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MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 1 February 1978
Presiding Officer: J. Arthur Keith
Recording Secretary: Esther Peterson

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except James Brooks, Rosella Dickson, Wolfgang Franz, Mary Mahan, Willa Dene Powell, Russell Ross, and E. Dee Torrey.

Visitors Present: Lou Bovos, Pearl Douce, and Clarence Beecher.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

Mr. Keith announced the following changes:

1. Under "Communications" add
   B. Letter from Linda Clifton
   C. Letter from Fern O’Neil
   D. Letter from Richard Doi
   E. Letter from Ken Winslow
   F. Letter from Greg Trujillo
   G. Letter from Burton Williams
   H. Letter from Don Cummings

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Keith announced the following correction: on page 3, paragraph 1, the last word in line 6 should be credit.

Without objection, Mr. Keith ruled the minutes of January 18, 1978 approved as corrected.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

A. Letter from Greg Trujillo, dated January 18, in reply to a letter from Mr. Keith, saying he will send him whatever information he can generate on retention statistics as soon as possible.

B. Letter from Linda Clifton, dated January 24, replying to Mr. Keith's letter, saying the Board of Trustees appreciates the Senate's concern on the question of tenure. She assured him that his letter was carefully read and seriously considered by each of them as they made their individual deliberations on the issue.

C. Letter from Fern O’Neil, dated January 25, informing the Senate that Woodrow Monte and Carolyn Schactler have resigned as the Senate representatives for the Department of Home Economics - Family & Consumer Studies and Willa Dene Powell will replace the senator and Fern O’Neil will replace the alternate.

D. Letter from Richard Doi, dated January 20, informing the Senate that Larry Porter has resigned as Senator for Ethnic Studies and Richard Doi will replace him.

E. Letter from Ken Winslow, dated January 23, saying his replacement as student representative of the Board of Control will be Michael Golden.

F. Letter from Greg Trujillo, dated January 24, saying he has shared Mr. Keith’s letter of January 18 with Jack Purcell, director of Institutional Studies. Mr. Purcell has a study underway in which he intends to isolate the effect of the on-campus student on Central’s attrition and retention rates, and will share the results of the study with the Senate when it is completed.
G. Letter from Burton Williams, dated January 23, responding to a request from Mr. Keith for information on the progress of Douglas Honors College. This fall 13 students applied for admission to Douglas College and several more applied this winter. Professor Street can supply information on the number that has been admitted. Mr. Williams has also written some 60 letters to outstanding freshmen and sophomores, as well as the National Merit finalists encouraging them to apply for admission to Douglas College. In addition, during registration both fall and winter quarters, they have manned a table at registration. This winter they began their Honors College Colloquia with some six students enrolled and several more prepared to begin the Colloquia spring quarter.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

A. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals, page 484.

MOTION NO. 1687: Mr. Benson moved, seconded by Mr. Habib, to approve the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals, page 484.

Mr. Warren raised a question regarding the number of the course addition, Psy. 374.

MOTION NO. 1688: Mr. Warren moved to amend, seconded by Mr. Mitchell, that Psy. 374 be deleted from consideration of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals on page 484. Passed by a hand vote of 11 yes, 10 no.

Motion No. 1687, as amended, voted on and passed by a unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1689: Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Mr. King, that the course addition Psy. 374 be returned to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for either renumbering on the 200 level or to give an explanation for the level designation as well as the pre-requisite.

Mr. Keith remarked that, as an item of clarification, the practice of the university in the Curriculum Guide specifies that 100 level courses can be taken by anyone; that 300 level courses can be taken by students in their sophomore year, so that numbering of a course 300 does not imply that it has to be taken during the third year of college.

Motion No. 1689 defeated by a majority hand vote.

MOTION NO. 1690: Mr. Tolin moved, seconded by Mr. Benson, to approve the course addition Psy. 374 on page 484 of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1691: Mr. Habib moved, seconded by Mr. Tolin, to waive the rule requiring proposals not be considered for approval until the first regular Senate meeting which occurs three weeks or more after distribution of the proposals for one course addition, Chem. 184, on page 485.

Mr. Habib explained his reason for this was Chem. 184 replaces Chem. 185, which was being taught by him and is obsolete. He was concerned that it be approved at the February 1 Senate meeting in order to be in the schedule which had a deadline of February 2, or he would not be able to teach the class Spring quarter. The obsolete course has now been deleted.

Motion No. 1691 passed by a two-third majority vote.

