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

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Peter Gries, Robert Lapen, Kathleen Morris, John Savage, and Eric Thurston.

Visitors Present: Jean Putnam, James Caesar, Don Schliesman, Phil Backlund, Ken Harsha and Dale Comstock.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

1) Under "Communications" add
   C. Letter from Ed Harrington, dated October 20, 1981.

2) Under "Old Business" delete
   A. Withdrawal Policy.
   This item had been placed on the agenda at the request of Larry Lawrence, and he has since requested it be deferred until a later date.

3) Under "New Business" add
   A. Academic Affairs Committee Report on Program Review and Evaluation.
   B. Academic Affairs Committee Report on Senate Size and Representation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION NO. 2065: Mr. Vleck moved, seconded by Mr. Lillard, that the minutes of October 7, 1981 be approved. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

COMMUNICATIONS

A. Memo from Jerry O'Gorman, dated October 13, 1981, transmitting a copy of the Phased Retirement for Faculty plan as approved by the CWU Board of Trustees. This new program is now available to all eligible CWU faculty. Application for phased retirement should be made in the same manner as for regular full retirement. The possibility for reduced teaching time should be discussed with the prospective retiree's department chairman and dean.

B. Letter from Charles McGehee, Chairman of the Board of Academic Appeals, dated June 12, 1981, and received in the Senate office October 19, 1981, transmitting a comprehensive revision of the Rules Governing the Board of Academic Appeals for Senate consideration.

C. Letter from Vice President-Harrington, dated October 20, 1981, requesting that the Senate disregard his letter of September 22 regarding the "Withdrawal Policy" which is clearly misleading as it represents the "action" of the COAD. The intent of the letter was a recommendation to the Faculty Senate for a change in the proposed policy. No change in the present policy will be made until the issue is resolved, although he hopes the new policy can be implemented in the Winter Quarter, 1982.

CURRICULUM

A. University Curriculum Committee proposals, pages 597 through 600.
   1. Page 597
      a) DRAMA -- COURSE ADDITION
         DR 330. Theatre Management. (4)
2. Pages 598 and 599
   a) MILITARY SCIENCE -- PROGRAM ADDITION
      BACHELOR OF SCIENCE
      MILITARY SCIENCE MAJOR

3. Pages 599 and 600
   a) MILITARY SCIENCE -- COURSE ADDITIONS

   ML S 101. The Army Officer. (1).
   ML S 102. Smallbore Rifle Marksmanship. (1).
   ML S 211. Land Navigation. (1).
   ML S 212. Leadership Laboratory. (1).
   ML S 310. Military Science and Tactics. (3).
   ML S 311. Military Science and Tactics. (3).
   ML S 312. Military Science and Tactics. (3).
   ML S 412. Military Science and Tactics. (2).

MOTION NO. 2066. Mr. Brunner moved, seconded by Ms. Schactler, that the above course proposals, pages 597 through 600, be approved. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

REPORTS

A. Chairman--Meetings attended as a representative of the Faculty Senate:

   1) Budget Advisory--Some items discussed at the meeting were:
      Charging students for copies of transcripts; charging departments or programs for postage used. No action was taken.
   2) COAD--Some items of discussion were:
      The request of Jean Putnam for a change in the current summer session from nine to eight weeks;
      the lack of consistency in contact hours in certain courses, particularly off-campus courses and workshops.
   3) Other Universities--GWU and the other universities have been exchanging minutes of their senate meetings. These minutes are in the Faculty Senate office and anyone who wishes to look at them may do so. Mr. Tolman noted he finds them interesting, particularly in regard to the types of action being taken on the budget crunch and types of recommendations they are making, although their involvement is very different from CWU's.
   4) Meeting with Jerry Jones--Mr. Jones is requesting the support of the Senate in his work with legislative liaison officers of the other four-year institutions in attempting to make a concerted effort during the two weeks preceding the initiation of the legislative session to influence legislators. That group will be contacting every group possible that would be sympathetic to the cause of higher education and attempting to get individuals in those groups to contact legislators. Faculty will also be encouraged to contact legislators either by letter, or the hot line or any other means in support of higher education.
   5) Legislative Hearing--There will be a legislative hearing open to the public in Yakima at the Yakima County Court House on Friday, October 23, at 5 p.m. Mr. Tolman encouraged anyone that could attend to do so.

