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MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 15 October 1975
Presiding Officer: David Lygrc, Chairman
Recording Secretary: Esther Peterson

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except Rosella Dickson, Stan Dudley, John Gregor, Charles Hawkins, Paul Kuroiwa.


AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman suggested the following changes:

1. Under "Communications" add
   C. Letter from David Anderson
   D. Letter from Robert Dean
   E. Letter from Bob Yee
   F. Letter from James Alexander
   G. Letter from Paul Kuroiwa
   H. Letter from Curt Wiberg
   I. Letter from Mary Ellen Matson

2. Under "Reports" delete
   C. Vice President

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

A. Letter from Dale Otto informing the Senate that WCECE will elect a Senator to represent their department as soon as possible.

B. Letter from Charles McGehee regarding the withdrawal grading policy. This has been referred to the Curriculum Committee.

C. Letter from David Anderson submitting his resignation as a Faculty Senator.

D. Letter from Mr. Dean, chairman of the Department of Mathematics, announcing that the department has declined to select another representative.

E. Letter from Mr. Yee, chairman of the Political Science Department, submitting a Resolution that the department has confidence in its elected representatives.

F. Letter from James Alexander, chairman of the Anthropology Department, concerning the role of the Senate and stating their vote of confidence in the current senator and alternate.

G. Letter from Paul Kuroiwa, director of the Ethnic Studies Program, stating that he has been elected a senator and Don Woodcock has been elected as alternate to represent the Ethnic Studies program.

H. Letter from Curt Wiberg, Biological Sciences Department, stating they had passed a motion concerning the reorganization of the Faculty Senate and that the Biology staff wishes their current senator to serve.
I. Letter from Mary Ellen Matson, chairperson of the Early Childhood Education Personnel Committee, announcing that Rosella Dickson will be the senator and Margaret Lawrence will be the alternate for their department.

REPORTS

A. Chairman's Report--Mr. Lygre welcomed the newly elected Senators. He expressed regret at the resignation of David Anderson as a Senate representative for the Mathematics Department.

The information Mr. Lygre has received so far regarding an appeal of Judge Baker's ruling on the Code is that the NSP and AAUP have decided not to appeal. No decision on this matter has been reached by the AFT.

Mr. Lygre reminded the Senators of the draft on postsecondary education which has been developed by the CPE. There will be a meeting on October 21 at 1:00 in Sub 204-205 to discuss that draft.

The Board of Trustees meeting has been changed from October 17 to October 31 and November 1.

B. Executive Committee--Mr. Bennett reported that Wolfgang Franz has been appointed as a member of the Council of Faculty Representatives.

A matter needing action by the Senate is the appointment of faculty members to the Board of Academic Appeals. This Board is charged with providing 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.

MOTION NO. 1316: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Mr. McQuarrie, that Roger Stewart, Ronald Boles, G. W. Beed, Paul LeRoy and Mary Ellen Matson be appointed to serve on the Board of Academic Appeals. Voted on and passed with a majority voice vote.

Mr. Bennett reported that another committee which the Senate needs to elect is the Faculty Grievance Committee, which was established in the new Code. The Executive Committee is not yet ready to recommend these appointments but would welcome suggestions as to people who might serve on this committee.

Under the new Code there is a need for two additional at-large senators. Business and Economics will be qualified to nominate three candidates for one position. The departments of English and Music are equally qualified to select three candidates for the other at-large position. Therefore both of these departments are being asked to jointly nominate three candidates. Another committee which needs to be ratified by the Senate is the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Organizational Structure.

MOTION NO. 1317: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Mr. Jakubek, that Ross Byrd, Clint Duncan, Ham Howard, Allen Gulezian, Tom Kerr and Martin Kautz be appointed to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Organizational Structure. Voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

C. Standing Committees

1. Budget Committee--David Anderson, former chairman of the committee, reported that the committee had met and he gave them some recommendations regarding their charge. They will be meeting again soon and will be electing a new chairman.

2. Code Committee--Ms. Lester reported that the committee has met. She presented their meeting schedule for review of the Code. She would like written Code amendment suggestions that they can consider at these meetings.

3. Curriculum Committee--Mr. Jakubek reported that the committee has been charged with bringing a recommendation to the Senate regarding reorganization of the Department of Communication and Mass Media. This reorganization has already been done.
MOTION NO. 1318: Mr. Jakubek moved, seconded by Ms. Young that the Senate approve the merger of the Mass Media and Communications program as proposed in a letter dated October 6, 1975 from Dean Housley to Mr. Harrington and with the understanding that Speech is to be moved into Allied Health Science Program area. Voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

4. Student Affairs--No report at this meeting.

5. Personnel Committee--No report at this meeting.

D. Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators. Warren Street presented the Report which had been attached to the Agenda for this meeting.

