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MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 15 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 George Fadenrecht, Robert Mitchell, Dale Samuelson, and E. Dee Torrey.

Visitors Present: Dale Comstock, Don Caughey and Pearl Douce'.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

Mr. Keith announced the following changes:
1. Under "Communications" add
   H. Letter from V. Gerald Reed, dated February 8.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of February 1, were corrected as follows: Page 4, second line under "D", change "Tolin" to "Tolman."

The minutes were approved as corrected.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:
A. Memo from Don Cummings, dated January 30, informing the Senate that the General Studies Committee has voted to wait until the Senate has acted on their upcoming General Studies proposal before they recommend one way or another on Bob Mitchell's suggestion to allow students to use courses to satisfy breadth requirements if they are required by their major but lie outside their major departments.
B. Letter from Ed Harrington, dated February 2, requesting the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to appoint a "Blue Ribbon" faculty committee to work with the deans and himself on a plan for "year-round operation", or a formal "four-quarter plan."
C. Letter from Don Schliesman, dated February 6, requesting Faculty Senate approval of a proposed policy statement recommended by the Undergraduate Council. The Proposed Policy would be: All courses may be repeated. All grades earned at CWU will be used in the computation of the grade point average. Successful repetition of a course orginally passed carries no additional credit towards a degree. Courses may not be repeated on a credit/no credit option.
D. Letter from Philip Tolin, expressing concern over the grade distribution report submitted to the Senate by the Academic Affairs Committee dated January 30. Mr. Tolin suggests that the Senate consider the formation of an ad hoc committee to study the university's off-campus programs and courses.
E. A letter from V. Gerald Reed, Director of Cooperative Education, suggesting an alternate system or grading proposal to be used at Central.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

A. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals, the remainder of page 485, and pages 486 and 487.

MOTION NO. 1701: Mr. Street moved, seconded by Mr. Tolin, to approve the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals, the remainder of page 485, and pages 486 and 487. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and one abstention.
**REPORTS**

A. Chairman—Mr. Keith reported on the disposition of several matters which have come to the Faculty Senate. He received from Patrick Callan his answers to some questions presented at the Joint Session of the House and Senate Higher Education Committees, copies of which he has distributed to the Senators at this meeting for their information. Essentially, Mr. Callan argued for the continued decentralization of governance of the three regional universities—the state college, and the two universities—and suggests that the State Higher Education Board is probably not the answer to Washington's higher education situation.

Table I, from a report prepared by Greg Trujillo, has been distributed to Senators, and is a part of the Retention and Recruitment sub-committees. It contained some interesting data regarding the sex distribution of students. The university is now in a situation where women students outnumber men. Table I is a part of that report and is a graph of changes from 1970 through 1977. Copies of the entire report are in the Senate office for anyone who wishes to read it.

In response to the communication from Vice-President Harrington, the Senate Executive Committee has recommended to Mr. Harrington and his advisory council five people representing the academic schools, three of whom serve on the Senate Standing Committee for Personnel, plus two other members. They have nominated someone from the Library and someone from the Counseling area. John Vifian and Mr. Keith represent the Executive Committee. These people will be working on developing a proposal for "year-round scheduling."

The letter from Don Schliesman, regarding the grading policy, has been sent to the Curriculum Committee. Under the clause in the Code for that Committee, it says that the Curriculum Committee has such other duties as given it by the Executive Committee. Since the Academic Affairs Committee has several other items on its backlog, the decision was to give this proposal to the Curriculum Committee for recommendation.

Payroll proposals are being disseminated to the Deans by Vice President Harrington, and from the Deans to the department chairmen, with the intent of gathering information so that Mr. Harrington can propose a new payroll policy. Once that payroll policy is proposed, it will go to the Senate and be charged then to the Budget Committee for their consideration.

Actions that have been taken to motions that were passed at the last Senate meeting are as follows: Regarding the motion on linguistic sexism, Mr. Keith has requested Deans Comstock and Schliesman, in their roles as administrators in charge of curriculum committees, graduate and undergraduate, to pass that information on and request those committees to be careful about the use of linguistic sexism in catalog copy and in course titles and course descriptions. Mr. Keith has drafted a memo to the Curriculum Committee of the Senate asking them to be aware of the same situations.

The Speaker's Bureau proposal that was passed has been transmitted to Jimmie Applegate in the President's office and requests have been sent out for people interested to list themselves and information.

The motion regarding workshop hours that was passed has been transmitted to Dean Schliesman for inclusion in the Curriculum Guide.

The motion requesting involvement in the Presidential Search efforts has been transmitted to the Board of Trustees. The Board chairman and Mr. Keith have discussed this and will discuss it at another time also. There is no information to report at this time as to actual candidates and interviewing schedule. However, the Board is anxious that, as they proceed through the selection process, the faculty members have an opportunity to feed back information to the Board, either directly or through the Presidential Search Committee.

The Central Investment Fund Committee is operating and will be using the same procedures to solicit funds from the downtown community and from the campus community as were utilized last year.

The Central Investment Fund Scholarship Committee is in the process of trying to identify 50 scholarship recipients out of a total of approximately 275 applications that have been received from high school students.
Mr. Keith announced the Senate Executive Committee has decided to discontinue coffee service at the Senate meetings. Unless there are strong objections and many contributions of money to buy coffee, no coffee service will be available at Senate meetings.

B. Executive Committee--no report.

C. Dale Comstock--Energy Studies Center. Dean Comstock distributed a report to the Faculty on the Status of Energy at CWU, and commented on its progress and constitution. The report was prepared by Ken Hammond and Bob Bennett. Mr. Comstock mentioned that a number of grant activities are underway, or are pending to date, that total $156,116, some of which are cited in the handout.