B. Executive Committee Report--

   1) The Executive Committee has been meeting with Vice President Harrington and is now meeting with the Deans regarding the lay-off process. In that regard, all faculty will be receiving soon a letter asking for faculty input to the Executive Committee as to any suggestions which they think might be useful in preparing such a plan.
2) The Executive Committee is recommending Gerald Brunner to replace Wayne Klemin on the Senate Curriculum Committee.

MOTION NO. 2067: Mr. Pratz moved, seconded by Mr. Dugan, that the Senate ratify the appointment of Gerald Brunner to the Senate Curriculum Committee. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

C. Standing Committees--
1. Academic Affairs--Corwin King, Chairman, discussed the report distributed at this meeting by the Academic Affairs Committee regarding the charge to them to review the request of Jean Putnam, Director of Summer Session, to modify the length of the 1982 Summer Session by shortening the full summer session from nine weeks to eight, and to shorten the first and second sessions from four and a half weeks to four. The committee recommends that the Senate endorse the modification for a one-year trial period. It recommends further that following the 1982 Summer Session, a review of the modified session's effectiveness be conducted by the Summer Session Office and reported to the Senate, with future approval of the modified session to be contingent upon these results.

MOTION NO. 2068: Mr. King moved, seconded by Mr. Dugan, to adopt the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee.

Betty Putnam was present to provide background information and to answer questions.

A great deal of discussion ensued in opposition to the recommendation.

Motion No. 2068 passed by a roll call vote of 18 aye, 9 nay, and 3 abstentions, as follows:


Abstain: F. Bovos, S. Worsley, and R. Jones.

2. Budget Committee--No report.

3. Code Committee--Mr. Lawrence noted that the new Faculty Code is in the process of being prepared by the President's office and should be available in two weeks.

4. Curriculum Committee--No report. Mr. Tolman remarked that the Senate office is in the process of preparing a draft of the Curriculum Guide with revisions adopted by the Senate last year. The matter of open-ended courses is still pending and will be a charge to the Curriculum Committee this year.

5. Personnel Committee--No report.

D. CFR--Ken Harsha presented a report on CFR activities. He noted that the new Chairman for 1981-82 will be Mark McDermott from UW. The CFR met at the University of Washington on October 3, 1981. It was decided at that meeting that the CFR should develop and distribute a news release statewide regarding the 10.1 percent budget cuts. Main focus of the news release would be on student access, quality of education, public service programs and corporate recruiting.

Barbara Vanderkolk, Northwest Regional Consultants, employed by AAUP as a lobbyist in Olympia, and by the Faculty Council at WSU, was present at the meeting and discussed with the CFR legislative strategies and stated that she felt the CFR should make a public statement relative to the budget cuts. It was proposed that the CFR consider joining AAUP and the Faculty Council at WSU in providing financial support for a lobbyist in Olympia. Each CFR delegation was asked to recommend that its Senate consider retaining a lobbyist through private faculty donations of perhaps $1 to $2 per paycheck for lobbying purposes, to be put into a private account established for receipt and distribution of funds. They are asking for some feedback on the suggestion.
NEW BUSINESS

A. Academic Affairs Committee report on Program Review & Evaluation—Although this report had been presented to the Senate this Spring, the matter was deferred, and copies of the report were again distributed at this meeting. Corwin King reviewed the report, providing background information, and noted that the committee concluded that while the policy of the program review is generally good, the procedures are in need of improvement. The committee recommends, therefore, that all reviews now in process be suspended until a revised set of procedures is approved by the administration and accepted by the Senate, and a new, more realistic schedule for reviews is established. If the procedures proposed by the Program Review & Evaluations Committee are adopted, and dates are changed in the current schedule, this could be accomplished with a minimal delay in continuing the review.

MOTION NO. 2069: Mr. King moved, seconded by Mr. Lillard, that the Senate approve the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee that all reviews now in process be suspended until a revised set of procedures is approved by the administration and accepted by the Senate, and a new, more realistic schedule for reviews is established. Passed by a unanimous voice vote and no abstentions.