MOTION NO. 1319: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Ms. Hileman, that the Senate adopt the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators.

There was considerable discussion on the Report.

MOTION NO. 1320: Mr. Winters moved, seconded by Mr. Keith, to amend the motion to say the Senate accepts and endorses the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators, but recommends that no college-wide evaluation be imposed.

Mr. McQuarrie called for a point of order on whether the amendment is to the motion itself or whether it is changing the motion.

The chair ruled that the amendment was out of order.

MOTION NO. 1321: Mr. Applegate moved, seconded by Mr. Jakubek, to amend by including the following changes to the report:

On Page 13, item 3, in the second sentence, the word "adopted" be replaced with the words "examined as a possible model;" Item 6, line 2, instead of the word "followed," insert "examine carefully before acceptance;" Item 7, line 2, between the word "his" and "evaluation" insert the word "current;" and in Item 7, third line, add "delete or" between "will" and "add" and insert as Item 1, with the numbers of the other recommendations increased by one, the following statement: "Information collected shall be used only for improved instructional or administrative practices."

Motion No. 1321 was voted on and failed with a majority hand vote of 10 Aye, 15 Nay, and several abstentions.

There was considerable discussion on the main motion.

MOTION NO. 1322: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Mr. Synnes, for the previous question.

Motion No. 1319 was voted on by roll call vote:


Nay: John Vifian, Richard Dui, Beverly Heckart.

Abstain: Roger Winters, Nancy Lester.

Motion No. 1319 passed with 22 Aye, 3 Nay, and 2 Abstain.

E. Report from President Brooks--Mr. Brooks presented a brief report on what is happening regarding the legislature. He said the Council of Presidents have been actively at work during the summer. They have asked the committees that report to them to work on a number of issues including faculty salaries. Everybody seems concerned about Initiative 314 and whether or not it will pass. This will have an impact on legislative appropriations for the college. The Committee of 1,000 is no longer operating on the matter of salaries. A new Committee is being formed-- a Committee on Higher Education.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.
AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, Oct. 15, 1975
Room 471, Psychology Building

I. ROLL CALL

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

III. COMMUNICATIONS
   A. Letter from Dale Otto
   B. Letter from Charles McGehee

IV. REPORTS
   A. Chairperson
   B. Executive Committee
   C. Vice-President
   D. Standing Committees
      1. Budget
      2. Code
      3. Curriculum
      4. Student Affairs
      5. Personnel
   E. Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators

V. OLD BUSINESS

VI. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Ad Hoc Committee on Competence-Based Requirements

VII. ADJOURNMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATOR</th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumbaugh, Dick</td>
<td>Phil Tolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersen, David</td>
<td>William Cutlip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applegate</td>
<td>Neil Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachrach, Jay</td>
<td>Peter Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Robert</td>
<td>Robert Bentley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, James</td>
<td>Edward Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson, Rosella</td>
<td>Margaret Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douce', Pearl</td>
<td>Joan Howe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doi, Richard</td>
<td>Constance Speth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, Stan</td>
<td>Gerald Brunner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, Roger</td>
<td>Lynn Osborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregor, John</td>
<td>Bill Hillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulezian, Allen</td>
<td>Wolfgang Franz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, Charles</td>
<td>David Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heckart, Beverly</td>
<td>Gordon Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hileman, Betty</td>
<td>Deloris Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakubek, Otto</td>
<td>Joel Andress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, J. Richard</td>
<td>Bonalyn Bricker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Art</td>
<td>George Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klug, Linda</td>
<td>Clayton Denman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdiwa, Paul</td>
<td>Don Woodcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester, Nancy</td>
<td>Dieter Romboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lygre, David</td>
<td>Helmi Habib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuarrie, Duncan</td>
<td>Owen Pratz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Robert</td>
<td>Wallace Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purcell, John</td>
<td>Kent Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Milo</td>
<td>A. James Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synnes, Earl</td>
<td>Dolores Osborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, William</td>
<td>Lee Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vifian, John</td>
<td>Keith Rinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiberg, Curt</td>
<td>Thomas Thelen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters, Roger</td>
<td>Robert Yee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh, Thomas</td>
<td>William Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Madge</td>
<td>Joe Schomer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATOR</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vifian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Garrett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson, Rosella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lygre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto Jakubek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Dudley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Doi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hawkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Douce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Applegate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Purcell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Yeh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Winters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milo Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Klug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Jensen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Heckart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Keith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuoriwa, Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan MCQuarrie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Gulezian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Wiberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gregor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Lester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Backrach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madge Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Hileman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Synnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Alumbach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISITORS
PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

