

2-3-1971

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 02/03/1971

Linda Busch

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

---

### Recommended Citation

Busch, Linda, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 02/03/1971" (1971). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 426.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/426>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [pingfu@cwu.edu](mailto:pingfu@cwu.edu).

MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 3 February 71  
Presiding Officer: Kenneth Harsha, Chairman  
Secretary: Linda Busch

### ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All senators or their alternates were present except Steve Fletcher.

Others Present: William C. Smith, Vic Battson, Donald Schliesman, Robert Y. Dean, Webster F. Hood, Fred Lister, B. A. Robinson, Bryan Gore, Peter A. Merrill, Catherine J. Sands, Bernard L. Martin, Thomas Walterman, Beverly Heckart, Y. T. Witherspoon.

### AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman announced that the following items of business would be discussed:

Three letters would be included under Communications:

- A letter from Charles McGehee, dated January 28, 1971.
- A letter from James Furman, dated January 28, 1971.
- A letter from Bernard Martin, dated February 1, 1971.

The withdrawal policy would be discussed during the Executive Committee Report.

The Honors Evaluation Report would be considered during the Curriculum Committee's Report.

The ROTC contract would be discussed under Old Business.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 13, 1971, were approved as printed and distributed.

### COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

1. A letter from Charles McGehee, chairman of the Student Affairs Committee, dated January 28, stating that App Legg had for some time been unable to participate in the work of the committee because of his heavy work load. Mr. McGehee asked the chairman for a replacement for Mr. Legg. Mr. Harsha stated that he had written a letter to Mr. McGehee in reply, asking Mr. McGehee and the Student Affairs Committee for recommendations for a replacement. The chairman felt, however, that the vacancy should be filled by someone from the student service's area. The Executive Committee would discuss all recommendations and appoint a replacement.

2. A letter from James M. Furman, Executive Coordinator of the Council on Higher Education, dated January 28, acknowledging receipt of the Executive Committee's letter to him of January 26 concerning recommendations by the Council on Higher Education. Mr. Furman stated that the Council would be happy to provide the Executive Committee with copies of reports concerning higher education policy recommendations when this material was published. The reports would contain both the rationale and certain supporting statistical data for the Council's recommendations. Mr. Furman further stated that he would like to meet with the Executive Committee in Olympia to discuss the work of the Council on Higher Education.
3. A letter from Bernard L. Martin, dated February 1, giving a breakdown, by program, of the \$150,000 returned to the Governor which had not been accounted for in his memo of December 2 to the Faculty Senate. This breakdown was requested by Mr. Lawrence at the December 2 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Copies of the latter two letters were distributed to the Senate members at the beginning of the meeting.

The chairman stated that an additional communication had been received from Russell Hansen, Sociology, regarding an alleged violation of academic freedom. This letter was sent to Frank Collins, chairman of the Senate Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will consider the charge and deliver its recommendation to the Faculty Senate at a future date.

### REPORTS

- A. Executive Committee--Mr. Hammond commenced discussion of student withdrawal from class. He commented that the Executive Committee had investigated and discussed the matter of policy formulation by Deans' Council. Of the policies involved, the withdrawal policy merited direct action by the Faculty Senate and should be considered at the earliest time possible. The Executive Committee was not recommending action on the other Deans' Council policies. If, however, the Senate wished to consider the other policies, it could do so under "New Business," and, if a majority of the Senate wished to act on or assign a matter to a committee, that would be the appropriate time.

Senate members were provided with four possible alternative withdrawal policies. The Department of Anthropology submitted an additional alternative. This was to be considered as withdrawal alternative #5. All five possibilities were placed before the Senate prior to any discussion on any one alternative.

No. 1 is the policy approved by the Deans' Council on January 5, 1971, which was questioned.

No. 2 is a policy proposed in Deans' Council.

No. 3 is a motion approved by the Deans' Council on January 27, 1971.

No. 4 is a statement of policy proposed by the Senate Executive Committee.

No. 5 is a motion submitted by the Department of Anthropology.

1. Withdrawal from a course may occur after the "Change of Schedule" period until the end of the 25th day of instruction. Forms, available in the Registrar's Office, must be completed. The student will be assigned a grade of "W" if he is passing at the time of withdrawal or an "E" if he is failing. Credit may not be earned in a course from which a student withdraws. After the beginning of the 26th day of instruction, withdrawal from a course will result in a grade of "E". Exception to this may be made if such withdrawal is requested by the College, in case of serious illness, or other highly extenuating circumstances. Student letters of petition for exceptions must be addressed to the Dean of Students. (For Summer Session regulation on course withdrawal consult the Summer Session Bulletin.)

Withdrawal from the College may be made under the conditions given above. Students who leave the College without official withdrawal will receive failing grades.

2. Withdrawal from a course may occur after the "Change of Schedule" period until the last day of instruction preceding final test week. Forms, available in the Registrar's Office, must be completed. The student will be assigned a grade of "W" if he is passing at the time of withdrawal or an "E" if he is failing. Credit may not be earned in a course from which a student withdraws. Official withdrawals are approved for such reasons as: when requested by the College, in case of serious illness, or other highly extenuating circumstances. Withdrawals are approved by the instructor.