MOTION NO. 1692: Mr. Habib moved, seconded by Mr. Mitchell, to approve the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposal, Chem. 184, on page 485. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

REPORTS

A. Chairman--Mr. Keith has addressed a request to Mr. Trujillo to provide the Senate with information regarding the retention statistics. The Council on Postsecondary Education has provided some statistics that show that CWU has the highest percentage of students taking 10 or fewer credit hours each quarter, and also the highest percentage taking 5 or fewer. His question was, in what way is that set of information skewing the retention statistics. Obviously, the student who enrolls in an off-campus course that he taught fall quarter in Omak is going to show up in the retention statistics as not being enrolled this quarter. Mr. Trujillo's letters are relative to that.
Three persons have now requested leaves of absence spring quarter for the purpose of freeing up a little bit of money for travel for the off-campus programs. One of those requests is for only a half-time leave of absence. Mr. Keith urged that if any Senators or faculty are thinking about it and can arrange it, he was sure the Vice President would be very happy to receive those requests for leaves of absence for spring quarter with the intention of working this summer. The university is approximately $20,000 short of money to fund the off-campus program for spring.

Mr. Keith remarked that the latest information he has is that the university is now at approximately 85,000 student credit hours for winter quarter. The university is just barely making it from quarter to quarter.

The Executive Committee has identified some persons who they have requested to serve on the Distinguished Professor of the University Selection Committee. Those people have been contacted and the faculty should be getting from the Vice President an announcement soliciting recommendations. Mr. Keith pointed out that this is different from the Distinguished Professor and Distinguished Alumni Award that the Alumni Association has. In the Faculty Code there is provision for a Distinguished Professor of the University and this is the one he was talking about at this time.

B. Executive Committee--Committee Structure. Mr. Vifian presented a brief report concerning campus committee structure. A new proposed description of committees reporting to the Dean of Students was distributed at this meeting. New proposed descriptions will be distributed piece-meal by administrative reporting authority. The proposal was handed out for information and will be discussed at the next Senate meeting.

The Executive Committee are also trying to get the policies and procedures manual up to date.

Mr. Keith remarked that this proposal will appear under Old Business at the next meeting for a vote.

C. Standing Committees--

1. Academic Affairs--Mr. Andrews, Chairman, presented a report on the material distributed to Senators at this meeting regarding off-campus grades, fall quarter, 1977. The material was presented for informational purposes only and was compiled by Larry Lawrence for the Academic Affairs Committee from data supplied by the university.

2. Budget Committee--no report.

Mr. Keith mentioned a charge which has been given to the Budget Committee. Apparently, the institution has been in violation of the state's constitution for some time in regard to payment in advance of service. Questions have been raised about the practice, which has also been happening in other institutions; CWU is in violation of the state constitution by the fact that faculty members receive 40 percent of an academic year salary at the end of December, having worked 33 percent of the academic year. The Budget Committee has been charged with reviewing the matter and making a recommendation.

3. Curriculum Committee--no report.

4. Code Committee--no report

5. Student Affairs--no report.


OLD BUSINESS

A. Motion concerning linguistic sexism--Motion No. 1682 was presented by Mr. Yee at the January 4 meeting, and presented at this time for discussion and a vote.

Mr. Vifian suggested a substitute motion, rationalizing that the problem is a real one; however, perhaps any changes to be made should go through appropriate committees, such as the Curriculum Committee, which determines policy for the university. The catalog, at every re-writing, should be scrutinized for needless or inappropriate sexual distinctions that should be removed.
MOTION NO. 1693: Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Mr. Tolin, the Senate recommends that, in preparing catalog copy and all other university documents, careful attention should be paid to the language to avoid using any needless or inappropriate sexual distinctions, and advises the Curriculum Committee to study the problem of sexist language, if such language exists, in course titles and descriptions and make a suitable recommendation to the Senate.

Chairman Keith ruled the substitute motion was in order and that it would be the motion on the floor to debate. Discussion followed.

Motion No. 1693 passed by a show of hands of 22 yes, 1 no, 5 abstentions.

B. Speakers Bureau--Mr. King explained the proposal on the University Speaker's Bureau which was distributed to the Senate at a prior meeting with the following motion:

MOTION NO. 1694: The Executive Committee moves that the Faculty Senate endorse a University Speaker's Bureau, and that it urge the faculty to participate in it.

Mr. King commented a few people have suggested to him it might not be appropriate for the Faculty Senate to ask the faculty to participate in anything and that it might be more appropriate to vote to endorse a Speaker's Bureau, leaving the urge to faculty to participate in this part of the motion up to individual faculty members. He therefore would accept an amendment to eliminate the last part of the motion "and that it urge the faculty to participate in it." No amendment was received.