Warren Street
Bruce Feets
Charles Wilson
David Anderson
Joel Domatsch
Philip Ulm
W. W. Hewes-Waelder

Last person signing please return to the Recording Secretary.
TO: Dave Lygre, Chairperson, Faculty Senate

FROM: Dale Otto  

SUBJECT: WCECE representation on the Faculty Senate

The new Faculty Code includes the WCECE as being eligible for having a representative on the Faculty Senate (Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure (1975), 1.25, A., (1)). We will proceed without delay with the election of our senator. Please let me know if there is any special procedure to have this person seated on the senate.

cc: Mary Ellen Matson, Chairperson, WCECE Personnel Committee

DEO: has
Dr. David Lygren, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Central Washington State College

Dear Dr. Lygren:

Recently a seeming inconsistency in our withdrawal grading procedure has come to my attention.

When a student withdraws from a class after add-drop day and before the deadline for withdrawal, the student is given either an E to denote satisfactory performance or an F to denote unsatisfactory performance. A student's GPA is calculated into the GPA as would any other grade even though the withdrawal grade is not an evaluation of the entire quarter's work. This is inconsistent and unfair in my opinion.

I would therefore recommend that the college accept for withdrawals "withdrawal-passing" (WP) and "withdrawal-failing" (WF) grades, neither of which would be calculated into the GPA. I respectfully request that the Senate Curriculum Committee consider this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charles L. McElhaney
Assistant Professor
HAMORANDUM

TO: Senators and Senate Alternates
FROM: David Lygre
DATE: October 7, 1975

Subject: Establishment of Ad Hoc Committee on Competence-Based Requirements

Last February the Senate received a letter from Roger Winters requesting that the Senate review and evaluate the College's programs in English composition, with a view toward trying to improve the general competence in writing skills among our students. Subsequently, the Senate received a report from Mrs. Lawrence and Vifian on the matter. In the ensuing discussion a suggestion was made that an ad hoc committee be established to study the matter and propose recommendations to the Senate. Concern was expressed about the adequacy and effectiveness of our present efforts to improve writing skills. One of the ideas mentioned in that discussion was the possibility of developing some competence-based requirement in English. If this were adopted, it might lead to the setting of competence-based requirements in other areas—for example, mathematics. The impact of adopting such requirements, particularly the effect on enrollment in the College and in specific departments, also was discussed briefly.

I would like to propose that an ad hoc committee be established to investigate the desirability and feasibility of adopting competence-based requirements in English composition and, if the committee considers it appropriate, in other areas as well. The committee also would be charged to determine whether (and how) reasonably and valid standards of evaluation could be implemented, whether (and how) students could receive adequate coursework and other assistance to meet any requirements which are adopted, and what impact the adoption of such standards would have on the College and on specific departments. The committee recommendations would then be presented to the Senate for their consideration.

I plan to present a motion to establish this Ad Hoc Committee on Competence-Based Requirements at the October 15 Senate meeting.
REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Lawrence Danton, Economics
Carol McRandle, Communications
Bruce Teets, English
Madge Young, Education
Warren Street, Psychology, Chairman

At its May 7, 1975 meeting, the Faculty Senate received recommendations from its Personnel Committee regarding a program of evaluation of faculty and administration. The present committee was charged with the task of soliciting reactions to the Personnel Committee's report and recommending a course of action to the Senate. Thus, our task may be viewed as that of evaluating the evaluations of the Evaluation Committee's evaluation. Our ad hoc committee met frequently throughout the summer quarter, 1975. We spent our early meetings in clarifying our charge and in discussing the recent history of this issue. Fred Cutlip, of the Senate Personnel Committee, Gregory Trujillo, of the Office of Testing and Evaluation, and John Purrell, of the Office of Institutional Research, aided us in our preliminary research.

Interpretation of Committee's Task

As the committee became more familiar with the issue of administrative and faculty evaluations, it became obvious that the performance of the most literal interpretation of our charge would leave several questions unanswered. The committee expanded upon its charge in three significant ways. First, the report of the Senate Personnel Committee made recommendations regarding the purposes of evaluation, the identities of those to be evaluated, the identities of their evaluators, the development of an evaluation instrument, the frequency of evaluations, and the distribution of the results of evaluation. In addition to seeking reactions to these issues, the ad hoc committee sought feedback on four other policy matters. They were the extent to which the person being evaluated can alter the evaluation process, the degree of anonymity of the evaluators, the degree of advisement for improving one's evaluation, and the appropriateness of votes of confidence in evaluations.

