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MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 16 February 1977
Presiding Officer: Helmi Habib, 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 James Brooks, Richard Dietz, John Gregor, Richard Jensen and Margaret Sahlstrand.

Visitors Present: James Brennan, Jon Daigneault, and Don Schliesman.

Chairman Habib introduced two of the three new student Senators: Chuck McClure and Ken Winslow. The other student senator is Richard Dietz.

AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman suggested the following changes:

1. Under "Communications" add
   A. Letter from James Alexander
   B. Letter from Owen Dugmore
   C. Letter from Don Schliesman
   D. Letter from George Stillman


3. Under "Reports" delete
   B. Executive Committee Report.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of February 2, 1977 were approved as distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

A. Letter from James Alexander, Chairman of the Department of Anthropology, dated February 8, 1977, stating that the faculty of the Anthropology Department are convinced that the proposed revisions in the General Education requirements are inconsistent, academically indefensible, unnecessarily rigid, and that changes of this magnitude to the current requirements would be ill-advised at this time. In view of this, they request the proposal be assigned to the Academic Affairs Committee for study and to hold hearings on the proposal. They also suggest that the Senate should develop the procedure to require committees to hold hearings during the earlier stages of development of any proposals on policies which will directly affect academic activity.

B. Letter from George Stillman, dated February 14, 1977, advising the Senate that the Art Department's alternate and senator have agreed to exchange places, and Margaret Sahlstrand will now be Senator and Louis Kollmeyer will be the alternate. They also, by unanimous vote, wish to join the English Department in its action disapproving the "Proposed Policy on Evaluation and Review" as it is presently written.

C. Letter from the department of Philosophy, dated February 15, 1977, recommending that the Faculty Senate vote against the proposal of Mr. McQuarrie and the Undergraduate Program Review and Evaluation Committee proposal. They are in hopes that the Committee be dissolved. They also hope that the whole issue of curriculum evaluation be maintained under its present system.
D. Memo from Owen Dugmore, Chairman of the Student Affairs Committee, dated January 10, informing the Senate that both its charges have been resolved and the committee has no recommendations for the Senate's consideration.

E. Letter from Donald Schliesman, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, dated February 4, 1977, transmitting a proposal to revise the General Education Program which was developed by the General Studies Committee and approved by the Undergraduate Council at its meeting on January 26, 1977. Copies have been sent to school deans, department chairmen and program directors. Approval by the Faculty Senate is recommended.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

A. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals, pages 457 and 458.

MOTION NO. 1565: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Mr. Street, to adopt the curriculum proposals on pages 457 and 458, with the modification that Psych. 362 be added to the list of appropriate statistics courses on the bottom of page 457, provided that it is agreeable with the Department of Psychology and to the Home Economics Department.

Several problem areas were discussed.

MOTION NO. 1566: Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Mr. Hawkins, to send the Bachelor of Science major back to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee with instructions to resolve the problem areas and re-submit to the Senate. Passed with a majority voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1567: Mr. Keith moved, seconded by Mr. Vifian, for the adoption of HOFN 442, the course addition on page 458. Passed by a majority voice vote.

Chairman Habib stated he would refer the Bachelor of Science major back to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and ask them to confer with the Home Economics Department to straighten out the program and bring it back to the Senate for action.

REPORTS

A. Chairman and Executive Committee Reports--

Mr. Habib reported that he went to Olympia last February 7 and testified before the House of Higher Education Committee about University status. The Committee seemed to be in favor of it and will probably recommend a Do Pass on legislation.

Executive Order 772 from the Governor has been received which has frozen all funds for the institution. There will be a general faculty meeting called as soon as Vice President Harrington receives more information on the situation. Hopefully, the meeting will be in the next few weeks to let faculty know what the status is, what to do about it and how it will affect everyone.

The General Education proposal has been referred to the Senate. The letter received from Mr. Alexander, chairman of the Anthropology Department, concerned this proposal. The Senate Executive Committee has referred the proposal to the Senate Academic Affairs Committee and to the Senate Curriculum Committee to be reviewed separately. They are to hold joint open hearings and come up with joint recommendations before the Senate.

