

5-26-1976

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/26/1976

Esther Peterson

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

Recommended Citation

Peterson, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/26/1976" (1976). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 793.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/793>

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.

MINUTES: Special Senate Meeting, 26 May 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 Craig Allen, Pearl Douce', Owen Dugmore, John Gregor, Allen Gulezian, Otto Jakubek, J. Richard Jensen, Paul Kuroiwa, Robert Miller, Dale Saumelson and Ruth Vogel.

Visitors Present: Charles McGehee, Lou Bovos, Dale Comstock, Don Schliesman, Joe Schomer, Ron Frye and Bill Floyd.

Mr. Lygre announced this special meeting is for the purpose of holding election of officers. Additional items on the Agenda will be handled during counting of the ballots.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Election of Senate Executive Committee Officers for 1976-1977:

1. Chairperson nominees:

Jimmie Applegate

There were no other nominations from the floor.

MOTION NO. 1477: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Ms. Klug, that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot cast for Jimmie Applegate to be elected as chairperson. Passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. Vice-Chairman nominees:

Robert Mitchell
Helmi Habib

There were no other nominations from the floor.

MOTION NO. 1478: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Mr. Winters, that the nominations be closed. Passed by unanimous voice vote.

Helmi Habib was elected as Vice Chairman on the first ballot by majority vote.

3. The following were nominated from the floor for Secretary:

John Vifian
Dolores Osborn
Robert Mitchell

MOTION NO. 1479: Mr. Winters moved, seconded by Mr. Bennett, that the nominations be closed. Passed by unanimous voice vote.

Robert Mitchell was elected as Secretary on the second ballot by majority vote.

4. At-Large Executive Committee Officers (2):

George Fadenrecht
Linda Klug
Dolores Osborn
David Burt
Nancy Lester

MOTION NO. 1480: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Mr. Winters, that the nominations be closed. Passed by unanimous voice vote.

Linda Klug and Nancy Lester were elected on the first ballot by majority vote.

CODE PROPOSALS

Ms. Lester presented the following Code amendment proposals:

MOTION NO. 1481: The Code Committee moved adoption of the recommendation that the following change be made on page 10 of the Code:

Section 1.60. Deletion of a special meeting called for elections.

- A. Principal officers of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the Senate ~~annually at a special Senate meeting called for the purpose and held~~ within one month prior to the last regular Senate meeting of each academic year. (No further change in the paragraph.)

Reason: To facilitate business and reduce the number of meetings required at the end of the year.

Motion No. 1481 passed by unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1482: The Code Committee moved adoption of the recommendation that the following change be made on page 17 of the Code:

Section 1.160. Voting procedures.

- A. (Last sentence only) All votes on formal motions shall be recorded ~~with voting done by roll-call vote; unless a secret ballot is requested~~ and approved by a vote of the Senate.

Reason: It is unnecessary to have all votes done by roll-call. Also, it is customary for the Senate to adopt Robert's Rules of Order at the first meeting in the fall, and thereafter to proceed according to them.

Motion No. 1482 passed by unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1483: The Code Committee moved adoption of the recommendation that the following change be made on pages 13 and 14 of the Code:

Section 1.85 Senate Standing Committees.

- A. There shall be six standing committees of the Faculty Senate: the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee; the Faculty Senate Code Committee; the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee; the Faculty Senate Student Affairs Committee; the Faculty Senate Budget Committee; and the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee.

Section 1.90 Senate Standing Committees--Powers and Duties.

- B. (6) (new Section)

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

Motion No. 1483 passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Lester advised that the Code Committee and President Brooks cooperatively developed the following Code amendments regarding the RIF policy.

MOTION NO. 1484: The Code Committee moved adoption of the recommendation to rescind Motion No. 1352, in which the RIF machinery was to be set in motion if one person should be affected. (P. 64, 3.78 E).