Second, President Brooks has directed the Office of Testing and Evaluation to devise an instrument of evaluation for administrators. The instrument that was developed was administered in a trial run early in 1975 and the responses are currently being analyzed with an eye toward reducing the number of items. At the same time, the Office of Testing and Evaluation has proposed policies for the collection of evaluations and the dissemination of their results. Their policy statements deal with many of the same issues as those confronted by the Senate Personnel Committee, although there are differences between the two sources in the specific policies recommended. Our ad hoc committee decided to
include the recommendations of the Office of Testing and Evaluation in our survey of faculty opinion. This provided our respondents with more information about alternative solutions to each problem, and, occasionally, a clear-cut choice between two very different courses of action.

Third, our charge asked us only to solicit the opinions of faculty members. We also solicited the opinions of administrators and civil service exempt employees, since they will be affected by the policies that are finally instituted. The responses of administrators and civil service exempt employees were separated from faculty responses and are a subject of a separate section near the end of this report.

Questionnaire Method and Results

The ad hoc committee prepared an eleven item questionnaire, a copy of which was sent to all faculty, administrators and civil service exempt employees on July 24. Respondents were given two weeks in which to answer. By August 8, responses had been received from 35 faculty and 10 non-faculty respondents. Each item and a summary of the faculty responses is reported below:

1. Purposes of evaluation

Proposal A: To evaluate (a) accuracy of job description, (b) personal growth, (c) motivation for higher standards, (d) communication across levels, (e) determination of manpower resources, and (f) for decisions relating to retention, dismissal, and salary.

Proposal B: Recognizes purposes of self-improvement and job advancement. Emphasizes need for honesty generated by desire to help others improve. (Some doubt has been expressed about whether purposes of self-improvement are compatible with questionnaire to be used in determining retention, salary, etc.)

Your reactions:

21 - preferred alternative A.

5 - preferred alternative B.

2 - had no opinion.

4 - pointed out that alternative A was more specific thus preferred alternative B.

3 - expressed doubt that the varied purposes of evaluation could all be met by one single evaluative instrument.
1. Contended evaluation should be based only on one's service to education knowledge and serving the state.

2. Proposed that democratic decision making be added as a criteria.

3. Said that it was impossible to list all the attributes of a good worker.

Comment: Proposal A is taken from the Office of Testing and Evaluation proposal. Proposal B is taken from the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee report.

2. Who will be evaluated?

Proposal A: Not all administrators. Names President, Vice-Presidents, Deans, Registrar, Department Chairmen, Faculty and Directors of Continuing Education, EOP, and Admissions. Total of 16 administrators.

Proposal B: All administrators and civil service exempt personnel from President to Assistant Director of Housing. Faculty and Department Chairmen excluded. Total of 56 persons altogether.

Your reactions:

2 - preferred Proposal A.

31 - preferred Proposal B.

7 - said that department chairmen should be included.

1 - proposed that only the President be evaluated.

1 - proposed more comprehensive evaluation for top administrators.

Comment: Proposal A was produced by the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee. Proposal B was produced by the Testing and Evaluation Office. Faculty and Department Chairmen were excluded from Proposal B because there are existing mechanisms for their evaluation, although they may be inconsistently applied in actual practice. Many respondents contended that policies regarding evaluation should be as uniform as possible in their application to all CWSC employees.
3. From whom are evaluations obtained?

Proposal A: All subjects are to be evaluated by their immediate supervisor. President, Vice-Presidents, and Deans are also evaluated by colleagues and subordinates. Colleague and subordinate evaluation is optional for others. The subject and his supervisor choose the colleagues and subordinates to be selected, or a random sample may be taken.

Proposal B: Evaluations are to be carried out by a committee of colleagues and subordinates, who may contact such others as they see fit. Superiors are sometimes included on these committees, sometimes not. Committees range from 3 to 9 members. Evaluation committees may choose points on which subject is to be evaluated.

Your reactions:

10 - preferred alternative A.
11 - preferred alternative B.
7 - added mandatory colleague and subordinate evaluations to proposal A.
2 - contended that only the faculty may judge administrators, since the purpose of administration is to serve the academic work of faculty.
2 - asked that the person being evaluated be allowed to choose his own evaluators.
1 - proposed colleague and subordinate evaluation only.