Motion No. 1694 passed by a unanimous voice vote and one abstention.

C. Motion concerning inter-class time period--Academic Affairs Committee.

Mr. Andress distributed at the January 18 meeting the Committee's report on a proposal to lengthen the inter-class break to 15-minutes to accommodate handicapped students (Catherine Sands, Assistant Dean of Student Development), with the following motion:

MOTION NO. 1695: The Academic Affairs Committee moves:

1) That the Senate Chairman send a memorandum to the faculty calling attention to the difficulties handicapped students have in getting to class on time, and urging that instructors give such students the choice of leaving class 5 minutes early.

2) That the Senate Chairman send a memorandum to the Physical Plant calling attention to the necessity of maintaining campus clocks in better synchronization at the correct time.

A lengthy discussion of the motion followed.

MOTION NO. 1696: Mr. King moved, seconded by Mr. Yee, to table the motion until the next regular Senate meeting pending further information from the Academic Affairs Committee on legal guidelines, if any, that might need to be observed and perhaps additional information from Catherine Sands, or others, as to the actual seriousness of the problem. Passed by a two-third majority voice vote.

Mr. Keith commented he would feel uncomfortable in sending out a memorandum singling out the handicapped in some kind of special way and suggest that they leave early; however, if directed by the Senate to do so, he would. If the committee has the information by the next meeting, it will appear under Old Business. If a delay is asked for at that time, another time period will be scheduled for it.

D. Motion concerning distribution of 4% salary monies--Budget Committee.

Mr. Tolin presented the motion distributed at the January 18 meeting as follows:

MOTION NO. 1697: The Senate Budget Committee makes the following motion:

That the monies available for next year's salary increase be distributed as follows, assuming adequate funding:

1. A general one-step increment.

2. Up to $25,000 to be used for promotions, merit increases and/or scale adjustments.
3. Balance of funds, if any, to be used for a fixed Dollar adjustment to the scale.

As an item of explanation, Mr. Keith said the procedure would be, if this recommendation is accepted by the Senate, he would take that recommendation to the President's Budget Advisory Committee and that group then would make a recommendation to the President, who would submit his recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

In response to a question as to whether there was another part to the motion, Mr. Tolman said they would add an Item 4 to make it clear that this is intended to be available to everyone and it not discriminate against those who have reached the lowest level of the next higher rank.

Chairman Keith suggested this should be in the form of an amendment, either as an Item 4 or an addition to Item 1 that would say something like a general one-step increment for all faculty except those at step 23.5 who would receive half a step and those at step 24 who would receive no increment.

In response to another question as to the effect on retirement, which is based in the last year upon the average, Mr. Keith replied that it would not affect anyone who retires this year since it would not be implemented until July 1, 1978.

As another item of clarification, Mr. Keith said at the last meeting a point was raised regarding the Faculty Code saying something about overlap. Mr. Keith said it would be his position with the administration in the budget discussions that there is no published overlap information. There is reference in the Code to overlap, but no printed information which has been generally available to the faculty specifying how big the overlap should be. The 1976-77 and 1977-78 salary schedules do not show any overlap.

MOTION NO. 1698: Mr. Yee moved to amend, seconded by Mr. Carlson, to add to Item 1: All faculty are to receive a general one-step increment, except those at step 23.5 shall be moved to step 24, and those at step 24 will not be changed in step. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Discussion resumed on the main motion, as amended.

Motion No. 1697 voted on and passed by a unanimous voice vote.

E. Curriculum Committee recommendations concerning workshop hours.

At the last Senate meeting a recommendation was distributed by the Curriculum Committee. A motion regarding these recommendations was distributed at this meeting as follows:

MOTION NO. 1699: The Curriculum Committee moves that the Curriculum Guide (May 18, 1977) be amended where it reads:

p. 10, Credit Allocation to Courses, 3. Workshops, Practicum, Field Experience, Consultation: A minimum of 20 hours per credit.

p. 13, Workshops, 1. A minimum of 20 hours must be spent in class for each credit assigned to the workshop.

To read:

p. 10, Credit Allocation to Courses, 3. Workshops, Practicum, Field Experience, Consultation: A minimum of 20 hours (16-17 clock hours) per credit.

p. 13, Workshops, 1. A minimum of 20 hours (16-17 clock hours) must be spent in class for each credit assigned to the workshop.