All of these activities led the committee working on this to realize that they need to get some coordination on these activities. A group of faculty that has been interested in these projects, and the deans, met and agreed on appointing an ad hoc committee to begin planning some objectives and curricular possibilities in the area of energy. An ad hoc committee was appointed by Vice President Harrington, consisting of Bob Bennett, Ken Hammond, Clint Duncan, Richard Mack, Art Keith and Ken Calhoun. This committee meets weekly and are preparing position papers to be presented and they are trying to develop some objectives and purposes for the Center and develop future directions for that Center. They have drafted a working paper and hope to reach consensus and present it in the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Keith commented that he asked Dean Comstock to present this report in order to alert the Senate that the Energy Studies Committee may have a curriculum prepared for submission.

D. Standing Committees--

Mr. Keith informed the Senate that the letters regarding the grading have been referred to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Mr. Habib reminded the chairman that in 1976 the Senate was presented with another grading proposal which was never discussed last year because of the pressure of business, and should be referred to the Academic Affairs Committee. Mr. Keith will follow up on it.

1. Academic Affairs Committee--Mr. Andress presented a substitute motion to replace Motion No. 1695, copies of which were distributed to Senators at this meeting. The Committee has received information on two matters relating to the Committee's recommendation, namely, the legality of the recommendation, and the seriousness of the problem addressed by the recommendation. They therefore request the substitute motion replace Motion No. 1695.

The report was discussed and the motion postponed until Old Business for discussion and action.

2. Budget Committee--no report.

Mr. Keith informed Senators that the action on the motion from the Budget Committee has been transmitted to the Budget Advisory Committee of the University.

3. Curriculum--no report.

4. Code Committee--Mr. reported that the Code Committee is concerned that the Personnel Committee has a proposal they would like to see acted upon, because they are considering reviewing some of the procedures for promotion, etc. A full written report will be presented at the March 8 meeting.

5. Personnel Committee--Mr. Klemin, in the absence of the chairman of that committee, mentioned they would present a motion at the next meeting on the proposal from the Education Department.

6. Student Affairs Committee--no report.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Motion No. 1695 (tabled until this meeting)
Mr. Andress presented a substitute motion:

MOTION NO. 1702: The Senate Academic Affairs Committee moved that the Senate Chairman send a memorandum to the faculty asking that in the classroom and in advising they be cognizant of the difficulties handicapped students may have in getting to class on time, and that suitable arrangements be worked out with each student as the need arises. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

B. Committees reporting to Dean of Students--

Mr. Keith reviewed the proposed restructuring of Committees reporting to the Dean of Students.

MOTION NO. 1703: The Senate Executive Committee moved that their recommendation of the proposed committee structure of committees reporting to the Dean of Students be approved. Passed by a unanimous hand vote and one abstention.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Keith announced that the next meeting date of the Senate is March 8. All committees should have their final reports and recommendations ready for distribution at the April 19 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
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AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., February 15, 1978
Psychology Building, Room 471

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of February 1, 1978

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

A. Letter from Don Cummings, dated January 27
B. Letter from Ed Harrington, dated February 2
C. Letter from Don Schliesman, dated February 6

V. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

A. Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals, pages 485, 486, 487

VI. REPORTS

A. Chairman
B. Executive Committee
C. Dale Comstock---Energy Studies Center
D. Standing Committees
   1. Academic Affairs
   2. Budget
   3. Curriculum
   4. Code
   5. Personnel
   6. Student Affairs

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Motion No. 1695 (tabled)
B. Committees reporting to Dean of Students

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURNMENT
ON January 6 the General Studies Committee discussed the suggestion Bob Mitchell had sent originally to the Senate and which you subsequently passed on to us. The suggestion was that we allow students to use courses to satisfy breadth requirements if they are required by their major but lie outside their major department. The following week Don Schliesman talked further with Bob. On January 13 Bob met with the Committee for further discussion of some of the assumptions and implications of his suggestion. After that discussion the Committee voted to wait until the Senate has acted on our upcoming General Studies proposal before we recommend one way or the other on Mitchell's suggestion.
Dr. J. Arthur Keith
Chairman, Faculty Senate
Central Washington University
Campus

Dear Dr. Keith:

Following our several discussions, I believe you and I are agreed that we need a "Blue Ribbon" faculty committee to work with the deans and me on a plan for "year-round operation", or a formal "four-quarter plan." Would you and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee please appoint such a committee? I suggest appropriate representation would include faculty from all five schools as well as members of the counseling and library faculty.

Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington
Vice President for Academic Affairs

cc: Dr. Brooks
Vice President's Advisory Council
February 6, 1978

Dr. Arthur Keith  
Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
CWU  
Campus

Dear Dr. Keith:

During its meeting of February 3, 1978 the Undergraduate Council passed a motion to approve the policy statement written below. The attached copy of a letter to Vice President Harrington from Mr. Bovos presents rationale for the policy. The Council added the last sentence after hearing from Mr. Bovos that students frequently try to increase their g.p.a. by repeating courses on a credit/no credit basis under the current policy. For your convenience, the current policy and the proposed policy are both stated below.

Current Policy

Courses completed with a grade lower than "C" may be repeated. In the computation of the grade point average, only the grade earned in the repeated course is used. If the course is repeated more than once, all grades will be averaged in the computation of the grade point average. Successful repetition of a course originally passed carries no additional credit towards a degree.

Proposed Policy

All courses may be repeated. All grades earned at CWU will be used in the computation of the grade point average. Successful repetition of a course originally passed carries no additional credit towards a degree. Courses may not be repeated on a credit/no credit option.

The Council requests Faculty Senate approval of the proposed policy.