A report has been received from the ad hoc Committee on Retirement with a final draft of Retirement Rules and Regulations. Due to a lack of funds, it was not possible to have copies reproduced for everyone; however, a report is on file in the Senate office which can be looked at. Mr. Newschwannder, chairman of the ad hoc Committee on Retirement, has been asked to come to the next Senate meeting and explain the revised rules and regulations and answer questions. Action on the revised rules and regulations will be asked for at that time so that they may be presented to the Budget Committee and then to the Board of Trustees.

Chairman Habib and Dean Schliesman have reviewed the campus committee structure and decided there is an excess of committees and a dearth of faculty to serve on those committees. It is becoming too difficult for Dean Schliesman and the Senate Executive Committee to keep these committees filled with replacements of vacancies all year.
They are proposing to eliminate some committees, combine some committees and reduce membership on others, and have effectively eliminated 69 faculty positions. The proposal is currently with the Vice President for discussion with his advisory council and, after it has been reviewed there, it will be presented to the Senate. Hopefully, there will be a more condensed committee structure next year.

The President's Advisory Council has established a new committee, The Energy Conservation Committee. Mr. Habib has suggested three names for the three faculty positions to be filled.

A message has been received from the Dean of Natural Science and Mathematics relative to a course that is on the graduate curriculum changes that have been proposed to the Senate. These are on file in the Senate office. The course is Math 560 and was not brought out of committee due to conflicts. Last Wednesday was the last day to include courses on the printout for summer. The Executive Committee has approved including the course on the printout with the proviso that after Senate consideration of the course, if the Senate does not approve the course, it will immediately go on the delete sheet.

C. Standing Committees--

1. Council of Faculty Representatives Report--Wolfgang Franz presented a report on several subjects.

   The Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR), at their most recent meeting, instructed Ellis H. Dill, chairman of the CFR, to convey to the Governor the following resolution:

   Whereas it will require a 21.4% average salary increase for faculty in order to restore the purchasing power of ten years ago, and

   Whereas the state should provide a 2% average increase in lieu of time-in-grade step increases that would be available in a merit system;

   Therefore, the Council of Faculty Representatives requests an average salary increase of 23.4% for 1977-78 for faculty at the state colleges and universities and a second year increase of 5.1% equal to the projected cost of living increase for 1978-79.

   Mr. Franz discussed related information distributed at the Senate meeting, along with a graph giving the basis of comparison on faculty salaries.

   Mr. Franz attended a CFR meeting last Saturday. Four different tuition bills which have been introduced in the legislature were discussed.

   A sabbatical bill, which has been introduced, was discussed at the meeting also.

   Another topic discussed at the meeting was a collective bargaining bill which has passed the House and has been sent to the Senate. Mr. Larry Banton was present at the Senate meeting and commented on the collective bargaining.

   2. Academic Affairs--No report.

   3. Budget Committee--No report.


   5. Curriculum Committee--Warren Street presented a report, and circulated a proposed addition to the Guide to Curriculum Change: page 10, to be inserted between material describing Extension Courses and that describing Individual Study Courses: Minicourses

   Minicourses offer short-term, in-depth instruction in timely academic subjects and specific related skills. Each minicourse carries one credit and has a minimum of nine class-hour meetings. The meetings may be compressed into only a few calendar days, e.g., one meeting daily for two weeks.
Minicourses are listed in the catalog under the numbers 294 or 494 for lower-and upper-division content, respectively. The catalog title, "Minicourses in (department name) ," and the course description given in catalog examples are uniformly used for all minicourses. Several minicourse topics may be offered under one catalog number each quarter. Specific minicourse titles are not listed in the catalog, but are listed in the quarterly class schedule. Minicourse topics should be submitted to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies for review and distribution to departments. Care should be taken not to duplicate the offerings of other departments. Students may enroll for the minicourse number repeatedly if a different topic is taken each time. Letter grades or S/U grades may be used.

