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## ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except Frank Carlson and Elwyn Odell.

Others Present: Thomas Dalglish, John A. Green, H. S. Habib, Martin Kaatz, Bernard L. Martin, Charles McGehee, and E. S. Murphy.

## AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

No changes were presented.

## MINUTES

The Senate minutes of January 7, 1970, were approved as printed and distributed.

## COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Nylander read the following communications:

1. A letter from Mrs. Hugh Minor, dated January 27 , 1970, in regards to the joint Faculty Senate-Trustee meeting of Saturday, January 24, 1970 .
2. A memo from Dr. Kosy regarding the grading scale at Central. This memo was forwarded to the Dean's Council.
3. A letter from Senator Magnuson concerning Congressional action affecting TIAA-CREF system. Mr. Nylander noted that other such letters had also been received from congressmen, representatives and other colleges in the state.
4. A letter from Mr. Bohne regarding Motion No. 625 passed at the January 7 Senate meeting.
5. A letter from Jon Ericson regarding the approval of a Transfer Program in General Education from Grays Harbor Community College. This was in accordance with Motion No. 510 passed at the January 15, l969, meeting.

## REPORTS

A. Special Reports
l. Mr. E. S. Murphy gave a brief statement to clarify the Report of the Ad Hoc ROTC Study Committee at CWSC. It was pointed out by the Chairman, Mr. Nylander, that neither the substance or the process of this report was to be debated at this meeting. The purpose of this statement was merely for the purpose of greater understanding of the report in order that forthcoming recommendations from the Executive Committee may be discussed and voted upon.

Mr. Murphy said there were three sections of the report
(1) recommendations, (2) a section detailing activities of the committee and giving some of the history and status of ROTC on this campus, and (3) an appendage giving facts about the program。

He said the members of the committee represented a broad spectrum of opinion and at the conclusion of the meetings it was agreed to make compromise recommendations in the report. On page 3 and 4 the committee tries to justify recommendations made on page $l^{2}$

Mr. Murphy pointed out that all the members of the committee were not unanimous in their own feelings about ROTC on campus, but one point which all the members could agree on was that ROTC occupies an unusual position on the college campus because of the minimum control the administration has over this program.

Questions and discussion followed. Some of the questions asked and the answers given were as follows.

How much money does the college receive for the ROTC program and for support of the physical plant? Each student in the ROTC reserves receives $\$ 50$ a month, but it receives no money from the Air Force for support of the physical plant.

How many students at Central received this money last year? Approximately 40 students.

If recommendation was followed to eliminate all military personnel
as instructors in academic courses, would the salary of an additional full-time instructor to handle aerospace courses be paid by CWSC? Yes.

Were all the Air Force courses approved by the Senate Curriculum Committee and passed by the Faculty Senate? Yes.

What are the statistics on how many colleges decided to drop this program？The accurate statistics were not known．

Is there any feeling on the part of the Air Force that these programs could be done away with and taken care of during summers？ The Air Force likes the ROTC program．This is where they get many of their officers．

Do you（Mr．Murphy）feel that your committee gathered enough objective data that the report can give the Senate a factual report to act on since no evidence of students＇opinion is offered in the report about what they get out of this program？ Mr．Murphy said this is a report he could defend and would like to see it put into action．Appendix B indicates students and student cadets who expressed their opinions to the committee． Also it was pointed out that a number of open hearings were held inviting anyone to express their questions and opinions．

2．President Brooks then reported briefly on how the legislation is going in Olympia．He said there has been some talk about cutting the budget for higher education below what has been presented． He also said the general public feels higher education is not doing its job and as a result there is less response to education＇s needs．Therefore，he feels public relations is an area the college needs to devote more time to．