Sincerely yours,

Donald M. Schliesman  
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

cc: Vice President Harrington, Dr. Byrd
October 17, 1977

Dr. Ed Harrington  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Campus

RE: Repeat Grades

Dear Dr. Harrington:

I would like to recommend a change in the current policy of Repetition of Courses. The current policy, page 34 of the 1977-78 catalog, states that only courses with a grade lower than a "C" may be repeated. I would like to recommend that all courses regardless of grade earned be allowed to be repeated. The rationale is students who earn a grade of "C" who wish to earn a better grade and improve their knowledge are not allowed to do so. If the student does repeat the course the second grade is not allowed. Students who wish to improve their knowledge are limited by this policy. This office has had occasions where a student has earned a "C" grade in a course, repeated the course for a better grade and was denied the second grade even though the second grade was much higher.

I would also recommend that all grades be used in the calculation of grade point average. A student who earns a grade of D in a course, repeats the course, earns a B, the grade point average should be a C. Currently the institutional policy eliminates the first grade. It seems that by averaging all grades would reflect the correct grade point average of the student.

My recommendation would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repetition of Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All courses may be repeated. All grades earned will be used in the computation of the grade point average. Successful repetition of a course originally passed carries no additional credit towards a degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your consideration in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Louis H. Bovos  
Registrar

LHB:mk
The grade distribution report submitted to the Senate by the Academic Affairs Committee dated January 30, 1978, is cause for great concern. While the problem of grade inflation is a familiar one, the distribution of off-campus courses is, even by current standards, appalling. While the Committee speculated that the difference between on- and off-campus grades "may not have great significance," the difference is statistically significant and, I suggest, meaningful.

If all our off-campus offerings were graduate courses, perhaps the grade distribution would not be so startling. But many are undergraduate courses. Some of these courses may be "affectively", rather than "cognitively" oriented and therefore hard to evaluate. But such courses are surely in the minority. In some courses we "teach to objectives" but, again, in most we don't. And in those so taught, are the objectives as rigorous as perhaps they should be?

While we tend to focus on the problem of "grading", we have not given sufficient thought to a more fundamental problem: Is the problem merely due to sloppy evaluative procedures or are we teaching so little that by any reasonable measure most students can be said to have grasped all that was "taught"? I suspect that there is a little truth in both propositions. Surely most disciplines are sufficiently sophisticated that it is unreasonable to suppose that 91% of the students should excel.

There are a number of issues that deserve study. How rigorous and intellectually demanding are our off-campus courses? Are students being taught anything new? Or are they being served a reprise of that which is already familiar? Are we making intellectual demands or are we exalting the banal?

Why do adjunct professors tend to grade higher than professors from campus? Are they teaching as much?

At present, we offer numerous graduate-level courses that have no prerequisites. Some were, until recently, undergraduate courses. Have the demands placed on the students changed along with the change in course numbers?
Off-campus students have little or no access to library facilities. Can quality upper-division and graduate courses be maintained under such circumstances?

Rumor has it that we have hired some adjuncts with dubious credentials. Is this true?

Are the rigors of travel, particularly without released time on campus, conducive to the maintenance of quality instruction?

Some courses appear clearly to fill the needs of people around the state. Others, what one colleague calls "dog and pony shows", appear to fill only the need to generate student credit hours. Should we be offering as many courses as we do?

The questions go on and on. They are important questions and we need answers. The Institutional Studies Office appears not to have studied these problems. The Academic Affairs Committee is already burdened with a variety of other important tasks. Therefore, I propose that the Senate consider the formation of an ad hoc committee to study our off-campus programs and courses.

I hope that it can be shown that we are, indeed, offering quality educational experiences in all our off-campus programs. Clearly, sacrifices must be made if we are to put our current difficulties behind us. However, there would be little worth saving if among these sacrifices were our integrity and our reputation.

Sincerely,

Philip Tolin

PT:gf
February 8, 1978

Dr. Art Keith, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Dr. Keith:

Duncan McQuarrie’s recent letter regarding grades given at CWU prompted me to sit down and elaborate upon a grading proposal I previously suggested. I am enclosing it for your examination and referral to an appropriate subcommittee, which I assume would be the Academic Affairs committee.

It is important to note that the proposed system would ask nothing new of the faculty; the computer would be used entirely in implementing it.

If there are any questions I would be glad to discuss this proposal further with any interested persons.

Sincerely,

V. Gerald Reed, Director
Cooperative Education

VGR:cv

cc: Dr. McQuarrie

Attachment
PROPOSAL FOR A RELATIVE GRADING SYSTEM

The present grading system has become, or perhaps always has been, difficult to interpret in practice. It is proposed that to resolve the grading problem it is necessary to carefully identify the purposes for grading and to devise a system which specifically services those purposes. To begin, it is necessary to recognize that a grading system is by definition a system for giving relative ratings.

But what are the grades relative to? That is the issue - and it is a legitimate issue. Scores or grades can legitimately be given relative to an average (which itself can be calculated in different ways) for the group an individual is in, or relative to an ideal standard, or relative to a composite average of many groups, or relative to a composite collection of criteria, and so on (leaving out some facetious possibilities). Confusion in giving and interpreting grades arises when the reference standard is not uniformly agreed upon, which is the case in higher education today.

Moreover, the objections that are raised to imposing the average for the immediate group as the appropriate relative standard do have some legitimacy. However, while they are valid objections, the need for making a realistic relative judgement about students' performance is also equally apparent.

The present grading system is expected to serve two divergent purposes--which may become increasingly divergent with new developments in education. The two purposes are:

1. To provide an evaluative measurement for a students' performance in a course according to criteria established by the instructor--whatever those criteria may be, so long as they are academically defensible. (The instructor's good judgement in establishing appropriate criteria is a large part of the reason for his or her employment. Contrary criteria should not be imposed by anyone else.)
2. To provide relative performance information to students about how well they are doing as compared to other students at the institution, which can be useful to them in finding the appropriate discipline to be in, determining whether or not they really should be pursuing higher education or even graduate study, and in determining how well they are acquiring the knowledge they will need when they are later employed professionally.

