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MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 21 April 1976
Presiding Officer: David Lygre, Chairman
Recording Secretary: Esther Peterson

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except Stan Dudley, Art Keith, Robert Miller, Dale Samuelson, and Ruth Vogel.


AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL
The chairman suggested the following changes:
1. Under "Communications" add
   E. Letter from Don Schliesman
   F. Letter from James Brooks
2. Under "Reports" insert, prior to Chairperson's Report,
   A. President's Report
   B. Vice President for Academic Affairs
3. Under "New Business" delete
   B. Proposed Collective Bargaining Election(s)
   This will be brought up under the Executive Committee Report.
4. Add under "New Business"
   B. Proposed policy on undergraduate program review and evaluation.
   C. Code Committee Proposals.

COMMUNICATIONS
A. Letter from John Purcell, dated April 8, 1976, regarding the Academic Plan for 1976-1981. He requests that the Faculty Senate conduct a review of Draft #6 which has been disseminated to the faculty.
B. Letter from Al Lewis, dated April 8, 1976, requesting the Faculty Senate to take such action as will exempt Professor John Foster from the code rank requirements set forth in Section 2.10. This has been referred to the Personnel Committee.
C. Letter from Edward Harrington, dated April 9, 1976, regarding the Faculty Senate Executive Committee recommending a member to serve on the Search Committee for the position of Assistant Vice President for Off-Campus Programs.
D. Letter from W. W. Newschwander, regarding Senate Motion No. 1024 which was passed last year authorizing a senate sponsored election to determine a negotiating agency for the purpose of collective bargaining.
E. Letter from Don Schliesman, dated April 15, 1976, regarding policies and procedures for review and evaluation of undergraduate program. The Undergraduate Council is submitting it to the Faculty Senate with the recommendation that it be approved.
F. Letter from James Brooks, dated April 14, 1976, regarding recommended salary adjustments from the Vice President's Advisory Council.
CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

A. Graduate Proposals, page 78.

MOTION NO. 1454: Mr. Winters moved, seconded by Mr. McQuarrie, that the Senate approve the Graduate Curriculum Proposals on page 78. Voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

REPORTS

A. President's Report--President Brooks reported on the Governor's action on the Budget Bill and the effects it may have relative to CWSC. Mr. Brooks also reported that an agreement had not yet been reached with the other institutions regarding a common faculty salary schedule and policy.

B. Vice President for Academic Affairs--Vice President Harrington presented a report on planning and distributed an article on "The Art of Planning" to senate members.

He reported on the status of the enrollment, remarking it is at present below the number of student credit hours needed to match the number contracted for.

C. Chairperson--No report at this meeting.

D. Executive Committee--Mr. Bennett reported the Executive Committee has reviewed Mr. Schneider's request to be permitted to pursue a master's degree in Music and a letter has been sent to Vice President Harrington recommending that his request be approved.

Senate elections will be coming up in May. The Code provides that newly elected senators will begin their term on June 15. Senate Executive Committee officers assume office the day following the last regular senate meeting of the academic year. The Executive Committee has consulted with the Code Committee and concurs with their judgment that newly elected senators should be eligible for election to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Harrington has sent a letter requesting the Senate Executive Committee name a member to the Search Committee for the Position of Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, and suggests the faculty representative might be one of the off-campus coordinators. The Executive Committee feels there is a possible conflict of interest involved in naming an off-campus coordinator. The Executive Committee has therefore selected Duncan McQuarrie, who has agreed to serve. Mr. Harrington has, since that time, requested the Executive Committee to appoint a second faculty member, keeping in mind Affirmative Action.

Mr. Newschwander, president of Local 3231 AFT, has called the attention of the Senate Executive Committee to Senate Motion No. 1024. In that motion it was stipulated that the Senate Executive Committee should hold an election of the faculty to determine a negotiating agency for the purpose of collective bargaining. The Executive Committee has devised a schedule to implement this motion. Elections will be held on May 4 to determine whether the faculty wishes to be represented by a negotiating agency. On May 18 an election will be held, if the results of the May 4 election is affirmative, to select a specific negotiating agency. If no agency obtains a majority vote on that election between the two groups with the greatest number of votes, a run-off election will be held on June 1.

Mr. McQuarrie remarked that there was inadequate faculty representation on the Search Committee for the Assistant Vice-President for Off-Campus Programs.

There was considerable discussion regarding the composition of the Search Committee.

MOTION NO. 1455: Mr. Hawkins moved, seconded by Ms. Heckart, that the Executive Committee recommend that two people, in addition to Duncan McQuarrie, be appointed to serve on the Search Committee. Voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote and several abstentions.

E. Standing Committees

1. Curriculum Committee--Otto Jakubek reported that the committee is presently working on the charge to examine all of the major and minor programs in the
catalog for hidden pre-requisites and other unstated requirements that students would have to meet.