Reason: The reason given at the time of recommending adopting Motion 1352 was:
"Theoretically, a faculty member should have the protection of RIF, or else 'due cause' should be the reason for his departure. Between 0 and 10 lies a limbo. Until a solution is invented, the faculty should push for full protection."

There was considerable discussion regarding rescinding the motion.

Motion No. 1484 passed by a show of hands; 13 Yes, 10 No, and 3 Abstentions.

MOTION NO. 1485: The Code Committee moved adoption of the recommendation that the following change be made on page 64 of the Code:

Section 3.78 E. Introductory paragraph restated in two paragraphs:

- E. Should a reduction-in-force be required, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be responsible for recommending directly to the President and the Board of Trustees all reduction-in-force that amounts to ten (10) or less full-time equivalent faculty positions. The ten (10) positions shall be exclusive of vacancies normally occurring; e.g., retirement, resignation, non-renewal of contract, non-completion of contract, and one-year contracts not being renewed.

In the case of the reduction-in-force for ten (10) or fewer positions, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall follow all policies listed below except Section 3.78 E (1). If the reduction-in-force must exceed ten (10) positions all procedures in the following section shall be observed.

Reason for change: Clarification. See further clarification proposed for 3.78 E (5).

Motion No. 1485 passed by a majority voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1486: The Code Committee moved adoption of the recommendation that the following changes be made on pages 64-66 of the Code:

Section 3.78 E.(1). Reorganization of the section to allow a rified faculty member due process.

E. (1) to contain the first five paragraphs. E (2) to begin at the sixth paragraph:

- E. (2) Any faculty member who disagrees with his termination of employment as provided in this section (3.78) must appeal in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs within ten working days from receipt of written notification from his department or section chairman or program director of the submission of the recommendations to the appropriate Dean, and the Vice President. A written response to the faculty member will be provided by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the appeal and response will be appended to the final recommendation going to the President.

Any faculty member may request an informal hearing on his case before the Faculty Grievance Committee. And, as provided for in this Code, any person who disputes the recommendations or the decisions of the Faculty Grievance Committee or the Vice President for Academic Affairs may request a formal administrative hearing as to the termination of his appointment. Procedures for formal and informal hearings shall be those detailed in this Code. (See sections 3.84, 3.87)

(The rest of the material in 3.78 E would remain as written, except that it would be re-numbered: (2) becomes (3), etc.)

Reason: Under this re-organization, the College would not go into a full RIF for the first ten people affected. However, they would now be protected by the right of "due process" and especially "grievance." In view of the destructiveness of the RIF, the Code Committee recommends this solution.

MOTION NO. 1487: Mr. Winters moved to amend, seconded by Ms. Kingman, by adding the statement "The Vice President of Academic Affairs shall notify each person terminated under RIF Policy of all appeal options available to them."

MOTION NO. 1488: Ms. Heckart moved, seconded by Ms. Lester, to substitute the amendment to the motion with the statement: "The written notification of a faculty member's termination of employment shall contain a copy of the informal and formal appeal procedures available to the faculty member as provided in this reduction-in-force policy."

Agreed to by Mr. Winters and his second, Ms. Kingman.

Motion No. 1488 passed by unanimous voice vote.

Motion No. 1486, as amended, now reads as follows:

- E.(2) Any faculty member who disagrees with his termination of employment as provided in this section (3.78) must appeal in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs within ten working days from receipt of written notification from his department or section chairman or program director of the submission of the recommendations to the appropriate Dean, and the Vice President. The written notification of a faculty member's termination of employment shall contain a copy of the informal and formal appeal procedures available to the faculty member as provided in this reduction-in-force policy. A written response to the faculty member will be provided by the Vice President for Academic Affairs; the appeal and the response will be appended to the final recommendation going to the President.

Motion No. 1486 passed by unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1489: The Code Committee moved adoption of the recommendation that the following changes be made on pages 70-71 of the Code:

Section 3.84. Procedure for Informal Hearings: Dismissal of Faculty Member for Cause or Termination of Employment due to Reduction in Force.