There was considerable discussion on the motion. Chairman Keith commented that if the Senate adopts this motion, then the Curriculum Guide will be amended, and that then provides guidance to departments, chairmen, committees, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and to the Faculty Senate in terms of approving course descriptions for workshops.

Motion No. 1699 passed by a majority voice vote and two abstentions.
F. Personnel Committee recommendation concerning faculty rank.

Mr. Klemin requested the report on this be delayed until the next Senate meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Benson commented that one of the most important things facing the faculty is the presidency. He questioned what role, if any, the Senate is going to play in the selection process. The Board of Trustees has promised a role to the Senate if they wish to assert it. He asked if it was planned to have the candidates come before the Senate, or what.

Mr. Keith responded that the Selection Committee has disbanded and have submitted, in response to their charge, eight candidates to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees will decide which of the eight candidates will be visited and/or will be asked to visit the university. He would welcome comments on the role the Senate should play in these visitations of candidates.

MOTION NO. 1700: Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Mr. Carlson, that the Faculty Senate, at the earliest possible moment, be involved in the Presidential candidate review process, that the candidates meet with the Senate and the Senate be informed at regular intervals of the progress of deliberation. Passed by a unanimous voice vote, and one abstention.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
### FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF February 1977-78

#### ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATOR</th>
<th></th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Kathleen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayton Denman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andress, Joel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cal Willberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>David Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, James</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkholder, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chester Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Madsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson, Rosella</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucretia Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doi, Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarence Beecher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugmore, Owen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Nuzum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadenrecht, George</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairchild, Sandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jay Forsyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz, Wolfgang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Brummett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden, Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Dietrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gries, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Galer Beed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habib, Helmi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deloris Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hales, Ron</td>
<td></td>
<td>George Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hileman, Betty</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Gregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killorn, Erlice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dolores Osborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klemin, V. Wayne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahan, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fern O'Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Karl Zink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Willa Dene</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Cory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahlstrand, Margaret</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuelson, Dale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max Zwanziger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street, Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolin, Phil</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milo Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolman, Rosco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrey, E. Dee</td>
<td></td>
<td>James Brennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vifian, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Thelen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Kerr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiberg, Curt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neil Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yee, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Madge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISITORS
PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting
Louis H. Bovor
Pearl Vance
Clarence Breake

Last person signing please return to the Recording Secretary.
AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., February 1, 1978
Psychology Building, Room 471

I. ROLL CALL
II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF January 18, 1978
IV. COMMUNICATIONS
   A. Letter from Greg Trujillo
V. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
   A. Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals, page 484
VI. REPORTS
   A. Chairman
   B. Executive Committee -- Committee Structure
   C. Standing Committees
      1. Academic Affairs
      2. Budget
      3. Curriculum
      4. Code
      5. Student Affairs
      6. Personnel
VII. OLD BUSINESS
   A. Motion concerning linguistic sexism
   B. Speakers Bureau
   C. Motion concerning inter-class time period -- Academic Affairs Committee
   D. Motion concerning distribution of 4% salary monies -- Budget Committee
   E. Curriculum Committee recommendations concerning workshop hours
   F. Personnel Committee recommendation concerning faculty rank
VIII. NEW BUSINESS
IX. ADJOURNMENT
January 18, 1978

J. Arthur Keith
Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Re: Retention Statistics

Dear Dr. Keith:

I have taken note of the information that you requested in your memorandum of January 12, 1978. The information that I have regarding any of the questions that you raised is extremely limited. However, I might be able to generate some information from our data files which may provide indirect answers. I have used the word "indirect," because we have a great deal of trouble reaching off campus students with our questionnaires. Do not interpret this as meaning that we do not hear from them at all. Complete data return from all of them is very difficult. As a matter of fact, from the records that I have available to me, it is very difficult to tell who is an on or off campus student. It is a problem with which I must deal very soon if we are to improve the quality of our information.

I will send whatever information I can generate to you as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

Greg Trujillo
Special Assistant to the President

cc: R & R Committee
Dear Dr. Keith:

We appreciate your concern in writing us as we consider this important question of tenure. Please be assured that your letter was carefully read and seriously considered by each of us as we made our individual deliberations on this issue.

We hope you will continue to feel free to express your ideas and feelings to the board at any time.

Sincerely,

Linda J. Clifton
Chairman
Board of Trustees
MEMORANDUM

TO: Art Keith, Chairman
    Faculty Senate
FROM: Fern O'Neil, Chairperson
    Home Economics--Family & Consumer Studies
DATE: January 25, 1978
RE: Senators from Home Economics

Woodrow Monte and Carolyn Schactler have resigned as our Faculty Senator and alternate. The Home Economics faculty have elected Willa Dene Powell as the new senator and Fern O'Neil as the alternate.