2. Budget Committee—Mr. Applegate reported that the Senate Budget Committee met last Thursday. On Friday, the Senate Chairman and he met with Vice-President Harrington. The Budget Committee will meet with Mr. Harrington to ascertain, among other things, the amounts of money the administration recommends to be used for salary inequities, promotion, merit and scale or step adjustments.

Mr. Applegate distributed a draft of a letter to be distributed to the faculty to solicit their views on the distribution of money for salary increases. He asked the Senate to give him their reaction as to whether they think this letter should be sent to the faculty.

MOTION NO. 1456: Mr. Jensen moved, seconded by Ms. Klug, that the Senate approve the circulation of the document by the Senate Budget Committee.

There was considerable discussion on the motion.

MOTION NO. 1457: Mr. McQuarrie moved to amend, seconded by Mr. Vifian, to delete that part of the letter referring to the sending of copies to President Brooks, Vice President Harrington, and Dr. Brain and that responses to this proposal be sent to the Senate Budget Committee. Voted on and passed with a majority voice vote and several abstentions.

Motion No. 1456 was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

3. Student Affairs Committee—Mr. Garrett presented a report on three charges before the Committee. They were requested to look into the areas of the Campus Police, the Health Center as to the possibility of immediate student danger, and the Board of Academic Appeals. The Committee has been in contact with Dean Miller, the administrator in charge of these programs.

The Committee has determined there has been no curtailment of security services in the area of the Campus Police, and the budget deficit has been reduced from $10,000 to $4,600 at this time.

As to the Health Center, there appears to be a budget deficit. However, money is being found to provide services needed and there appears to be no problem in this area at present. They have enough money in the budget to get by this fiscal year, but don't know about next year.

The Committee has been charged to look into the procedures used by the Board of Academic Appeals and are setting up a meeting with Professor LeRoy to look into the matter further. At the present time, after discussing this with Dean Miller privately, there seems to be primarily a dispute in terms of jurisdiction. Since it has legal ramifications, the Committee is not sure they are qualified to pursue the matter. However, the Committee is planning to meet with the Board of Academic Appeals and Dean Miller to make sure the students can use the Board of Academic Appeals. The Committee is recommending the Board get the counsel of Steve Milam and then come to the Senate with a proposal.

4. Personnel Committee—No report at this meeting.

5. Code Committee—Ms. Lester reported the Code Committee has had two meetings regarding the proposed Academic Affairs Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, April 21, 1976
Room 471, Psychology Building

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. COMMUNICATIONS
   A. Letter from John Purcell
   B. Letter from Al Lewis
   C. Letter from Ed Harrington
   D. Letter from Bill Newschwander

IV. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
   A. Graduate Proposals, page 78

V. REPORTS
   A. Chairperson
   B. Executive Committee
   C. Standing Committees
      1. Curriculum
      2. Budget
      3. Student Affairs
      4. Personnel
      5. Code

VI. OLD BUSINESS
   A. Code Committee Proposals
   B. President's Code Proposals

VII. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Proposed Policy on Nonmatriculated Students
   B. Proposed Collective Bargaining Election(s)

IX. ADJOURNMENT (4:30) followed by hearing on Draft #6 of Academic Plan 1976-1981
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATOR</th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Craig</td>
<td>Phil Tolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumbaugh, Dick</td>
<td>Neil Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applegate, Jimmie</td>
<td>Peter Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Bentley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachrach, Jay</td>
<td>Edward Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Robert</td>
<td>Richard Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, James</td>
<td>Margaret Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt, David</td>
<td>Joan Howe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson, Rosella</td>
<td>Constance Speth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douce', Pearl</td>
<td>Gerald Brunner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doi, Richard</td>
<td>Robert Nuzum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, Stan</td>
<td>Charles Brunner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugmore, Owen</td>
<td>Lynn Osborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz, Wolfgang</td>
<td>Bill Hillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, Roger</td>
<td>Jay Forsyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregor, John</td>
<td>David Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulezian, Allen</td>
<td>Gordon Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, Charles</td>
<td>Deloris Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heckart, Beverly</td>
<td>Joel Andress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hileman, Betty</td>
<td>Bonalyn Bricker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakubek, Otto</td>
<td>George Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, J. Richard</td>
<td>Clayton Denman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Art</td>
<td>Don Woodcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingman, Kathy</td>
<td>Dieter Romboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klug, Linda</td>
<td>Helmi Habib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuroiwa, Paul</td>
<td>Owen Pratz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester, Nancy</td>
<td>Wallace Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lygre, David</td>
<td>Blaine Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuarrie, Duncan</td>
<td>Kent Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Robert</td>
<td>Lee Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Osborn</td>
<td>A. James Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purcell, John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuelson, Dale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Milo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vifian, John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogel, Ruth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiberg, Curt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters, Roger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Madge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Senate Meeting

W. W. Newschwander
W. D. Floyd
M. Harrison
Jack Leventhal
Charles Wayman
Don Carnegie
Wes Ruff - WTH
V. Gerald Reed
Bernard Zartaj
O. Howley
Dino Ricciarelli
Mr. Schuemig

Last person signing please return to the Recording Secretary
Dear Dr. Lygre:

The final copy of the Academic Plan for 1976-1981 as developed by the Vice Presidents' Advisory Council (Draft #6) has been officially transmitted to the Long Range Planning Committee by Dr. Harrington, Vice President for Academic Affairs. The next step in the institutional planning process requires that this document be reviewed by the Faculty Senate and others.