B. Academic Affairs Committee report on Consideration of the Senate Size and Representation—This report was presented to the Senate last May, but was tabled at that time. Copies of the report were distributed at this meeting, again, and Corwin King provided background information on the proposal. The size of the Senate and its method of representation were studied, responding to concerns that the Senate has grown too large for a truly deliberative body. A survey was conducted among all faculty members on possible alternatives to the present system, and the committee concluded that a reduction in Senate size might be desirable. The committee recommends, therefore, that the Senate adopt option "B" in the survey: Reduce the Senate size to twenty-five with proportional representation from each school, with each school faculty electing its own Senators. It recommends further that, if adopted, the Senate Executive Committee be empowered to determine the appropriate number of Senate positions per school, arrange for elections, and propose the necessary changes (under Senate Membership) in the Faculty Code and Senate By-Laws.

MOTION NO. 2070: Mr. King moved, seconded by Mr. Pratz, that the Senate approve the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee.

Considerable discussion ensued.

MOTION NO. 2071: Mr. Vlcek moved to amend, seconded by Mr. Jones, to delete the last sentence, after the word "Senators."

More discussion ensued. It was agreed by consensus that the term school meant unit and that all faculty would be part of a unit with Senate representation.

Motion No. 2071, to amend, was then withdrawn by Mr. Vlcek and Mr. Jones.

Motion No. 2070 was voted on and passed by a majority hand vote.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

The next Senate meeting will be November 4, 1981, at 3:10 p.m., in SUB 204-205.
AGENDA
REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, October 21, 1981
SUB 204-205

I ROLL CALL

II CHANGES TO AGENDA

III APPROVAL OF MINUTES of October 7, 1981

IV COMMUNICATIONS
A. Memo from Jerry O'Gorman, dated October 13, 1981

V CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
A. University Curriculum Committee proposals, pages 597 through 600

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

VII OLD BUSINESS
A. WITHDRAWAL POLICY

VIII NEW BUSINESS

IX ADJOURNMENT
### 1981-82

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF  **Oct 21, 1981**

ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATOR</th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bovos, Fran</td>
<td>Trudy Rodine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs, Kenneth</td>
<td>Karen Jenison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunner, Gerald</td>
<td>Galer Beed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanton, Thomas</td>
<td>Thomas Blanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzler, Lillian</td>
<td>Larry Wald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Frank</td>
<td>Calvin Greatsinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Robert</td>
<td>Barney Erickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugan, John</td>
<td>David Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan, Clint</td>
<td>John Meany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eickhoff, Henry</td>
<td>Ray Wheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Betty</td>
<td>Jim Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouts, Roger</td>
<td>Patrick O'Shaughnessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gries, Peter</td>
<td>Larry Sparks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossman, George</td>
<td>Sidney Nesselroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinthorne, James</td>
<td>Jan Reinhartsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Robert</td>
<td>Don Ringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaatz, Martin</td>
<td>Makiko Doi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr, Tom</td>
<td>Ken Hammond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Corwin</td>
<td>Robert Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klemin, V. Wayne</td>
<td>Roger Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapen, Robert</td>
<td>Connie Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, Larry</td>
<td>John Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillard, Clair</td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Kathleen</td>
<td>Richard Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylander, Jim</td>
<td>Wells McInelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, James</td>
<td>Stan Sorenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratz, Owen</td>
<td>Max Zwnaiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramedell, Daniel</td>
<td>Larry Lowther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage, John</td>
<td>Marco Bicchieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sands, Catherine</td>
<td>Kenneth Cory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schactler, Carolyn</td>
<td>Patrick O'Shaughnessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillman, George</td>
<td>Nancy Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston, Eric</td>
<td>Peter Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolman, Rosco</td>
<td>William Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utzinger, John</td>
<td>Ed Golden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlcek, Charles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsley, Stephen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chris Day ASC rep.*
VISITORS PLEASE SIGN

Jan Petruco
James McLean
Dorothy Listerman
Phil Backlund
Jim Peterson
Ken Harsha

PLEASE RETURN TO THE FACULTY SENATE SECRETARY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATOR</th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Ramsdell</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Larry Lowther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Brunner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Galer Beed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hinthorne</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Eickhoff</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran Bovos</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Kaatz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint Duncan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Utzinger</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Sands</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corwin King</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Grossman</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Stillman</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Blanton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dean</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Thurston</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Lawrence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Fratz</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Carlson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hawkins</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max Zwanziger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calvin Greatsinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Fouts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Betty Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Worsley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Larry Sparks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Klemin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Vicek</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Nylander</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Savage</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kerr</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lapen</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Schactler</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clair Lillard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Briggs</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Canzler</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dugan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gries</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosco Tolman</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roll Call Vote**

Motion 2068

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 13, 1981

TO: Donald L. Garrity, President  
    Edward J. Harrington, V. P. for Academic Affairs  
    Courtney S. Jones, V. P. for Business & Financial Affairs  
    Deans Applegate, Danton, Schneider, Williams  
    Academic Department Chairmen  
    Chairman, Faculty Senate  
    Members of the Retirement & Insurance Committee

FROM: Jerry J. O'Gorman, Benefits Administrator

SUBJECT: Phased Retirement for Faculty

Attached please find a copy of the PHASED RETIREMENT FOR FACULTY plan as approved by the CWU Board of Trustees.