We are increasingly discovering that these two grading purposes may not be equivalent. It is, therefore, proposed that the existing system be retained intact to serve the first purpose and that a supplementary Relative Grading system (until a better name is suggested) be implemented which would use the grades given by the instructors in a converted form to accurately serve the second purpose. The proposed system would abide by the following conditions:

1. There should be little or no interference with the instructor's judgement as to how to grade a course.
2. All aspects of the existing grading system, such as calculation of a cumulative G.P.A., should be retained and they should be used in whatever manner is appropriate.
3. The Relative Grading system should be clearly and simply explained to students and future receivers of transcripts.
4. The Relative Grading system should closely resemble the existing system in order to easily provide meaningful interpretation.
5. The Relative Grading system should employ a simple conversion method, which could be done quickly by the computer using only the instructor's submitted grades as raw data, and the resulting relative grades (RG's) should be amenable to the same kind of manipulations, i.e. calculations
of a cumulative RG, as can be done with instructor's grades.

6. The Relative Grading system should not be used for any purposes other than to provide better evaluation information until extensive experience has been acquired in using it.

There may be many alternative ways of developing a Relative Grading system consistent with all of the above conditions. The following suggested method is one possible system for converting instructor's grades to RG's:

1. Instructor would submit grades as is currently done.
2. The letter grades would be converted to the numerical values we currently give them, i.e. C = 2.0, C- = 1.7, D+ = 1.3, etc.
3. The computer would:
   a. calculate the mean grade for the class (rounded to the first decimal place, e.g. calculated means between 1.45 and 1.54 would be rounded to \( \bar{x} = 1.5 \)).
   b. calculate the difference (\( \Delta \)) of each student's given grade from the computed mean, e.g. if a student received an A- and the class mean grade, \( \bar{x} \), was 2.3, the difference (\( \Delta \)) for that student would be \( 3.7 - 2.3 = 1.4 \).
   c. calculate an RG for each student equal to \( 2.0 + \Delta \), e.g. if\( \Delta = 1.4 \) then \( R.G. = 2.0 + 1.4 = 3.4 \).
   d. calculate quarterly and cumulative R.G. averages in exactly the same way that quarterly and cumulative G.P.A.'s are now calculated, except to use R.G.'s in place of instructor's grades.
4. The computer would also continue to do all of the traditional treatment to instructor's grades as is currently done.
The proposed change might be shown on a grade report somewhat like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>course</th>
<th>credit</th>
<th>grade</th>
<th>relative grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAWE 101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STBU 313</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXLE 258</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEDR 488</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Credit = 12, Qtr. G.P.A. = 2.75, Qtr. R.G.P.A. = 2.03

The mean grade given for each class need not be shown. However, an interested person could easily figure them out from the conversion formulae RG = 2.0 + Δ, Δ = Grade - X, so X = Grade - Δ = Grade - (RG - 2), i.e. X = Instructor's grade + 2.0 - R.G.. Thus the class means for the above courses must be 3.7, 2.0, 2.5, and 3.5 respectively. Of course the class grade means could also be printed on the report form, but there is no real need to do that.

This proposed system would yield negative RG's but only rarely, when X for a class is high and a students grade is low. Note in the above example that for BEDR 488 the student earned a D in a course where the mean grade given was 3.5 (B+ to A-). It would also be possible to get an RG higher than 4.0, but again only rarely, when X for the class is below 2.0 and a student receives a high grade in the class. Negative RG's could be avoided by defining RG as 4.0 + Δ, but that would also increase the likelihood of very high RG scores.

The suggested value of RG = 2.0 + Δ seems most sensible, since it would yield RG's exactly equal to the given grades in any class where the mean given grade is a C.

A few examples may help to clarify the proposed grading system:

1. Assume a class of 5 students in which the given grades were A, A, A, C, D. The corresponding RG's would be 3, 3, 3, 1, and 0. \((\bar{X} = (4 + 4 + 4 + 2 + 1)/5 = 3.0)\)
2. Assume a class of 7 students in which the given grades were A, B, C, C, C, D, E. The corresponding RG's would be 4, 3, 2, 2, 2, 1, 0. (Note that the given grades are symmetrically distributed around C, thus $\bar{X} = 2.0$)

3. Assume, in example 2, that the E grade was a D. Then the corresponding RG's would be 3.9, 2.9, 1.9, 1.9, 1.9, 0.9, 0.9. (The one grade change in this class would raise $X$ from 2.0 to 2.1 (rounded)).

4. Assume a class of 7 students in which the grades are A, C, C, D, D, D, E. The corresponding RG's would be 4.4, 2.4, 2.4, 1.4, 1.4, and 0.4.

Several points should be apparent about the proposed RG system.

1. The size of the differences between students' scores are unchanged by converting from given grades to RG's, and all RG's would be distributed over a four point spread or less in any given class.

2. Getting a high RG (above 2.0) would require relatively superior performance in any class, but there would be limited opportunities for students in classes where the mean given grade is high (B or higher).

3. A high cumulative RG average would be a very reliable indicator of superior performance regardless of classes taken and how they were graded.

4. In terms of RG's the possible advantages of enrolling in courses where high grades predominate would be eliminated, as would be the disadvantages of enrolling in courses where low grades are frequently given. Instead the important emphasis would be on amount of motivation and aptitude of the student for the course. The importance of differences of grading practices between professors and between departments would be largely eliminated.

5. Cumulative RG average for students would be normally distributed about
a value of 2.0. Values above and below 2.0 would be very reliably informative, particularly extreme values.

6. By preserving the existing system along with a relative grading system, it would still be possible, even reasonable, for an instructor of a small class of select students to give all A's in the class.
Table 1. Fall Quarter Headcount Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year to Year Difference</th>
<th>Proportion of Difference Accounted for by Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3976</td>
<td>3538</td>
<td>7514</td>
<td>-93*  (148.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>4021</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>7421</td>
<td>-741*  (39.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>3570</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>6680</td>
<td>-242*  (-3.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>3118</td>
<td>6438</td>
<td>527  78.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3435</td>
<td>3530</td>
<td>6965</td>
<td>709  61.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3706</td>
<td>3968</td>
<td>7674</td>
<td>87  214.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3606</td>
<td>4155</td>
<td>7761</td>
<td>115  141.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3558</td>
<td>4318</td>
<td>7876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* the minus (-) sign indicates a decrease in enrollment between the consecutive fall quarters.

