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MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 4 May 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 Pearl Douce', George Fadenrecht, John Gregor, Chris Graap, and Ken Winslow.

Visitors Present: James Brennan, Zoltan Kramar, Edward Harrington, Otto Jakubek, Kent Richards, Don Caughey, David Kaufman and Don Schlesman.

AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman suggested the following changes:
1. Under "Communications" add
   C. Letter from Kent Richards.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 20, 1977 were approved as distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

A. Letter from Bruce Teets, Acting Chairman of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, dated April 25, asking for clarification from the Faculty Senate of the exact meanings and implications of its ruling that variable credits are permissible. The Committee would like a detailed interpretation of the Senate's decision so they can act according to its ruling. This letter has been referred to the Senate Curriculum Committee for review and recommendation.

B. Letter from Galer Beed, chairman of the Technology and Industrial Ed Department, informing the Senate that Stan Dudley has been elected to represent their department, in place of Bob Envick.

C. Letter from Kent Richards, dated April 29, 1977, responding to Professor Teets' letter of April 25 to the Senate concerning the change of certain history courses to variable credit. He attended the meeting of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on February 25 and answered points raised in Professor Teets' letter. It was his understanding that a decision had been reached to allow variable credit courses. He does not understand why the UCC is again seeking the guidance of the Faculty Senate on this point and urges the matter not be re-submitted to the Senate and that the policy be followed. This letter was referred to the Senate Curriculum Committee.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

A. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals, page 466.

MOTION NO. 1603: Mr. Street moved, seconded by Mr. Danton, to approve the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals on page 466. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

REPORTS

A. Chairman's Report--Mr. Habib explained there is a Scholarship Fund Drive underway currently called the Central Investment Fund Drive. This is a joint project between businessmen in the surrounding area and college personnel to raise a stated goal of $30,000 for scholarships and advertising for the college. The first joint meetings were on Monday and Tuesday evenings to assign businessman-faculty partners to go out
and ask people to make investments in Central. There were approximately 60 or 70 people at the meeting Monday. There was another meeting Tuesday night and approximately 30 people were there. The campaign will be strictly in the Ellensburg area at this time. However, there will be similar campaigns each year and hopefully it will expand through the years. This fund drive will also be held on campus. Hopefully, most of the drive downtown will be finished by May 16. The Executive Committee will present a motion later in the meeting on the fund drive. If someone is already donating substantially to a scholarship on campus, they will not be expected to donate twice. The general coordinator for the College is Jimmie Applegate.

Chairman Habib announced there will be a general faculty meeting on May 5 at 4:00 p.m. in Hertz. President Brooks will talk about what is going on in the legislature, and will also talk about the Central Investment Fund. Joe Kelleher will be there.

Mr. Habib reminded Senators that some departments need to hold a departmental election for new senators if the term of their senate representative expires. The Senate Office must be informed by May 10 of the results of these elections.

Results of the general faculty referendum on the Program Review & Evaluation proposal were: Total of 246 valid ballots returned; 137 yes and 109 no.

Several reports were distributed to Senators for action at the next Senate meeting. One is Recommendations for Code Changes submitted by the Senate Code Committee in conjunction with the Executive Committee; another is a proposal for a new Campus Committee structure, submitted by the Senate Executive Committee and Dean Schlesman. On that proposal, they consulted extensively with the appropriate Deans, the Council Chairmen and others before preparing the proposal. The campus committees are within the purview of the Vice President of Academic Affairs so changes made will be a recommendation to him.

Some new proposed Faculty Code Revisions, dated April 14, from President Brooks, were also distributed to the Senators. These particular Code changes deal with the RH Policy. If the changes are minor and not substantive, the Senate Code Committee will be asked to look at them and perhaps get those changes to the Senate this year. If the changes are substantive, they will require a great deal of study and thus cannot be under time pressure. The Code Committee will look at them and if they are substantive they will make a recommendation that further study be made by the new Code Committee.

The report relative to Recommendations on the General Studies Proposal, submitted jointly by the Senate Academic Affairs and Senate Curriculum Committee was also distributed to the Senators at this meeting.

Mr. Habib announced there will be another Senate meeting next Wednesday, May 11.