Withdrawal from the College may be made under the conditions given above. Students who leave the College without official withdrawal will receive failing grades.

3. Withdrawal from a course may occur after the "Change of Schedule" period until the end of the 25th day of classes. Forms, available in the Registrar's Office, must be completed. The student will be assigned a "W." Credit may not be earned in a course from which a student withdraws. Withdrawals after this date may be made if such withdrawal is requested by the College, in case of serious illness, or highly extenuating circumstances. The professor will indicate whether the student is doing passing or failing work at the time the withdrawal is requested. Student letters of petition for exceptions will be addressed to the Dean of Students.

4. Routine withdrawal from a course may occur after the "Change of Schedule" period until the end of the 25th day of instruction. Withdrawal forms will be available in the Registrar's Office. Credit may not be earned in a class from which a student withdraws. After the 25th day of instruction, late withdrawal will require approval by the Dean of Students. Approval for late withdrawal may be granted when withdrawal is requested by the College, in the event of serious illness, or for other highly extenuating circumstances. Student letters of petition for special withdrawal must be addressed to the Dean of Students.

After the "Change of Schedule" period, a grade of "W" will be assigned if the student is passing at the time of withdrawal or an "E" if failing.

Withdrawal from the College may be made under the conditions given above. Students who leave the College without official withdrawal will receive failing grades.

For Summer Session regulations on withdrawal consult the Summer Session Bulletin.

5. Withdrawal from a course may occur after the "Change of Schedule" period until the last day of instruction preceding final test week. Forms available in the department offices must be completed. The student will be assigned a grade of "W" if he is passing at the time of withdrawal or a grade of "E" if he is failing. Credit may not be earned in a course from which a student withdraws. Official withdrawals are approved for such reasons as: when requested by the College, in case of serious illness, or other extenuating circumstances. Withdrawals are approved by the instructor, subject to review by the department chairman.

Withdrawal from the college may be made under the conditions given above. Students who leave the college without withdrawal will receive failing grades.

MOTION NO. 738: Mr. Hammond moved, seconded by Mr. Reed, that the Senate adopt proposal #4 as put forward by the Executive Committee.

The chairman stated that prior to voting on this motion, all alternatives presented should be discussed.

The merits and weaknesses of each alternative were thoroughly discussed. The Executive Committee attempted to explain the rationale behind alternative #4. Bill Smith of the Anthropology Department explained the withdrawal policy used by his department, alternative #5.

The discussion centered on such things as the reasons for students withdrawing from class, who should make the given determination and withdrawal decision, whether or not a strict withdrawal policy discourages "shopping" for classes, inconsistencies from department to department in interpreting the present college withdrawal policy, and the pros and cons of a free withdrawal system.

Mr. Odell read a letter from the Political Science Majors stating opposition to the withdrawal policy developed by Deans' Council. The students felt that the withdrawal date should be later in the quarter.

Following the lengthy discussion, Motion No. 738 was voted on and ended in a tie vote. Thus, Motion No. 738 was defeated.

Ayes: D. Wise, J. Purcell, R. Doi, H. Williams, K. Berry, L. Lawrence, F. Collins, I. Easterling, K. Hammond, E. Glauert, D. Anderson, G. Leavitt, J. Putnam, G. Reed, A. Lewis.

Nays: D. Dillard, J. Allen, G. Clark, L. Duncan, D. Jakubek, D. Ringe, C. Keller, J. Nylander, A. Ladd, L. Sparks, E. Odell, C. McGehee, O. Shadle, D. Rennie, C. Wright.

Abstentions: J. Alexander, K. Harsha, P. Douce, R. Jones, E. Harrington.

MOTION NO. 739: Mr. Alexander moved adoption of proposal #5, as presented by the Anthropology Department.

Bill Smith of the Anthropology Department again explained and answered questions regarding proposal #5. This precipitated another lengthy discussion concerning withdrawal from class. Some members of the Senate could see no essential difference between #5 and the withdrawal policy currently stated in the catalog. Mr. Smith stated that one major difference was the petition system used, whereby the student wishing to withdraw from class had to state in writing to the department precisely why he was wanting to withdraw from class.

The chairman asked Mr. Smith if the petition was a part of the motion. Mr. Smith said it was not.

There seemed to be general agreement that the current catalog statement regarding withdrawal from class was confusing and that departments across campus were drawing their own conclusions as to what the policy actually meant. Some departments permit withdrawal at any time during the quarter, while other departments permit virtually no withdrawal after the change of schedule date.

MOTION NO. 740: Mr. McGehee moved, seconded by Mr. Odell, to amend the main motion by adding that students may appeal the decision of a department to the Dean of Students, and that the Dean of Students may override the decision of the department.

Mr. Alexander asked who would assign the grade? If the instructor told a student he could not withdraw, and the Dean of Students said he could, who would give the grade?