As Chairman of the Long Range Planning Committee, I am now requesting that the Faculty Senate conduct a review of Draft #6 which has been disseminated to the faculty using any procedures, including hearings, that the Executive Committee deems appropriate. The results of the review, including suggestions for improvement or modification, should be forwarded to me as soon as possible but no later than May 7, 1976. I regret the early deadline but the State requires that our next biennial budget request be specifically and demonstrably related to our institutional plans. In order to do this, the final version of the plan must be submitted to the Board of Trustees at their June meeting because the 1977-79 Capital Budget Request must be submitted at that time. Obviously the Long Range Planning Committee must have some time after your review to carry out their tasks so that the final version will be ready in time for the Board's consideration. Given this time constraint, we will have to adhere to the May 7 deadline and if we have not heard from reviewing bodies by that time we will have to assume that no response will be forthcoming and that the document is acceptable to your constituents as presented.

I will be happy to meet with the Executive Committee should there be need for clarification of the planning process or any other matter related to this request. The Long Range Planning Committee wishes to thank you in advance for undertaking this task and we know you will be both thorough and constructive.

Cordially,

John Purcell, Chairman
Long Range Planning Committee

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
Dear Dave:

The Personnel Committee of the Department of Communication, Dean Williams, Vice President Harrington and I have all examined the professional records of John Foster as well as the new Faculty Code. I believe Professor Foster to be eligible for consideration for promotion under Section 2.12 of the Code. I am officially requesting the Faculty Senate to take such action as will exempt Professor Foster from the code rank requirements set forth in Section 2.10.

Cordially,

Albert Lewis
Chairperson

cc: Vice President Harrington
    Dean Williams
    Mr. Reynolds
    Mr. Foster
Dr. David Lygre, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
CWSC, Campus  

Dear Dr. Lygre:

As per our discussion, I would appreciate the Faculty Senate Executive Committee naming a member to the Search Committee for the position of Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. As I indicated, the balance of the committee will be the existing Task Force for Off-Campus Programs (Comstock, Schlesman, Ball, Martin, Williams, Erickson, Housley).

Since talking to you, it has been suggested the faculty representative might be one of our off-campus coordinators. At any rate, whoever the representative is he will have to be available to meet with the committee during the period between regular session and summer school.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

cc Dr. Brooks  
W.P. Advisory Council
Dr. David Lygre, president  
CHSC Faculty Senate 
Edison Hall  

Dear David:  

This letter is in response to Senate MOTION NO. 1024 authorizing a Senate sponsored election to determine a negotiating agency for the purpose of collective bargaining. This motion reads as follows:  

Mr. Lygre moved, seconded by Mr. Thelen, that the Executive Committee of the Senate make arrangements with the AAUP, AFT, NSP and any other appropriate negotiating agencies to present on campus their viewpoints concerning collective bargaining for the CHSC faculty. After these presentations have been made, a formal vote of the faculty will be made to determine whether the faculty chooses to be represented by a negotiating agency for the purpose of collective bargaining. If this vote is affirmative, an election will be conducted to select a specific negotiating agency.  

The viewpoints of AAUP, AFT and NSP have been given. We believe that last year's Senate poll concerning whether our faculty chooses to be represented by a negotiating agency was in the affirmative, but if last year's poll by the Senate does not meet the requirements of Motion No. 1024 then the CHSC local of the American Federation of Teachers requests that such an election be held May 4 to determine whether the faculty chooses to be represented by a negotiating agency.  

The CHSC AFT also requests that on May 18 the Senate Executive Committee or its representatives hold an election to select a specific negotiating agency. The AFT also requests that if an agency does not obtain a majority vote in the May 18 election, then on May 25 the Senate Executive Committee or its representatives hold a run-off election between those two groups securing the highest vote in the May 18 election.  

Very truly yours,  

W. W. Newschwander, president  
Local 3231 AFT
Dr. David Lygre
Chairman
Faculty Senate
C.W.S.C.
Campus

Dear Dr. Lygre:

Transmitted herewith is a statement of policies and procedures for review and evaluation of undergraduate programs. It was developed by the Undergraduate Program Review and Evaluation Committee and has been approved by the Undergraduate Council. During the process of development, input was solicited from the Vice President for Academic Affairs, deans, department chairmen and program directors. It is submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Undergraduate Council with the recommendation that it be approved.