Comment: Proposal A is that of the Office of Testing and Evaluation. Proposal B is that of the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee. Several respondents supported the random sample provision of Proposal A.

Content of Evaluation.

Appropriate items from pool of 85 items devised by Testing and Evaluation Office. Covers areas of (a) planning and resource management, (b) decision making, (c) leadership and initiative, (d) professional competence and self-development, (e) communication, (f) personnel management and development, (g) working relationships, (h) personnel characteristics, (i) effectiveness of area of office, (j) recommendations relating to advancement. Each item rated 1 to 5 or "no opportunity to observe."
Your reactions:

20 - gave general approval of this proposal.

2 - asked that items appropriate to faculty evaluation be added, and the same questionnaire used for all employees.

2 - said the listed areas were unrealistically complex.

1 - asked that professional contributions, research, and writing be added.

1 - asked that relations with subordinates be stressed.

1 - proposed that open-ended items be used.

1 - asked that job conditions, in addition to personnel, be evaluated.

1 - pointed out that any list of job areas has the unfortunate effect of restricting job performance to only those listed areas.

Comment: The Faculty Senate Personnel Committee recommended that an evaluative instrument be developed with the cooperation of the Testing and Evaluative Office. The areas listed in this item are those included in the Testing and Evaluation Office instrument. Our respondents were not presented with a choice on this item, but many of their written comments, as noted, are worthy of consideration.

5. To what extent are evaluations quantified?

Each item is a statement describing a job-related trait. The subject may be rated from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (truly outstanding) on each. A sixth category may be used if the rater has no opinion or basis for judgment. Summary statistics, showing average ratings, are to be prepared by the Testing and Evaluation Office and delivered to the subject's supervisor. This method makes possible numerical comparisons between subjects and between years, for the same subject.

Space for written responses accompanies each group of items. Any responses are included in the summary report. Written justification is mandatory on a few crucial items.

Concern has been expressed that quantification of ratings distorts evaluations because:
a. The numbers are capable of greater discrimination and manipulation than the evaluations they express.

b. Each rating has a weight equal to each other rating.

c. Numerical averages can be directly compared with each other, although the topics of evaluation may not be directly comparable.

There are many advantages of numerical scales which should be mentioned:

(a) they are widely and quickly understood, (b) they are easy to respond to, (c) they provide a basis for comparisons.

Your reactions:

10 - approved of numerical ratings.

10 - expressed distrust of numerical ratings but had no better suggestion.

5 - disapproved of numerical ratings.

3 - advised that written judgments be strongly requested.

2 - had no opinion.

1 - suggested dichotomous rating.

1 - asked that all ratings be justified in writing.

1 - required written justification of very low and very high ratings.

1 - suggested reporting frequency distributions.

1 - suggested reporting standard errors.

1 - suggested reducing number of items.

1 - suggested all written comments be reported verbatim

Comment: This item consists primarily of proposals by the Testing and Evaluation Office. The Faculty Senate Personnel Committee report raises the issue of quantification, pointing out the dangers of "quantifying the unquantifiable."

5. Frequency of evaluations.
Proposal A: On alternate years for President, Vice-President, and Deans. Yearly for others.

Proposal B: Yearly for all.

Your reactions:

3 - supported Proposal A.

2d - supported Proposal B.

3 - proposed alternate years for everyone.

2 - said only that faculty and administration should be on the same schedule.

1 - proposed yearly evaluation for self-improvement, alternate years for salary decisions.

Comment: Proposal A comes from the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee. Proposal B from the Testing and Evaluation Office. It was pointed out that, since salary decisions are made each year, evaluations should follow that same schedule. Those who said the faculty and administration should be evaluated at the same intervals did not speculate on the possibility that this might mean evaluation of administrators at the end of each quarter.

7. Who should have access to evaluations?

The person being evaluated and his supervisor have access to all forms except the individual evaluations submitted by other persons. The supervisor's summary ratings are open to the President, his assistant, the Vice-President, and Board of Trustees. An Appeal Board, the Director of Testing and Evaluation, and the Salary Committee have access to evidence relating to their work. The person being evaluated may grant access to others. The person being evaluated will be notified when someone demonstrating a "need to know" has been granted access to his/her file.

Your reactions:

16 - gave general approval to these provisions.

6 - said that the person being evaluated should be notified before access is granted to his file of the identity and rationale of those requesting access.
2 - asked whether the Salary Committee should have access.