Mr. McGehee stated that he only had in mind the decision of withdrawal. He would make it explicit that the power of the Dean of Students was only for the matter of withdrawal and not grades.

Mr. Odell withdrew his second to Motion No. 740, doing so on the basis that remedying the confusion in the catalog might settle the problem of withdrawal from class.

Mr. Alexander then seconded Motion No. 740.

Mr. Smith asked what recourse a student had at present when he felt that some aspect of the conduct of courses was unfair--poorly taught, etc.?

Mr. Harrington stated that his understanding was that a student didn't have any. He said these students usually head for the President's Office and then to him. He would like to recommend to the Senate that before the end of this year, we do have some kind of academic committee to hear these cases. Mr. Harrington said he must tell students that he cannot change grades.

Motion No. 740 (Amendment to Motion No. 739) was voted on with a roll call vote and was defeated. 9 Ayes, 18 Nays, and 8 Abstentions.

Ayes: J. Alexander, K. Berry, I. Easterling, J. Putnam, C. McGehee,  
A. Lewis, D. Rennie, E. Harrington, C. Wright.

Nays: D. Wise, J. Allen, R. Doi, G. Clark, K. Harsha, H. Williams, D. Jakubek,  
F. Collins, K. Hammond, D. Ringe, E. Glauert, D. Anderson, G. Leavitt,  
C. Keller, J. Nylander, L. Sparks, E. Odell, O. Shadle.

Abstentions: J. Purcell, D. Dillard, L. Duncan, L. Lawrence, P. Douce, R. Jones, A. Ladd, G. Reed.

Discussion continued on Motion No. 739, Alternative #5.

Mr. Glauert suggested that the motion of withdrawal from class be referred to the ad hoc committee recently created to study the entire grading system.

Mr. Keller stated that he could see some value to Mr. Glauert's suggestion, but felt that the whole matter could perhaps be settled by getting rid of the ambiguity present in the current catalog statement.

MOTION NO. 741: Motion to commit, for the purpose of removing the ambiguity from the catalog statement. The motion carried by voice vote, with Mr. Alexander and Mr. Dillard Opposed. (Motion No. 741 to commit took precedence over Motion No. 739.)

Mr. Harrington stated that it would be necessary to rewrite the catalog statement within the next week. He asked who was going to clear the rewrite?

The chairman asked if it would be acceptable to the Senate for the Executive Committee to confer with Deans' Council for the purpose of rewriting the withdrawal statement. There was no objection.

## B. Standing Committees

### 1. Curriculum Committee--Mr. Glauert

Mr. Harsha asked Beverly Heckart, chairman of the Honors Evaluation Committee; and Catherine Sands, Acting Director of the Honors Program, to discuss the committee's report. He stated that the committee's recommendations could be accepted, rejected, or modified.

The following recommendations were presented to the Senate by the Honors Evaluation Committee:

1. Advertise the program better. Through this means, it should be possible to increase the total applicants and hence insure a better selection of students. This year, there were 29 applicants from which 22 were selected. Many student participants thought the program would increase the interest of high-school students in the college. The honors director could encourage high-school faculty and senior counselors to inform high-school students about the program and to recommend suitable students to him. Some recruiting could be done at freshman orientation, and college faculty could be encouraged to suggest suitable students for the program.
2. Although the program's drop-out rate in 1969-70 was lower than last year's, the selection of students could still be refined. A common complaint of both students and tutors was the student's lack of preparation for the project selected. Sometimes this took the form of ignorance of elementary knowledge in the field studied. This is particularly a problem in the natural sciences, but occurs in other fields also. At other times, lack of

preparation stemmed from the student's failure to find out whether or not materials for his project are available. The committee strongly recommends that students selected for the program demonstrate a basic knowledge of the field chosen for individual study and indicate that he has given some initial time and thought to his project. At the same time, the committee would like to stress that selection has already been much improved.

3. Above all, refine the selection of tutors. Students seem to have complained much more frequently about the irresponsibility of tutors than tutors about the irresponsibility of students. Tutors who have time should be chosen. Mere interest or promise of willingness to take time is insufficient. Reduction of regular load by 2-3 load points would be ideal. Increasing the prestige of the program so that a participating tutor can substitute it for committee assignments may be one way around the problem of reduced load. For some faculty, participation in the program is equivalent to one whole course; a tutor, if conscientious, does as much work for one student as for 20, 30, or 100 -- and sometimes more.
4. Initiate a short orientation meeting to inform both student and faculty participants about such problems as initial confusion in independent study and joint responsibilities of tutor and tutee in fixing meetings, arranging kinds and amounts of work, and grading.
5. There are possibly two ways to decrease the weaknesses of the honors evenings. The first way would be to decrease their importance for the program as a whole by meeting less frequently. More time could then be devoted to planning the evenings or to planning additional special events which have proven successful in the past. The second way would be to initiate joint responsibility between the honors director and the students for the organization of the meetings. Some combination of these two suggestions might be attempted.

Following a question and answer session, the chairman asked the Senate if there was a motion to accept the Committee's recommendations. At this point there existed some confusion as to whether or not the Senate should first make a motion to continue or discontinue the Honors Program.