Thank you.
TO: Art Keith, Faculty Senate Chairperson

FROM: Richard Doi, Acting Director

RE: Senate Representation

Larry Porter has asked to be relieved of his duties as faculty senate representative for the Ethnic Studies Program. Because of various commitments and conflicts, he finds it difficult to attend faculty senate meetings.

I, Richard Doi, will serve as his replacement for the Ethnic Studies Program.

Please make this change in the faculty senate roll.

copy: Larry Porter
January 23, 1978

Faculty Senate
Arthur Keith, Chairman
Edison 102
CAMPUS

Faculty Senate,

This is to inform you that my replacement as a student representative to the Faculty Senate will be Michael Golden, BOC Elect. I am sure Mike will do an excellent job in representing the students of Central.

Sincerely,

Ken Winslow
Board of Control

KW:rl
TO: J. Arthur Keith, Chairman, Faculty Senate
FROM: Greg Trujillo, Special Assistant to the President
DATE: January 24, 1978
RE: Retention Statistics

I shared your letter of January 18, 1978, with Jack Purcell, Director of Institutional Studies. He told me that he has underway a study in which he intends to isolate the effect of the on-campus student on Central's attrition and retention rates. I am sure that when he has completed the study, he will share the results with you.

G.T.

bd

cc: Jack Purcell
Dear Art:

Since I am the one to whom the Douglas Honors College committee reports I am taking the liberty of responding to your memo to Dr. Harrington of January 11, 1978 regarding the status of the College.

To begin with I am somewhat surprised that its status is unknown by yourself and Dr. Unruh. News of the College's plans and prospects since last spring, has been disseminated at the spring Honors Convocation by Mrs. Clifton, in the Ellensburg Daily Record, in the Crier, in Central Today, on the local radio station, Yakima TV, Seattle TV and to Professor Kathy Adams who this fall called me and asked me to report on the membership of the committee, its work, student applications, etc. I should also point out that all appropriate campus committees reviewed the Douglas College proposal and gave their approval as did the Faculty Senate.

The standing committee of Douglas College consists of the following faculty members; Warren Street, Don Shupe, Zoltan Kramar, Lawrence Lowther, Elwyn Odell and myself as an ex-officio member. I appointed this committee nearly two years ago. In consultation with Dean Schliesman it was agreed that the committee would report to me. After our standing committee commenced its work we enlarged the scope of the committee by adding Professors Franz, Eickhoff, Cutlip, and Unruh to help in planning the College's program so that all five schools would have opportunity for input. That input was received, if and when offered, and with the approval of Douglas College the task force fulfilled its charge. Subsequently, the standing committee continued as the 'administrators' for Douglas College, i.e., Kramar, Lowther, Shupe, Street, Odell and myself with Professor Street serving as chairman of the committee.

This past fall thirteen students applied for admission to Douglas College and several more applied this winter. Professor Street can supply you with the number that have been admitted. Also, I have written some sixty letters to outstanding freshman and sophomores, as well as to National Merit finalists encouraging them to apply for admission to Douglas College. In addition during registration, both fall and winter quarters, we have manned a table at registration. This winter we began our Honors College Colloquia with some six students enrolled and several more prepared to begin the Colloquia spring quarter.

In short I believe that I and the committee have tried to keep all interested parties informed of our activities. I am sorry that Professor Unruh misunderstood his role on our committee. It was not intended that those faculty from...
the four other schools were to remain as members of the standing committee. We look to them now as our liaison to and from the schools they represent.

I hope this rather lengthy letter will serve to clarify the status of Douglas College.

Sincerely,

Burton J. Williams
Professor of History
and Dean

cc: Dr. Unruh
Dr. Harrington
Dean Schliesman
Members of the Douglas College Standing Committee
Professor Warren Street  
Psychology Department  
Campus: CWSC  

Dear Warren:

By this letter I am requesting you to serve as chairman of a standing committee for our proposed honors college. Also I am requesting the following persons to serve on this committee: Zoltan Kramar, Lawrence Lowther, Elwyn Odell and Don Shupe. I propose to serve as an ex-officio member.

I would suggest that this committee will recommend both policy and procedures for the inauguration of the college and will continue to serve until such time as more formal administrative procedures may be required.

I do hope we can begin at least a pilot program by September of this year.