## B．Standing Committees

1．Executive Committee－－Mr．Harsha reported the following。
a．During winter quarter，the Executive Committee is meeting on Monday afternoons at 4：00pm in either Mitchell Hall or the Deans＇Conference Room，Barge Hall．
b．President Brooks attended the Executive Committee meetings on two occasions during the month of January to discuss some items of mutual concern and importance to both the Senate and the President＇s office．Dr．Brooks asked the Executive Committee if it would consider acting as a temporary faculty legislative committee，particularly for the present special session of the State Legislature．The Committee agreed to do so．The President further suggested that a Senate committee be formed in the future to act in this capacity。
c．Mr．Nylander met with the Senate Curriculum Committee on January 15 to discuss the work of that committee relative to total curriculum development at Central Washington State College。
d. Dr. E. Smith Murphy, Chairman of the Ad Hoc ROTC Study Committee, met with the Executive Committee to discuss and interpret the committee's report and recommendations. Understanding of the report by the Executive Committee was substantially enhanced by the discussion with Dr. Murphy. The Executive Committee felt that perhaps an appearance at a Senate meeting by Dr. Murphy to explain the report and answer inquiries from Senators would prove very beneficial in preparing the Senate for subsequent recommendations, recommendations from the Executive Committee and from the Senate floor.
e. The recent two-day code hearing on the simple majority amendment was attended by one visitor, Mr. Comstock of the Senate Executive Committee.
f. The Executive Committee is pleased to report that two ad hoc committees; Symposium Evaluation and the Committee on Departmental chairmanships and Faculty Handbook are meeting regularly and making progress.
g. The Executive Committee agreed that the Faculty Senate should recognize and send a congratulatory letter to Mr。 Michael Whitley, Assistant Professor of Art, for winning the Annual Faculty Presentation Award. The Committee would like to commission its secretary to write such a letter.

MOTION NO. 628: Mr. Harsha moved, seconded by Mr. Comstock, that the Senate Secretary write a letter to Mr. Michael Whitley congratulating him on the Annual Faculty Presentation Award. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.
h. Mr. Mitchell of the Executive Committee attended a meeting to hear a proposal stressing the system approach in decision making. The proposal, formally called A Decision Making Model for SmalJ. Colleges and Universities, is being drafted by Larry Bundy and John Purcell in conjunction with others and a long-range planning committee. The proposition involves an effort to meet long-range objectives by use of the systems approach in organizing and implementing the various elements needed to reach specified goals. The Executive Committee intends to remain abreast of this proposal in an attempt to learn more about the advantages and hazards involved in such an approach to planning. For this reason, Mr. Bundy and Mr. Purcell have agreed to meet with the Executive Committee to further dicuss the proposal.

Mr. Burt asked for clarification of the executive committee acting as a temporary faculty legislative committee. Mr。 Brooks said he asked this Committee to act as an ex-ófficio
committee temporarily until a regular committee can be formed, because there are several bills which need attention at the present time.

Mr. Keller asked if the Executive Committee has considered inviting several people familiar with systems to the meeting at which Mr. Purcell and Mr. Bundy will further discuss the proposal. Mr. Harsha stated that the Committee did intend to do so.
2. Budget Committee--Mr. Berry reported that during deliberation at a regular session held February 2, 1970, the Budget Committee agreed to propose the following l970-71 salary schedule:
a. Scale adjustment to reflect $4 \%$ increase per step.
b. General increments to be awarded as per the faculty Code.
c. An amount equal to $30 \%$ of the total increase alloted to promotions and special increments as per the faculty Code.

A brief discussion followed concerning the salary proposals adopted last year.
3. Code Committee
a. Mr. Dillard reported that hearings for the amendment of the Code Section XIII, B, 4, were held on January l3-14 with only one person, Mr. Comstock, attending the hearings besides the Committee。

MOTION NO. 629: It was moved by Mr. Dillard, seconded by Mr。 Keller, to approve the Code amendment to Section XIII, B, 4 which reads as follows: "If the proposed amendment passes the Senate by a two-thirds majority, it shall then be submitted to the faculty for approval or rejection by a simple majority of the faculty voting."

President Brooks said when the present voting structure was set up much concern was expressed about the mailing of ballots and allowing a certain amount of time to respond.

Mr. Mitchell said he would like to see a minimum of time between the mailing and counting of ballots established in the Code, so that an amendment could not be rushed through before ample voting time was allowed.

Mr. Keller said that the $2 / 3$ majority vote of the Senate would be a check before amendments would ever be voted on by the faculty.

Motion No. 629 then passed by a roll call vote of 29 Ayes and 3 Nays.
Ayes: S. Bayless, J. Brooks, D. Dillard, C, Condit, K. Harsha, H. Williams, G. Clark, M. Zwanziger, C. Keller, S. Farkas, H. Michaelson, G. Fedenrecht, D. Schliesman, D. Comstock,
D. Jakubek, S. Dudley, J. Putnam, A. Lewis, E. Glauert, G. Leavitt, R. Mitchell, I. Easterling, J. Liboky, R. McCarty, C. Hawkins, J. Alexander, J. Nylander, D. Burt, F. Collins.