Sincerely yours,

Donald M. Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
All undergraduate academic departments and their associated programs are subject to review by the Undergraduate Council every five years, with approximately one-fifth of the departments reviewed each year. Interdepartmental programs are reviewed in conjunction with the review of the department to which the program director reports. Those programs, designated by the Undergraduate Council, which do not have the director reporting to an academic department are reviewed as separate departments.

The purpose of the review is to ascertain the merit or worth of programs. The findings of the review will be used as the basis for recommendations to the Undergraduate Council towards strengthening established programs.

The reviews are under the jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Council and are administered by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The recommendations are ultimately reported to the Faculty Senate for final action. The Program Review and Evaluation Committee, a standing committee of the Undergraduate Council, acts for the Council in: (1) selecting departments to be reviewed; (2) selecting committees and consultants to review departments; and (3) preparing preliminary reports and recommendations that are submitted to the full Council.

The departmental reviews are based largely on written evaluation reports by Internal Committees and External Consultants. External Consultants may be called in by the Program Review and Evaluation Committee upon the recommendation of the department(s), the dean(s) to which the department(s) reports, or the Program Review and Evaluation Committee.
The Internal Committees are composed of tenured faculty members drawn from the faculty within Central Washington State College other than members of the department(s) being reviewed. The Program Review and Evaluation Committee will be assisted in identifying candidates in the following manner. The department(s), school dean(s) and Dean of Undergraduate Studies are invited to submit a list or lists of suggested members for the Committee. This may be done separately or in consultation with each other. The Program Review and Evaluation Committee will study the composite list and may add additional names to form a preliminary composite list. Copies of the preliminary list will be sent to the department(s), school dean(s) and Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The department(s) are permitted to delete either individual committee or consultant names from the list. The Program Review and Evaluation Committee will identify the tentative Internal Review Committee, no sooner than one week after circulating the preliminary list, and notify the department(s) of its selections of committee members. The final selections of committee members will be made by the Program Review and Evaluation Committee, no sooner than one week after notifying the department(s) of the tentative committee membership, and reported to the committee members, the department(s), school dean(s) and Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

The bases for the review are the departmental (program) statement of objectives and long-range plans. The review committee and/or consultants may recommend changes in long-range goals even though primary considerations will be made relative to the objectives and plans as they exist at the time of review.

The Internal Committee has the major functions of formulating judgments of the quality and effectiveness of undergraduate programs. This evaluation is concerned primarily with the quality of education actually achieved by students, and includes, but is not restricted to, an assessment of the quality of faculty, the adequacy of curriculum offerings and program options, the existence of policies and practices in support of students, adequacy of the departmental budget, and the adequacy of physical facilities, library resources, equipment, and other research facilities.
The External Consultants, who are recognized specialists in the subject fields under review, are chosen from other institutions (universities, industry, or government). The appointment of External Consultants follows the same policy and procedure that govern the appointment of Internal Committees. The number of consultants would depend upon the department(s) and the circumstances involved. The External Consultants will provide broad, expert judgments on the quality of the program under review.

As an aid to External Consultants and Internal Committees, packets of documentary materials are prepared by the departments under review with the assistance of the office of the school dean and sent to consultants and committee members in advance of the review. These materials follow a format outlined by the Undergraduate Council and include such information as: (1) faculty vitae; (2) course listing and program options; (3) admission policies and degree requirements; (4) statistical data on enrollment, degrees granted, faculty loads, and other data pertinent to the department; (5) financial data; and (6) a description of research facilities, equipment, space, library holdings, and other data pertinent to the department.

A survey of graduates over the past five years will be conducted by the Testing and Evaluation service. The survey is intended to determine whether the needs of students are being met when judged by their proficiency and attainment subsequent to receiving their degrees. Survey data are made available to the Internal Committees and the External Consultants.

The External Consultant's report should be sent directly to the Program Review and Evaluation Committee who will send copies to the department(s). The Internal Committee submits a draft of their report to the department(s) under review and the appropriate school dean(s). The department(s) and school dean(s) will have the opportunity to discuss the report with the Internal Committee and suggest changes due to errors of interpretation or omission. Department(s) and the school dean(s) will be encouraged to submit written responses. The intent is to allow
opportunity for the department(s) and school dean(s) to constructively criticize and suggest revisions in the draft report before it is finalized. The report, and any written responses, are submitted to the Program Review and Evaluation Committee. That committee holds open hearings with the school dean(s) and department(s) and, in many cases, other faculty members including the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. On occasion the committee also consults with present and/or past students of the department.

The Program Review and Evaluation Committee then reviews and summarizes the two reports and prepares its recommendations. The full reports, written responses, summary and recommendations are then submitted to the full Council for their consideration with copies going to the department(s), school dean(s), and Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The Undergraduate Council takes appropriate action on the report of the Program Review and Evaluation Committee (e.g., accepting the report, or returning it to the Program Review and Evaluation Committee for further action with recommendations).