2 - said only the individual should have the power to grant access to his file.

2 - contended that all files should be made public.

2 - proposed that one's supervisor's rating should be accessible to other raters.

1 - proposed granting free access to chairman of the Faculty Senate.

1 - proposed that access be granted only to the subject and his supervisor.

1 - said that the same policy should apply to both faculty and administrators.

Comment: This policy is the one prepared by the Testing Evaluation Office.

8. To what extent can the person being evaluated influence the evaluation process?

Subject cannot refuse evaluation and cannot censor information reported to superior by Testing Office. Subject can ask that specific people be contacted for evaluation and that additional items be included on evaluation instrument. Subject may submit additional evidence that he/she feels appropriate.

Your reactions:

20 - gave general approval to this item.

S - proposed restrictions on the subject's ability to choose his evaluators.

1 - proposed that the subject receive a copy of everything sent to his superior.

Comment: This is the position proposed by the Testing and Evaluation Office. Many respondents pointed out that the privilege of choosing one's evaluators is not extended to the faculty, and should not be extended to others.

9. To what extent are evaluator identities recorded and revealed?
Identity of respondent can be either (a) public-known to Testing Office, Subject and his supervisor; (b) confidential known only to Testing Office, available by subpoena; or (c) anonymous—unsigned and uncoded, respondent would be known only as one of a number that was contacted.

Your reactions:

7 - the identities of all parties should be made public.

7 - preferred confidential responses.

12 - preferred that all responses be anonymous

2 proposed that respondent may make the choice.

Comment: This issue was unresolved by both the Personnel Committee and Testing and Evaluation Office. The trial run of the Testing and Evaluation Office instrument was conducted under conditions of confidentiality. The office was later criticized both by those who demanded anonymity and those who demanded full public disclosure. There is no unanimity of opinion on this item. Those who opted for anonymity often gave as their reasons either protection from reprisals stemming from unfavorable faculty evaluation of administrators, or the reason that student evaluations of faculty are anonymous and that a consistent policy should be followed.

10. To what extent should advice for improving one’s evaluation be given?

Subject and supervisor use evaluations to detect areas of weakness and write down improvements to be made. These forms are consulted at the time of the next evaluation. No agency or source of advice for improvement is recommended. Records are retained for a period of time, then discarded. Sources could be identified which may serve as consultants to faculty seeking advice on how to improve.

Your reactions:

19 - gave general approval to these provisions.

4 - contended that the college must commit more of its resources to professional development.

2 - contended that only the subject can decide how and whether he will improve.
3 - felt that suggestions for improvement should already be part of the supervisor's normal duties.

2 - pointed out that policies setting times for the destruction of records should be set.

Comment: The conference between the subject and supervisor is one of the proposals of the Testing and Evaluation Office.

11. Are "votes of confidence" appropriate?

Both stress that evaluation should be a systematic process, occurring at regular intervals. This would preclude votes of confidence centered on one specific issue. The questionnaire devised by Testing and Evaluative Services asks whether the subject should be retained in his/her position. This may be considered a vote of confidence item, although the timing of the evaluation may not coincide with a crisis of confidence.

Your reactions:

13 - approved of votes of confidence, but said they should not be included in the systematic evaluation program.

7 - felt that evaluation item concerning job retention could be used as a vote of confidence.

6 - expressed approval of votes of confidence without commenting on their timing.

6 - said votes of confidence are not appropriate.

1 - said that item regarding job retention should be removed.

Comment: A number of respondents pointed out lack of confidence on a given critical issue does not necessarily imply dismissal from one's position. Thus the items regarding job retention and a vote of confidence may be seen as two separate types of evaluation.

Non-faculty Responses

In addition to these responses from faculty, ten administrators and civil service exempt employees returned questionnaires. Their responses are very much like those of the faculty and may be quickly summarized as follows:
Item 1: Preferred alternative A.

Item 2: Preferred alternative B.

Item 3: Strong preference for alternative A. Two respondents pointed out that one's supervisor is the only valid source of evaluation.

Item 4: General approval.

Item 5: Approval mixed with skepticism; one respondent expressing disapproval of quantification.

Item 6: Mixed opinions, with more support for yearly evaluation.

Item 7: General approval of stated access restrictions, but two respondents proposed public access.

Item 8: General approval.

Item 9: Six preferred public disclosure, three preferred confidential records, and one preferred anonymous returns.

Item 10: General approval, with two suggesting development of consulting services for improvement.

Item 11: General disapproval of votes of confidence.