(The underlined words in the title are new.)

- 1) The aggrieved faculty member shall apply for the informal hearing by filing his request for a hearing with the President or his designee within ten days after receiving written notice of the intention to recommend dismissal or termination due to reduction-in-force, and the hearing shall be granted. Upon receipt of the faculty member's request for an informal hearing, the President or his designee shall provide a copy of his notice to the faculty member and the faculty member's request for an informal hearing to the chairman of the Faculty Senate. A hearing will be scheduled as soon as possible.
- 2) The chairman of the Faculty Senate shall establish a date for an informal hearing by the Faculty Grievance Committee. Such notice shall be provided not more than ten days from the date of the Faculty Senate Chairman's receipt of the faculty member's request for an informal hearing and shall provide not less than ten (10) days' notice to the faculty member of the date, time, and place of such hearing.
- 3) The Faculty Grievance Committee, upon reviewing the case, may recommend that the case proceed directly to formal hearings.
- 4) The Faculty Grievance Committee may rule that it is impossible to conduct an informal hearing. The Committee may refuse to hear the case, or refer it to the President or his designee for formal hearings.
- 5) The faculty member may request a formal hearing according to the provisions of RCW 28B.19.110, as amended by Section 3.81 A (2) of this Code.
- 6) The informal hearing shall be conducted as expeditiously and as continuously as possible and on successive days if possible.
- 7) The grievant and any other parties the committee deems necessary for the hearing shall make himself or themselves available once the hearing begins unless he or they can verify to the Faculty Grievance Committee that his or their absence is absolutely necessary.
- 8) A member of the Faculty Grievance Committee shall remove himself from the case if he deems himself disqualified for bias or interest. Grievance Committee members who are members of the same department as the grievant or grievants shall not serve at the hearing. Each party shall have the privilege of one challenge without stated cause.

- 9) In informal hearings, the faculty member shall be permitted to have with him a Central Washington State College faculty member of his own choosing to act as advisor and counsel. The faculty member must be selected from those covered in Section 1.01 of this Code, provided that such faculty member is not a member of the Washington State Bar or any bar of the United States.
- 10) Any legal opinion or interpretation given to the Faculty Grievance Committee shall be shared with all other parties to the case.
- 11) Informal hearings will be closed to all except those personnel directly involved. All statements, testimony, and all other evidence given at the informal hearing shall be confidential and shall not be subject to disclosure or discovery and shall not be released to anyone including the parties involved. Such statements, testimony and evidence may not be used to question the veracity of any party to the case without permission of the person who divulged the information.
- 12) The Faculty Grievance Committee shall file its recommendations with the President of the College or his designee, the Faculty Senate Chairman and all principals to the case within five days after the conclusion of the informal review. There shall be no hearing before the Faculty Senate.
- 13) Within five days of the receipt of the recommendations of the Faculty Grievance Committee, the President or his designee shall inform all principals to the case, Faculty Grievance Committee and the Faculty Senate Chairman of his decision to approve or disapprove the recommendations. This action of the President or his designee shall constitute notice of the final decision in the informal hearing procedure.
- 14) If the faculty member disagrees with the President or his designee, and/or the Faculty Grievance Committee he may request a formal hearing on the matter by directing a request for such hearing to the chairman of the Board of Trustees within ten days after notice of the final decision concerning the informal hearing.

Reason: The section is re-worded to conform as much as feasible with the section on informal reviews which we have already passed. Items 1-6 are the same as are presently in the Code. Items 7-14 parallel the new informal review section.

While RIF and "due cause" are two separate things, both can lead to the loss of employment, and "due process" should be available in either case.

This version of section 3.84 includes the last two items on the Presidents list of February 17, and are agreeable to the Code Committee.

Motion No. 1489 passed by majority voice vote with several abstentions.