Numbers in parenthesis indicate the proportion of decrease accounted for by women.
It is recommended that page 65 and 66 of Part VII of the Policies and Procedures Manual be revised as follows:

C. POLICIES RELATING TO STUDENT SERVICES

I. Student Personnel Committees--Coordinated by the Dean of Student Development Services

Several committees assist the Student Personnel Program. Members of the Student Personnel Division work independently with the Associated Students. Major policy recommendations coming from this work or from the committees listed below may be reviewed and forwarded to the President's Council, to the Faculty Senate, or other appropriate group for consideration or action.

Academic Standing Committee: (Re-definition of charge; change in number of faculty)

The Committee serves as a final appeal board for students who have been suspended from the University for academic difficulties. The Committee also reviews the academic progress of students receiving financial aid to determine if satisfactory academic progress warrants the continuation of financial aid.

12 faculty
5 students

Board of Academic Appeals: (No change)

The Board provides for the airing and redress of grievances with due processual guarantees for any student against any other student, or member of the faculty, staff or administration, or any faculty member against any student in matters concerning academic welfare.

5 faculty
5 students

Campus Judicial Council: (No change)

The Council is the highest tribunal in the campus judiciary hierarchy authorized to hear complaints against students and student organizations.

4 faculty
7 students

Joint Student Fees: (Change from reporting to Vice President of Academic Affairs to Dean of Student Development)

The Committee reviews budget requests from Joint Student Fee users, e.g., Samuelson Union Building, athletics, and the Board of Control (BOC). A preliminary budget is recommended to the Dean of Student Development who confers with the BOC before sending the budget via the President to the Board of Trustees for review and approval.

3 faculty
3 students
1 ex-officio -- Controller
Samuelson Union Board: (No change)
The Board assists the Dean of Student Development or his desigee in recommending policy and program planning for the Samuelson Union Building (SUB). The Board provides an opportunity for student and faculty involvement regarding the operations of the SUB.
   3 faculty
   4 students
   1 ex-officio -- Dean of Student Development or his designee

Student Financial Assistance: (No change)
The Committee facilitates procedures in processing student applications for loans, scholarships, and work assignments.
   3 faculty
   1 ex-officio -- Director of Financial Counseling and Financial Aid

Student Wage Committee: (Change from ad-hoc status to permanent committee)
The Committee recommends policies for student employment and wages to the Student Employment Office of Financial Counseling and Financial Aid.
   1 faculty
   1 student
   4 staff members appointed by the Dean of Student Development or his designee
   2 ex-officio -- Directors of Student Employment and Financial Counseling and Financial Aid
Response given by Patrick M. Callan, Executive Coordinator, Washington Council for Postsecondary Education to Questions Presented by a Joint Session of the House and Senate Higher Education Committees January 30, 1978

Senator Goltz: Would you recommend any basic structural changes in our governance of postsecondary education?

After directing several studies of governance in other states, my reaction to Washington's rather decentralized structure is positive. This state has moved more cautiously in the last ten or fifteen years than the rest of the country in the direction of highly centralized systems. In 1940, 70 percent of the American four-year institutions were under single governing boards. By 1975 that figure had dropped to 30 percent.

Since the primary disadvantage of centralized governance is its complexity, one has to question centralization as a panacea for simplifying governance. We have a large number of boards and commissions participating in the management and guidance of postsecondary education in Washington. But the real question is not one of numbers but whether this is a help or a hindrance in the achievement of the state's educational and public policy objectives.

One of the positive results of the current system is a more diverse array of higher education opportunity than exists in most states. We have a well-developed system of academic and vocational education available at different types and sizes of institutions. As the population participating in postsecondary education has become more diverse, it has been important to maintain equally diverse institutions. We don't treat everyone the same way, and a diverse educational system allows a response to the different goals that people have - academic, vocational, graduate, undergraduate, traditional, innovative, etc.
A second point. As I look around the country at the large, highly centralized multi-campus systems under their single boards and chancellors, it seems to me that one is hard put to come up with evidence that either management or the quality of education has been improved. Yet, what we see is a very definite trend towards a large scale, state-level bureaucracy in higher education.

When I left California the last time in 1973, the central staff of the University of California, which controls, along with the Board of Regents, only nine of the some 130 public campuses in the state, had 1,300 people on its payroll. That number represents only the central office staff; this is in addition to the vast array of chancellors and vice-chancellors on the separate campuses. As soon as a central administrative authority is established, that person must have the staff to oversee all aspects of campus activities from building and grounds maintenance to academic programs. I suggest that a cost/benefit analysis of such a system would not show a positive relationship, and there is no evidence that educational quality has been improved. Rather, the bureaucracy in higher education has increased, and the chances for flexibility are reduced.

I read an interesting statement by Virginia Smith, President of Vassar College, who was formerly Director of the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education. She said in her opinion the creation of bureaucratic systems in higher education was as much an impediment to flexibility as the numerous governmental controls initiated in the last few years. So I would say that we in this state should continue to be rather skeptical of moves towards centralization, and that we should ask what the questions are this proposed solution is the answer to; what are the problems it is designed to solve.
If the question is: Will it really produce savings, then I think the answer has to be, no. If that is not true, then the question becomes whether or not it will improve the educational process. I think the answer is again, no. At the same time, the higher education community in this state should welcome evaluations which either the legislative or executive branch, or both, might want to make. It is not a perfect system and it can be improved. But it is terribly important that the educational community itself be willing to deal analytically with the problems and make improvements in the system.