This new program is now available to all eligible CWU faculty. The basic provisions governing the program are as stated in the attached document.

Application for phased retirement should be made in the same manner as for regular full retirement. The possibility for reduced teaching time should be discussed with the prospective retiree's department chairman and dean. I will be happy to answer any questions concerning the impact of phased retirement on retirement income benefits and insurance coverages.

Please feel free to contact me if I can be of any help in interpreting the provisions of the program. I will also be happy to meet with any department that would like to discuss phased retirement as a department meeting agenda item.

JJO/cak

ENCL.

cc: Wadell D. Snyder, Director  
    Personnel & Benefits
PHASED RETIREMENT FOR FACULTY

1. At, or after, age 62 and until age 70, a faculty member may elect to reduce his service to the University by entering a phased retirement program. The faculty member may continue teaching up to 40% of an academic year teaching load in his respective discipline(s). For this policy, 40% is considered to be 15 contact hours per academic year.

2. The faculty member will be paid on a pro-rated basis of his adjusted salary as he completes his assignment.

3. During his phased retirement, the retiree’s salary will be adjusted in accordance with any general salary increases that are subsequently provided to the faculty at large.

4. The decision to teach part-time (as noted in 1 above), once made, shall continue for each retiree to age 70, or until such time as the retiree declines to continue. A decision by the retiree to discontinue the program at any point shall be final.

5. The phased-retiree shall exercise his option to teach the following academic year by March of each year. Failure to notify the school/college dean by this date will indicate to the University that the retiree releases all rights to the phased retirement program and shall be considered fully retired from Central Washington University. Failure to exercise the option by reason of illness shall not prejudice the retiree’s right to his option up to age 70, provided that his incapacity is verified in writing by a medical doctor and that the University may require a medical examination by a medical doctor of its choosing. In case of disagreement, the retiree will abide by the ruling of the medical doctor selected by the University.

6. During phased retirement, the retiree shall retain all the tenure and seniority privileges he had at the time of retirement. He shall not be excused from any performance standards applied to the faculty at large, except as provided herein.

7. The phased-retiree shall be required to meet all the obligations of classroom teaching, including holding office hours, but he shall not be required to perform other duties such as research, public service, service on departmental and other university committees and acceptance of special assignments.

8. The University academic administrators will make every effort to arrange teaching schedules to accommodate the reduced loads and personal plans of the phased-retiree’s right to teach up to 40% (15 contact hours) per academic year in his discipline(s).

9. The specific teaching assignments (courses) and schedules for the ensuing quarters shall be mutually agreed to by the phased-retiree, the department chairman (or program director) and the appropriate school/college dean at least six (6) months prior to the first day of instruction of each fall quarter; provided that, in case no agreement can be reached, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall rule on the matter.

10. Office space and general secretarial and other services shall be provided to the phased-retiree as are provided to full-time faculty.

11. According to the policies of the State Employees’ Insurance Board, phased-retirees may be eligible to continue, on a self-pay basis, certain group insurance coverages and/or to enroll in the retiree medical and life insurance plans.

12. Other fringe benefits shall continue for the phased-retiree according to the policies of Central Washington University.

13. Should a faculty member select a phased retirement option prior to age 65, retirement benefits shall be actuarially reduced from age 65 benefits.

NOTE: Application for phased retirement should be made as for regular retirement - written notice to department chairman at least 9 months prior to anticipated date of retirement.
June 12, 1981

Professor Larry Lawrence
Chairman
Faculty Senate
CWU Campus

Dear Professor Lawrence:

The Board of Academic Appeals, in cooperation with Dr. Greg Trujillo, Associate Dean of Students, has prepared a comprehensive revision of the Rules Governing the Board of Academic Appeals. On June 11, 1981, the Board voted to recommend to the Faculty Senate adoption of these rules, and, accordingly, a copy is enclosed for your consideration. If you have any questions, please call me.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Charles L. McGehee, Chairman
Board of Academic Appeals

CLM: fj
Dr. Rosco Tolman  
Chairman, Faculty Senate  
CWU, Campus  

Dear Dr. Tolman:

Thank you for discussing the "Withdrawal Policy" with me. Please disregard my letter of September 22, 1981, which is clearly misleading as it represents the "action" of COAD.