MOTION NO. 1490: The Code Committee moved adoption of the recommendation that the following changes be made on page 68 of the Code:

Section 3.78 (E) (5) (Reduction in Force)

- E. (5) If faculty members must be notified of termination of employment, under this reduction in force policy, notice shall be given according to Section 3.60 of this Faculty Code, with the exception that those who have serve the college for three or more years shall be given twelve calendar months notice.

Reason: Section 3.60 A (4) (Non-Reappointment--Notice Requirements) could be interpreted to read twelve months before the end of an academic year, if an academic year is regarded as the normal "appointment." Thus, at any time after the end of an academic year, if notice is given it would have to apply to the end of the second academic year. If interpreted this way, this policy actually provides 12 to 24 months notice, depending on exactly when the notice is given. The problems of Reduction-in-Force (3.78 A,B) would be difficult to address under these conditions, given the fact that most of our faculty have served Central well over three years.

Motion No. 1490 passed by unanimous voice vote with several abstentions.

MOTION NO. 1491: The Code Committee moved adoption of the recommendation that the following changes be made on page 62 of the Code:

Section 3.73 (2). Also related to RIF.

- (2) Where termination of an appointment is based upon financial exigency, faculty members may, at their option, have the issues reviewed through the appeal procedures provided in this Code. In every case of financial exigency, the faculty members concerned will be given notice as soon as possible.

Reason: The addition of the phrase "at their option" makes it clear that the option lies with the teacher.

Motion No. 1491 passed by unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1492: The Code Committee moved adoption of the recommendation that the following changes be made on pages 48 and 49 of the Code:

Section 3.09 A. (4) Types of Appointments

Change first sentence:

A regular full time contract year appointment may be for any three terms from among the fall, winter and spring quarters and a contiguous summer session if the summer session salary is augmented to a full quarter's compensation and the work assignment adjusted accordingly. Such contract year appointment shall be made only with the concurrence of the appointee.

Reason: To conform to the change proposed for Section 3.78 E (5) and to correct a misinterpretation that the College has authorized 3/9 pay for all who teach summer session.

Motion No. 1492 passed by unanimous voice vote.

PROPOSED POLICY ON AWARD OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES

Mr. Don Schliesman, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, presented a proposed policy regarding the award of undergraduate degrees with honors. He asked the Senate to concur with the recommendation of the Undergraduate Council by adopting the Latin terms and by raising the g.p.a. requirements as follows effective for all students fall quarter, 1977:

- cum laude 3.4
- magna cum laude .. 3.6
- summa cum laude....3.8

MOTION NO. 1493: Mr. Applegate moved, seconded by Mr. Bennett, to accept the changes suggested in the May 10, 1976 letter to Mr. Lygre from Mr. Schliesman.

MOTION NO. 1494: Mr. Hawkins moved, seconded by Mr. Winters, to divide the motion and to vote on the g.p.a. issue separately from the titles. Defeated by majority nay vote.

Discussion resumed on the main motion.

Motion No. 1493 passed by majority voice vote.

PROPOSED POLICY ON NONMATRICULATED STUDENTS

Mr. Schliesman presented the proposed policy on nonmatriculated students. He explained that current admission policies and procedures require students to submit all of their past academic records prior to being admitted. It is frequently difficult for off-campus students to accomplish this before enrolling in their first course or before the tenth day of instruction. Consequently admissions are delayed and accurate enrollment data are not available until late in the quarter. The proposed policy will help solve the problem by permitting students to enroll in courses with nonmatriculated status, subject to the

conditions indicated in the policy which follows:

A nonmatriculated student is one who is authorized to enroll for study but does not intend to pursue a degree or certificate program. Each student will be required to sign a statement indicating that published admission criteria to the college have been met. Enrollment may not exceed nine credits a quarter. Subject to approval, up to forty-five quarter credits earned with nonmatriculated status may later be applied to a baccalaureate degree should formal admission to the college be granted.

High school students may enroll with nonmatriculated status only if they have a signed release from their school principal.

