proposal for charging fees for use of C.W.U.'s microcomputers and computer terminals. He explained that Central has placed a major emphasis on fostering student knowledge of computers by encouraging their use at every opportunity, but the state has not provided sufficient funds to support the operational expenses resulting from the increased use of the computers. He went on to say that although both faculty and administrators have been opposed to charging students additional fees to meet increased operating costs ((i.e., instruction and instructional support, expenses for laboratory student assistants, computer paper, software, and other supplies such as ribbons, printer cartridges and floppy disks), the expense of operating the computers and computer laboratories has become so great that they can no longer be met by "borrowing" from other budgets.

After considerable study by an ad hoc committee and the Council of Academic Deans, the following proposal was advanced to establish a special student-use fee to fund the cost of operating computers used by students:

- 1) Students enrolled in courses which require computer use (as listed):  
Fee = \$10.00/Course
- 2) Students wishing to use the microcomputer and computer terminals independent of scheduled classes: Fee = \$10.00/Quarter

(Fees to be effective Spring Quarter 1987)

The President's Advisory Council will soon review the fee proposal; if approved, it will be presented to the Board of Trustees on February 20, 1987. Vice President Harrington introduced Dave Storla, Director of Academic Computing, and asked that the Senate direct its questions to him.

Chair Gamon opened the floor for questions and discussion of the fee proposal. Senators expressed concern that fees could have a negative effect on general computer use and individual class enrollment, that some classes require minor computer use but are included on the list of courses for which a fee would be charged, that students could lend their access cards to others who hadn't paid the fee, that departments with specialized computer equipment would continue to pay for

- 2. VICE PRESIDENT HARRINGTON - COMPUTER USAGE FEE, continued  
their operating expenses from departmental budgets, that no provision has been made for non-student (county) users of the Library microcomputer labs and that patterns of class vs. non-class use are not clear.

Dave Storla explained that the Student Information System (SIS) is not capable at this time of putting a maximum limit on individual student fees and that this proposal was presented as the easiest way to assess a fee with as little administrative cost as possible. Chair Gamon added that although it is not legal at this time to charge a single, across-the-board fee to all C.W.U. students, this may change as a result of the HEC Board's proposals on tuition and fee re-structuring; he also noted that implementation of this proposal would be on a trial-run basis for Spring quarter 1987 only. Dean Jimmie Applegate stated that the Ad Hoc Committee on Computer Usage Fees originally proposed a \$15/course fee with a maximum of \$25 and a flat \$15 fee for non-class use. As discussion continued, support developed for a single computer-use fee for class and non-class users; Chair Gamon suggested as a point of procedure that formal motion(s) on this issue be proposed under 'New Business.'

- 3. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
No report

- 4. BUDGET COMMITTEE  
Chair Phil Backlund reported that the Senate Budget Committee will meet on January 26 to review merit and professional growth and for preliminary discussion on distribution of additional faculty salary monies.

- 5. CODE COMMITTEE  
No report

- 6. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE  
\*MOTION NO. 2538 Barry Donahue moved approval of the Business Administration/Marketing Management Program Change on University Curriculum Committee page 841. Motion passed.

<u>PAGE</u>		
841	Business Administration/ Marketing Management	Program Change

- 7. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE  
No report

OLD BUSINESS  
None

NEW BUSINESS

-Computer Usage Fees

Several Senators noted that the proposal was presented to the Senate on short notice and that the President's Advisory Council would meet and make its proposal before the next regular Faculty Senate meeting, but the 1986-87 Senate Operating Procedures approved 10/1/86 (Motion No. 2521) state that substantive committee motions will be printed on the agenda and will not be discussed and voted on until a subsequent meeting.

\*MOTION NO. 2539 Owen Pratz moved and Phil Backlund seconded a motion to break with operating procedures. Motion passed (15 yes, 7 no).

\*MOTION NO. 2540 Owen Pratz moved and Libby Street seconded a motion to instruct the Senate chair, as a member of the President's Advisory Council, to vote for and support a single computer usage fee for all computer users. Motion passed (16 yes, 10 no).

Senators also requested that the Senate chair report to the Faculty Senate on the effectiveness of any computer-usage fee proposal which may be implemented.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING  
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, January 14, 1987  
SUB 204-205

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - December 3, 1986
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS  
-12/12/86 letter from Dean Don Schliesman, Undergraduate Studies, informing the Senate of Undergraduate Council approval for admissions criteria to the Department of Communication (effective Fall 1987).
- V. REPORTS
  - 1. Chair
  - 2. Academic Affairs Committee
  - 3. Budget Committee
  - 4. Code Committee
  - 5. Curriculum Committee  
-UCC Page 841
  - 6. Personnel Committee
- VI. OLD BUSINESS
- VII. NEW BUSINESS
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

\* \* \* \* \*

WINTER QUARTER FACULTY SENATE MEETING SCHEDULE  
January 14, 1987    February 14, 1987    February 25, 1987  
3:10 p.m., SUB 204-205