Sincerely,

Burton J. Williams  
Professor of History  
and Dean

cc: Dr. Kramar  
    Dr. Lowther  
    Dr. Odell  
    Dr. Shupe
8 December 1977

Dear

I am dismayed at the action taken by the Faculty Senate at its 7 December 1977 meeting in approving a motion concerning a new course in Religious Studies. The Faculty Senate perpetuated linguistic sexism by allowing the course title, Man and Religion, to stand. It would seem, as educators concerned with the social impact of language use (if not with the furtherance of justice itself), we would be sensitive to the need to avoid unnecessary sexism in our use of English. Making light of the matter or suggesting as justification the existing use of linguistic sexism (e.g., "We already have a Museum of Man.") is an evasion of the issue.

Just as ethnic-based jokes are no longer acceptable among thoughtful members of the academic community, I suggest that the continued use of the word "man" to stand for "human beings" and "people" should also be no longer acceptable, at least in university settings. If it is necessary to provide authoritative references in this regard, may I refer you to "Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language," prepared by the American Psychological Association Task Force on Issues of Sexual Bias in Graduate Education, American Psychologist, (June, 1975) pp. 682-684. Those guidelines are designed:

- to overcome the impression presently embedded in the English language that...people in general are of the male gender and...to insure that psychological writing does not degrade or circumscribe human beings.

Another reference is the "Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language in NCTE Publications," published by the National Council of Teachers of English. The Introduction to the guidelines notes that:

Eliminating sexist language will not eliminate sexist conduct, but as the language is liberated from sexist usages and assumptions, women and men will begin to share more equal, active, caring roles... (teachers) help shape the language patterns and usages of students and thus have potential for promoting language that opens rather than closes possibilities to women and men.
Accordingly, I am requesting that the Faculty Senate at its next regular meeting consider for adoption the following resolution:

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate, in its concern for eliminating linguistic sexism, especially in its more obvious forms, requests that department chairpersons and program directors, members of campus committees, Deans, and all others responsible for University publications (e.g., annual Catalog) review such publications with the intent of removing sexist usages therein and avoid further use of linguistic sexism in University publications. In this regard, the following may serve as appropriate alternatives:

**Catalog at p. 9**

For: "the student's understanding of himself..."

Replace with: "the students' understanding of themselves..."

For: "Pressing problems of mankind, his social orders, and his environmental conditions..."

Replace with: "pressing problems of human beings, their social orders, and their environmental conditions..."

**Catalog at p. 39**

For: 'Anthropology and Museum of Man''

Replace with: "Anthropology and Museum of Peoples"

Sincerely,

Robert Lee
Chairman
Several years ago, Central maintained a campus speaker's bureau through which college personnel were made available to address groups in the local and regional community. For various reasons (primarily financial), it was eventually discontinued.

It now seems wise to revive the bureau. It could serve a strong public relations function for us, especially in promoting our new university title and changing our image as a "teacher's college." It could serve as an aid to student recruitment, as a means of publicizing our programs, and of better displaying the talents of our faculty and staff. Most important, it could help us fulfill our role as a true community resource, providing service to the public in ways beyond traditional classroom teaching and research.

The new bureau would operate as the old one did, though hopefully on a broader scale. Members of the faculty and staff would volunteer to speak on topics in their area(s) of expertise, and from this a booklet of speakers and programs would be prepared for distribution to groups and organizations -- business, professional, social, educational, etc. The booklet (sponsored either by the Office of University Information or of Off-Campus Programs) could highlight topics of particular public interest, and could also include "collective" speaking events (debates, panel discussions) on topics of particular public controversy.

Arrangements for speakers would be made directly with the speakers themselves through office phone numbers listed in the booklet. A central phone number, either for University Information or for Off-Campus Programs, would be listed as well, to reach speakers unavailable directly and to request speakers on topics not included in the booklet. For educational groups (e.g., high school or community college classes), speakers would normally be available without charge or at a minimal cost to cover travel expenses. For other groups, a fee might be charged at the speaker's option.

That the Faculty Senate endorse a University Speaker's Bureau, and that it urge the faculty to participate in it.
COMMITTEE REPORT

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Academic Affairs Committee
DATE: January 17, 1978
RE: Proposal to lengthen the inter-class break to 15 minutes to accommodate handicapped students (Catherine Sands, Assistant Dean of Student Development).

I. Background

By letter to the Faculty Senate Chairman dated July 5, 1977, Professor Sands asked that the Senate consider her proposal to lengthen the break between classes to 15 minutes to enable physically handicapped students to get to class on time. As she noted, classes now are held at widely separated locations on the campus, and even physically fit students may sometimes have to either leave early or arrive late at the next class.