Discussion

In addition to the questionnaire form returns, we received a few letters from our respondents. These letters tended to be skeptical about the success of any evaluation program, and discussion of the conclusions to be drawn from our survey will begin with points raised in one of these letters. The author of this letter pointed out that the CWSC faculty has participated in an evaluation program for some time. Each faculty member is evaluated by his colleagues, his departmental personnel committee, his chairman, and his dean. In addition, most faculty solicit student evaluations through the program conducted by the Testing and Evaluation office. The author argues that no benefits have accrued to the faculty as a consequence of their heavy participation in these evaluation programs. Theoretically, the evaluation program is part of a merit system of advancement, but our experience has been that advancement is far less dependent upon merit than upon legislative allocations and whatever factors influence them.
The tone of this letter leads one to consider the proposed purposes of an evaluation program and the actual likelihood that these purposes will be achieved. If the purpose is that of self-improvement, what is the likelihood that evaluation results will actually cause a faculty or administration member to improve his performance? If the purpose is professional or salary advancement, what is the likelihood that favorable evaluations will actually lead to those benefits? If the purpose of the evaluation is to determine one's fitness for continued employment, what is the likelihood that low evaluations will actually result in one's dismissal? If there are pressures upon the college to carry out frequent and systematic evaluations of all employees, then administering yearly evaluation forms will certainly satisfy that requirement, but that may be the only result that may be counted upon with any certainty.

In addition to all of the possible benefits of an evaluation program, there are possible unintended negative results which should be taken into consideration. We can confidently predict that a good many hours will be taken up in evaluation each year, hours in addition to those already spent on this sort of activity. Those who come in contact with many administrators will be more heavily impacted by this increased paper work than others. The evaluation program may create suspicions, jealousies and counter-productive rivalries between those who should be working as colleagues. The quality of an administrator or faculty member's work may suffer if he is placed in a position of choosing between popularity and integrity. These are a few of the possible negative consequences of an evaluation program. During our college symposium preceding this quarter's session, Dr. Lewis Mayhew responded to a question about the effectiveness of evaluation programs. He said that they are effective in altering behavior if the person being evaluated sees himself in terms very different from those used by his evaluators. Smaller differences will be "assimilated," that is, seen as being roughly identical to the status quo and not calling for any change.

Recommendations

On the positive side, evaluations will provide for contact between supervisors and those they supervise, and there is some reason to hope for change as a result. If we decide to go ahead with the program of evaluation for this or other academic reasons, or for political reasons, our committee can make some recommendations with regard to policies.

1. It is important that a uniform evaluation policy be applied to all participants in the program, be they faculty, administration, or civil service exempt. Implicit in this point is that no member of these groups should be exempted from the evaluation program.
2. Each person must be evaluated by superiors, colleagues and subordinates. When possible, the respondents should be chosen at random from a larger pool of eligible respondents. Respondent names may be added, but not deleted, by the subject.

3. The instrument being developed by the Office of Testing and Evaluation should be adopted. Superfluous or unreliable items, as indicated by item analysis, should be deleted. Student evaluations of faculty should be integrated into this system.

4. The summary of quantitative scores should be reported as central tendencies accompanied by some measure of variability, either standard deviations or confidence limits. Written comments should be reported verbatim. The summary of student evaluations of faculty, as presently produced by the Testing and Evaluation Office, may serve as a model in this regard.

5. Evaluations should be administered yearly.

6. The Testing and Evaluation Office policy on access to evaluations should be followed, providing that the subject is notified before access is granted to persons other than those who have open access to all files. The access applicant's name and justification should be made known.

7. In general, the subject may not act in ways which will restrict or delete information from his evaluation, but he may act in ways that will add to the information in his file.

8. The identity of an evaluator should be known only to the Testing Office. This policy of confidentiality is a compromise between public disclosure, which may inhibit the respondent's honesty, and anonymity, which may be illegal and certainly seems unethical.

9. Votes of confidence are an issue apart from a program of systematic evaluation. If the subject wants feedback on specific decisions, these items may be added to his evaluation form. Otherwise, the Faculty Senate should consider the issue of votes of confidence as falling outside the subject matter of this report.

10. Student evaluations should be made of those administrators and civil service exempt employees who have extensive contact with students.
11. Each person should have a yearly meeting with his supervisor to review the results of his evaluation.