The intent of the letter was to suggest that reservations have been expressed regarding the use of the letter grade "E" in the withdrawal process.

The suggested emendations* are intended as a recommendation to the Faculty Senate for a change in the proposed policy. I would be pleased to learn the Senate's reaction to the proposed change.

Obviously no change in the present policy will be made until the issue is resolved, although I would hope the new policy can be implemented in the Winter Quarter, 1982.

Sorry for the confusion.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

* A student may make an uncontested withdrawal from a course through the end of the second full week of class. Between the beginning of the third and the end of the fifth full week a student may withdraw with the signature of the instructor and will receive either a "WF" or a "WE".

Withdrawals after the fifth full week will be allowed only in cases of extreme hardship. A student wishing to withdraw during this period must present a written petition to the Dean of Admissions and Records, with a copy to the instructor. If the Dean of Admissions and Records determines that there are extenuating circumstances, the student will receive a "WP" or a "WE".
DRAMA

COURSE ADDITION

MILITARY SCIENCE

PROGRAM ADDITION

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE
MILITARY SCIENCE MAJOR

The major in military science is designed to give the interested student the necessary military science background for a career in the military. Students selecting the military science major are also required to complete a second major that is to be completed in conjunction with the military science major. Selection of this major will therefore provide both background for a career in the military and academic knowledge gained via a second major.

Corr

ML S 101, The Army Officer ..... 1
ML S 102, Principles of Rifle Marksmanship ..... 1
ML S 210, Military Science and Tactics ..... 2
ML S 211, Principles of Land Navigation ..... 1
ML S 310, Military Science and Tactics ..... 3
ML S 311, Military Science and Tactics ..... 3
ML S 312, Military Science and Tactics ..... 3
ML S 390, Army ROTC Advanced Camp ..... 3
ML S 410, Military Science and Tactics ..... 4
ML S 411, Military Science and Tactics ..... 4
ML S 412, Military Science and Tactics ..... 4

Required Supporting Courses

CRJ 297, Introduction to Communication Studies ..... 3
POSC 441, U.S. Foreign Policy ..... 5
POSC 210, American Government ..... 5
HIST 314, American Military History ..... 5
MG 380, Organizational Management ..... 4
PSY 326, Social Psychology ..... 4

Select 16 credits with advisement from the courses listed below.

ENG 310, Technical Writing ..... 4
SOC 307, The Individual and Society ..... 5
MG 385, Organizational Theory ..... 5
MILITARY SCIENCE  B.S. MILITARY SCIENCE MAJOR - Continued

GEOG 346, Political Geography  ...  4
SOC 340, Social Interaction  ...  5
PHIL 302, Ethics  ...  5

TOTAL  ...  15

*May not meet both General Education and Major requirements.
This class has a prerequisite of PSY 101.

COURSE ADDITIONS

ML S 101. The Army Officer. (1). An orientation to the military
life. Relationship of academic majors and minors to Army officer
skills, jobs and general life style.

ML S 102. Smallbore Rifle Marksmanship. (1). Designed to provide
an understanding of the origin and evolution of firearms; proper
handling and safety of weapons; interrelated aspects of positions and
techniques in smallbore rifle marksmanship; discussion of marks-
manship; discussion of marksmanship philosophy, p sychology and
development of psychomotor skills. Open to any student.

ML S 210. Military Science and Tactics. (2). Prerequisite, ML S 101
or equivalent. An introduction to basic skills of value to the
soldier. Four hours of laboratory.

ML S 211. Land Navigation. (1). Prerequisite, ML S 101 or permission
of instructor. Principles of land navigation and orienteering with
practical field applications.

ML S 212. Leadership Laboratory. (1). Prerequisite, 101, 102 and
permission of instructor. Practical experience in leadership and
basic military skills. May be repeated.