Mr. Duncan asked if the Honors Evaluation Committee would recommend continuation of the program. Miss Heckart replied that the committee, on the basis of its evaluation, would recommend continuation of the Honors Program.

MOTION NO. 742: Mr. Duncan moved, seconded by Mr. Williams, to continue the Honors Program for two more years, with evaluation reports presented to the Faculty Senate at the end of each year.

Motion No. 742 was voted on and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

2. Budget Committee--No report at this meeting.



3. Code Committee--Mr. Ringe stated that most of the Senate members had seen the Code revisions done by Mr. DalGLISH last spring. The committee is going to recommend some changes and felt that it would be a good time to at least adapt the format and numbering system used by DalGLISH. The committee would like to hear whether or not the Senate feels it would be proper to revise the Code with a different format, using present Code language with some of the committee's suggested changes. Mr. Ringe asked the Senate members if they had any objections to simply rearranging the Code using present Code language.

The chairman then asked if there was any objection by the Senate.

Mr. Odell stated that as he recalled, the Senate spent many hours discussing the proposed revisions of the Code and much had to do with the content. If he understood Mr. Ringe, he thought the committee's intention was to rearrange it and make it easier to find things. Mr. Odell said he could be wrong about the charge of the Senate to the Code Committee, but perhaps the present Code Committee was not acquainted with the original charge. He would recommend without motion that the committee review the original charge.

Mr. Berry stated that the Budget Committee was considering securing information to revise the section regarding salaries. The committee would probably be making recommendations to the Code Committee on that.

Mr. Odell said he thought the President raised considerable objections to the Code because it wasn't in line with AAUP standards and what might be expedient. So much substance was raised at that time, perhaps the charge to the Code Committee might be revised.

Mr. Nylander said that there was no charge to the Code Committee regarding revision of the Code. The suggested revision came out of the President's Office.

Mr. Berry stated that a couple of years ago, Mr. Dillard asked that the Code be revised and the Senate denied his request.

Mr. Dillard said that, as a member of the Code Committee for two years, he could say that the Code Committee came to the Senate and proposed that an ad hoc committee be formed and given the responsibility for total revision of the Code, breaking it down into three sections. The Senate turned down the proposal. Last spring, Mr. DalGLISH gave the committee a copy rewrite of the Code with the old Code on one side and the new Code on the other, and some rationale. The Code as it is now written is not too defensible. At the beginning of this year, it was Mr. Dillard's understanding that the Code Committee felt they should consider revising the entire Code, re-wording it around Mr. DalGLISH's suggestions. Mr. Dillard felt that the committee shouldn't attempt this until directed to do so by the Senate.

The chairman asked if there was any serious objection to the Code Committee revising Code format, but with the understanding that the Senate would need to approve any changes, and that the faculty would have to approve changes in content.

MOTION NO. 743: Mr. Ladd moved, seconded by Mr. Hammond, that the Faculty Senate vote in favor of Mr. Ringe's procedure as outlined. The motion carried by a voice vote, with Mr. Dillard and Mr. Ringe Abstaining.

#### OLD BUSINESS

The chairman commented that previous minutes of the Senate (March 11, 1970) stated that the ROTC contract should come back to the Senate for consultation and advice. Mr. Harsha stated that the President had been holding the contract for Senate discussion. He then asked if there was any objection to the ROTC contract.

Mr. Keller asked if it had been reviewed by the Senate Curriculum Committee. The chairman said this wasn't the charge. The ROTC Study Committee examined the contract. The chairman stated that if there was no objection, the contract would be forwarded on. If there were objections or questions, it would be held, and comments should be addressed to Dr. Green or Dr. Brooks.

Mr. McGehee asked if non-ROTC students could take these courses. The answer was "yes."

There were no objections. The chairman stated that he would notify Dr. Green and the President that the Senate had no objections to the contract as written.

#### NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Alexander brought up the problem of enrollment limitations and the possible effect such limitations might have on returning veterans. He stated that he would like to see every eligible veteran admitted to the college, regardless of enrollment limits. He asked the Senate to recommend to the administration that all qualified veterans be given priority regarding enrollment in the college.

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Alexander if he would consider adding the words "or persons drafted for alternative services."

MOTION NO. 744: Mr. Alexander moved, seconded by Mr. Shadle, that all qualified veterans or persons drafted for alternative services be admitted to the college regardless of enrollment limitations.

Mr. Leavitt asked Mr. Alexander to write a letter to the Executive Committee, since there wasn't much time left at the meeting to consider this.

The chairman asked Mr. Alexander if he would consider Mr. Leavitt's suggestion. Mr. Alexander felt it would be too late then to be of any consequence.