Chairman Habib suggested the discussion of the proposal on Minicourses be delayed until the next Senate meeting. It will be an Agenda item under New Business as Consideration of Curriculum Committee's Report on Minicourses.

6. Personnel Committee--No report.

7. Student Affairs--This committee has now completed its charge and submitted its report.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Action on Motion No. 1560--This motion was made to adopt the proposed statement of academic standards and to fill the blanks according to the provision under Roberts Rules for "Motion for filling the blanks."

The following values were nominated to fill the three blanks: 1.5, 2.0, and 2.25. Considerable discussion ensued.

MOTION NO. 1568: Mr. McQuarrie moved for the previous question. Seconded by Mr. Mitchell. Passed by a two-thirds majority vote.

MOTION NO. 1569: By majority vote, the value of 2.0 was elected to fill the blanks.

Discussion resumed on the main motion to adopt the proposed statement of academic standards.

MOTION NO. 1570: Mr. King moved to amend the section on academic probation to include a statement on academic warning, to say in essence that a student whose quarterly GPA falls below 2.0 will receive notice of academic warning. Died for lack of a second.

MOTION NO. 1571: Mr. McQuarrie moved for the previous question. Seconded by Mr. Street. Passed by a two-thirds majority vote.

Motion No. 1560 was voted on and passed by a majority hand vote, with Nay votes from Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Hawkins, and no abstentions.

B. Action on Motion No. 1562--This motion was to adopt the proposed Policy on Program Evaluation and Review, dated January 27, 1977.

Mr. McQuarrie replied briefly to some of the comments received on the proposal.

Mr. Street asked whether the Council on Postsecondary Education intends to ask for a review.

Mr. McQuarrie replied that there is intention in the five year plan in that they propose to initiate a review and evaluation of undergraduate programs comparable to the procedure they now have for the review and evaluation of graduate programs which they are now currently engaged with. They have delayed the review of undergraduate programs and are reviewing the graduate programs for a second time. The associate director of CPE has expressed interest in seeing what Central develops as a procedure.
Mr. Schliesman pointed out that the CPE has legal authority over Higher Education in the state. He read a portion of page 68 of their report: Planning and Policy Recommendation for Washington Postsecondary Education, 1976-1982. The document has been approved by the CPE. It says the Council on Postsecondary Education is obliged by law to review and evaluate the undergraduate degree programs.

MOTION NO. 1572: Mr. Hawkins moved to amend page one, bottom line of the proposal, by deleting the words "other than members of the department(s) being reviewed." The motion died for lack of a second.

MOTION NO. 1573: Mr. Mitchell moved for the question on Motion 1562. Passed by a show of hands of 21 Aye, 4 Nay, and no abstentions.

Motion 1562 to adopt the Proposed Policy on Program Evaluation and Review, dated January 27, 1977, passed by a show of hands of 13 Aye, 12 Nay, and 4 abstentions.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, February 16, 1977
Faculty Development Center
Bouillon Building
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II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF February 2, 1977

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
   A. Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals, pages 457 and 458

VI. REPORTS
   A. Chairman
   B. Executive Committee
   C. Standing Committees
      1. Academic Affairs Committee
      2. Budget Committee
      3. Code Committee
      4. Curriculum Committee
      5. Personnel Committee
      6. Student Affairs

VII. OLD BUSINESS
   A. Action on Motion No. 1560
   B. Action on Motion No. 1562

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURNMENT
## FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF Feb. 16, 1977

### ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATOR</th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Kathleen</td>
<td>Clayton Denman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andress, Joel</td>
<td>Cal Willberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, James</td>
<td>Ed Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Frank</td>
<td>Glenn Madsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson, Rosella</td>
<td>Imani Mwandishi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietz, Richard</td>
<td>Woodrow Monte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douce', Pearl</td>
<td>Robert Nuzum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugmore, Owen</td>
<td>Ron Hales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envick, Robert</td>
<td>William Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadenrecht, George</td>
<td>Larry Danton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz, Wolfgang</td>
<td>Bill Hillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulezian, Allen</td>
<td>Don Dietrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregor, John</td>
<td>David Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habib, Helmi</td>
<td>Deloris Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, Charles</td>
<td>Bonalyn Bricker Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hileman, Betty</td>
<td>Roger Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, Richard</td>
<td>George Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Corwin</td>
<td>Margaret Sahlstrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Art</td>
<td>Dieter Romboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollmeyer, Louis</td>
<td>Robert Yee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester, Nancy</td>
<td>Max Zwanziger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahajani, Usha</td>
<td>(No alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClure, Chuck</td>
<td>Blaine Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuarrie, Duncan</td>
<td>Richard Doi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Robert</td>
<td>Karl Zink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborn, Dolores</td>
<td>Richard Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter, Larry</td>
<td>E. Dee Torrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Russell</td>
<td>Phil Tolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahlstrand, Margaret</td>
<td>Chester Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuelson, Dale</td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Milo</td>
<td>James Brennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street, Warren</td>
<td>Thomas Thelen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utzinger, John</td>
<td>Neil Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vifian, John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, Gordon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiberg, Curt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winslow, Ken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Madge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISITORS
PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

James Brannan
Jon Daigneault
Dana Skelton

Last person signing please return to the Recording Secretary.
Dear Mr. Habib:

On February 7, 1977, the faculty of this department met with Dean Schliesman to discuss the proposed revisions in the General Education requirements. After an extended and detailed discussion of the proposal the faculty of this department are convinced that the proposed changes are inconsistent, academically indefensible, unnecessarily rigid, and that changes of this magnitude to the current requirements would be ill-advised at this time.

In view of the foregoing, we are requesting that the Faculty Senate assign this proposal to the Academic Affairs Committee for study and that they be instructed to hold hearings on the proposal. This would provide us with an opportunity to air our concerns for a wider audience.

We would also like to suggest to the Senate that procedures should be developed to require committees to hold hearings during the earlier stages of development of any proposals on policies which will directly affect academic activity. We do not think, for instance, that the proposal currently in question should ever have been presented to the Undergraduate Council by the General Studies Committee without such hearings.

The faculty of this department will sincerely appreciate due consideration and action by the Faculty Senate on our requests and concerns.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. ALEXANDER
Chairman
MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee, Faculty Senate
FROM: Student Affairs Committee, Owen Dugmore, Chairman
SUBJECT: Disposition of Charges to the Student Affairs Committee
DATE: January 10, 1977

The Student Affairs Committee has been informed that both its charges have already been considered and effectually resolved by other college agencies--by the Dean of Student Development Services in one case and by the President's Council in the other.

With reference to the first charge, Dean Guy has told the committee the difficulties with academic-appeals procedures have been overcome. The acting assistant dean, Catherine Sands, is able to tell students precisely how to use the Board of Academic Appeals, to furnish appeals forms and to advise students how to ensure airing and redress of grievances.

With reference to the second, and final, charge, Vice President Harrington has told the committee that the President's Council has decided honor graduates should wear colored braids at commencement exercises. The color of the braid will designate the level of honor. Mr. Bovos is completing arrangements that will allow the 1977 honor graduates to be so designated.

The decisions and actions of the Dean and of the President's Council have disposed of all the charges made to the Student Affairs Committee on October 6, 1976.

The committee has no recommendations for the Senate's consideration.

WOD/erm
28 January 1977

The Honorable Dixie Lee Ray
Governor of Washington
Legislative Building
Olympia, WA 98504

Dear Governor Ray:

The Council of Faculty Representatives of the State Colleges and Universities has instructed me to convey to you the following resolution which was passed unanimously at our most recent meeting:

Whereas it will require a 21.4% average salary increase for faculty in order to restore the purchasing power of ten years ago, and

Whereas the state should provide a 21 average increase in lieu of time-in-grade step increases that would be available in a merit system;

Therefore, the Council of Faculty Representatives requests an average salary increase of 21.4% for 1977-78 for faculty at the state colleges and universities, and a second year increase of 5.1% equal to the projected cost of living increase for 1978-79.