\* \* \* \* \*



<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John AGARS	<input type="checkbox"/> Gary GALBRAITH
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jay BACHRACH	<input type="checkbox"/> Rae HEIMBECK
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phil BACKLUND	<input type="checkbox"/> Roger GARRETT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bill BENSON	<input type="checkbox"/> Frank SESSIONS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerry BRUNNER	<input type="checkbox"/> G.W. BEED
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Frank CARLSON	<input type="checkbox"/> Cal GREATSINGER
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John CARR	<input type="checkbox"/> William BARKER
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lori CLARK	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barry DONAHUE	<input type="checkbox"/> Bernard MARTIN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wayne FAIRBURN	<input type="checkbox"/> Larry BUNDY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken GAMON	<input type="checkbox"/> Barney ERICKSON
<input type="checkbox"/> Phil GARRISON	<input type="checkbox"/> David CANZLER
<input type="checkbox"/> Norm GIERLASINSKI	<input type="checkbox"/> Dick WASSON
<input type="checkbox"/> Larry GOOKIN	<input type="checkbox"/> Robert PANERIO
<input type="checkbox"/> Richard HASBROUCK	<input type="checkbox"/> Walter EMKEN
<input type="checkbox"/> A. James HAWKINS	<input type="checkbox"/> Randolph WISCHMEIER
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beverly HECKART	<input type="checkbox"/> Larry LOWTHER
<input type="checkbox"/> Mike HENNIGER	<input type="checkbox"/> David SHORR ( <u>A. Sippola?</u> )
<input type="checkbox"/> James HINTHORNE	<input type="checkbox"/> Don RINGE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> George KESLING	<input type="checkbox"/> Allen GULEZIAN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>Scott LEMERT</del> MARK JOHNSON	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Nancy LESTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kelton KNIGHT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clair LILLARD	<input type="checkbox"/> R.J. CARBAUGH
<input type="checkbox"/> Linda MARRA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wendy RICHARDS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Victor MARX	<input type="checkbox"/> Makiko DOI
<input type="checkbox"/> Wells McINELLY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Don WISE
<input type="checkbox"/> Willa Dene POWELL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David GEE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owen PRATZ	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> John RESSLER	<input type="checkbox"/> Otto JAKUBEK
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Julie RHODES	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Connie ROBERTS	<input type="checkbox"/> Ken HARSHA
<input type="checkbox"/> Sam RUST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Arne Sippola</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lynel SCHACK	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Willard SPERRY	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Libby STREET	<input type="checkbox"/> Jim EUBANKS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ned TOOMEY	<input type="checkbox"/> Denis THOMAS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bill VANCE	<input type="checkbox"/> Ralph NILSON
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rex WIRTH	<input type="checkbox"/> Jim BROWN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom YEH	<input type="checkbox"/> William SCHMIDT

Please sign your name and return  
this sheet to the Faculty Senate Secretary  
directly after the meetings. Thank you.

January 14, 1987  
DATE

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

*Edward J. Harring*

*David L. Stork* Director of Academic Computing

*Jimmie Applegate*

DEC 18 REC'D

Central  
Washington  
University



Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Bouillon 207 1  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-1403

December 12, 1986

Dr. Kenneth O. Gamon, Chair  
Faculty Senate  
Central Washington University  
Campus

Dear Dr. Gamon:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you and the other senators that the Undergraduate Council approved criteria and procedures for admission to several majors offered by the faculty in the Department of Communication. The action was taken at the request of Professor Corwin King. The policy will become effective with those students who seek admission to Public Relations or Mass Communication starting fall 1987.

A copy of the policy is attached.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, which appears to read 'Donald M. Schliesman'.

Donald M. Schliesman  
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

DMS:rd

cc: Vice President Harrington  
Dr. C. King

Attachment

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

### Admission to Departmental Programs

1. Students pursuing either majors or minors are required to register with and be advised by the departmental faculty.
2. Students majoring in Public Relations or Mass Communication must, before obtaining entrance to the major, complete COM 201 and COM 208 or equivalent, and have a grade point average of at least 2.25 overall. Continuance as a major will be provisional, subject to completion of a written test of media writing skills that serves as a further prerequisite to COM 370.
3. Students must earn a minimum grade of C- in each course allowed toward fulfilling major and minor requirements.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AND FORWARDED TO THE SENATE

MUSIC

COURSE ADDITIONS

- MUS 382. Survey of Chamber Music (3). Prerequisite, MUS 282.
- MUS 383. Survey of Symphonic Music (3). Prerequisite, MUS 282.
- MUS 384. Survey of Choral Music (3). Prerequisite, MUS 282.
- MUS 385. Survey of Opera (3). Prerequisite, MUS 282.
- MUS 386. Survey of 20th Century Music (3). Prerequisite, MUS 282.

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM CHANGE

AS IT APPEARS

PROPOSED

Marketing Management

Advisors: Beaghan, Johnson, Spreece

The marketing curriculum provides background for careers in sales, advertising, marketing management, research and analysis and retail management. Marketing topics include researching and analyzing consumers, market demands, pricing, product distribution and development, and communication in order to develop marketing strategies and policies. Minimum of 25 credits required.

Required:	Credits
MKT 462, Marketing Promotion Management	4
MKT 468, Marketing Problems and Policies	5
MKT 469, Marketing Research	4

At least 12 credits from the following electives with the prior approval of the Marketing Management advisor:  
ECON 301, MKT 361, MKT 367, MKT 368, MKT 463, MKT 467, other approved courses may be included.

Marketing Management

Advisors: Beaghan, Johnson, Spreece

The marketing curriculum provides background for careers in sales, advertising, marketing management, research and analysis and retail management. Marketing topics include researching and analyzing consumers, market demands, pricing, product distribution and development, and communication in order to develop marketing strategies and policies. Minimum of 25 credits required.

Required:	Credits
MKT 462, Marketing Promotion Management	4
MKT 468, Marketing Problems and Policies	5
MKT 469, Marketing Research	4

At least 12 credits from the following electives with the prior approval of the Marketing Management advisor:  
ECON 301, ECON 310, MKT 361, MKT 367, MKT 368, MKT 463, MKT 466, MKT 467; other approved courses may be included. Only one non-marketing elective may be used in meeting the minimum requirements of 25 credits.