Motion No. 744 was then voted on and carried, with Messrs. Doi, Douce, Glauert, Hammond, Leavitt, Purcell and Miss Rennie Opposed, and Messrs. Alexander, Collins, Duncan, Ladd, Lawrence and Williams Abstaining.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

AGENDA  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
4 p.m., Wednesday, February 3, 1971  
Room 123 - Hertz Hall

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS -
  - ✓ L Martin
  - ✓ L Fairman
  - ✓ L Melcher
- V. REPORTS
  - A. Executive Committee - *Withdrawal Policy*
    - 1. Report by Vice Chairman
  - B. Standing Committees
    - 2. 1. Budget
    - 3. 2. Code
    - 4. 3. Curriculum - *Honors Evaluation*
    - 4. 4. Personnel
    - 5. 5. Student Affairs
  - C. Report from the Chair
- VI. OLD BUSINESS - ROTC Contract
- VII. NEW BUSINESS
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF February 3, 1971

ROLL CALL

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alexander, James	<input type="checkbox"/>	Marco Bicchieri
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Allen, John	<input type="checkbox"/>	Robert Harris
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Anderson, David	<input type="checkbox"/>	Frederick Lister
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Berry, Kenneth	<input type="checkbox"/>	Alan Bergstrom
<input type="checkbox"/>	Brooks, James	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Edward Harrington
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Carlson, Frank	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bill Floyd
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clark, Glen	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sheldon Johnson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Collins, Frank	<input type="checkbox"/>	Robert Benton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dillard, David	<input type="checkbox"/>	App Legg
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Doi, Richard	<input type="checkbox"/>	James Sahlstrand
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Douce, Pearl	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wesley Adams
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Duncan, Leonard	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ted Bowen
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Easterling, Ilda	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gerhard Kallienke
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fletcher, Steve	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Glauert, Earl	<input type="checkbox"/>	Kent Richards
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hammond, Kenneth	<input type="checkbox"/>	Joel Andress
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Harsha, Kenneth	<input type="checkbox"/>	Earl Synnes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jakubek, Doris	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jim Parsley
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jones, Robert	<input type="checkbox"/>	Charles Vlcek
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Keller, Chester	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jay Bachrach
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ladd, Arthur	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bryan Gore
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lawrence, Larry	<input type="checkbox"/>	Donald King
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Leavitt, Gordon	<input type="checkbox"/>	John DeMerchant
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lewis, Albert	<input type="checkbox"/>	Katherine Egan
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McGehee, Charles	<input type="checkbox"/>	Frank Sessions
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nylander, James	<input type="checkbox"/>	Betty Hileman
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Odell, Elwyn	<input type="checkbox"/>	Robert Yec
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Purcell, John	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Putnam, Jean	<input type="checkbox"/>	Everett Irish
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reed, Gerald	<input type="checkbox"/>	James Klahn
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reid, Mike	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ringe, Don	<input type="checkbox"/>	Steven Farkas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shadle, Owen	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gerald Brunner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sparks, Larry	<input type="checkbox"/>	Max Zwanziger
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Williams, Harold	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gordon Galbraith
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wise, Don	<input type="checkbox"/>	Howard Shuman
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wright, Cheryl	<input type="checkbox"/>	

*substitute Diana Rennie*

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 3, 1971

William C. Smith - Anthropology  
Student Senate

Vic Battson - Geography

Donald M. Schleisman

Robert Y. Dean - Math

Fred Lister - Math

Bill Robinson - Math

Peter A. McGill

Catherine J. Tams - Honors Div.

Bernard L. Martin

Thomas Waltherman

Bryan Gore

Robert E. Wood

Beverly Heckart

Y. P. Kitherspoon

Com

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEAN OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

February 1, 1971

Dr. Kenneth Harsha, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
Campus

Dear Dr. Harsha:

In reading the Senate minutes of December 2, 1970, I notice a request by Mr. Lawrence that I be asked to furnish information relative to the \$150,000 which was not reported to you on my memo of December 2. As I am only partially responsible for the instructional aspects of the College's operation, I, of course, reported only the amount of savings required of the 060 and 070 programs and the specific area where the funds are being found. The additional \$150,663 is to be made up on a prorated basis from the remaining programs on campus. I will list the programs and the prorated amounts which have been furnished me by Mr. LaBay as of January 21, 1971.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Proportionate Amount to Save</u>
010 (Administration)	\$ 42,461
030 (Student Services)	33,669
040 (Physical Plant)	36,018
050 (Library)	37,113
090 (Continuing Education)	---
100 (Departmental Research)	<u>1,402</u>
	\$150,663

If more specific details are necessary, I would suggest that you contact the administrator responsible for that particular program for details as to the location of funds to accomplish that portion of the savings.

Sincerely yours,



Bernard L. Martin  
Dean of Arts and Sciences

  
RICHARD P. WOLLENBERG  
CHAIRMAN

JAMES M. FURMAN  
EXECUTIVE COORDINATOR



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
**COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

1020 EAST FIFTH ST.  
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98501  
753-2210

January 28, 1971

Central Washington State College  
Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
Mr. James Alexander  
Mr. Kenneth Hammond  
Mr. Kenneth Harsha  
Mr. Gordon Leavitt  
Mr. Albert Lewis

Gentlemen:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 26 concerning recent recommendations by the Council on Higher Education about tuition and fee policies and enrollment policies. Naturally, the Council will be happy to provide you with copies of these and other reports concerning higher education policy recommendations when this material is published within the next few weeks. The reports contain both the Council's rationale and certain supporting statistical data for the recommendations which were made. I refer you specifically to the appendix material of the enrollment and tuition and fee reports for much of the backup statistical data which were used by the Council.