Further supportive information is enclosed.

We respectfully request that you make such an appropriation request to the legislature.

Sincerely yours,

Ellis H. Hill, Chairman
Council of Faculty Representatives
Professor and Chairman, Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics
University of Washington

cc: Council of Presidents

The CFR is composed of three faculty representatives from each of the six state-supported four-year colleges and universities of the state of Washington. It was created to permit the faculties of the four-year institutions to speak with one voice on issues affecting higher education in the state of Washington.
COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES

FACULTY SALARY REQUEST

The Council of Faculty Representatives' request of a 23.4% salary increase for 1977 is based upon the changes in the Consumer Price Index and changes in the numbers of faculty in each rank. The request, if granted, will bring faculty of each rank to the average purchasing power which faculty of that rank earned in the academic year 1967-68, including an estimated 5.2% for the inflation expected during this fiscal year and the 2% recommended by Governor Evans in recognition of the lack of incremental or step increases for higher education faculty.

During the past decade the Consumer Price Index has increased by 71.4%. The increase in faculty salaries at the four-year colleges and universities has fallen far short of this increase in the CPI while the secondary school teachers of the state have more than kept pace with inflation inasmuch as their salaries have increased by 87%. This is the same as the increase in the national average hourly wage for privately employed workers calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

A graph showing the average salaries for college and university faculty in the state of Washington, and showing the national average hourly wage paid to privately employed workers, all relative to the Consumer Price Index, is attached.

The financial plight of our college faculties is the result of two factors. The first is that a few relatively large salary increases have failed to compensate for several years of very small increases or even none at all. Secondly, our faculty for many years have had no consideration whatsoever of the salary increases normally associated with promotion or professional advancement. In this regard they, of all state employees, stand alone. Unlike civil service personnel and community college or secondary school teachers, higher education faculty and exempt staff receive no regular step increases. The only raises they receive are those noted by the legislature.

Governor Evans noted this in his budget message, which recommended an additional 2% increase (in lieu of step increase) for our college faculties. But this situation has continued for some time and the cumulative effect of ten years of neglect, coupled with the inadequate general salary increases noted above, has been devastating. In order to bring the average salary of each rank up to a level such that the average professor, the average associate professor or the average assistant professor would have (1976-77) the purchasing power of his counterpart of nine years ago, an immediate salary increase of 15.4% would be required. In addition, the expected 5.2% inflation during the current year will make the required compounded salary increase for 1977-78 equal to 21.4%.
Dear Dr. Habib:

This letter transmits a proposal to revise the General Education Program which was developed by the General Studies Committee and approved by the Undergraduate Council during its meeting on January 26, 1977. Copies of it have been sent to school deans, department chairmen and program directors.

We strongly recommend its approval by the Faculty Senate.

Sincerely yours,

Donald M. Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
MEMORANDUM

TO: Department Chairmen and Program Directors

FROM: Donald M. Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

DATE: February 4, 1977

Attached is a copy of a proposal to revise the General Education Program which was developed by the General Studies Committee and approved by the Undergraduate Council during its meeting on January 26, 1977. It has been forwarded to the Faculty Senate with recommendation to approve.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Undergraduate Council

FROM: General Studies Committee

DATE: December 1, 1976

RE: A PROPOSAL TO REVISE THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

An important function of the General Studies Committee is to initiate continued development of the general education component (basic and breadth requirements) of CWSC's bachelor degree programs. We have culminated several years study in the accompanying plan for revision of that component. This is submitted as a formal proposal for consideration and action by the Undergraduate Council.

The proposal is presented in two sections: (1) a draft to explain the program in "catalog copy" style, and (2) a set of guidelines for initiating and administering the program. In the event further explanation is needed, our committee is prepared to meet for conversation with the Council.