January 12, 1987

PROPOSAL FOR CHARGING FEES  
FOR USE OF MICROCOMPUTERS AND COMPUTER TERMINALS

Meeting the expense of operating computers and microcomputers for student use has become a serious problem for the University. On one hand Central, like most universities, has placed a major emphasis on fostering student knowledge of computers by encouraging their use at every opportunity. At the same time, the state has not provided sufficient funds to support the operational expenses resulting from the increased use of the computers.

Faculty and Administrators have been opposed to charging students additional fees to meet the increased operating costs. Therefore, during the past few years funds have been "borrowed" from other sources, i.e., instruction and instructional support, to pay the expenses of laboratory student assistants, computer paper, software, and other supplies such as ribbons, printer cartridges, and floppy disks. The expense of operating the computers and computer laboratories has become so great that they can no longer be met by "borrowing" from other budgets. Further, those budgets have increasing demands which must be fulfilled.

After considerable study by an ad hoc committee and the Council of Academic Deans, a proposal is being advanced to establish a special student-use fee to fund the cost of operating computers used by students. It is appropriate to reverse the trend of shifting costs of educational requirements from the user to the provider. One example of that shift should suffice: In former years students purchased or rented a typewriter, bought their own paper and typed (or hired someone else to type) their term papers. Today many papers are prepared in the university microcomputer laboratories, wherein the terminal, the software, ribbons, and the paper are available at no cost. In addition, a student assistant is available free of charge to give assistance in using the equipment. Such free service can no longer be provided.

Now, therefore, the following proposal is offered:

FEES FOR USE OF MICROCOMPUTERS  
and COMPUTER TERMINALS

Students enrolled in courses which require computer use --  
\$10.00/Course

Students wishing to use the microcomputer and computer  
terminals independent of scheduled classes --  
\$10.00/Quarter

Fees to be effective Spring Quarter, 1987.



JAN 6 1987

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

## SUMMARY

COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH  
ACADEMIC COMPUTING/WORD PROCESSING  
LABS AT CENTRAL

PROJECTED COSTS TO RUN THE LABS FOR ONE YEAR (1987)

Item	TOTAL for Class and Non-Class Use	TOTAL for Non-Class Use
Salaries for student assistants	\$60,000	\$49,060
Computer Paper	\$11,230	\$9,161
Other Supplies: ribbons, laser printer cartridges, floppy disks etc.	\$6,350 -----	\$5,094 -----
TOTALS:	\$77,580	\$63,315

Note: These figures are combinations of actual and projected costs since several areas have only recently been put into operation or been modified, so actual costs are not yet available.

Also, these figures are for the operation of the following Micro-computer labs (Apple in Black Hall, IBM in Shaw/Smyser, and TRS-80 in the Library), the DECmate word processing lab in Shaw/Smyser, the terminal and microcomputer labs in Computer Science area in Hebel and terminal labs in Lind, Shaw/Smyser, Dean, Instructional Building, Psychology, and the planned Math lab in Bouillon.

IT DOES NOT cover costs for lab facilities in I&ET, the GIS lab in the Instructional Building, the Kaypro microcomputers from Extended University Programs, the terminal lab in Kennedy Residence Hall or micros in Physics or other departments. These areas are funded by individual departments, not general university funds.

PROJECTED REVENUE FROM STUDENT USE OF THE LABS

Scheduled courses requiring computer use - - - - -	\$ 40,875
Independent users - - - - -	<u>19,500</u>
	\$ 60,375

Courses for which a Computer Fee Should be Charged

ACCT 302	FIN 370	MGT 482
305	398	
351	470	MS 221
405	475	323
455	478	324
461		386
489	HOFN 440	387
		410
ADOM 304	IET 265	
305	272	MKT 368
379	355	469
388#		
479#	MATH 311	PE 498 Computer
	410.1	Applications for
CHEM 251.1	410.2	Athletics & Phy. Ed.
	411.3	
CPSC All Courses	413	PSY 300
	464	362
	481.1	462
ECON 324	481.2	557
422	481.3	558
	130.1*	
	163.1*	
ECE 498 Micro-	163.2*	
computer with the	164.1*	
Primary Aged Child	172.1*	
	172.2*	
ED 316	265*	
498 Computer	272.1*	
Literacy for the	272.2*	
Classroom Teacher	365*	
	376*	
ELT 373	420*	
374	425*	
	510*	
ENG 412	511.1*	
101*	511.2*	
102*	512.3*	
310*		

# Proposed Courses

\* Some sections use the computer

January 12, 1987

TRANSCRIPT  
COMPUTER USAGE FEES  
REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: January 14, 1987

KEN GAMON:           Anyone want to make any comments on this proposal? Libby?

LIBBY STREET:        I have, I suppose, two comments. One, that I continue to stand in opposition to this fee, not because we don't need to generate some money but because I think it should be a service that is funded much in the same way as the Library. But I recognize Gary's problem. My major concern is that we are setting up conflicting contingencies for faculty. It will now stand that if you add a class which has major or heavy computer use to the list, that your students will be charged another \$10, and for every one you add there will be an additional \$10 fee. And I think that that's something that should be considered. \$10 or \$15 maximum seems to me to be a fairer way to go. I'm particularly concerned... I should say I do understand the problem that we have with the Student Information System (SIS), but I don't think that justifies the proposal as I understand it. Right now we have students who are using the computers for other than class use, at least classes that are listed, who may well be much heavier users than students who might be using it for classes in a quarter, and we're going to have a \$50 fee structure set up there. I think that's of considerable concern, and particularly for those of us who are increasing the number of classes in which we require computer use.