I am not certain I fully understand your comments concerning the request for the information and data which were used to arrive at the Council's "drastic and far reaching recommendations." As I am sure you know, policy matters affecting tuition and enrollments were discussed in monthly meetings of the Council for well over a year. At these meetings, considerable discussion was generated about the state's financial dilemma and, in addition, a great deal of information and counsel were provided by public college and university presidents, legislators, key government officials, representatives of private higher education, community college officials, and members of the staff of the Council on Higher Education. The final recommendations and vote of the Council reflect the material prepared by the staff and the opinions expressed by these various officials of government and education.

I think your suggestion that the Council make periodic visits to colleges and universities is a good one and the Council has made these visits when an invitation has been extended. Accordingly, the Council in the last year has met at the University of Washington, Seattle Pacific College, Green River Community College, and Everett Community College. Further, as the Council proceeds during the next few months with the development of a comprehensive state plan for higher education, it is my intention to establish several dozen advisory committees to work with the Council and the staff in the preparation of this report. Faculty members, of course, will be represented heavily on all of these advisory groups.

I am well aware of the joint meeting of the boards of trustees of the state colleges which was held in December as I met with this group and spent nearly two hours discussing various projects of the Council on Higher Education. In addition, I have met on several other occasions with trustees of Washington's state colleges and universities. All of these meetings have been very productive and have helped to bridge the communication gap between the institutions and the Council. Although it is difficult for me to travel during the time the State Legislature is in session, I would be delighted to meet in Olympia with you and your colleagues to discuss the work of the Council and to describe, as best I can, the context in which many of these educational issues has been discussed and considered.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "James M. Furman".

James M. Furman  
Executive Coordinator

JMF:jj



CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

Department of Sociology

January 28, 1971

Dr. Kenneth Harsha, President  
Faculty Senate  
Campus

Dear Ken:

App Legg has for some time been unable to participate in the work of the Student Affairs Committee because of his heavy work load.

I would like to ask you to please replace him on the committee. It seems that our work is likely to continue and we need all the active help we can get.

I know the prerogative of committee assignments is yours, but will you accept suggestions or recommendations in the matter of filling vacancies?

Very truly yours,

*Charles L. McGehee*

Charles L. McGehee  
Chairman, Student Affairs Committee

cc: App Legg

January 28, 1971

Mr. App Legg  
Samuelson Union Building  
Campus

Dear App:

Last fall you predicted that your heavy work load would likely interfere with your ability to participate in the work of the Student Affairs Committee. It is clear now that you knew what you were talking about and it was unreasonable of me to let you continue on the committee under the circumstances. In good conscious I do not wish to compell you or the committee to continue to work under these conditions.

I am therefore asking Ken Harsha to replace you on the committee. Thank you very much for the time and effort you, have been able to give us.

Very truly yours,



Charles L. McGehee  
Chairman, Student Affairs Committee

cc: Ken Harsha

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
DATE: January 29, 1971  
RE: Institutional policy on student withdrawal from class.

This matter will be on the agenda for the February 3 Senate meeting. A procedural revision and an attempt by the Deans' Council to clarify statements in the College Catalog were questioned by Dr. Virgil Olson in a letter to the Executive Committee. Subsequent discussions have led to a proposal (No. 3 below) which would modify grading practices. This is clearly a matter for Faculty Senate concern.

No. 1 is the policy approved by the Deans' Council on January 5, 1971, which was questioned.

No. 2 is a policy proposed in Deans' Council.

No. 3 is a motion approved by the Deans' Council on January 27, 1971.

No. 4 is a statement of policy proposed by the Senate Executive Committee.

1. Withdrawal from a course may occur after the "Change of Schedule" period until the end of the 25th day of instruction. Forms, available in the Registrar's Office, must be completed. The student will be assigned a grade of "W" if he is passing at the time of withdrawal or an "E" if he is failing. Credit may not be earned in a course from which a student withdraws. After the beginning of the 26th day of instruction withdrawal from a course will result in a grade of "E". Exception to this may be made if such withdrawal is requested by the College, in case of serious illness, or other highly extenuating circumstances. Student letters of petition for exceptions must be addressed to the Dean of Students. (For Summer Session regulation on course withdrawal consult the Summer Session Bulletin.)

Withdrawal from the College may be made under the conditions given above. Students who leave the College without official withdrawal will receive failing grades.

2. Withdrawal from a course may occur after the "Change of Schedule" period until the last day of instruction preceding final test week. Forms, available in the Registrar's Office, must be completed. The student will be assigned a grade of "W" if he is passing at the time of withdrawal or an "E" if he is failing. Credit may not be earned in a course from which a student withdraws. Official withdrawals are approved for such reasons as: when requested by the College, in case of serious illness, or other highly extenuating circumstances. Withdrawals are approved by the instructor.