We appear very close at times to claiming that the whole set of prerogatives higher education has been given over the years - academic freedom, tenure, special legal status and the protection of having our own boards - have become rights. The higher education community must realize that those are tools given to us by society to improve the service that our institutions can render. They are not rights, and we are not operating in an era which is likely to view them as such. It will be necessary, if these advantages are useful, to justify them in terms of the public good, and not in terms of some inherent right to special privilege. As all of you know, that idea just doesn't wash; I don't believe it and I don't think you do either.

Washington's postsecondary education system is coordinated by the Council with a staff of 25 people, including clerical support. A fourth of that staff runs the student financial aid program, a program that would be necessary under any system. We have a system, then, with a combined state and federal budget of over $1 billion, being coordinated by a staff of less than 20 working under a Council representing both the public and the institutions. While this structure could be improved, the burden of proof should lie heavily on those who propose any other, and that burden should be to show that the alternative really will improve service and not just reduce costs.
Both philosophically and in terms of the experience I have had working in this system, I think a lot of its vitality comes from the fact that decisions are made close to the people who are affected by them. I have been as frustrated as you from time to time with campus administrations and governing boards, but I see no evidence that moving decisions up a couple of layers will improve the situation. I have been comfortable with the advisory authority the Council has, and I would not want a blank check to become involved in the details of internal institutional management. I hope that a high priority for both the legislature and the Governor and also for the institutions of higher education will be to maintain the decentralized system we have now and not vest an enormous amount of power in some central staff. The institutions need a certain amount of pressure from us and from you to maintain a public interest perspective in their internal deliberations. Nevertheless, I think this system of checks and balances, with authority divided among state government, the Council, and the institutions, is as effective as I have seen, in spite of the frustrations it can give from time to time.

Finally, centralized systems - whether statewide or regional - are more easily subjected to political influence. Political influence should not be confused with accountability. The latter is a mechanism by which public institutions are required to show that they have efficiently achieved the public purposes for which they were established and funded. Political influence, on the other hand, occurs when institutions which have been structured to provide insulation from short-term vicissitudes of politics in order to achieve their purposes of teaching, research and public service are brought under the undue control of a single politician or political point of view. This can affect not only the management of the institution,
but such fundamental values as academic freedom as well. I maintain that a decentralized system with no superboards and no czars of higher education, a system with shared responsibilities and checks and balances is one of our best protections against politically inspired disruptions of the academic process.

Senator Goltz: What are the major issues you see in the State of Washington in the next five to ten years?

Well, my crystal ball has never been terribly clear, but there are a few things, some of which you have already heard about this morning. I think the possibility of stable and declining enrollment is probably the most important of the management and education problems that we face. A new type of management will be needed to deal with that situation. All the energies of management in higher education in the post World War II era have focused on matters of growth. These problems are no longer in evidence. Let me talk about a few of the problems I see related to that.

First, there is the question of tenure. Washington has the second highest proportion of tenured faculty in public higher education in the country. This means that in an environment where the bulk of retirements will not occur until after the year 2000, a gradual aging of the current staff will occur, and concerns about faculty and staff development and the maintenance of vitality with little new blood coming into the system will certainly arise. For those concerned about the interests of women and minorities in the system, there is a special problem because we now have large numbers of qualified people coming out of the graduate schools for whom there are no jobs.

The second problem is the reluctance of institutions to plan, even on a contingency basis, for declining enrollments. I think such planning is absolutely essential. Declining enrollment is always a problem that is
going to happen to someone else. It is going to require external pressure from the legislature and the Council for that type of planning to happen in this state.

Third, a more self-critical attitude at the institutional level is going to be needed in the near future. If there are not additional resources, faculty and students coming into the system through growth, the only way to maintain vitality will be through more precise sense of priorities and development of the management tools needed to reallocate internally. That approach to management is not very strong anywhere in the public sector; higher education is no exception.

Declining enrollments present a host of problems which are going to become fairly visible in the future. The questions from the earlier presentation (on enrollment projections) about the state's policy towards higher education clienteles and the extent to which there is a public interest in serving people of various age groups need to be addressed. Should those new consumers of educational services be subsidized through the same policies that have existed for the traditional college student? To what extent should such a subsidy continue? I don't know the answer to these questions, but I suggest that they are important. We have a system of funding off-campus instruction that is not terribly rational, because, in effect, it is a status of the faculty member teaching the course that determines whether the student will get a state subsidy in an off-campus course. I suspect we can do better than that. If funds are limited, there must be thought given to targeting the groups which there is some public purpose in serving. Perhaps people in areas such as Representative Burns mentioned earlier, or in the Tri-Cities where we have recommended off-campus programs, should be treated differently. There may be some benefit to targeting by income level in order to get people back into the work world by giving them the necessary education.
Some kind of targeting is essential unless the subsidy is to be provided across the board. Most of us agree there are some highly paid professions that we would not want to subsidize, and most of us also agree that certain subsidies are in the public interest. Many of these decisions are in a gray area and need to be addressed as public policy questions.

I think there will have to be some attention to stimulating more activity in the area of basic skills. This is becoming more of a concern because of declining test scores, et cetera. I have been trying to think about what the Council's role ought to be. The agency has no authority to tell anyone what to do, but it can still bring together all of the diverse groups that are going to have to work on this problem. It is a K-12 problem, because that is where the students are who aren't learning what they need to learn; but it is a higher education problem because we are training the teachers who are not, it would appear, teaching the students what they need to know.

The next issue is one I have already mentioned. I think the pressures toward more centralized governance will continue, and centralization will appear to be a simple answer to fiscal stringency. I think this is an issue that needs careful evaluation. I suggest here, as I have privately to some of you, that you start thinking seriously about how you would evaluate the present system and the alternatives to it. It is not an issue that is likely to go away.