KEN GAMON:           I think that this comment is well taken, and I'd just like to say that I was in on the discussion when this was written, and we should recognize that this is a trial. I'm not sure how many students are going to take five classes that use the computer; I would assume that would be the relatively rare exception, but I don't know. And also I'd like to say that in the meeting yesterday in Seattle, one of the things that came out of the question #8 paper was that the [HECB] staff has recommended that the state continue to set the tuition and fees but that the universities be able to set general fees, which would mean that we would be able to set a general computer fee which could very well be \$8-\$10 across-the-board, bring in more money than this would and not really create a hardship. So my point in making that statement is that what we're looking at now is something that is a kind of "get-through-Spring-quarter" type thing, and we don't have any idea of what's going to be next year or in succeeding years. So I think we need to look at it from the standpoint of "is this a reasonable way to get through Spring quarter?"

BILL BENSON:        One of my comments along with Libby here is that, if I'm correct in assuming, it looks to me like most of

the cost here is in non-class use. Why charge students at all? If you take a look at salaries for student assistants, \$49,000 of the expenditures are coming from non-class use. So the problem seems to be non-class use if these statistics are correct. So why charge students enrolled in classes at all? That seems to account for \$63,000 of the \$77,000, and along that line what we're doing is we're charging the students to subsidize the non-class use if that logic is correct.

CLAIR LILLARD: I don't think that's quite true Bill.

BILL BENSON: These statistics aren't correct?

CLAIR LILLARD: Well, that isn't what I said. As I understand these figures from Ed, this class use as opposed to non-class use is labs specifically assigned to students for their labs, and Barry you can probably speak to this. As opposed to the lab time that the equipment is available... and we have what I think qualifies as a lab over in Shaw-Smyser, but there's never anybody there. So that the roughly 80% of this \$63,000 that's for student assistants is for student assistance there to help these students with lab projects for Computer Science and other things. The kind of student that Libby spoke about that may not be taking a class at all and uses it is not demanding any assistance. He is using paper, and he's using the machines, but that's about all he's getting.

KEN GAMON: But he may be getting assistance, too.

CLAIR LILLARD: Not much in my experience. In the first place, with all respect to the lab assistants that the Computer Science people have over there, they're not much value in the kind of projects that I've sent students over there for because they didn't know what they were doing in that respect. Now the lab assistants are there, as I understand it Barry, primarily to help the people in Computer Science classes. That's where they're hired, and that's the budget from which they're paid. And even they have said, justifiably so in some cases, "Look, I don't know what the hell you're doing for Lillard's class --- go ask him!" So 80% of this cost for non-class use is still to cover students for the classes that they're taking in computers. Barry, correct me if I'm wrong about this.

BARRY DONAHUE: That's right.

KEN GAMON: The thing that is definitely true here is that you can't really cut things out black and white. All of these things, whether it's class use or non-class use, all of those things are intermixed to the point that you can't really make a good separation. This is an attempt on their part; it isn't necessarily meant to be 100% accurate.

OWEN PRATZ: I'd like to pick up on Libby's point and propose, or ask you to please propose, that only one standard fee be charged, that it not be multiplied by class. I can see situations as she described it where enough assignments will be in, let's say reasonably 2 or 3 classes, for a student to have to pay say \$30 just to take the classes. And they don't do much, where somebody else pays \$10 for a user's fee and has total access to every terminal and micro on campus and may very well exploit that to the fullest. That's unfair I think, and it seems to me that if I can not take a class that requires that I pay \$10 and have 40 hours a week access to anything on campus, then the student that takes one class and is required to pay the fee ought to have total access, 40 hours a week, to any machine on campus and not have to double or triple the fee. That's seems clearly inequitable.

KEN GAMON: Dr. Applegate, since your committee's been working on this, would you like to respond to that?

JIMMIE APPLGATE: Well, the original committee, Mr. Chairman, recommended as you perhaps know --- I don't know what Vice President Harrington said because I wasn't here --- but that the fee be set at \$15 per course not to exceed a maximum of \$25 and that the fee for individual out-of-class users be \$15 period. So at the beginning of the discussions about fees, there was, I guess, the principle included that users would pay fees for out-of-class use as well as in-class use and that probably the in-class users would pay more than the out-of-class users. That was a principle that was accepted at the beginning as far as discussion in our committee was concerned, and I think that was a principle that was pretty much accepted when the Council of Academic Deans was discussing it. I don't know what happened in the Computer Committee.

KEN GAMON: Beverly?

BEVERLY HECKART: Do we have any data on how many students take more than one course requiring the use of computers?

DAVE STORLA: We had a list of courses.

BEVERLY HECKART: Well, how many students would be paying, let's say, more than \$20 or \$30?

DAVE STORLA: No; we made some guesses Beverly, but we didn't have any data from which we could truly operate.

KEN GAMON: John?

JOHN AGARS: Supposing that this proposal was passed and fees were collected, who would collect the fees and where would they end up? Would they stay in the departments that collect



the fees? Would they be collected University-wide in general?

KEN GAMON: The idea was that they would be collected at the time of registration and that the fees would go directly to Computer Services.

JOHN AGARS: But it wouldn't be returned to the departments?

KEN GAMON: It wouldn't go back to the departments. No, it would be used to run the computer labs.