B. Executive Committee report--Art Keith presented the report. He said the Senate Executive Committee has been meeting jointly with the Senate Code Committee the last three weeks and also with President Brooks and the Assistant Attorney General, Owen Clarke, Jr., to go over Code amendments.

The Senate Executive Committee met with Mr. Dumas to discuss the Central Investment Fund Program and met with Dean Schlesman regarding the Campus Committee structure. These will be covered at a later date.

Mr. Keith presented a motion from the Senate Executive Committee.

MOTION NO. 1604: Mr. Keith moved, seconded by Mr. Rinehart, that the Faculty Senate approve and endorse Faculty participation in the Central Investment Fund drive, and encourage participation by every faculty member. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and 1 abstention.

Mr. Keith passed out forms to be filled out by Senators regarding being a solicitor for their department, or identifying a CIF Solicitor, or for those who do not want to be involved, to mark that choice. The forms are to be returned to the Senate office by May 6. Payroll deduction forms will be given to each solicitor to be filled out by faculty who are willing to contribute. They are also to be returned to the Senate office, as soon as they are filled out.

At the last Senate meeting some changes to the Rules Governing the Board of Academic Appeals were passed. In Section III.d. there is a sentence that says "the terms of office for students will be one year with options of renewal for two more terms."
question was raised, at whose option? The Executive Committee proposed the following motion:

MOTION NO. 1605: Mr. Keith moved, seconded by Mr. McClure, that Section III d. in the Rules Governing the Board of Academic Appeals be amended to add the following clause to the last sentence in the section: "the options being at the discretion of the Joint Committee on Committees (III c.)." Passed by a unanimous voice vote and 3 abstentions.

C. Standing Committees

1. Academic Affairs Committee—Mr. McQuarrie reported that the committee had two items to present. The Committee met Tuesday, May 3, and further discussed the proposal from the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences for an Honors College. In looking over the proposal, the Committee generally approved of its form, and found a couple of areas they would suggest modifying. One in terms of the restatement of the purpose and rationale. It will be presented next week, as amended, for deliberation and action before the end of the year.

The second item is regarding all college grade distribution for Spring and Fall, 1976, and Winter of 1977. He distributed copies of the grade distribution by course to the Senators. Mr. McQuarrie met with the Registrar and representatives of Computer Services and they discussed alternative ways to summarize the data in the printout form to make it more amenable for analysis. This quarter it will be put out that way.

2. Budget Committee—no report
3. Code Committee—no report
4. Curriculum Committee—no report
5. Personnel Committee—no report
6. Student Affairs Committee—no report

Mr. Habib announced that on May 13 and 14 there will be a public Board meeting at which the Code revisions and the new revisions to the Rules Governing the Board of Academic Appeals will be presented. He asked for someone from the Senate Code Committee and the Senate Student Affairs Committee to be present at that meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Action on Proposed Code Changes.

Mr. Jensen, chairman of the Code Committee, announced there were a few corrections to be made on the recommendations presented—Sections II and III. On page 2, paragraph 3, insert (14) after the word fourteen in the places it appears. On page 3, paragraph 6, second line, strike the word "in." On page 4, paragraph A (1), after the word ten, insert (1) in two places; under recommendation, 2nd line, change Section 3.84 to Section 3.92. On page 5, paragraph (4), third line, strike the word "for"; paragraph (5) sixth line, a line should be through the word "interest"; under recommendation for paragraph (6), the word hearing should not be capitalized. On page 6, under recommendation, 4th paragraph, after the words "including the" insert the word "parties"; paragraphs (9) and (10), after the word five, insert (5). On page 7, paragraph (11), delete the entire paragraph.

MOTION NO. 1606: Ms. Lester moved, seconded by Mr. McClure, to approve the Code Committee recommendations, Parts II and III. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and 5 abstentions.

Mr. Habib announced that Part IV will be considered next week at the May 11 Senate meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Presentation of New Campus Committee Structure.

Mr. Habib yielded the chair to Art Keith. Mr. Keith stated he would like to recognize Chairman Habib for his presentation of the Committee structure. Mr. Keith explained
that while this action has been reviewed by the Executive Committee, it has been the prime sponsorship of the chairman of the Faculty Senate.

Mr. Keith turned the chair back over to Mr. Habib.