General Studies Committee:

Ham Howard, Chairman
Anthony Candel
David Nesford
Chet Keller
John Pearson
Dan Hamsdell
Don Kings
Donald Schliesman
Robert Inc
General Education Program

The General Education Program is comprised of basic studies in combination with breadth studies in the traditional areas of humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. The program intends to complement specialized study leading to a bachelor’s degree and to provide an intellectual foundation for continued learning in later life. Basic studies focus on improvement of academic skills related to success in breadth studies, other college work and independent study. Breadth studies require students to sample in a comprehensive manner the ideas and theories in the basic academic disciplines and the modes of inquiry used in each. The general education program makes up approximately one-third of various programs leading to baccalaureate degrees.

Basic Studies include courses in writing, reasoning, physical activity, and non-written expression as follows:

- Written communication (Eng. 101, 301) 8 cr.
- Reasoning (math/logic)* 5 cr.
- Non-written expression (art, communication, drama, music, P.E., TIE, etc.)* 5 cr.
- Physical activity (P.E.)* 2 cr.
- Total 20 cr.

These requirements must be completed to the College’s standard by all candidates for bachelor's degrees unless they are exempted by means of examination or equivalent experience at another college or university.

Courses in the basic studies program must be lower division (except Eng. 301) and selected from those indicated. Such courses have no prerequisites, and are designed in content and method to meet general education objectives.

Breadth Studies include courses in basic academic disciplines in three broad areas. Each student must complete at least 15 credits from each broad area.

List of Breadth Courses *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses to be approved by General Studies Committee.
These traditional academic groupings focus on the study of the individual in three basic relationships: to self, to others and to the physical universe. These disciplines represent foundational areas of study. Applied areas of study, including vocational, are properly considered in other components of the degree program.

To ensure breadth of study, students may count no more than five credits in any one discipline. Credits must be earned by successfully completing courses included on the approved list.

To maintain balance in undergraduate study, courses required in the major or major discipline may not be allowed in breadth.

Since the laboratory method is an essential characteristic of study in the natural sciences, students are required to include at least one lab course in the physical or biological sciences.
Each discipline offers courses in the one breadth area which best characterizes the content and method of inquiry in its field.

Departments will be asked to submit at least one, but no more than ten courses for inclusion on the approved list for breadth.

Breadth instructors are encouraged to use teaching methods and materials which reinforce basic academic skills in addition to providing students with content and methods of inquiry in their fields.

The Committee generally subscribes to the view that courses in General Education (breadth) should emphasize subject matter, history, philosophy, method of inquiry, and theory of the discipline. The Committee has normally disapproved courses emphasizing other features of the discipline, such as skills, technique and method of application.

The Committee will approve courses in basic and breadth studies following consultation with involved departments.
FROM: The Department of Philosophy  
TO: The Faculty Senate, Dr. Helmi Habib, Chairman  
DATE: February 15, 1977  
RE: Undergraduate Program Review and Evaluation Committee Proposal

Dear Sirs:

The Department of Philosophy strongly recommends that the Faculty Senate vote against the proposal of McQuarrie and the UPREC. We would hope that the Committee be dissolved and that their pseudo-function be declared non-existent.

Our two basic reasons are:

1. Fully adequate means for evaluation of programs and departments already exist. Further duplication of these important functions would result in the proliferation of bureaucratic flim-flam, the waste of time and paper, the creation of fear and loathing within our already crumbling academic community, and a general lowering of our current low faculty morale.

2. The Committee, as described in the proposal, would have non-representative, arbitrary and undefined power over disciplines, programs and individual faculty members in the college.

We hope that the whole issue of curriculum evaluation be maintained under its present system, and that any drastic revisions of curricula be democratic, responsible to all concerned sectors, sensitive to the needs of both the present and the future. The legislature and some elements of the academic community itself would like to reduce the issues of education to entirely quantitative matters; in reality the issues are always substantive. They require the greatest care and deliberate consideration, with full recognition of the difficulty of the standards and the application of standards to ongoing communities and institutions.