JOHN AGARS: Ho, ho, ho. Suppose that you had a course that had computer use but wasn't managed through the computer lab system? Then my students would not be paying computer fees, and I wouldn't be getting any return for the fees that they pay.

KEN GAMON: Well, my assumption would be that if you're hiring lab assistants and buying the paper and all this, then you'd get the money for that. Now, keep in mind that if you have a class that's using the computer and they're using it outside of class, they're going to use any lab on campus with that card. I mean, with that card, they can use any lab on campus.

JOHN AGARS: It wouldn't do them any good. I have the first graphics computer on this campus and the only one.

KEN GAMON: Well, my point is this: that with that card they can use any lab on campus for writing a term paper...

JOHN AGARS: There wouldn't be any advantage for them to do that.

KEN GAMON: Well, maybe they wouldn't be using it directly for your course is what I'm saying.

JOHN AGARS: I think that what is going to happen on campus is that as time goes along and as fledgling departments like the Art Department start acquiring various specialized equipment that you're going to find that you're going to have very, very specialized labs. Geology will have an extremely specialized computer lab, we will have an extremely specialized computer lab which will be of no interest and no use to anybody else, and our people will have no interest in doing word processing, for instance, in order to get visual images because they can't get visual images on a word processor.

KEN GAMON: I would assume that your class wouldn't then be one of them that's listed as using that kind if it's completely within your department.



DAVE STORLA: Basically, this funding proposal is for the general use of computers on campus. Maybe it would help focus the discussion a bit if I tell you where exactly we're talking about. We're talking about the terminal labs that are available for general use: in Shaw-Smyser that Clair talked about, we're talking about the ones in Lind Hall, in Dean Hall, in the Psych Building on the 4th floor and those types of areas, in the Instructional Building, we're talking about the micro lab/TRS-80 in the Library, Apple lab in Black Hall, and the IBM lab in Shaw-Smyser, we're talking about the Computer Science labs. We are NOT talking about, at this point, the Geography and the GIS lab in the Instructional Building, we're NOT talking about items in the Technology Program, although I realize that in several of these areas there are students that have been hired by the departments to help students who are using those facilities. They may in the future come into this thing, but at the moment those are not included. I hope that helps.

KEN GAMON: Does that help with your question John?

JOHN AGARS: Yes, and it might really be a good idea when this discussion gets down to the nitty gritty and gets more formalized to sort of at least talk to that subject of what constitutes a computer lab that is managed by the university, and what constitutes a lab that is an internal department lab.

BILL BENSON: You know, one of the problems here Dave, let's take the Instructional Building lab, which I know about, it's on our floor, right? At the moment we have no supervision in that lab; the lab is open from 8am until, with permission, 10 o'clock at night. You get people from all over campus. In order to enforce this particular policy, and that's why I asked this before, if it's going to be available say from 8am to 5pm, you're going to have to have a supervisor, you're going to have to pay that particular supervisor; if it's going to be available for a week, you're going to have perhaps 56 hours or 40 hours and so on. If you don't, then we're going to close the lab, right? So people aren't going to have access to the lab because if it's open and free and so forth, we might be giving something away for nothing. That's where I get back to. Now, what you're doing, is you're ...

OWEN PRATZ: They can't get on, Bill. They can't get on without logging in. And that log-in is controlled by the Computer Center.

DAVE STORLA: Let me explain quickly. Yes, I agree that Shaw-Smyser, the Instructional Building, Lind and all these types of things, these terminal areas, do not have supervised labs, ok? As Owen indicates, in order to use the labs, the

only place you can go is to a VAX account. In order to use a VAX account, you have to either pay the fee because you're taking a class, or you would have to, if you have an individual account you would have had to pay to get that individual account.

BILL BENSON: Or that's another possibility, right? You could, like all good communal people, we share our accounts with our buddies, right? John Agars and I are friends, and we have an account, and there's no way without supervision and so on... Collective deviance.

DAVE STORLA: The intent is not to add supervision in those labs. They will still be unsupervised, and they would be open. We realize there is that glitch in the whole operation.

BILL BENSON: And then the problem becomes that these unsupervised areas may be the place where people go where they're not known, and so on...

DAVE STORLA: We feel that there will be some loopholes in this because it is not feasible to try to close all the holes. It would cost more to implement it if we tried to do that.

KEN GAMON: Mark?

MARK JOHNSON: Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate. When we start talking about computer fees, one great concern comes to my mind: will these particular fees have a negative effect on the amount of users that would actually be using the computers? The casual user that comes in to do their term paper, the people that want to enroll in a class, will a \$10 fee have an effect on the actual number of students using it? In my opinion, I think we're here to promote the use of computers. We're moving into a high-tech society, and we'd like our students, myself personally also, to use computers more. Will this have any effect and hamper what we're actually trying to do?

KEN GAMON: I think everyone would agree that there's a very good chance that in their figures that they've used, that the dollars they have down there for independent users can be much lower than what they're saying. It's kind of like you raise the price of gasoline from 30 cents to a dollar and assume that everyone's going to buy as much gas; well, they don't buy as much. So I think that your point is well taken. We probably will discourage a lot of those people. And I think we do need to keep in mind that what we're talking about is a trial, and it's for one quarter, and we have no idea at this stage what we'll have next Fall. I don't want to imply that we won't have a computer fee, but this is strictly a trial to see what happens. And I think we need to keep that part of it in

mind, too.

WILLARD SPERRY: It appears that some of the money collected will go back into computer supplies. And I notice that the Physics Department micros are exempted. Now we have expenses for computer supplies, and we use our computers for education, and I'm not sure it's fair to just wipe it. I guess I want to know why were some of these computer-exempt? They're being used for education, too. Why do we have to pay that out of our departmental budget?