Nays: L.C. Duncan, K. Hammond, K. Berry.
b. Mr. Dillard said the committee also discussed the idea of changing the name of Faculty Senate to College Senate or something comparable and they decided to retain the present name unless otherwise directed.
4. Curriculum Committee--Mr. Glauert referred to his memorandum of February 2 which reads as follows:

ACCC Proposals
p. 46 (A/S) B.A. Degree Program in Chemistry
p. 69 Sociology 307

Social Psychology

## Suggested Modifications

Add footnote: (A/S) Chemistry Major "l"
"Students majoring in chemistry must develop a background in mathematics eventually equivalent to a year's work in calculus (Math 27l.1, 27l.2, 27l.3) and a year's work in elementary physics (Physics l61, 162, 163)."

Change title to: Sociology 307
"Principles of" Social Psychology

Reconsideration of Curriculum Proposal Approved at Last Senate Mecting
(A/S) Physics Major ${ }^{1}$
Add to the footnote presently in Catalog the following statement.In addition to courses in Physics a major must complete the following: Mathematics: l7l.l, l7l.2, 27l.l, 271.2, 271.3, 376.1, 376.2, 376.3.

After consultation with the ACCC and the Physics Department, the following statement on prerequisites is suggested for the physics major in place of the one approved at the last meeting.
"Students majoring in physics must develop a strong background in mathematics, eventually equivalent to a year's work in applied differential equations (Math 376.l, 376.2, 376.3)."

MOTION NO．630：Mr．Glauert moved，seconded by Mr．Mitchell，that the Senate vote to replace the footnote added to the Physics Major with the statement suggested in the Curriculum Committee report．

Mr．Nylander requested consent of the Senate to reconsider this portion of Motion No． 626 in the January 7， 1970 minutes．There being no objections，consent was given for Motion No． 630.

Mr．Hawkins asked what the purpose of changing the footnote was． Mr．Glauert responded that the former proposal was somewhat cumbersome． He said it was not the intent that students must take all these courses as long as they develop a strong background equivalent to a year＇s work in applied differential equations．

Dr．Schliesman asked for a clarification of the phrase＂eventually equivalent＂used in the proposal．Mr。Mitchell stated that during the course of study，by the time a student is a senior，he will need to have a specific level of background．

Mr．Hawkins then proposed that＂should＂be proposed instead of＂must．＂ Mr．Glauert did not accept this change．

Motion No． 630 then carried by a voice vote with C．Hawkins and H．Michaelson voting nay．

Mr．Glauert then proceeded stating that his committee suggested a title change of Social Psychology to＂Principles of＂Social Psychology to avoid having two courses of the same title in the catalog。

MOTION NO．63l：Mr．Glauert moved，seconded by Mr．Hawkins，to accept Sociology 307 with the title changed to＂Principles of＂Social Psychology．

Mr．Glauert said the Psychology Department did not oppose this new course，but merely the title。

Further discussion ensued with Senators speaking for and against the motion．

MOTI ON NO．632：Mr．Dillard moved，seconded by Mr．Harsha，to table Motion No．631．Motion carried．

Mr．Nylander announced that there will be a special meeting on Wednesday，February ll， 1970 in Hertz Hall，room 123.

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6：15 p．m。
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III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES for meeting of January 7. 1970
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1 1. Ad Hoc ROTC 8tudy Comenttee = Mr. Murphy
(Mr. Murphy will report and entertain questions. This is for the purpose of greater understanding of the repost in order that forthconing recommendations from the Executive Cormittee may be discussed and voted upon.)
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Fasterling, Ilda
Fadenrecht, George
Glauert, Earl
Hammond, Kenneth
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Leavitt, Gordon
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$\square$
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## Executive Committee Report, February 4, 1970

The Senate Executive Committee met once each week since the last regular Senate meeting of January 7, 1970. The ensuing Senate business transpired during this period:

1. During winter quarter, the Executive Committee is meeting on Monday afternoons at 4:00 p.m. in either Mitchell Hall or the Deans' Conference Room, Barge Hall.
2. President Brooks attended the Executive Committee meetings on two occasions during the month of January to discuss some items of mutual concern and importance to both the Senate and the President's office. Dr. Brooks asked the Executive Committee if it would consider acting as a temporary faculty legislative committee, particularly for Cor m the present special session of the State Legislature, The ag President further suggested that a Senate committee be formed in the future to act in this capacity.
3. Mr. Nylander met with the Senate Curriculum Committee on January 16 to discuss the work of that committee relative to total curriculum development at Central Washington State College.