Students wishing to audit courses may enroll with nonmatriculated status.

Nonmatriculated students will be enrolled on a space available basis.

MOTION NO. 1495: Mr. Purcell moved, seconded by Mr. Tolin, that the policy on nonmatriculated students be approved.

There was considerable discussion on the motion. Mr. Schliesman advised the Senate that the plan is to initiate this policy as soon after Senate and Washington Administrative Code approval as possible.

Motion No. 1495 passed by unanimous voice vote.

PROPOSED POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW AND EVALUATION

Mr. Schliesman explained a statement of proposed policies and procedures for review and evaluation of undergraduate programs. The proposal was submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Undergraduate Council with the recommendation that it be approved.

MOTION NO. 1496: Mr. Dudley moved, seconded by Mr. McQuarrie, that the report be approved.

Mr. Comstock suggested a friendly amendment that the Senate recognize the necessity of coordinating graduate and undergraduate review efforts.

Discussion followed.

MOTION NO. 1497: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Mr. Tolin, to refer this item to the Academic Affairs Committee if such a committee is eventually approved by the Board of Trustees.

The question of whether there is another motion on the floor to be voted on was raised.

Mr. Lygre advised the Senate that a motion referring a matter to a committee takes priority.

Motion No. 1497 passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

1975-76

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF

May 26, 1976

ROLL CALL

SENATOR

ALTERNATE

Allen, Craig
Alumbaugh, Dick
Applegate, Jimmie

Phil Tolin
Neil Roberts

Bachrach, Jay
Bennett, Robert
Brooks, James
Burt, David

Peter Burkholder
Robert Bentley
Edward Harrington
Richard Johnson

Dickson, Rosella
Douce', Pearl
Doi, Richard
Dudley, Stan
Dugmore, Owen

Margaret Lawrence
Joan Howe
Constance Speth
Gerald Brunner
Robert Nuzum

Franz, Wolfgang

Charles Brunner

Garrett, Roger
Gregor, John
Gulezian, Allen

Lynn Osborn
Bill Hillar
Jay Forsyth

Hawkins, Charles
Heckart, Beverly
Hileman, Betty

David Kaufman
Gordon Warren
Deloris Johns

Jakubek, Otto
Jensen, J. Richard
Keith, Art
Kingman, Kathy
Klug, Linda
Kuroiwa, Paul

Joel Andress
Bonalyn Bricker
George Grossman

Lester, Nancy
Lygre, David

Dieter Romboy
Helmi Habib

McQuarrie, Duncan
Miller, Robert
Dolores Osborn
Purcell, John
Samuelson, Dale
Smith, Milo

Owen Pratz
Wallace Webster
Blaine Wilson
Kent Martin
Lee Fisher
A. James Hawkins

Vifian, John
Vogel, Ruth
Wiberg, Curt
Winters, Roger

Keith Rinehart
Thomas Thelen
Robert Yee

Yeh, Thomas
Young, Madge

William Craig
Joe Schomer

May 26

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

Charles W. Hibel

Low Boss-

John R. Winstock

W. Schlessman

Joe Schomer

Ron Foye

Bill Floyd

NOMINATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FACULTY SENATE--1976-77

CHAIRMAN

Ed
Jimnie Applegate

VICE-CHAIRMAN

Robert Mitchell

Chem
Helmi Habib

~~Art Keith~~

SECRETARY

1st ballot
~~John Vifian~~
2nd ballot
~~Belores Osborn~~
Robert Mitchell

AT-LARGE OFFICER

George Fadenrecht

1st
Linda Klug

~~Helmi Habib~~

Belores Osborn

~~John Vifian~~

David Burt

1st
Nancy Lester

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON
98926

RECEIVED

MAY 12 1976

May 10, 1976

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David Lygre, Chairman
Faculty Senate
C.W.S.C.
Campus

Dear Dr. Lygre:

This letter transmits recent action taken by the Undergraduate Council regarding the award of undergraduate degrees with honors. To be in concert with most other four-year colleges and universities in Washington state as well as across the nation and to reestablish meaning and credibility to honors degrees, the Council approved unanimously the following motion:

.....that the Undergraduate Council accept the Bovos proposal to adopt the Latin terms and raise the g.p.a. requirements as:

cum laude.....3.4
magna cum laude.....3.6
summa cum laude.....3.8

to be effective for all students fall quarter, 1977.