This matter was included in the charge to the Academic Affairs Committee last fall, and the Committee discussed it on January 11th, 1978.

II. Discussion

Professor Sands recommended that the additional time needed for the longer break could be taken from the last period of the day, thus eliminating that period entirely. It was suggested that little harm would be done because that period is not much used in any case.

If the time module were 50 minutes plus 15, the daily schedule would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 8:50</td>
<td>12:20 - 1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:05 - 9:55</td>
<td>1:25 - 2:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 - 11:00</td>
<td>2:30 - 3:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 - 12:05</td>
<td>3:35 - 4:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatively, in a 45 + 15 module classes would begin on the hour and there would be the same number of classes per day as at present.

The Committee agreed that handicapped students are at a disadvantage under the present schedule and campus layout. On the other hand, it was felt that a 50 + 15 module would result in a very confusing schedule, with classes beginning and ending at irregular positions of the clock. A 45 + 15 module would produce uniformity, but at a cost in time for a 5 credit course of 25 minutes per week or one week per quarter. A module of 60 + 15 would result in classes beginning and ending on even 15-minute intervals, but reduce the number of periods in a day to seven.

The Committee concluded that it would be unwise to change the class schedule campus-wide for the benefit of a relatively small number of students. However, recognizing that the present schedule may be unfair
to the handicapped, the Committee concluded that the problem could be at least ameliorated by taking two steps:

1) The Senate should call the attention of the faculty to the difficulties handicapped students have in getting to class on time, and urge instructors who have handicapped students to allow them the choice of leaving the class five minutes early.

2) The Senate should ask the Physical Plant to keep the campus clocks better synchronized, and synchronized at the correct time.

III. Motion:

The Academic Affairs Committee therefore makes the following two-part motion:

1) That the Senate Chairman send a memorandum to the faculty calling attention to the difficulties handicapped students have in getting to class on time, and urging that instructors give such students the choice of leaving class 5 minutes early.

2) That the Senate Chairman send a memorandum to the Physical Plant calling attention to the necessity of maintaining campus clocks in better synchronization at the correct time.
The Senate Budget Committee recommends that the 4% salary increase for next year be allocated as follows:

1. A general one-step increment

2. Up to $25,000 to be used for promotions, merit increases and/or scale adjustments.

3. Balance of funds, if any, to be used for a fixed dollar adjustment to the scale.

The committee realizes that if these recommendations are accepted those faculty members at step 24 (10) will not be eligible to receive the step increase and those at step 23.5 (2) would receive only 1/2 step. We feel that this is justified in view of the fact that these individuals have gained the most over the past several years of percentage adjustments to the scale and lack of general increments. Furthermore, the recommendations embody the spirit of establishing a regular maturation increase, as recently accepted by the Senate.
TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: BUDGET COMMITTEE
SUBJECT: DISTRIBUTION OF 4% SALARY INCREASE FOR 78-79
DATE: JANUARY 16, 1978

The Senate Budget Committee makes the following motion:

That the monies available for next year's salary increase be distributed as follows, assuming adequate funding:

1. A general one-step increment.
2. Up to $25,000 to be used for promotions, merit increases and/or scale adjustments.
3. Balance of funds, if any, to be used for a fixed Dollar adjustment to the scale.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Art Keith, Chairman
   Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee

DATE: January 16, 1978

RE: Number of class hours for workshops

The Curriculum Guide now states that "a minimum of 20 hours of participation per credit" is required for workshops. A question has arisen as to whether or not this requirement is excessive.

After soliciting comments from department and program chairpersons and the undergraduate dean, and after considerable discussion in committee, it was decided that the problem could be solved by an editorial change in the Curriculum Guide. It appears that in all but a few instances, CWU workshops do conform to the policy in the Curriculum Guide, but there is some confusion about clock (60 minutes) and classroom (50 minutes) hours.

Proposed editorial changes:

p. 10. 3. Workshops, Practicum, Field Experience, Consultation: A minimum of 20 hours (16-17 clock hours) of participation per credit.

p. 13. 1. A minimum of 20 hours (16-17 clock hours) must be spent in class for each credit assigned to the workshop.
February 1, 1978

Move that the Curriculum Guide (May 18, 1977) be amended where it reads:

p. 10, Credit Allocation to Courses, 3. Workshops, Practicum, Field Experience, Consultation: A minimum of 20 hours per credit.

p. 13, Workshops, 1. A minimum of 20 hours must be spent in class for each credit assigned to the workshop.