Pr. E. Smith Murphy, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study ROTC, met with the Executive Committee to discuss and interpret the committee's report and recommendations. Understanding of the report by the Executive Committee was substantially enhanced by the discussion with Dr. Murphy. The Executive Committee felt that perhaps an appearance at a Senate meeting by Dr. Murphy to explain the report and answer inquiries from Senators would prove very b eneficial in preparing the Senate for subsequent recommendations, recommendations from the Executive Committee and from the Senate floor.


A memo from Dr. Eugene-Kosy regarding grading procedures and recompermations was read and considered. The Executive Cornmittee decided to refer this particular item to the Deans' Council for further deliberation.
6. The recent two-day code hearing on the simple majority amendment was attended by one visitor, Mr. Comstock of the Senate Executive Committee.
7. The Executive Committee is pleased to report that two ad hoc committeesamsmposium Evaluation and the Committee on Departmental Chairmanships and Faculty Handbookjpure meeting regularly and making progress.
8. The Executive Committee agreed that the Faculty Senate should recognize and send a congratulatory letter to Mr. Michael Whitley, Assistant Professor of Art, for winning the Annual

Faculty Presentation Award. The Committee would like to commission its secretary to write such a letter,

9. Mr. Mitchell of the Executive Commitee attended a meeting to hear a proposal stressing the systems approach in decision making. The proposal, formally called A Decision Making Model for Small Colleges and Universities, is being drafted by Dr. Larry Bundy and Dr. John Purcell in conjunction with others and a long-range planning committee. The proposition involves an effort to meet long-range objectives by use of the systems approach in organizing and implementing the various elements needed to reach specified goals. The Executive Committee intends to remain abreast of this proposal in an attempt to learn more about the advantages and hazards involved in such an approach to planning. For this reason, Dr. Bundy and Dr. Purcell have agreed to meet with the Executive Committee to further discuss the proposal.
 The Budget Comatimae of the Faculty Senate agreed to propose? the soliontine: 1970.0 splay schedule:
increase Cover
A. Scale auiusimmt to reflect th increase per step.


3294539
2. Genial increments to be awarded as per the saculíy cods.
3. An amorist equal to the inarierse allowed to promotions and special increments as per the faculty code.


Ken Berry, Chairman

TO: Senate Menbers
FRCI: Serate Curriculum Committee
DATE: February 2, 1970
RE: All College Curriculum Committee Proposals (ACCC)

The Senate Curriculum Connittee (SCC) at its meetings of Jamary 16, 21,28 and February 2 voted to recommend passage of the ACCC proposals, pp. 45 through 92, with the following revisions.

ACCC Pxoposals Suggested Revisions


Reconsideration of Cumpiculum Proposal. Aporoved at last Senate Meecing (A/S) Plyysics Majorl After consultation with the ACCC Add to the footnote presently in Catalog the following statement. In addition to courses in Physics a major must complete the following: Mathemaitics: 171.1, 171.2: 271.1, 271.2, 271.3, 376.1, 376.2, 376.3. and the Physics Department, the following statement on prerequisites is suggested for the physics major in place of the one approved at the last meeting.
"Students majoring in physics must develop a strong background in mathematics, eventually equivalent to a year's work in applied differential equations (Math 376.l. 376.2, 376.3)."

SENATE MEMBERSHIP IN RANDOM ORDER NUMBER 010 , 1969-1970


# 2lxited States Serrate $^{2}$ 

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

Dr. Robert C. Iithchell, Secretary
The Faculty Senate
Central. Washington state college
Ellenshurg, Fashington
Dear Dr. Mitchell:
Your concern about: the legisslation which would grant a federal cinarter to the College Benefit Srstem of America is anpreciater. I want to reassure you that my support for either S-1290 or ro-nnlo is comtinuing ame I just lnope that we have an opportunity to vote upne ome of these bills.

As you mary lanow, i.t was at the recruest of TIAA that Hearings were only held in the Senate Jast year, and it came as a bit of a setback to learn then that one of the principal sponsors, Senator nirksen, had chasged his positinn. His position as Chajrman of that particular Subcomittee of Jurliciary has now been assumer by Senator Mruska -- wo $I$ am told is also opposed to this measure.