We request that the Faculty Senate approve this recommendation. Mr. Bovos and I would be pleased to provide data or answer questions.

Sincerely yours,



Donald M. Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

la

cc: Vice President Harrington

Esther

SUMMER 1974

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<hr/>			
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>		297	
Honors	3.25 - +	64	21.5
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	38	12.8
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	22	7.4
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	4	1.3
<hr/>			
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>		161	
Honors	3.25 - +	41	25.5
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	22	13.7
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	16	9.9
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	3	1.9
<hr/>			
<u>B. A.</u>		131	
Honors	3.25 - +	22	16.8
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	16	12.2
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	5	3.8
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	.8
<hr/>			
<u>3.</u>		5	
Honors	3.25 - +	1	20.0
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	1	20.0
<hr/>			
<u>PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>		39	13.1
Summa cum laude	3.40	25	64.4
Magna cum laude	3.60	12	30.8
Summa cum laude	3.80	2	5.1

FALL 1974

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>		224	
Honors	3.25 - +	64	28.0
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	37	16.5
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	20	8.9
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	7	3.1
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>		140	
Honors	3.25 - +	45	32.1
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	27	19.3
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	12	8.6
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	6	4.3
<u>B. S.</u>		83	
Honors	3.25 - +	19	22.9
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	10	12.0
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	8	9.6
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	1.2
<u>B. S.</u>		1	
Honors	3.25 - +	0	
<u>NEW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>		36	16.1
cum laude	3.40	18	8.0
magna cum laude	3.60	13	5.8
summa cum laude	3.80	5	2.2

WINTER 1975

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>		260	
Honors	3.25 - +	75	31.3
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	44	18.3
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	26	10.8
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	5	2.1
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>		124	
Honors	3.25 - +	44	35.5
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	25	20.2
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	14	11.3
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	5	4.0
<u>B. A.</u>		110	
Honors	3.25 - +	26	23.6
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	16	14.5
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	10	9.0
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	0	0.0
<u>B. S.</u>		6	
Honors	3.25 - +	5	83.3
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	3	50.0
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	2	33.3
<u>MSW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>		49	20.4
sum laude	3.40	27	11.3
magna sum laude	3.60	18	7.5
summa cum laude	3.80	4	1.7

SPRING 1973

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>		650	
Honors	3.25 - +	208	32.2
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	114	17.5
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	65	10.0
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	30	4.5
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>		328	
Honors	3.25 - +	122	37.2
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	75	22.9
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	36	11.0
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	11	3.4
<u>B. S.</u>		310	
Honors	3.25 - +	83	26.8
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	39	12.6
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	26	8.4
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	18	5.8
<u>B. E.</u>		12	
Honors	3.25 - +	4	33.3
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	3	25.0
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	8.3
<u>NEW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>		135	20.8
cum laude	3.40	67	10.3
high cum laude	3.50	49	7.5
summa cum laude	3.80	19	2.9

SUMMER 1975

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<hr/>			
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>		239	
Honors	3.25 - +	34	14.2
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	21	8.8
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	11	4.6
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	7	2.9
<hr/>			
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>		175	
Honors	3.25 - +	32	17.5
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	12	9.5
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	9	7.1
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	.8
<hr/>			
<u>B. A.</u>		109	
Honors	3.25 - +	12	11.0
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	9	8.3
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	2	1.8
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	.9
<hr/>			
<u>B. S.</u>		4	
Honors	3.25 - +	0	
<hr/>			
<u>MCJ PROGRAM - HONORS</u>		23	9.6
summa laude	3.40	16	6.7
summa cum laude	3.60	5	2.1
summa cum laude	3.80	2	.8