Mr. Habib explained that this new campus committee structure came about after attempting to fill slots for these committees. This is a process that continued all year, because of resignations nearly every day. Mr. Habib and Mr. Schlesman decided, therefore, to weed out the committees that are not essential, combine some, and try to streamline the whole process, thereby eliminating many committees. Virtually all of these committees report directly or indirectly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and he is in charge of committee structure. When these have been considered and approved by the Senate, they will be a recommendation to the Vice President, who will then consider it together, hopefully, with the Senate chairman and come up with a new committee structure to implement.

B. Presentation of revised General Ed Program.

On behalf of the joint committees, Academic Affairs and Senate Curriculum, Mr. McQuarrie presented the written report, as distributed at this meeting, on the General Studies Proposal. He explained this proposal came from the General Studies Committee, to the Undergraduate Council, from there to the Senate Curriculum Committee and to the Senate Academic Affairs Committee, and now to the Senate.

MOTION NO. 1607: Mr. McQuarrie, on behalf of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee and the Senate Curriculum Committee, moved for the adoption of the recommendations of the two Committees' report, relative to the General Ed Proposal. Seconded by Mr. Street.

Discussion began on the motion. Mr. McQuarrie mentioned that one of the major criticisms of the proposal as they received it was that the proposal lacked a well-developed rationale. He said he will contact the general studies committee to have them provide some sort of written rationale for the Senate's consideration. Mr. Habib suggested that a copy of the rationale for the present General Ed. program should also be provided for comparison purposes.

MOTION NO. 1608: Mr. Hawkins moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, to defer voting on the program and in the meantime a revised proposal be distributed to the entire faculty.

MOTION NO. 1609: Mr. Keith moved to amend the motion to postpone by inserting the words "to be voted on at the next Faculty Senate meeting" and delete reference to distribution to the entire faculty. Seconded by Mr. Carlson. Passed by a majority voice vote.

Discussion resumed on the main motion to postpone.

Motion No. 1608, as amended, passed by a majority voice vote.

C. Presentation of further Code Revisions.

Chairman Habib said Part IV of Code Revisions were distributed to the Senators at this meeting. They will be an action item for the next Senate meeting on May 11.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
AGENDA

REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, May 4, 1977
Faculty Development Center
Bouillon Building

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of April 20, 1977

IV. COMMUNICATIONS
   A. Letter from Bruce Teets
   B. Memo from G. W. Bead

V. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
   A. Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals, page 466

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 Committee

VII. OLD BUSINESS
   A. Action on Proposed Code Changes

VIII. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Presentation of New Campus Committee Structure
   B. Presentation of revised General Ed Program
   C. Presentation of further Code Revisions

IX. ADJOURNMENT
**FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF**  
**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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Frank</td>
<td>Ed Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson, Rosella</td>
<td>Glenn Madsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietz, Richard</td>
<td>Imani Mwandishiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doucet, Pearl</td>
<td>Woodrow Monte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugmore, Owen</td>
<td>Robert Nuzum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envik, Robert</td>
<td>Ron Hales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadenrecht, George</td>
<td>William Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz, Wolfgang</td>
<td>Jay Forsyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulezian, Allen</td>
<td>Larry Danton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregor, John</td>
<td>Bill Hillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habib, Helmi</td>
<td>Dietz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, Charles</td>
<td>Don Dietrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hileman, Betty</td>
<td>David Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, Richard</td>
<td>Deloris Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Corwin</td>
<td>Bonalyn Bricker Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Art</td>
<td>Roger Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Corwin</td>
<td>George Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester, Nancy</td>
<td>Dieter Romboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahajani, Usha</td>
<td>Robert Yee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClure, Chuck</td>
<td>Max Zwanziger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuarrie, Duncan</td>
<td>(No alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Robert</td>
<td>Blaine Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborn, Dolores</td>
<td>Richard Doi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter, Larry</td>
<td>Karl Zink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Russell</td>
<td>Louis Kollmeyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahlstrand, Margaret</td>
<td>Richard Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuelson, Dale</td>
<td>E. Dee Torrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Milo</td>
<td>Phil Tolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street, Warren</td>
<td>Chester Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utzinger, John</td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vifian, John</td>
<td>James Brennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, Gordon</td>
<td>Thomas Thelen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiberg, Curt</td>
<td>Dietz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winslow, Ken</td>
<td>Neil Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Madge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