Another issue that this state is going to have to deal with is that of consumer protection. Washington is a diploma mill state. We need not have heavy-handed regulations, but we do need basic protection for people in this age of the educational entrepreneurship. There needs to be some basic assurance that the school will be there, that its advertising claims are accurate, and that, at the least, records will be maintained.
Throughout the country, we need to look more at evaluation of instructional programs and find out more about what the state could do to stimulate these efforts aimed at determining what the effect of programs is on students in terms of occupation preparation and personal development.

I think we also need to look at greater integration of the public and private sector; (both the private four-year sector and the private proprietary sector) not in terms of bringing private education under more state control, but in terms of more cooperative arrangements. The possibility of contracting should be explored, especially when certain programs exist in the private sector which might not have to be started up in the public sector.

In a time of scarce resources, we need to emphasize more inter-institutional and even inter-state cooperation in order to concentrate resources so we can continue to provide the highest quality programs. The existence of Council of Presidents, an association with which I have been known to disagree with from time to time, has kept Washington as one of the few states where voluntary inter-institutional cooperation has not been driven out by the existence of the state coordinating board. I am sorry to see that the concept has not been carried further. On a programmatic basis, I don't see why that organization couldn't begin to think about greater cooperation in service to students.

I think as a final problem that we need to look at the whole process of enrollment-driven budgeting in a time of stable, probably declining, enrollment. In addition, we should try to improve and refine our formulas in terms of equity along the lines the Council has suggested. I don't have an alternative, but I think we need to recognize a certain historical imperative - growth - that drove the development of an enrollment-based budgeting systems in this and other states. There may be a better way to deal with the questions of formulas and
state funding that would maintain equity but not tie them so closely to enrollment that the incentives to the institutions are to try to grow or to plan on a growth that very probably won't be there.
C O M M I T T E E  R E P O R T

TO Faculty Senate

FROM Academic Affairs Committee

DATE February 14, 1978

RE Proposal for a 15-minute break between classes (Catherine Sands, Ass't. Dean of Student Development)

REFERENCE Academic Affairs Committee Report dated January 17, 1978, and Senate Motion No. 1696.

By motion No. 1696, the Senate asked for further information on two matters relating to the Committee's recommendation, namely: the legality of the recommendation, and the seriousness of the problem addressed by the recommendation.

The question of legality was put to Mr. Clarke, Assistant Attorney General for the University. His opinion is that, to give handicapped students the choice of leaving class 5 minutes early is "probably not illegal and probably legal" within the meaning of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

On the second matter, neither the Committee nor the office of the Dean of Student Development have been able to find adequate statistics concerning the number of physically handicapped students on the campus. According to EOP records, however, there are 75 handicapped students who qualify for vocational rehabilitation, so this is the minimum number. Furthermore, we do not know either the maximum time or the average time needed for handicapped students to move over the campus. We can only assume that something between 10 and 20 minutes is needed.

After further thought, the Committee believes that, in the circumstances, it would be best if the problem were dealt with on an individual basis, rather than by changing the schedule of classes campus-wide.

The Committee therefore would like to withdraw its previous motion (No. 1695) and make the following motion:

MOTION

That the Senate Chairman send a memorandum to the Faculty asking that in the classroom and in advising they be cognizant of the difficulties handicapped students may have in getting to class on time, and that suitable arrangements be worked out with each student as the need arises.
It is recommended that page 65 and 66 of Part VII of the Policies and Procedures Manual be revised as follows:

C. POLICIES RELATING TO STUDENT SERVICES

I. Student Personnel Committees--Coordinated by the Dean of Student Development Services

Several committees assist the Student Personnel Program. Members of the Student Personnel Division work independently with the Associated Students. Major policy recommendations coming from this work or from the committees listed below may be reviewed and forwarded to the President's Council, to the Faculty Senate, or other appropriate group for consideration or action.

Academic Standing Committee: (Re-definition of charge; change in number of faculty)

The Committee serves as a final appeal board for students who have been suspended from the University for academic difficulties. The Committee also reviews the academic progress of students receiving financial aid to determine if satisfactory academic progress warrants the continuation of financial aid.

12 faculty
5 students

Board of Academic Appeals: (No change)

The Board provides for the airing and redress of grievances with due processual guarantees for any student against any other student, or member of the faculty, staff or administration, or any faculty member against any student in matters concerning academic welfare.

5 faculty
5 students

Campus Judicial Council: (No change)

The Council is the highest tribunal in the campus judiciary hierarchy authorized to hear complaints against students and student organizations.

4 faculty
7 students

Joint Student Fees: (Change from reporting to Vice President of Academic Affairs to Dean of Student Development)

The Committee reviews budget requests from Joint Student Fee users, e.g., Samuelson Union Building, athletics, and the Board of Control (BOC). A preliminary budget is recommended to the Dean of Student Development who confers with the BOC before sending the budget via the President to the Board of Trustees for review and approval.

3 faculty
3 students
1 ex-officio -- Controller
Samuelson Union Board: (No change)
The Board assists the Dean of Student Development or his designee in recommending policy and program planning for the Samuelson Union Building (SUB). The Board provides an opportunity for student and faculty involvement regarding the operations of the SUB.
3 faculty
4 students
1 ex-officio -- Dean of Student Development or his designee

Student Financial Assistance: (No change)
The Committee facilitates procedures in processing student applications for loans, scholarships, and work assignments.
3 faculty
1 ex-officio -- Director of Financial Counseling and Financial Aid

Student Wage Committee: (Change from ad-hoc status to permanent committee)
The Committee recommends policies for student employment and wages to the Student Employment Office of Financial Counseling and Financial Aid.
1 faculty
1 student
4 staff members appointed by the Dean of Student Development or his designee
2 ex-officio -- Directors of Student Employment and Financial Counseling and Financial Aid
February 14, 1978

REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE ON STATUS OF ENERGY AT CWU

ORIGINS

Many people believe the United States now has an energy crisis and will soon face even more difficult problems for both energy supply and distribution.