Senator Jom Mcclellan, ranking mender of that Subcommittee, assures me that he will contimus his efforts to move this bill along in the Senate. J have talled with my colleague in the House, Mr. Cellar, mio ins Chairman of the Fouse Juaiciary Cominittee and sponsor of the lionse bill, and he hones to be able to move things along orer there.

I rould hone that ald of our good faculty members out home remain, but $I$ know we must have the nJaA-CWEF system available nationally and tie mobility tha' this retircment program affords all persomnel is vital to higher erucation in our nation. I am enualov aware that it hoes not involve any costs here at the federai level.

Ary nunker of your colleagues at Ceatral have written to me about. those tro bills, and it rould be appreciated if you would let thein know my viowe.


Dr. James Nylander<br>Chairman, Faculty Senate Central Washington State College Ellensburg, Washington

Dear Jim,
Thank you for your part in setting up the Faculty Senate-Trustee meeting last Saturday. I for one felt it was very informative.

I am still a bit uneasy about pre-registration and curriculum advisement, and I hope there will be a follow-up on both. For pre-registration to have a chance of success, it seems to me that Mr . Underwood's efforts will have to be combined with great flexibility in class scheduling on the part of the faculty. I. refer to the classroom utilization study where the choice daytime hours are jam-packed:

Regarding advisement, $I$ feel sure that Mr . Dudley is correct in stating that usually help can be found. But is it easily accessible and readily available when needed?

I sensed a genuine dedication toward teaching by the faculty with whom we talked-a most reassuring feeling since, without this, we might as well chuck the efforts toward an out-standing higher education program.


JM/jen

M $\underset{E}{M} \underline{O} \underline{R} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{U}$

TO: Dr. James D. Nylander, Chairman Faculty Senate
git
FROM: Eugene J. Kosy, Chairman Department of Business Education and Administrative Management

DATE: January 13, 1970

If my memory serves me correctly, Central Washington State College, through proper faculty and administrative action, agreed to operate a grading scale which encompasses A-B-C-D-E-I and $W$ with an option of using the plus and minus. It is also my recollection that special dispensation to this system was given student teaching activities where the use of $S$ and $U$ was authorized.

I request that the appropriate faculty sub-committee become concerned about the fact that these regulations are not being adhered to. Specifically, it appears to me that the Educational Opportunities Program is operating outside of this requirement and I guess I am more concerned when a review of the student initiated class Sociology 440 "The City" came across my desk. I note that initially students voted on an $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{W}$ grading system which was later changed to $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{I}$.

It appears to me that if we have a built-in A-B system for some students then other students should have the same opportunity. Maybe we should eliminate all grades in all classes or guarantee all an A or B.
cc: Eldon E. Jacobsen Acting Vice President
sks

## MEMORANDUM

> TO:

FROM :
DATE: January 29, 1970
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Minutes - January 7, 1970

In reviewing the Faculty Senate Minutes of January 7, 1970, I noted that Motion number 625 asked for "a moratorium to be declared immediately on further expansion of the Data Processing Center, to include both equipment and personnel."

As you are probably aware, the administrative ADP center reports to the Business Manager and I therefore feel that I should apprise the Senate of some recent developments. However, because the decision to implement the RCA Spectra $70 / 35$ was made before my tenure with the College, I know nothing about the historical background leading up to the decision to upgrade the administrative ADP center.

First of all, it is presently impossible to call a halt to any further expansion plans because contracts have been signed with RCA for delivery on July 1, 1970. Also, personnel commitments have been made to job applicants. Not to honor these obligations at this time could result in court action and expensive legal, fees.

Recently the Administrative Data Processing Committee asked for a meeting with the Instructional ADP committee to set up a joint group to investigate the feasibility of combining both computer centers into one. It is felt that we cannot afford two separate high-priced computer centers and that it would be best to establish one on a charge-back basis to users. I hope the above information allays some of the fears of the faculty. If it is desired, I would be most happy to appear at a Senate meeting to discuss any further concerns they may have.

SRB: gc
cc: Dr. Jacobsen
ADP Committee members

# CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE 

Dr. James Nylander, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Jim:
I wish to inform you that at our meeting yesterday 1-28-70, the General Education Committee approved a Transfer Program in General Education from Grays Harbor Community College. I have a copy of their program in my office and can easily transmit copies of that program to any Faculty Senators who might be interested in the information.

Cordial Regards,

(on M. Ericson, Chairman
Genend Education Comittee