There is a real danger that, as we spend more and more time in evaluation, we will have less and less time to do things upon which to be evaluated. In the end, we may simply be evaluated on our ability to fill out evaluations. This committee’s report is already an evaluation to the fourth or fifth power and, since the Guinness Book of Records has no record for evaluations, we might consider trying out for it. If we are to have a campus-wide program of evaluation, it need not be the subject of endless scrutiny and re-examination. It should be simple, quick, easily understood, and should yield a very few pieces of information which will be useful to the person being evaluated. These ideals are also suitable goals for our committee’s report, and each additional sentence takes us further from them.
October 9, 1975

Dr. David Isac
Chairman, Faculty Senate
Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Washington

Dear Dr. Isac:

During the debate of the Senate meeting of October 1, I supported
the concept of departments evaluating their representation on
the Senate considering the latest results of the dispute over
the Code and opening of governance of the College. Accordingly,
I am submitting my resignation as a Faculty Senator in order to
facilitate the Mathematics Department's deliberations.

Respectfully yours,

David E. Anderson

[Signature]

cc: Dr. Robert Y. Brown
Dr. David Lygree
Chairman, Faculty Senate
Edison Hall, Campus

Dear Dr. Lygree:

At our October 1, 1975 meeting, the members of the department of Anthropology discussed the current role of the Senate under the 1975 code. We agreed that according to that code and the court ruling of September 1975, all actions taken by the Senate are legally subject to the final approval/disapproval of the Board of Trustees. Thus, action by the faculty Senate alone can be neither prescriptive nor prospective.

In recognition of the role of the Faculty Senate as advisory to the Board of Trustees rather than as a partner in shared decision making, we have taken a vote of confidence in our current senator and alternate to determine if they appropriately represent our interests to the Faculty Senate. Both senator and alternate were given a positive vote of confidence, and they have agreed to continue to represent our department in academic affairs. This action is not to be construed as implying that either the senator, the alternate, nor any other members of the department necessarily agree with the action of the Board of Trustees in adopting the 1975 code, nor with the philosophy of College governance implied therein, nor with the assumption that a new contract has been validated between the individual and the Board of Trustees.

Sincerely,

Dr. James M. Alexander
Chairman and Professor of Anthropology
David Lygre  
Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
CWSC  

Dear David:  

The Political Science Department at its regular meeting,  
8 October 1975, passed the following resolution (5 for,  
0 against, 1 abstention):

RESOLVED, that the Political Science Department  
faculty has confidence in its elected represent- 
tive, Professor Roger L. Winters, and wishes him  
to continue to work with the Senate for the benefit  
of our Department and College.

Sincerely,

Robert Yee  
Chairman
The purpose of this communication is to inform you that at our regular department meeting on October 7, 1975, Dr. David E. Anderson submitted his resignation as Departmental representative to the Faculty Senate. His resignation was accepted with reluctance and regret. We feel that Dr. Anderson has served his various positions of membership and leadership in the Senate with vigor, honor, and distinction.

In the conclusion of a lengthy discussion the Department voted unanimously to decline to elect another representative until such time when that body presently designated as the Faculty Senate by the President's Faculty Code of Personnel Policy be reconstituted so as to be genuinely representative of the faculty, restructured so as to be more responsive, efficient and effective in conducting its affairs and hopefully granted once again the trust and dignity of working under the long-established concept of shared governance.
Washington Center for Early Childhood Education
Central Washington State College

Faculty Senate
Edition 102

Dear Sister:

It is my pleasure to present to you Dr. Virginia Dickson as our SDE representative to the Faculty Senate. Mrs. Margaret Lawrence will be our alternate. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Mary Ellen Matson
Chairman, ECE Personnel Committee

Mary Ellen Matson
Chairman, ECE Personnel Committee
October 15, 1975

Dr. David Lygren, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Central Washington State College

Dear Dr. Lygren:

On October 14, 1975, the Biology Department passed unanimously the following motion:

Due to the recent legal decision regarding shared governance at Central Washington State College and the intent of the 1975 code, the Faculty Senate should seek authorization from the Board of Trustees to reorganize itself according to new bylaws to be written by the Faculty Senate.

It was the consensus of the Biology Staff that I continue to serve on the Senate, however, this is not to be taken as an endorsement of the Senate as constituted under the 1975 code.

Sincerely,

[signature]

Curt Nielsen
Associate Professor

[Signature]
October 10, 1975

Memorandum

To : Earl Synnes, Secretary
    Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From : Paul Kuroiwa, Director
       Ethnic Studies Program

Subject: Election of Senator & Alternate

I have been selected to represent the Ethnic Studies Program as a Senator to the Faculty Senate.

Mr. Don Woodcock will be the alternate representative.

I am looking forward to a productive and rewarding year on the Senate.