Last person signing please return to the Recording Secretary.
April 29, 1977

Professor Helmi Habib, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Helmi:

I would like to respond to Professor Teets' letter of April 25 to you concerning the change of certain history courses to variable credit. It is not my intention here to argue the merits of variable credit, but to point out that there has been a long debate on this topic. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Senate Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Senate have all been involved. It was my understanding that a decision had been reached to allow variable credit courses. Indeed at the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting of February 25, 1977 four history courses were changed from five credits to 3-5 credits. I was present at that meeting and answered the points raised in Professor Teets' letter in great detail. Since that time I have discussed variable credits with Mr. Bovos and he assures me it will create no problem for the Registrar's Office. At the UCC meeting of April 21 at which the Committee directed Professor Teets to write his letter to you, they also approved a new history course as 3-5 credits (History of Social Welfare in the United States). The objection of the Committee does not appear then to be to variable credit but simply to the fact that twenty-one courses were submitted at one time.

I must confess that I do not understand why the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is again seeking the guidance of the Faculty Senate on this point. I strongly urge that this matter not be resubmitted to the Senate. We have a policy; let us follow it.

Sincerely,

Kent D. Richards
Chairman

cc: Dean Schliesman
    Professor Teets

DL

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
Dr. Helmi Habib  
Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
C.W.S.C.  
Campus  

Dear Helmi:

The History Department has recently requested the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to approve variable credits of 3-5 credits for twenty-one (21) history courses. The committee is hesitant to approve this kind of request without clarification from the faculty Senate of the exact meanings and implications of its ruling that variable credits are permissible. Several questions arose in the committee about this matter, some of which follow.

Does the Senate's ruling mean that a history course, if this application is approved, may be given each quarter for three credits only? Or for four credits only? Or for five credits only? Or does it mean that in one quarter a course may be given by one instructor in one class period in which some students receive three credits, some four credits, and some five credits? Does it mean that courses given on campus will be for five credits whereas the same courses given off campus will have three credits? Are off campus courses not equal to those given on campus, or is it a matter of convenience to give three-credit courses off campus instead of four- or five-credit courses? What rationale does the History Department offer for its proposal?

Also, what effects are foreseeable for the future if all departments and programs should adopt the variable credit plan for most or all of their courses? And will the registrar be able to process such a variety of courses and credits?

You no doubt realize the concern of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee about this unusual request. Will you please, therefore, let the committee have a detailed interpretation of the Senate's decision so we can act according to its ruling.

Thank you very kindly for as full and prompt a response as you may be able to supply.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce E. Teets, Acting Chairman  
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

cc: Dean Schliesman  
U.C.C. Members
Proposed Changes in Campus Committees

Submitted by the Senate Executive Committee and
Dean Donald Schliesman

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate current committee membership.

A. Eliminate:

1. Computer Services Committee (6)
2. Athletics Committee (5)
3. ASC Board of Control Advisory Committee (2)
4. Social Science Committee (9)

B. Reduce Membership:

1. Long Range Planning Committee (6)
   Faculty - 3
   Assoc. of Administrators - 1
   Employee Council - 1
   Students - 1
   Senate Chairman - ex officio
   Director of Institutional Research - ex officio

2. Faculty Research Committee (7)
   Faculty - 5 (one from each school)
   Coordinator of Academic Grants & Contracts - ex officio

3. Professional Leave Committee (6)
   Faculty - 6 (one from each school and the library)

4. Retirement and Insurance Committee (7)
   Faculty - 3
   Association of Adm. - 1
   Employee Council - 2
   Business Manager - ex officio

5. Library Advisory Council (9)
   Faculty - 5 (one from each school)
   Dean of Library Services - ex officio

C. Combine:

1. Campus Space Committee and Campus Site and Development Committee (13)
   Faculty - 4
   Employee Council - 1
   Space Analyst - ex officio
   Director Fac. Planning & Constr. - ex officio
   Association of Administrators - 1
D. Change Bureaucracy:
1. Professional Leave Committee to Professional and Scholarship Leave Committee.