ML S 310. Military Science and Tactics. (3). Prerequisite, ML S 101,
102 and 211, or permission of department chairman. Military
methods of instruction, first aid, weapons, communications, and
advanced land navigation. Prepare the student for Advanced Camp.
Required for commissioning.
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MILITARY SCIENCE

ML S 311. Military Science and Tactics. (3). Prerequisite, ML S 310 or permission of department chairman. Branches of the Army, small unit leadership techniques, and small unit tactics. Prepares the student for Advanced Camp. Required for commissioning.

ML S 312. Military Science and Tactics. (3). Prerequisite, 311 or permission of department chairman. Small unit tactics, land navigation, techniques of fire support and review of military skills. Prepares the student for Advanced Camp. Required for commissioning.


PROPOSAL ON CHANGE IN SUMMER SESSION

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Academic Affairs Committee
DATE: October 21, 1981

The committee was asked to review the request of Jean Putnam, Director of Summer Session, to modify the length of the 1982 Summer Session. The modification proposed is to shorten the full Summer Session from nine weeks to eight, and to shorten the first and second sessions from four-and-a-half weeks to four. This would involve changes in the time schedule for classes and changes in the lengths of class sessions, as described in the memo from the Summer Session Office to all faculty and administrators dated October 2.

The rationale for the modification is, essentially, that it would make it easier for returning teachers to take Summer Session classes, and so might boost Summer Session enrollments. The major drawback appears to be the effect it would have on five and six-credit classes offered either first or second session. The compression of these classes into four weeks would add another 30 minutes per day to class meetings, making them run two-and-a-half hours daily, and could limit the number of classes a student could take due to overlaps.

We have discussed this matter with Jean Putnam, and with the heads of most of the departments which offered five/six-credit classes last summer. The consensus of opinion is that while the shortened sessions could pose some problems, they are nothing that could not be resolved. The number of five and six-credit classes is relatively small (about 6% of those offered last summer), and many could be offered for the full session if departments desired. Further, many Summer Session students (about 50% of those attending last summer) carry loads of less than nine credits, and so would probably not take more than one or two classes per session.

The general feeling of those surveyed appears to be "neutral" towards a modified Summer Session. Few are strongly opposed or in favor of it, regarding it more as an administrative decision than a faculty one. The most common reaction, it seems, is that if it is something the Summer Session Office wants to do, let's try it for a year and see what happens.

RECOMMENDATION

The committee itself is divided on the proposal. Three members are in favor of it, one is opposed, and one could not be reached for an opinion. By a majority vote, therefore, the committee recommends that the Senate endorse the modification for a one-year trial period. It recommends further that following the 1982 Summer Session, a review of the modified session's effectiveness be conducted by the Summer Session Office and reported to the Senate, with future approval of the modified session to be contingent on these results.
PROPOSAL ON SENATE SIZE AND REPRESENTATION

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Academic Affairs Committee

DATE: May 6, 1981

The committee was charged to consider the size of the Senate and its method of representation, in response to a concern that the Senate has grown too large for a deliberative body. There are thirty-eight Senators presently, and more than ten percent of the faculty are Senators. Further, in the interest of having every voice heard, unequal representation has been accepted; a department of one has a Senator, as does a department of fifteen. It was felt that a smaller number of Senators, with each representing a more equal number of faculty, might function more efficiently and effectively.

The committee elected to survey the faculty for its opinion on the matter. A brief questionnaire was distributed, listing four possible options:

A. Reduce the Senate size to twenty-five and have all Senators elected at-large, with at least three to come from each school.

B. Reduce the Senate size to twenty-five, with proportional representation from each School, with each school faculty electing its own Senators.

C. Reduce the Senate size to twenty-five, with large departments represented by their own Senators and smaller departments combined for purposes of electing Senators.

D. Retain the present size and system of representation.

Respondents were asked to rank these options from one to four, one being first choice. The results of the survey, with 138 persons reporting, are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Row and column numbers do not always total 138 as several respondents ranked fewer than four options.
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The return rate on the survey was "modest" (less than 50%), which may suggest that the majority of the faculty is indifferent to the size of the Senate and its method of representation. On the other hand, nearly 75% of those who did return the survey favored a reduction in Senate size. The least popular option seemed to be "A", the most popular seemed to be "B". A few respondents suggested that the size should be smaller than 25, perhaps as low as fifteen or twenty.