The Pacific Northwest is very unique in that essentially all of the electrical energy used in the region is supplied by hydro dams. Sites for inexpensive hydro have largely been exhausted. This means that a rather sudden and dramatic change in energy use and/or energy supplies must be effected in the region. Proposals for alternatives are currently being considered. CWU has both an opportunity and some obligation to play a role in energy decision making. We may play a special role in meeting the need to extend the information into public schools.

For several years a rather substantial amount of relevant activity has been carried on at CWU. This is one of the reasons we were able to respond rapidly to the energy programs of government. For example in 1974 the Association of Students of Central and the Department of Geography co-hosted a conference on Alternatives in Agriculture which had more than 600 registered participants. A significant share of the conference was devoted to methods of reducing the dependence of agriculture on fossil fuels.

A number of people were involved in trying to establish some kind of educational program for alternatives: Jay Bachrach, Philosophy; Jeb Baldi, Continuing Education; and John Ressler, Geography, were among them. No formal program was launched at CWU but Environmental Studies did begin to offer a series of off-campus courses concerned with Energy in the Food System and strategies for reducing energy use. Several faculty members lecture in those courses. John Ressler offered a course in low energy living; Clint Duncan of the Department of Chemistry introduced Energy and the Environment, as a mini course.

Approximately at the same time Bob Bennett of the Physics Department proposed the development of an energy consulting service for home owners to help them conserve energy.
It is worth noting this was several years prior to the development of such a program at the Federal level. In addition, Dale Comstock spent a year with ERDA and Ken Hammond spent a sabbatical year studying energy options, energy futures and energy decision making in the Pacific Northwest. The development of Federal energy programs has stressed both the development of new sources of supply and conservation in the use of existing supplies. The role which CWU might play appears to be most closely related to the conservation of energy.

The Federal government created a conservation program under the Federal Energy Administration to assist industry in energy conservation. A new Department of Energy program for an Energy Extension Service to assist home owners and small businesses as well as certain institutions is currently in the process of being established.

It seems clear that numerous jobs are going to appear in the field of energy use and energy conservation. CWU is now offering and needs to become even better prepared to provide training in the field.

PROGRAMS AT CWU

A. When it was announced that a federally supported Energy Extension Service would be established on a pilot basis in 10 states, Larry Lowther, in the Grants Office, contacted interested staff members at CWU including John Ressler, Richard Mack, Jeb Baldi, Ken Hammond, Wayne Fairburn, Steve Worsley, Bob Bennett. Dale Comstock (then in D.C.) secured advanced information on the guidelines for proposal development. The group prepared a proposal and attended a meeting called by the State Energy Office for input into development of Washington's energy extension service proposal. The state of Washington was selected to receive one of the $1.1 million grants. WSU was designated the primary managing agency.

The program is concentrated in three areas of the state:

1. A portion of Spokane; 2. Portions of Seattle; and 3. Portions of Yakima County.

CWU is represented in the management of EES with Dale Comstock as a member of the statewide advisory committee to the state energy office; Clint Duncan, as a consortia member in Seattle, Bob Bennett in the Yakima consortia and Ken Hammond in Spokane.
CWU staff have proposed programs for sub-contracts in the EES to perform the following services:

1. to evaluate systems for auditing energy use in small businesses and to develop a new system which provides a more comprehensive energy audit including transportation and other energy demands in addition to the usual electrical energy;

2. to create courses to teach individuals to become professional and/or volunteer energy auditors and counselors for small businesses;

3. to work with financial institutions who provide one of the keys to making possible investments which will save energy;

4. to study the energy gains to be made through rationalizing transportation in the Yakima Valley, especially that of the public schools. A number of other projects are being attempted in other areas in which Central has some interest;

5. for the audiovisual and graphic production facilities of Central to play a major role in materials development for the energy extension program.

In addition, proposals are being solicited for what are called innovative high risk types of projects which, if they succeed, have potential for a high payoff and/or which could be applied fairly generally on a nationwide basis.

B. Central has a small contract with NORCUS to provide citizen workshops on energy conservation.

The workshops utilize an analog computer which simulates possible options for uses of energy and attempts to show what will happen if selected combinations of decisions are made.

Presenters in this program are Mack, Bennett, Comstock, Hammond.

C. Clint Duncan, Chemistry, and Bernie Martin, Dean of Natural Sciences, worked with the WSEO to set up a mobile display with a COSIP van. This display goes to public gatherings such as fairs. Duncan has also been active as a member of the Joint Scientific Committee of the Energy Research Center located at the UW.

D. The Department of Energy has given notice they intend to fund our summer workshop in energy concepts for high school teachers. The participants expenses will largely be paid by the grant.
The Project Director is Ken Hammond and the staff includes Clint Duncan and Bob Bennett.

E. Other proposals have been submitted but word has not yet been received on acceptance or rejection.

OTHER ACTIVITIES


A number of energy-related courses have already been developed or are proposed. Energy Systems in T & IE; Energy Economics in Economics & Business Administration; Low Energy Living in Geography; Energy in the Food System, Environmental Studies; Energy and the Environment in Chemistry. OCED will offer a summer short course on Energy Careers. New courses will be proposed for training of energy auditors.

A focus for all of this activity has been developed under the general title of Energy Studies Center. The center operates under the general supervision of Dale Comstock and has been both encouraged and supported by Dr. Harrington.

There appears to be considerable opportunity for individuals throughout the campus to participate in the development of instruction, research, and service in the field of energy. Numerous agencies are providing funding in the field. Support can be obtained from Jerry Jones and his staff in the Research Office. The field is open and participation would seem to be limited only by interest and energy. For example, Sun Day is being observed nationwide on May 3, a Wednesday. Appropriate activities could be incorporated across the campus.