TO READ:

p. 10, Credit Allocation to Courses, 3. Workshops, Practicum, Field Experience, Consultation: A minimum of 20 hours (16-17 clock hours) per credit.

p. 13, Workshops, 1. A minimum of 20 hours (16-17 clock hours) must be spent in class for each credit assigned to the workshop.
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Senate Personnel Committee
SUBJECT: Report on Education Department's Position Paper
DATE: January 18, 1978

The Senate Personnel Committee has studied the position paper submitted and supported by the Department of Education date May 11, 1977 on faculty rank.

Our committee agrees with the substance of the paper, it points up a very real problem; but, we do not agree with the solution presented.

This committee supports following the traditional rank system--it is and should be the highest form of merit. We suggest the possibility of granting release time and/or financial support for attending special conferences as a form of merit.

ACTION: We recommend the Faculty Senate direct the Senate Code Committee study the Education Department's position paper on faculty rank and submit its findings to the Faculty Senate for final action.
January 17, 1978

Dr. Larry Helms  
Assistant Vice President  
Off-Campus Programs  
Central Washington University

Dear Dr. Helms:

We find your memorandum of January 12, 1978 regarding summer schedules tremendously disturbing.

Not only has the administration taken away our options but you add insult to injury by legislating against any innovation. Clearly, this action is punitive.

What an appalling dichotomy. On the one hand President Brooks pleads for our help in launching a new effort to attract students and on the other hand the Deans destroy the one remaining innovation we have established in recent years. Are they totally deaf and blind to the fact that students overwhelmingly endorsed the four-day session? Are they going to continue to make a mockery out of the concept of faculty governance by ignoring the faculty referendum conducted by the Senate which also supported the four-day session?

God knows that our department has responded to student needs. We consistently generate student credit hours far beyond our allocations. We have made significant program changes. We maintain excellent rapport with the profession in the field and perhaps more significantly than anything else, we have taken our programs to the far corners of the state.

Where are the rewards? Where are the incentives? Where is the motivation? We'll tell you where it is! Our faculty loves and respects this institution and wants to see it survive not only for professional education but for every program we offer. We respond because we care. We will go to Ilwaco, to Omak, or anywhere else where we can be of service - because we care.

We believe it is high time that the administration begins to care about and reward these kinds of efforts. We are tired of hard, cold, monotonous memorandums of explanation regarding academic decisions about which virtually no one agrees.
We will never turn this institution around if everything is done for the sake of expediency. It is not enough to get through the day and say to hell with tomorrow. We can only do it by restoring faith, respect, and credibility.

At the moment these do not exist.

Yours very truly,

Elected Heads of Faculty,
Department of Education

[Signatures]

P.S. We understand that you and Dr. Erickson supported our position and for that we thank you.

cc: Dr. Robert Carlton
    Dr. James Erickson
    Dr. Ed Harrington
    Dr. James Brooks
    Dr. Art Keith, Senate
COMMITTEE REPORT

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Academic Affairs Committee
DATE: January 30, 1978
SUBJ: Off-Campus grades, Fall Quarter, 1977.

The figures below were compiled by Larry Lawrence for the Academic Affairs Committee from data supplied by the University. They are for the fall quarter, 1977, only. Compilation of this material was tedious and time consuming, and we have not had time to gather and process data from previous quarters for comparison. This report is therefore primarily informational.

I. DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Grade Points</th>
<th>Students (graded A-E)</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>14,942</td>
<td>48,529.7</td>
<td>4,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus</td>
<td>62,996</td>
<td>176,903.2</td>
<td>18,058 (includes 100 Cont. Ed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>77,938</td>
<td>225,432.9</td>
<td>22,622 plus 37 ungraded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. GRADE DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>2577 (56%)</td>
<td>1581 (35%)</td>
<td>408 (9%)</td>
<td>27 (.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus</td>
<td>6213 (34%)</td>
<td>6608 (57%)</td>
<td>3761 (21%)</td>
<td>746 (3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITE</td>
<td>8790 (39%)</td>
<td>8189 (36%)</td>
<td>4169 (18%)</td>
<td>773 (3.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITE</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Most off-campus courses are given by the Department of Education, which therefore has a large influence on the off-campus GPA.
2. Many Education courses off-campus are taken by experienced teachers, who may be expected to do well.
3. Adjunct professors tend to grade higher than do professors from campus.
4. The difference between on-campus and off-campus GPA's is difficult to interpret and may not have great significance.
5. What does seem significant is the extraordinary high percentage of grades that are A's and B's: 91% for off-campus and 71% for on-campus.