E. Re-Organize All Councils (36):
1. Graduate Council with 10 members chosen from departments or areas that have graduate programs.
2. Undergraduate Council with 15 members, 3 from each School.
3. Teacher Education Council with 10 members chosen such that a majority of the members are directly involved in teacher education.

F. From the membership of the three Councils, establish:
1. College Curriculum Committee consisting of 12 faculty, four from each Council.
2. College Admissions, Matriculation, and Graduation Committee consisting of 6 faculty, two from each Council.
3. College Program Review and Evaluation Committee consisting of 9 faculty, three from each Council.
4. General Education Committee consisting of 5 faculty all from the Undergraduate Council and selected so that it would consist of one member from each School.

Protocols relating to E and F:
1. The Dean of Graduate School and Research, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and Director of Teacher Education would be ex officio members of their respective Councils.
2. All members of the Councils are not to be assigned any other committee duties, whether standing or ad hoc.
3. Each Council will have a Chairman who will not be a member of any of the sub-committees of the Council and who will coordinate all activities relating to the affairs of his or her Council.

Committees that Remain Unchanged:
- Star Steering Committee
- Joint Student Fees
- Student Publications
- Campus Safety
- Bookstore
- Interdepartmental Major
- Academic Standing
- College Union Board
- Campus Judicial
- Traffic
- Student Financial Assistance
- Board of Academic Appeals
- Faculty Grievance
FACULTY MEMORANDUM

TO: FACULTY MEMBERS

SUBJ: Senate Academic Affairs and Senate Curriculum Committees

DATE: May 3, 1977

SUBJ: General Studies Proposal

The General Studies Committee, through the Undergraduate Council, has forwarded a proposed revision in the general studies (basic and breadth) requirements.

This proposed revision is the result of several years work and follows the revision made three years ago when the total number of courses meeting breadth requirements was reduced from over 1,000 to the present list of 403 courses. The present proposal would again reduce the number of courses that could be used to meet breadth requirements. The reduction would be accomplished by reducing the number of departments that would be allowed to offer breadth courses and by restricting the maximum number of courses any department could offer for breadth to 10.

The Academic Affairs and Curriculum Committees, meeting in three joint meetings heard testimony from many faculty members as well as from members of the General Studies Committee. On April 27 the joint committee voted (6 to 2) to recommend that the Faculty Senate approve an amended version of the general studies proposal. The amended form has Religious Studies deleted from the list of departments offering breadth courses in the Humanities area. Under basic requirements the amended form has Non-written expression deleted and those 3 credits returned to general elections.

During the three joint committee meetings, the committee heard a wide variety of views relative to the proposal. The first meeting took testimony from any member of the College who wished to speak, the second allowed the General Studies Committee to comment on those arguments, explain its goals, and answer questions, and the third meeting resulted in the above recommendation to the Senate. Throughout the entire process, it appeared that all of the arguments duplicated the answers of the General Studies Committee in its process of hammering out the proposal.

The proposed program is intended to be a significant improvement over the existing general studies program. It sharpens the focus of the General Studies requirements to fewer courses that form the foundations for later, more complex work. It reduces the likelihood of the exploitation of the General Studies program for non-academic purposes. It acts as a better form of advertisement for students.

During our joint committee meetings, few speakers disagreed with these goals of the proposal. Many speakers approved of both the goals and the methods of pursuing them found in the proposal. Many other speakers approved of the goals but opposed one or another method of pursuing them.
3. The proposal restricts the number of departments offering breadth courses to 11, representing the basic academic disciplines. Courses in applied disciplines count toward a student's elective credits. This restriction was opposed by some speakers.

2. The proposal restricts basic disciplines to one broad area only—humanities, social science, or natural science—as a means of directing the student to the basic representation of an area. Some felt that some disciplines were equally representative of two areas.

3. Some felt that there was no adequate reason for making any changes in the existing program. Others felt that it was wise to make changes in the present unsettled atmosphere.

Our Senate committee examined the General Studies Committee for its proposal, the product of much discussion and consideration of alternatives. Our recommended changes in the proposal reflect two perceived inconsistencies in the proposal. The Religious Studies program is interdisciplinary, not a basic academic discipline, and should be dropped from the breadth list. The non-written expression requirement does not provide "improvement of academic skills related to success in breadth studies, other college work, and independent study" and should be dropped.