DAVE STORLA: I think I can answer that. Basically, we looked at the ones that we are presently funding out of general funds. The supplies in your area were not included in that, I know.

WILLARD SPERRY: And I'd like them to be. I think that since we're re-thinking now, this is something that can be re-thought.

WAYNE FAIRBURN: I sat in on some of the meetings of this committee, and some of things that were discussed had to do with some impressions. One of them was fairness; that was a concern uppermost in most people's minds, trying to keep it fair. Ideally, you'd like to not charge at all and have unlimited equipment. Unfortunately, at least what I was told was that we would simply not have these machines nearly as widely available if we did not charge someone for them. The ideal thing would be to have a meter to put pennies in, the machine would keep time, and we would each pay for the exact amount of usage we had. It's clearly unwieldy. I guess it was not possible to get the SIS system easily adapted to charge a little bit more for one student because he uses it more than someone else, so they simplified it: pay \$10 a course. I think we are concerned with fairness and everything. Unfortunately, I think this is a compromise and I think the most workable thing that can be ironed out at this time. I think more importantly than just the size of the fee is the fact that students almost universally... George Kesling did a study of a lot of different classes and asked them if they'd rather pay for this or have very, very crowded labs or broken down machines that aren't maintained or lack of paper and supplies and things like this, and students universally and overwhelmingly would rather pay a fee and have that available rather than saving a few dollars and not having them available. It's not to say that this is a perfect system.

KEN GAMON: The key thing in this proposal, as I understand it, is that it's the easiest way to assess a fee with as little administrative cost as possible.

LIBBY STREET: It seems that there would be one easier way,

and that's to just have only one fee for anybody who wanted to use the labs. Completely scratch the course requirement fee; have one fee, if it's \$15 fine. That system's going to have to be in place anyhow. And if it's going to be available in that way, it's going to be available to anyone. And it seems to me that we might want to suggest when this comes up, if others in this room agree, that rather than having 2 parts to it they have only 1 part, it be one fee. If it needs to be \$15 to make all that iron out, that seems reasonable. I do strongly feel and am sure that we have students who will not sign up for any of these courses who may spend the entire 40 hours a week, and it's certainly true of my thesis students whom I require to work on the VAX. I won't share their thesis unless they do because I believe that it's important to get their use of the computer to a higher rate. And I would like to suggest that if there's some formal way we can do it that we find out what that is.

KEN GAMON: I think the easiest formal way to do that is for someone to move that I vote that way.

OWEN PRATZ: I move that you vote that way.

PHIL BACKLUND: I'll second it.

KEN GAMON: Okay, we have a motion and a second that the Senate chair as a member of the President's Advisory Council vote and support a single fee for all computer users. Is that the right motion?

CLAIR LILLARD: I'm opposed to this. Libby, what you're asking is that your thesis students who use the VAX relatively heavily be subsidized by the students who are writing a single term paper or some lesser usage by charging everybody the same. Certainly you are.

KEN GAMON: Actually, if anything she's the other way around. She's saying that students who have several...

CLAIR LILLARD: I don't see it to be the other way around.

KEN GAMON: Well, the way it is now, her student buys a \$10 card and has unlimited usage.

CLAIR LILLARD: Is the chair debating this issue?

KEN GAMON: No. I'm sorry about that Clair.

LIBBY STREET: Thank you for clarifying my point.

BEVERLY HECKART: Before I vote on this, I just want to know one thing. Barry and people who are in areas that have heavy

computer usage, is the assumption behind Dave Storla's proposal correct, that if you take courses you probably are going to use the computer more than if you don't take courses? Is that assumption correct?

BARRY DONAHUE: I don't understand your question.

BEVERLY HECKART: Well, the assumption behind the fee schedule that Dr. Harrington gave us is that by charging \$10 per course, which is more than the \$10 per student, the assumption is that if you take courses you're going to use the computers more than if you don't take courses. In your experience, is that correct?

BARRY DONAHUE: Oh, I'm sure. By far.

KEN GAMON: Wayne?

WAYNE FAIRBURN: The assumption was, perhaps it's not reasonable but I think it is, the more courses that you take that use the computer the more you're going to use the computer. It may be that there would be someone who would just pay \$10 and use it all the time and not take any courses or anything, but I think that's a very uncommon situation. I think most people believe that if you're taking more courses that use the computer, you're going to use the computer more and pay a little bit more. And that was one of the items that was mentioned earlier, that if you have more usage perhaps you should pay a little more.

OWEN PRATZ: I know how it is in some of the classes that you're teaching, but some of the classes listed in Psychology, for instance 300, require a relatively minor use of the computer, and certainly it's not very heavily used. You give someone a ticket and say "Look, you have unlimited use of any computer facility on campus, as much time as you can get in," then that ought to be the ticket. For \$10 you get that. If you want to use it, great; if you're not going to use it, great. But for one quarter, for \$10 you've got access to anything you want on campus. To say that to one person and then to say to somebody else, "Look, you signed up for two classes that happen to require a computer; you're going to have to double the amount of money you pay," I think is clearly inaccurate.

KEN GAMON: Bev?

BEVERLY HECKART: I'm going to vote no on this, and I'm going to vote no on the basis of what Barry and Wayne and others have just said, and I would suggest on the basis of what Owen has just said that what might be a better thing for the chair to go the President's Council saying is that this list of courses



should be very carefully reviewed before the fees are assessed. Dr. Harrington has already pointed out to David Gee that his course should not be on here; I assume it is, David? And Owen has just suggested that Psychology should not be on it, too. And I think that would be a better suggestion than, at the moment, Libby's motion.