All Undergraduate Council recommendations based on reviews are reported to the Academic Vice President who then transmits them in full to the Faculty Senate. The Vice President does not become involved in the review process prior to this stage. Generally, the Council recommends that the Faculty Senate: (a) approve the continuation of departmental programs; (b) discontinue some or all departmental programs; or (c) in effect, place a departmental program on probation by the instrumentality of a required progress report to be submitted to the Undergraduate Council at a stipulated date.

Staff work for the reviews is provided by the office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Funds necessary to cover expenses of the reviews, e.g., staff work, honoraria and expenses for External Consultants, postage and printing, etc. are provided by the college administration. Internal Committee members do not receive honoraria for their work.
April 14, 1976

Dr. David Lygre, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Dr. Lygre:

Attached for your information and for distribution to the Faculty Senate is a copy of a letter from Dr. Harrington containing recommendations regarding salary adjustments for 1976-77. Perhaps this could be discussed at the next meeting of the Senate.

Sincerely,

James E. Brooks
President

cc: Dr. Harrington
Attachment
Dr. James E. Brooks, President
CWSC
Campus

Dear Dr. Brooks:

After consulting with the Vice President's Advisory Council, and with their concurrence, I wish to make the following recommendations regarding salary adjustments for 1976-77:

1. Section 2.48 of the Faculty Code, Correcting Salary Inequities should be implemented first in any salary considerations for 1976-77. We were asked by Mr. Wallace Webster II to make a study of our current salary structure and then be prepared to explain apparent discrepancies for women and minorities (and for white males). We have done so and have prepared a list of faculty members whose salary we believe should be adjusted.

Mr. Webster indicated that we must adjust discrepancies where justified, when money becomes available.

After Section 2.48 of the Code is satisfied we recommend that Section 2.47 Yearly Salary Adjustments be implemented following the requirements therein.

2.47 Yearly Salary Adjustments

A. The salary of a faculty member may be changed as a result of any one or a combination of four types of actions. Subject to the availability of funds during any biennium and to the mandates of the State Legislature and/or the Governor, the following descending order of priority for the four types of actions shall be observed as yearly salary increases are considered, provided that up to ten (10) percent of all available funds may be designated by the Board of Trustees in any year for merit increases:

(1) Promotions in rank, provided that a faculty member promoted during any given biennium shall receive at least the current minimum salary for his new rank and a salary increase of a one (1) step on the salary scale; provided further that if the person's promotion comes at a time of a scale adjustment, he shall benefit from the scale adjustment; and provided further that the faculty member shall not be eligible for both a promotion increase (one step) and a regular step increase (one step).
(2) A scale adjustment, which for the purposes of this section is defined as a specific sum or percentage which is added to the salary scale according to rank needs. The increases shall be awarded on September 1 of each year.

(3) A step increase on the adjusted salary scale, amounting to at least three percent for each faculty member, provided that the faculty member is eligible (is not currently at the top of his rank).

(4) Merit increases may be given in any step amount to faculty members to reward them for outstanding service to the college. Merit increases are awarded in the same manner as promotions. Such merit increases, which are permanent, are separate from special salary awards or adjustments identified elsewhere in this code, such as in Sections 2.16 and 2.49.

Following 2.47 we strongly recommend that the Trustees allow us to use 10% of the funds remaining after adjustments for merit. After this the funds necessary for promotion should be deducted and then the balance be distributed according to Section 2.47, parts (2) Scale Adjustment and (3) Step Increase.

Further, we recommend that our proposal for distribution be made to the Board of Trustees at their May meeting. If the Trustees are agreeable we will have one month to process merit increases according to the Code requirements.

If the above plan is acceptable we can present to the Board in June:

1) a list of salary adjustments
2) the merit recommendations
3) the promotion list
4) a proposal to distribute the rest of the salary dollars

Finally, the period from the May to the June Board meeting will allow full opportunity for faculty and Faculty Senate input on Steps 2 and 3 of Section 2.47.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington
Vice President for Academic Affairs

sub

cc: Vice President's Advisory Council
THE ART OF PLANNING

- Harold L. Enarson

Planning is definitely an art, but mostly a bad art. College and university administrators often become bogged down in the "techniques and tools" of planning systems, thereby losing sight of the real problems and goals. Enarson defines the errors that inhibit good planning and prefers to use a planning model for the future that he calls the "Lewis and Clark tour."

I BELIEVE IN PLANNING ALL THINGS, large and small. And what I prescribe for myself and for my family I also prescribe for the cosmos and all persons and institutions privileged to occupy it. From extensive personal experience I know the penalties of not thinking ahead and not planning for tomorrow.