"Wer mit dem Kommittee Fruehstuck will, muss einen langen Loeffel haben!"

Sincerely,

John G. Utzinger
Chester Z. Kelle
Robert Goedecke
Jay E. Bachrach

cc Dr. Harrington
Dr. Kramar
Dr. Schliesman
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: George Stillman
DATE: February 14, 1977
RE: FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATIVE

At our last meeting of the faculty of the Art Dept., we have unanimously agreed to switch the places of the alternate and the present senator now representing the Art Dept. That is, Margaret Sahlstrand will now be our Senator and Louis Kollmeyer will be the alternate. This has of course been done with the agreement of both those involved. Please make the appropriate change in your roles.

Also, the Art Dept. by unanimous vote wishes to join the English Dept. in its action disapproving the "proposed policy on Evaluation and Review" as it is presently written.

kjs
HOME ECONOMICS, FAMILY AND CONSUMER STUDIES

PROGRAM INITIATION

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE
FOOD SCIENCE AND NUTRITION MAJOR

The Bachelor of Science in Food Science and Nutrition major prepares students for employment in advanced study in one of several professions and occupations in the broad area of foods and nutrition. Among these are public health nutrition, foods research and technology, food service management, and consumer advocacy in foods and nutrition. Although this program does not lead to a degree in Dietetics, two years of pre-dietetic study may be transferred to a coordinated undergraduate dietetics program in another institution.

Students will complete a basic core of courses (listed below) and those in one of the two specialization options, for a minimum total of 75 credits. Students must register with the department and consult a major advisor for approval of the program option.

CORE REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOFN 140</td>
<td>Food Preparation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOFN 340</td>
<td>Food Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOFN 341</td>
<td>Nutrition I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISC 113</td>
<td>Cellular Structure and Function</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISC 370</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOL 270</td>
<td>Human Physiology (or)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOL 341, 342</td>
<td>Human Anatomy and Physiology (see advisor)</td>
<td>3 or 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 111, 111.1</td>
<td>Introduction to Chemistry and Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 112, 112.1</td>
<td>Introduction to Organic Chemistry and Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 113, 113.1</td>
<td>Introduction to Biochemistry and Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>CHEM 181, 181.1, 182, 182.1, 183, 185, General Chemistry and Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 350</td>
<td>Elementary Organic Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 365</td>
<td>Biological Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(see advisor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 311</td>
<td>Statistical Techniques or</td>
<td>15 or 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 316</td>
<td>Educational Statistics or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAD 221</td>
<td>Introduction to Decision Sciences</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HOME ECONOMICS, FAMILY AND CONSUMER STUDIES

PROGRAM INITIATION (CONTINUED)

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE
FOOD SCIENCE AND NUTRITION MAJOR

FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

I. PUBLIC HEALTH NUTRITION

For those interested in public health, nutrition advocacy, health agency counseling, or advanced study in foods and nutrition or public health.

COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOFN 342, Diet and Disease</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOFN 345, Developmental Nutrition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOFN 441, Nutrition II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOFN 442, Nutritional Assessment and Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOFN 445, Problems of Human Nutrition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOFN 447, Nutrition and Society</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOHE 421, Methods in Adult Education in Home Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOEC 490, Contracted Field Experience</td>
<td>2 or 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>0 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 or 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. FOOD SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For those interested in food research and processing, food service management, agri-business, quality control for other food-related occupations.

COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOFN 440, Experimental Foods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOEC 499, Contracted Field Experience</td>
<td>4 or 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S ED 280, Principles of Accident Prevention</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S ED 386, Occupational Safety and Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 201, Principles of Economics Micro</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAD 335, Principles of Production</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAD 360, Principles of Marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 or 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COURSE ADDITION

HOFN 442, Nutritional Assessment and Evaluation. 2 credits.
Prerequisite: permission of instructor. Clinical evaluation of nutritional status; principles of program planning and funding.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate and Faculty
FROM: Senate Academic Affairs Committee
DATE: January 27, 1977
FK: Proposed Policy on Program Evaluation and Review

The Undergraduate Program Review & Evaluation Committee was charged by Dean Schliesman in the Fall of 1974 to develop a policy statement on program evaluation and review. This charge was initiated as a response to the intentions of the Council on Postsecondary Education (then the Council on Higher Education) to begin undergraduate program reviews. This intention was expressed in their five year plan for 1976-1982. Dean Schliesman argued that it would be to the College's advantage to develop our own review and evaluation program and policy rather than to have such a system imposed upon us by an external agency.