The committee believes that a reduction in Senate size might be desirable. The figure of twenty-five is somewhat arbitrary, though a figure much lower than this could create problems in staffing Senate Standing Committees and the Executive Committee. Regardless, a smaller number of Senators might be able to work together more closely to accomplish Senate business. If Senators were chosen from Schools rather than departments, it might encourage those who are most concerned about the Senate to serve. More important, it might encourage interdepartmental cooperation, and make the Senate a more genuine faculty body as opposed to a forum for special interests.

The committee recommends, therefore, that the Senate adopt option "B" in the survey: Reduce the Senate size to twenty-five, with proportional representation from each school, with each school faculty electing its own Senators. It recommends further that, if adopted, the Senate Executive Committee be empowered to determine the appropriate number of Senate positions per school, arrange for elections, and propose the necessary changes (under Senate Membership) in the Faculty Code and Senate By-laws.
The committee was asked to investigate the matter of program review and evaluation, in response to concerns that it consumes a great deal of faculty time and energy which might be more usefully employed elsewhere. Questions have been raised about the need for this activity, and especially about the process for carrying it out. Following are the committee's findings.

Background Information

In the Spring of 1977, a procedure for reviewing and evaluating undergraduate academic programs was approved by the Senate. A Program Review and Evaluation Committee (PREC), a standing committee of the Undergraduate Council, was created to administer it. The ultimate aim of the review was to make recommendations, through the Undergraduate Council, to the Senate on the continuation, discontinuation, or probation of academic programs. The review was initiated in response to the intentions of the Council on Postsecondary Education to begin reviewing undergraduate programs. It was felt that it would be to the university's advantage to develop its own review system rather than have one imposed on it by an external agency.

Subsequently, (Fall, 1978) the review was modified to include graduate as well as undergraduate programs, the jurisdiction of the PREC was changed from the Undergraduate Council to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the policy of making recommendations to the Senate on the status of programs was dropped. Under the current system, (Winter, 1980) the PREC's final report is submitted to the appropriate academic dean, with copies to the Vice President and reviewed department.

The basic procedure for the review, however, has remained the same: Departments compile various kinds of documentary material on their programs, and written evaluation reports are completed by both internal faculty review committees and external consultants. These are forwarded to the PREC, together with a survey of recent departmental graduates by Testing and Evaluation. All academic areas are subject to review every five years, according to a schedule developed by the PREC.

Current Situation

The first reviews began in the Spring of 1979 with four departments: accounting, biological sciences, English, and history. To date, only two of those reviews (biological sciences and history) have been completed. A second round of reviews of four more departments was scheduled to begin in the Spring of
1980. To date, those reviews have barely been started. A third round of re­
views, to begin in the Fall of 1980, has been indefinitely postponed. Clear­
ly, the reviews are way behind schedule, and it is taking much longer to 
complete them than anticipated.

There have also been doubts expressed about the value of the reviews that 
are finished. Apparently, there is some confusion about the purpose of the 
reviews, i.e., who is to see them and what is to be done with them. Members 
of one reviewed department claim that they were not even aware that they 
were being reviewed and were never consulted. Further, members of the internal 
faculty review committee for one department have questioned the wisdom of 
having non-experts in an academic area attempt to evaluate the area. Finally, 
uncertainty exists about the administration's role in, and commitment to, the 
reviews. Presently, the Vice President for Academic Affairs meets with the 
PREC just once a year, and the role of the deans seems similarly limited.

The committee has discussed these issues with the PREC, and with the Deans 
of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies. All feel that the reviews are useful, 
though they admit that the review process could be improved. The PREC has 
recently revised the guidelines for the review in response to this.

Discussion and Recommendation

The committee believes that the policy of the review is generally good. Per­
iodic reviews of academic programs are of value to the entire university com­
munity as well as the individual departments, and they have traditionally been 
part of a university faculty's responsibility. The committee also believes, 
however, that the current review procedures are vague, cumbersome, and possi­
bly ineffective. The revisions suggested by the PREC may remedy these problems, 
as they considerably streamline the procedures and shorten the time necessary 
for conducting them. Still, it is unlikely that the current schedule for re­
views can be met under any circumstances.

The committee recommends, therefore, that all reviews now in process be sus­
pended until a revised set of procedures is approved by the administration and 
accepted by the Senate, and a new, more realistic schedule for reviews is es­
tablished. If the procedures proposed by the PREC are adopted, and dates are 
changed in the current schedule, this could be accomplished with a minimal de­
lay in continuing the reviews.