Take this season's trip to our cabin in the Colorado mountains as a case study in how not to plan. My wife and I drove more than 1,000 miles to reach the gate to our mountain meadow—only to discover that she forgot the key to the lock. (My wife and I resolve this with the problem-solving technique standard in such marital situations—mutual recrimination followed by prolonged, grim silence as I rip down part of the fence to gain entry to our property.)

Our day proceeds to deteriorate. We buy $40 worth of groceries—only to discover on our return that we failed to pick up the following necessities: matches, fly swatters, Coors beer, mantles for the lamp, mouse traps, and staples to fix the fence I just tore down. The marital silence deepens.

The second day of vacation is an ordeal of compounding folly—all for want of planning. I saddle my horse to go inspect the thinning of ten acres of timber. The Department of Agriculture lists me as a cooperating landowner, since I agreed to pay—at a "bargain" rate—$450 for some thinning. The profit from the sale of the logs is all mine. The logs are neatly stacked, ready for sale. But exactly how am I to sell 40 cords of fresh timber, some of it quarantined because of pine beetle?

I ponder the prospect of loading the Volvo station wagon and parking on the outskirts of Boulder. In Walter Mitty fashion, I even think of a sign: Reduced Rates for Friends of the Big Ten Conference. No, that won't do. I do not even need an adding machine to conclude that thinning trees doesn't pay off. No sir, there is nothing like cost-benefit analysis—even after the fact. Indeed, I become so enchanted with the exquisite symmetry of cost-benefit analysis that upon unsaddling I fail to unbuckle the flank cinch—and have another painful lesson in the necessity of thinking ahead.

By now I am thoroughly repentant. On the back of an old and still unread university financial report, I write ten times the words of the Burnham gospel: "Make no little plans." And underneath I write a note to myself: "Get a case of Coors." So I retreat to the fugitive materials hastily tucked in my briefcase. It is dreary stuff; an Ohio Board of Regents report on student
to be used, just as the systems approach may represent a helpful grouping of problem-solving concepts.

The human factor

But let's take a very slow pause here, and note that techniques and tools tend not to be the neutral servants we describe them to be. Techniques and tools are used, always, by persons operating in time, place, circumstance, culture, and power relationships. The tools and techniques are, of course, neutral. But the persons who use them are never neutral, for, as human beings, we have as our burden and our pride the legacy of a congested bundle of ideas, faiths, opinions, preconceptions, goals, and aspirations. None of us is a disembodied soul, floating free in the cosmos, but we often pretend to be this neutral. Tools and techniques merge and meld with people and institutions. If we were truly curious about "system," we would explore the complex relationship which develops between the surgeon and his knives, the army general and his nuclear warheads, the manager and his operations management protocol, the agricultural extension agent and his chemical fertilizers, and the educational planner with his models, system, and advanced computer technology.

Our tools have a special allure for some of us, becoming part of our very identity. Horse and man combine to make the man different, more powerful. Motorcycle and adolescent combine to make the adolescent different, more powerful, something new under the sun. The computer, brilliant achievement and marvelous toy, has the same capacity to enthral, captivate, and finally to imprison. And so it is that we witness an excess of faith in the tool and the technique. The temptation is to overkill. Overkill is understandable, since the tool and the technique exist to be used.

Some years ago, I visited the major university of a Central American country and observed an institution-building project. A massive exercise in institutional research was being undertaken under supervision of a major United States university. Masses of data were being accumulated. Presumably, the decision-makers would have all the information necessary to plan the future intelligently. There was only one small flaw—the cost of the information gathering was roughly one-fourth of the entire budget. Here were sophisticated tools, sophisticated research, and sophisticated people—but a pathetic unawareness of absurd disproportion. I suspect that some of the research work currently being done suffers from a similar defect. I call this the "beagle fallacy." If you have never walked the woods with a beagle, you have missed a delightful experience. The beagle has a superb nose and follows the scent of the trail with total absorption. But the beagle has poor eyesight and seldom looks up to see the rabbit staring quietly (and I trust with amusement) at him.

Cost-benefit analysis

Some of our new tools may turn out to be more plausible than substantial—the cost-benefit analysis of the "inputs" and "outputs" of higher education, for example. What does one do with mountains of computer printouts on costs of instruction? I already know that physics costs more than poultry science (at least I think it does). I already know that the teacher-student ratio at a nearby private university is half that of Ohio State. So what. The teacher-student ratio is largely a function of resource availability. If a massive gift were made to a university doubling its resources, the ratio of faculty to students would soon double. And myth has it that quality would increase. But would it? You will search the literature in vain for evidence that the quality of learning varies proportionately with the teacher-student ratio.

No amount of cost-benefit analysis will help us decide whether to phase out a foreign language or whether to cut the library budget and increase the budget of the counseling service. And the value to society of a good plumber and a poor philosopher is truly beyond effective measure. Let the Corps of Engineers continue to play games with cost-benefit analysis, mesmerizing the Congress. But do not let the universities of this land fall into the trap of promising to show dollar value received for dollar spent.