PHIL BACKLUND: I would encourage you to vote in favor of the motion and, responding to Beverly, it seems like we could get into an administrative nightmare trying to decide which course has "enough" computer work to require the \$10 fee and which course didn't. In courses like mine where I don't require it but I suggest they use a word processor for their papers, just by changing my syllabus, I could charge \$10 or not charge \$10.

CLAIR LILLARD: Then change your syllabus.

PHIL BACKLUND: I don't want to. I'm going to vote for the motion.

BILL BENSON: A technical question, Dave. Most of these computer systems have a built-in access on and off. If we want to really, in the spirit of capitalism and so forth and Clair's spirit of "user fees and use," why don't we just bill on the basis of number of minutes? Don't we have that capability in the VAX to provide an account for everybody?

DAVE STORLA: We could do that on the VAX, although it would take some additional software which we do not have. But we could not do it with the micro-computer labs.

BILL BENSON: These don't have a sign-on? I mean, the DECmates and all that have a sign-on that's on your floppy disk; couldn't they turn it in at the end? I mean, if fairness is based upon use, then perhaps it isn't such an important point -- we should build in that software.

CLAIR LILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I think the motion is out of order. This was not on the agenda as a report from Dr. Harrington, and it was not part of our agenda for a motion or voting at all.

KEN GAMON: Good point.

CLAIR LILLARD: I ask the chair to rule it out of order.

KEN GAMON: Okay. That closes the discussion on the motion.

PHIL BACKLUND: There is nothing in the Bylaws that would keep us from bringing this up under New Business and voting on it there.



KEN GAMON: We aren't to New Business yet.

CLAIR LILLARD: Can we vote on it if it hasn't been before us before?

PHIL BACKLUND: Yes.

BEVERLY HECKART: No, we can't, Phil.

PHIL BACKLUND: The only thing in the Bylaws I know about is Changes to the Bylaws.

BEVERLY HECKART: It's not in the Bylaws. It's in the Operating Procedures.

LIBBY STREET: When will this come before the President's Council?

KEN GAMON: Approximately a week. Victor?

VICTOR MARX: One thing that hasn't been brought up... my understanding of the state support for our school is that the students pay one-third of the cost of their education, and state supports two-thirds.

CLAIR LILLARD: Approximately 25%.

VICTOR MARX: Well, and so if it's a course in computer use, we should aim for that percentage, and students should not pay more than 30% of the cost of using the computer. So the university from state appropriations should pay approximately 70%, and the students should pay approximately 30% of that.

CLAIR LILLARD: That applies to tuition, not to fees.

VICTOR MARX: I'm just extrapolating from the tuition situation. I don't have any qualm about charging for other non-course-related purposes, but for class-related purposes they should not pay more than 30% of the cost.

KEN GAMON: Well, I don't want this discussion to go on indefinitely, but I do feel good about getting all your comments because with or without a motion, I'm listening to the comments, and I'll certainly relate the comments to the Council when it meets.

MARK JOHNSON: One comment Mr. Chair, members of the Senate, apart from this motion with the parliamentary rules of order underway. One thing popped to my head. We get a card, correct? And we bring our card to the computer center, and we should it to the attendant there, and we get into the computer.

What's to say that I cannot lend my card to any of my friends and let them use it? Is there going to be some way to prevent that? I don't know.

KEN GAMON: Yes. I can answer that or Dave can answer that. Do you want to answer that, Dave?

DAVE STORLA: There's going to be minimal checking. We cannot at the moment, in the time frame that you're looking at, guarantee that not happening. It does somewhat get back to the aspect of how much you pay for fees. The hope is not only to make this system as it goes into place easy to administer but reasonable enough for the users that there's no real reason to do that. Whether that will happen or not it's too soon to see.

KEN GAMON: It's simply not a perfect system. Any other comments? Phil?

PHIL BACKLUND: This is our only shot at this one right now because the President's Advisory Council meets before the next Senate meeting. So if we're going to give you some advice, let's do it today, right?

KEN GAMON: Or between now and the time of the meeting.

PHIL BACKLUND: But if we want to take a position as a Senate, we've got to do it today.

KEN GAMON: Jerry?

JERRY BRUNNER: I'm not sure, but I might be the only one, but in reading the bottom paragraph on the second page, this does not cover facilities in IET, and then you go over to the third page, and the courses that are listed for our department as near as I know are planning on using the facilities in IET. So now what you're saying is, this program does not cover the courses or the labs in IET and yet those courses that are going to be using those labs in IET are going to be paying money to this operation to support some other labs on campus. I think we have a bit of a problem here.

KEN GAMON: I would suggest that if your courses are using your labs and your labs only that you get them excluded from this list.

DAVE STORLA: If I may just go back, one other thing that I should have said on this question, Mark, about how do we guarantee no cheating, one of the proposals that we're looking at is when a person comes in to use the equipment, they'd have to show their student card and more than likely this other card. Names or whatever would be checked, those types of things, so it would take a little bit more than having a card

or something like that passed along. It's still not guaranteed that some things won't go on.

To answer Dr. Brunner's question, the initial system we worked with included these classes that were on the VAX. I believe the 265 I think was on the VAX at one time. The other two I'm not sure of. These courses here, as Dr. Harrington specified, were looked at and suggested by the Deans and worked through the Registrar's office so that there are probably a few conflicts like this.

KEN GAMON: Bev?