Withdrawal from the College may be made under the conditions given above. Students who leave the College without official withdrawal will receive failing grades.

3. Withdrawal from a course may occur after the Change of Schedule period until the end of the 25th day of classes. Forms, available in the Registrar's Office, must be completed. The student will be assigned a "W." Credit may not be earned in a course from which a student withdraws. Withdrawals after this date may be made if such withdrawal is requested by the College, in case of serious illness, or highly extenuating circumstances. The professor will indicate whether the student is doing passing or failing work at the time the withdrawal is requested. Student letters of petition for exceptions will be addressed to the Dean of Students.

4. Routine withdrawal from a course may occur after the "Change of Schedule" period until the end of the 25th day of instruction. Withdrawal forms will be available in the Registrar's Office. Credit may not be earned in a class from which a student withdraws. After the 25th day of instruction, late withdrawal will require approval by the Dean of Students. Approval for late withdrawal may be granted when withdrawal is requested by the College, in the event of serious illness, or for other highly extenuating circumstances. Student letters of petition for special withdrawal must be addressed to the Dean of Students.

After the "Change of Schedule" period, a grade of "W" will be assigned if the student is passing at the time of withdrawal or an "E" if failing.

Withdrawal from the College may be made under the conditions given above. Students who leave the College without official withdrawal will receive failing grades.

For Summer Session regulations on withdrawal consult the Summer Session Bulletin.

The Senate can follow one of several courses of action:

1. Reject all of the proposals and (except for errors in the catalog) retain the present policy. (See footnote 1, p. 37 of the catalog.)
2. Approve one of the statements as is or with modifications.
3. Send the matter to committee with the understanding that the current policy will remain in effect for the academic year 1971-72.

To: Faculty Senate  
From: Department of Anthropology  
Date: February 9, 1971  
Re: Institutional policy on classes withdrawn from class

This matter, as outlined in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Memorandum of January 29, 1971, has been extensively debated by the faculty of the Department of Anthropology. As a result, the following motion and discussion are offered for consideration and, hopefully, for approval by the Faculty Senate.

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate recommend adoption of the following policy concerning student withdrawal from class.

Withdrawal from a course may occur after the "Change of Schedule" period until the last day of instruction preceding final test week. Forms available in the department offices must be completed. The student will be assigned a grade of "W" if he is passing at the time of withdrawal or a grade of "E" if he is failing. Credit may not be earned in a course from which a student withdraws. Official withdrawals are approved for such reasons as: when requested by the College, in case of serious illness, or other extenuating circumstances. Withdrawals are approved by the instructor, subject to review by the department chairman.

Withdrawal from the college may be made under the conditions given above. Students who leave the college without withdrawal will receive failing grades.

#### Discussion

1. This motion is similar to alternative No. 2 as presented in the Executive Committee Memorandum; but note the deletion of "highly" and the addition of "subject to review by the department chairman."
2. This is the policy currently being followed by the Department of Anthropology. Although the department serves a substantial number of students, there have been no serious complaints against this policy. One might conclude therefore that the policy works rather well. If it works for one department, it might work for the entire College. At least, this possibility seems worth of consideration.
3. This policy is consistent with the College's stated objective of excellence in education, in that:
  - a) it provides maximum flexibility and personal attention to individual cases, while providing for adequate review of individual decisions.
  - b) it makes use of student withdrawal from class as a means of evaluating faculty performance; by asking each student to state his reasons for withdrawal (rather than simply allowing him to vanish), the instructor and the department gain extremely valuable insight into the actual conditions of education in the College.
4. We believe that this is a good and effective policy; and we urge its approval by the Faculty Senate and by the College community as a whole.

  
Catherine Sands  
A. Deaman  
Teresa M. Flug

As if not a note

ROLL CALL VOTE

#4-10000

5

Senator	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Don Wise	✓		
John Purcell	✓		
David Dillard		✓	
John Allen		✓	
James Alexander			✓
Richard Doi	✓		
Glen Clark		✓	
Kenneth Harsha			✓
Leonard Duncan		✓	
Harold Williams	✓		
Kenneth Berry	✓		
Doris Jakubek		✓	
Frank Carlson			
Larry Lawrence	✓		
Frank Collins	✓		
Ilda Easterling	✓		
Kenneth Hammond	✓		
Don Ringe		✓	
Earl Glauert	✓		
Pearl Douce			✓
Robert Jones			✓
David Anderson	✓		
Gordon Leavitt	✓		
Chester Keller		✓	
James Nylander		✓	
Jean Putnam	✓		
Arthur Ladd		✓	
Gerald Reed	✓		
Larry Sparks		✓	
Elwyn Odell		✓	
Charles McGehee		✓	
Albert Lewis	✓		
Steve Fletcher			
Owen Shadle		✓	
Mike Reid		✓	
James Brooks			✓
Cheryl Wright		✓	
			Howard Shuman
			App Legg
			Robert Harris
			Marco Bicchieri
			James Sahlstrand
			Sheldon Johnson
			Earl Synnes
			Ted Bowen
			Gordon Galbraith
			Alan Bergstrom
			Jim Parsley
			Bill Floyd
			Donald King
			Robert Benton
			Gerhard Kallienke
			Joel Andress
			Steven Farkas
			Kent Richards
			Wesley Adams
			Charles Vlcek
			Frederick Lister
			John DeMerchant
			Jay Bachrach
			Betty Hileman
			Everett Irish
			Bryan Gore
			James Klahn
			Max Zwanziger
			Robert Yee
			Frank Sessions
			Katherine Egan
			Gerald Brunner
			Edward Harrington