FALL 1975

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>		181	
Honors	3.25 - +	51	28.2
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	27	14.9
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	18	9.9
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	6	3.3
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>		94	
Honors	3.25 - +	25	26.6
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	14	14.9
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	9	9.6
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	2	2.1
<u>B. S.</u>		85	
Honors	3.25 - +	26	30.6
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	11	15.3
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	9	10.6
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	4	4.7
<u>B. S.</u>		2	
Honors	3.25 - +	0	
<u>THE PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>		32	17.7
cum laude	3.40	16	8.8
magis cum laude	3.60	11	6.1
summa cum laude	3.80	5	2.8

WINTER 1976

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	CPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>		213	
Honors	3.25 - +	52	24.4
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	28	13.1
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	18	8.5
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	6	2.8
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>		84	
Honors	3.25 - +	29	34.5
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	16	19.0
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	9	10.7
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	4	4.8
<u>B. S.</u>		125	
Honors	3.25 - +	21	16.8
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	12	9.6
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	8	6.4
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	.8
<u>B. S.</u>		4	
Honors	3.25 - +	2	50.0
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	1	25.0
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	25.0
<u>NEW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>		32	15.0
cum laude	3.40	20	9.4
passa cum laude	3.60	6	2.8
summa cum laude	3.80	6	2.8

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

Dean of Undergraduate Studies

06926

RECEIVED

MAR 11 1976

FACULTY SENATE

March 10, 1976

Dr. David Lygre, Chairman
Faculty Senate
C.W.S.C.
Campus

Dear Dr. Lygre:

With increasing numbers of students being enrolled in off-campus courses, we are experiencing difficulties in processing applications for admission in a timely fashion. Because applications for admission are being completed during the first meeting of off-campus courses rather than on an advanced basis, students are enrolling in courses prior to being admitted to the college.

Current admission policies and procedures require students to submit all their past academic records prior to being admitted. Frequently it is very difficult for off-campus students to get this accomplished before enrolling in their first course or before the tenth day of instruction. Consequently, admissions are delayed and accurate enrollment data are not available until late in the quarter. The proposed policy printed below will help solve the problem.

Although we have had a nonmatriculated category of admissions for some time, it has had limited use until very recently. Almost all students have been required to matriculate. The modified policy will allow students to enroll in courses, with nonmatriculated status, subject to the conditions indicated.

The proposed policy has been considered by the Admissions, Matriculation and Graduation Committee and the Undergraduate Council. The A.M.G. Committee recommended a slightly different statement which was reviewed and modified by the Undergraduate Council. Both bodies recommend its approval by the Faculty Senate.

A nonmatriculated student is one who is authorized to enroll for study but does not intend to pursue a degree or certificate program. Each student will be required to sign a statement indicating that published admission criteria to the college have been met. Enrollment may not exceed nine credits a quarter. Subject to approval, up to forty-five quarter credits earned with nonmatriculated status may later be applied to a baccalaureate degree should formal admission to the college be granted.

Dr. David Lygre
March 10, 1976
page two

High school students may enroll with nonmatriculated status only if they have a signed release from their school principal.

Students wishing to audit courses may enroll with nonmatriculated status.

Nonmatriculated students will be enrolled on a space available basis.

Mr. Bridges and I will be happy to answer any questions the Senators may have.

Sincerely yours,

Donald M. Schliesman *la*

Donald M. Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

la

cc: Mr. Bridges
Vice President Harrington

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

80926

Dean of Undergraduate Studies

April 15, 1976


RECEIVED
APR 16 1976
FACULTY SENATE

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. Schlieaman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

In

enclosure

April 6, 1976

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE
Undergraduate Programs
A SUMMARY OF POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE
DEGREE PROGRAMS

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.