BEVERLY HECKART: Since I know that in the President's Council a great deal of debate takes place, and since we now have debated this quite a bit and have given the chair quite a few ideas, I move to close the debate on this issue.

CLAIR LILLARD: Seconded.

KEN GAMON: It has been moved and seconded that we close debate on this issue. All in favor of closing debate, say aye; all opposed, same sign. (Motion passed).

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

KEN GAMON: Any New Business?

OWEN PRATZ: I move we instruct you to ask for a single fee. Now, did Beverly and Phil decide whether that's permissible or not?

BEVERLY HECKART: We'd have to have a motion to break with procedures.

OWEN PRATZ: I move we break the procedures.

PHIL BACKLUND: I'll second it.

KEN GAMON: It has been moved and seconded that we break procedures. All in favor, say aye; all opposed, same sign. I think I only heard two (no).

PHIL BACKLUND: It takes a two-thirds vote anyway.

CLAIR LILLARD: Call for a show of hands.

KEN GAMON: All in favor, raise your right hand; all opposed, raise your right hand. (Motion passed: 15 yes, 7 no) The motion to break procedures has passed.

OWEN PRATZ: I move that we ask you to ask for a single

user fee.

LIBBY STREET:           Seconded.

KEN GAMON:               Okay, Owen Pratz has asked that we ask to have a single fee, and Libby Street seconded that. Is there any brief discussion on that?

JULIE RHODES:           I'd just like to say as a student that if we have to pay those fees, they'll likely help out, and I'd vote in favor of the class fees because the personal users, if they're going to pay the fee, then they're going to use it a lot, as much as the people in the class. And I don't see people that just have one term paper to do going in and using the computer; they still have a typewriter or something they can do it on.

BARRY DONAHUE:          I'd like to amend the motion to instruct you to request that, since it's been said that this is supposed to be a test for Spring quarter only, and I'm a bit, I guess, skeptical of that, I would request that you see if you can establish some means of reporting back to the Senate the effectiveness of the proposal and reporting to us again at the beginning of the next quarter if the fees do continue and the results of the test. I would also like to include in the amendment that you inform the people that you're meeting with that the faculty is very much opposed to this on principle, for philosophical and other reasons.

KEN GAMON:               Is there a second to the amendment?

PHIL BACKLUND:          They're sort of separate issues.

OWEN PRATZ:             It seems to me that's not an amendment, that's an addition.

KEN GAMON:               So, Barry would you like to wait? I think that once we've broken procedures, we can continue to break procedures.

CLAIR LILLARD:          How does the chair get a ruling like that? We broke procedures for a single issue.

BEVERLY HECKART:        Yeah, I think we'd have to have another vote.

BARRY DONAHUE:          Well, I thought the issue was to instruct the chair as to how he should present the views of the Senate on this issue.

LIBBY STREET:           But those are two very separate issues.

KEN GAMON:               Okay, any other discussion on the motion at

this point?

**BILL BENSON:** Although I voted to open discussion, I think this proposal does make it clear that there is a money problem with computing on campus, but I don't like any fee solution presented to us here, and I think it's asking an awful lot of us to come up with a better solution or a rational solution in this. We've only had this in front of us for an hour. I don't think that's long enough. I'm more or less... I'm going to vote against your proposal just because I haven't had enough time to think it over correctly.

**WENDY RICHARDS:** I think it should be pointed out that the committee has been working for a long time on this, and there are informed people who have been evaluating this whole problem and have come up with a recommendation.

**GEORGE KESLING:** There's one other addition. I'm going to vote against it because I don't believe in user's fees, and I don't believe in the philosophy behind any of this because I don't know where it stops. I don't know how you draw the line between this and if we get an expensive electronic microscope or something that might cost a great deal of money why we don't start charging proportionally and so on. I think this isn't the way to go; we have a money problem, and none of us in this room are in a position to even make a decision about whether or not all these alternatives have really been explored. That's the nonsense of the whole thing. There's no one in this room who has any power whatsoever to say that all options have been exhausted and so on, so I'm with you Bill. We haven't had enough time to make sure all these options have been explored. I think there are probably other options, even in the student government; if they want free use, student and activity fees could be put in this particular direction to support free computer use for students --- that's an alternative; I don't even know if that's been discussed, so I find it too rapid, and I'm not convinced that the alternatives have even been explored. I think there are a certain set of premises that have been used, but I'm not convinced that these justify this proposal.

**LIBBY STREET:** I think we should consider that the fee is highly likely to be put into place Spring quarter no matter what we say here. We might be able to influence "how." I have no confidence that we will influence "whether or not," and it's for that reason that I think this motion is reasonable whether or not we agree in theory with a user fee.

**CLAIR LILLARD:** Call for the question.

**KEN GAMON:** The question has been called for. We're voting on the motion that I be instructed to vote for and

support a single user fee. All in favor, raise your right hand; all opposed, same sign. (Motion passed: 16 yes, 10 no)

I would just like to say that I haven't been too much involved in the actual structure of this, but I have been in on the discussions, and I know that a lot of time went into it and all of these things were considered. I'm not sure that my vote will change anything, but I certainly will go with that charge. I'm not even sure that in the end analysis, the President's Council will not take that to heart and vote for a single fee, and I don't think that anyone really at this stage knows for sure how much difference that would be as far as how many dollars are collected. It's very possible that the number of dollars you're talking about may only be \$50-100, so it's still a trial run and we don't really know about this. But I certainly will go in with that as a charge. Any other New Business?

BARRY DONAHUE: If there's no objection, I would like to request that you ask them to report back to us the findings.

KEN GAMON: I will do that without a motion.