The value of the truly educated person is
In the fifteen years that I have served as an academic administrator, I have stared helplessly at more reports than I dare remember. But I can recall few reports that contributed directly or even indirectly to what is pompously called the “decision making process.” Our problem is not the shortage of facts, but our general inability to grasp the significance of the facts. We are also reluctant to do what needs to be done. The absence of nerve in university administration is far more serious than the shortage of information.

Chasing rabbits. This bit of western colloquialism may need explaining. The untrained hound dog in hot pursuit of a bobcat will turn off the trail as a rabbit crosses his path. So it is with much of our planning.

Future planning

America is hardly a tidy place, and our universities and our people and our institutions are caught in the convulsions of change. Integrated data bases do not excite me, nor do “models,” complete with software, compel my imagination. Too often these new tools and techniques create the illusion of planning and thus distract us from facing issues.

It is not our task to predict the future, but to shape our future to the greatest extent possible. If the “management of decline” is our new responsibility, then perhaps the new data bases will be useful in small ways. Trim a little here, trim a little there. Eliminate a few programs. Consolidate the enterprise. Point to small savings in huge budgets. But this is not enough, not nearly enough.

If we really embraced planning, we would be forced to define our ideal of the future. We would not be content with presiding over the status quo, with merely fronting for the entrenched vested interests of our institutions. Instead, we would turn, however reluctantly, to the long-neglected agenda.

Our head-in-the-sand view of the job market for our graduates won’t do. If the Department of Labor studies are even partly correct, we face a growing glut of college graduates who will be unable to work at jobs requiring college-level competencies. If the changing nature of the labor market is not explained to our students and our friends in the legislature, we risk flood tides of great resentment.

There are other compelling concerns: the revival of the liberal arts, the reconstitution of student counseling, the redefinition of institutional autonomy in the context of state systems, the development of remedial programs that really work. The agenda could be extended. Surely there is no want of major problems that we in education steadfastly ignore. And all the while the formal apparatus of planning grows.

Planning is inseparable from management, and both involve those elements we associate with art—intuition, creativity, discernment, command of the work tools and materials, an appreciation of the interaction of form and function.

There are planners and then there are planners—whether of mountain vacations or of state universities and state systems. There are at least two models: the Cook’s tour model and the Lewis and Clark model. The Cook’s tour defines a precise schedule on a well-defined route. “If it’s Tuesday, this must be Belgium.” The tour moves in orderly progression amid known landmarks. The name of the game is to so plan as to avoid contingencies. The unexpected is to be avoided. All is schedule, order, routine.

But I prefer the Lewis and Clark model with its sense of adventure as it explores new frontiers. Lewis and Clark envisioned their goal, assembled the minimum resources, and had the nerve and the courage to take the unexpected in stride. They knew in their bones that success depended upon painstaking completion of the smallest of plans—the building of the camps, the fording of the stream, the delicate negotiations with the Indians. Their epic success was a triumph of small daily successes—all within the context of a goal and clear sense of direction.

The Cook’s tour provides the illusion of planning in a world of imagined stability. The Lewis and Clark tour is an adventure into the unknown. Can there be any choice for us?
no more to be weighed and measured than is
a sonnet or a smile. The true values we seek
in higher education are, at bottom, matters
of faith. Why pretend that the teaching-
learning enterprise lends itself to simplis-
tic analyses?
Planning—whether for a new academic
program, a new university, or the “managed
decline” of a conglomerate of universities
captive in our new state systems—is
definitely art, but mostly bad art. I think of
at least five common errors in addition to
the “beagle fallacy.”

Definition of problems

Defining the problem too narrowly. Health
care requires nurses as well as doctors,
ambulatory clinics as well as hospitals,
dental hygienists as well as dentists.
This diversity is commonly ignored. Every-
where we see the latest state study of “The
Supply and Demand for Nurses” and “The
Supply and Demand for Physicians.” The
failure to define an appropriate framework
of inquiry invites, even guarantees, enor-
mous waste. In Ohio, the “doctor shortage”
has generated a demand for a third new
medical school in addition to the two new
schools recently established. The predictably
exorbitant costs of these new ventures will,
in a few years, put these schools in direct,
hurtful competition for the education dollar,
and all higher education in Ohio will be
poorer for it.

Defining the problem too widely. The
computer model does splendidly when cal-
culating how best to maximize the increase
in the weight of feeder calves, but it groans
and wheezes and spins out nonsense when
it works on a problem involving almost end-
less variables, with assumption piled upon
assumption—stacked dominoes reaching to
the very heavens. Is it possible to identify
all the variables that go into the demand for
nurses nationwide twenty years from now?
To begin, one is forced to make assump-
tions about population growth, income
growth and distribution, spending habits,
impact of new drugs, incidence of disease,
efficiency of health care systems. The list of
variables is literally endless. Such work is as
insubstantial as skywriting. Yet there is just
such a study now underway. The price tag
for the entire project is two and a half million
federal dollars. The technique and tool were
there, and the temptation to use both
proved irresistible.