The Undergraduate Program Review & Evaluation Committee developed a draft policy statement (4/15/75) and circulated it to the various Deans to be shared with Department Chairpersons. During the 1975-76 year the committee revised and rewrote the draft as a Proposed Policy and Procedure for Review of Undergraduate Degree Programs. This proposal was presented to the Undergraduate Council in March of 1976 and they made minor revisions at their March 8, 1976 meeting. The Undergraduate Program Review and Evaluation Committee approved the changes (4/6/76) and forwarded the proposal to the Faculty Senate through Dean Schliesman's office on April 15, 1976.

The proposed policy and procedure was placed on the Faculty Senate agenda for the April 21, 1976 meeting. Due to the press of other business it was not until the May 26, 1976 special meeting of the Faculty Senate that the policy was considered. Following a motion to approve the proposal a motion to refer it to the Academic Affairs Committee was approved.

The Academic Affairs Committee reviewed the proposal during Fall Quarter, held an open hearing on the proposal on January 18, 1977 and solicited written responses to it. At its January 25, 1977 meeting the Academic Affairs Committee voted to recommend to the Faculty Senate the attached Policy and Procedure for Review of Undergraduate Degree Programs.
CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE
Undergraduate Programs
A PROPOSED 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 to eight years, with approximately three 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 the college.

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 com-
posite 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 selec-
tions 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 tenta-
tive committee membership, and reported to the committee members, the department(s),
school deans(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.

-2-
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; (6) a description of research facilities, equipment, space, library holdings, and other data pertinent to the department; and (7) written comments from recent graduates.

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 departments(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 review 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.
To: Faculty Senate
From: Academic Affairs Committee
Date: February 2, 1977
Re: Modified Academic Standards

On January 14, 1977 Dean Schliesman forwarded a modified statement of academic standards that had been endorsed by the Undergraduate Council during its meeting of January 12, 1977.

The Academic Affairs Committee reviewed the proposal and recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt the following modified statement of academic standards:

Academic Standards

A. Good Standing. A student is in good standing when both the quarter grade point average and the accumulative grade point average are * or higher.

B. Academic Probation. Academic probation is a warning that unless the quality of academic work improves, students are in danger of losing the privilege of registering for classes offered by Central.

1. Students whose quarterly and/or accumulative grade point average falls below * are placed on academic probation for the subsequent quarter.

2. Probationary status is terminated and students are returned to "good standing" when both the quarterly and accumulative grade point average are at least *.

C. Academic Suspension. Academic suspension is the loss of the privilege to register for classes offered by Central.

1. Students, other than freshmen, will be suspended after two consecutive quarters of probationary status.

2. Freshmen students will be suspended after three consecutive quarters of probationary status.

3. Students who have been suspended from college for low scholarship may petition the Academic Standing Committee for review of their eligibility to register. Appointments for the review are made with the Office of the Dean of Student Development.

* The Undergraduate Council recommended a GPA of 2.0 (C). The Academic Affairs Committee believes that the Faculty Senate should carefully consider this level and others before approving the proposed standards.

The committee notes that a "C" grade (2.0) "indicates that the student has made substantial progress toward meeting the objectives of the course and has fulfilled the requirements of the course." It further notes that the Faculty
Senate has reaffirmed its commitment to the principle that "under normal circumstances, a 'C' will be the most frequently earned grade in a class at the undergraduate level."

The Committee believes that a question is raised by the idea that a student, whose average performance is very near that which is "normally expected" (say 1.90), should be considered to be not in good standing.