Counting the “countable.” It does not
follow that because something can be
counted it therefore should be counted. Stu-
dent credit hour production can be counted;
the cost of a student credit hour can be
counted. All kinds of comparisons can be
made from these data, but rarely are. No
one knows how much money is spent on
such counting. No one has counted that—
which is curious. One might have expected
a cost-benefit analysis . . .

In Ohio, and very likely in other states,
we tabulate in painstaking detail the dis-
tribution of faculty time spent on a variety
of activities. It’s all very impressive and
mostly useless as a crude measure of aca-
demic imagination and puffery. (We have a
tireless professor who regularly reports over
100 hours a week, and the computer dutifully
accepts the figure.) Incidentally, the form
provides no place to mark down hours spent
staring at fireflies or standing transfixed
under the shower. Yet it is just in such “idle
times” that something occasionally clicks
into place, and an idea is born. I think we
call it creativity.

The counting game

Our love of counting the countable would
be good clean fun were it not for the fact
that it distracts from other tasks. A depart-
ment chairman busy with such reports fails
to find time for the common sense judg-
ments which are his to make.

Collecting more facts. The researcher al-
ways hunches for more facts. He calls this
“enlarging the data base.” Dr. Jay W. For-
rester could have had education planners in
mind when he wrote: “There seems to be a
common attitude that the major difficulty
is shortage of information and data. Once
data is collected, people then feel confident
in interpreting the implications. I differ on
both of these attitudes. The problem is not
shortage of data but rather our inability to
perceive the consequences of the informa-
tion we already possess.”

1 “Counterintuitive Behavior of Social Sys-
credit hour production, a cost analysis of the OSU motor pool, a Big Ten report on intercollegiate athletics, and another on library costs (How did it get there?), a NCHEMS report, a paper on computer models with the engaging title "Counter-intuitive Behavior of Social Systems," and Kenneth Boulding's paper, "The Management of Decline." Surely somewhere in this clutter lie great insights into the nature of planning—planning as an art form, that is.

And so I read by lamplight, and with mounting disquiet I reflect on what I read and remember planning in higher education.

What in the literature and developments in state, regional, and national planning for higher education makes some of us troubled and uneasy? Management planning, planning by objective, systems management, systems dynamics, integrated information systems, cost relative to benefit. It all sounds so cool, thoughtful, and rational. The very words soothe, reassure; we are about to enter the promised land of "rational decision making."

New data

And who can quarrel with the need for more data, for comparable data, for exact measurement of cost, for analysis of benefits against costs? Who can quarrel with the need for planning (long range as well as short range) for individual institutions and for states? And how can one reject the exciting potential of models and of the application of computer technology to management decision making?

Not only is there a new frontier of data collection and analysis, but there are rapidly expanding systems of coordination and management—state coordinating agencies and regional planning agencies. In all this, there is the promise—sometimes implicit, occasionally prideful and boasting—that the great enterprise of postsecondary education is at last to become manageable. And with this bright promise is the image of the new manager, flanked always by his computer terminal—Mr. Facts in full command. Suddenly there are echoes of the familiar—of McNamara's adoration of systems management and infatuation with the computer, of the Corps of Engineers' adventures in river politics masqueraded in the mystique of elaborate cost-benefit analysis, and of Taylor's "one best way" concept of factory management. These echoes provide reasons for one's sense of disquiet.

Too often our planning efforts display an obsessive preoccupation with whatever is fashionable. Only a few years ago institutional research was the "in" thing with its own professional literature and leaders and learned essays about the role and proper place of institutional research in the scheme of things. But early obsolescence is the fate of all fads, and now institutional research—as we knew it in the 1950s and early 1960s—has been eclipsed by other fashions of the day.

Computers

Now the word "systems" appears everywhere. How could one resist the "systems approach" or deny its purity and compelling logic? It is almost as if we were off the sense of engulfing chaos by ritual incantation of magic words. Couple "system" with another strong, reassuring word such as "dynamics," and we have a new creed and a corporation to cry its praises and claim its profits. In all this, we risk the "triumph of technique over purpose"—a phrase made famous by Wallace Sayre in describing the defeat of sound personnel practices through the ritualism of "civil service."

Techniques and tools are important, and the fabled memory systems of computers are impressive until one learns of the even more impressive circuitry of the human brain. And the capacity of a computer to sort combinations of factors is even more impressive for the simple reason that the computer takes orders, while the human brain is quickly exhausted, even more quickly bored. Who wants to factor in one's own head the ideal combination of feed grain for cattle in a feed lot on the Great Plains? Let our patient computer do the drudgery. So plainly, the computer is a tool
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