Diana Dennis  
Harrington



ROLL CALL VOTE

*Amendment*

Senator

9  
AYE

18  
NAY

8  
ABSTAIN

Don Wise		✓		Howard Shuman
John Purcell			✓	
David Dillard			✓	App Legg
John Allen		✓		Robert Harris
James Alexander	✓			Marco Bicchieri
Richard Doi		✓		James Sahlstrand
Glen Clark		✓		Sheldon Johnson
Kenneth Harsha		✓		Earl Synnes
Leonard Duncan			✓	Ted Bowen
Harold Williams		✓		Gordon Galbraith
Kenneth Berry	✓			Alan Bergstrom
Doris Jakubek		✓		Jim Parsley
Frank Carlson				Bill Floyd
Larry Lawrence			✓	Donald King
Frank Collins		✓		Robert Benton
Ilda Easterling	✓			Gerhard Kallienke
Kenneth Hammond		✓		Joel Andress
Don Ringe		✓		Steven Farkas
Earl Glauert		✓		Kent Richards
Pearl Douce			✓	Wesley Adams
Robert Jones			✓	Charles Vlcek
David Anderson		✓		Frederick Lister
Gordon Leavitt		✓		John DeMerchant
Chester Keller		✓		Jay Bachrach
James Nylander		✓		Betty Hileman
Jean Putnam	✓			Everett Irish
Arthur Ladd			✓	Bryan Gore
Gerald Reed			✓	James Klahn
Larry Sparks		✓		Max Zwanziger
Elwyn Odell		✓		Robert Yee
Charles McGehee	✓			Frank Sessions
Albert Lewis	✓			Katherine Egan
Steve Fletcher				
Owen Shadle		✓		Gerald Brunner
Mike Reid	✓			
James Brooks	✓			
Cheryl Wright	✓			Edward Harrington

To: \_\_\_\_\_

From: Evaluative Committee - Beverly Beckert (chairman),  
Charles Fuller, George Grossman, Frank Sessions.

RE: Evaluation of General Honors Program.

The General Honors Program, now in operation for two years, selects freshmen and sophomores who express interest in the program and allows them to satisfy their breadth requirements in the Humanities, Social and Natural Sciences through individual study programs under the guidance of a tutor. In addition, there are weekly honors evenings and occasional special events, such as field trips and retreats, designed to enrich the educational value of the program and to acquaint the honors students with one another. This year, 20 students, working with 38 tutors, completed the program. At the end of the year, both completed evaluative questionnaires. The students also submitted completed projects for the perusal of the committee, and former honors students wrote letters assessing the program from the viewpoint of the "honors graduate."

The primary source material for this report, the questionnaires, contained the following information:

1. Students

- a. An outline of study programs in the Humanities, Social and Natural Sciences,
- b. A rating of their achievements with respect to quality and quantity of work, maturation of ideas, degree of academic interest and independence,
- c. A critique of their various materials,
- d. A critique of the program as a whole.

2. Faculty

- a. A rating of the tutors with respect to the same factors outlined in 1-b above,



- b. A rating of the program in terms of its results for the students,
- a. A critique of the program as a whole.

From this information, the evaluating committee compiled a statistical profile of the program and a list of its strengths and weaknesses.

The tables below summarize the results of the ratings of the various aspects of the program by both students and faculty. Table I assesses the value of the program in comparison with the regular curriculum.

TABLE I  
Evaluation of Program in Comparison with Regular Curriculum

STUDENTS	A	B	C	D	E	F
5	7(35)	2(10)	12(60)	10(50)	10(50)	8(40)
4	10(40)	14(56)	6(24)	4(16)	7(28)	9(36)
3	1(3)	2(6)		3(9)	1(3)	1(3)
2				1(2)		
1						
Number	18	18	18	18	18	18
Mean	4.33*	4.00	4.67	4.11	4.50	4.39

FACULTY

5	10(50)	14(70)	32(160)	16(80)	20(100)	11(55)
4	25(100)	23(92)	9(36)	20(80)	18(72)	24(96)
3	9(36)	11(33)	12(36)	19(45)	11(35)	15(45)
2	11(10)	7(14)	2(4)	4(8)	5(10)	5(10)
1	3(3)	3(1)			1(1)	
Number	55	55	55	55	55	55
Mean	3.62	3.82	4.29	3.87	3.93	3.75

- Key: 1 Much more                      A Amount of work  
 4 More                                    B Quality of work  
 3 Same                                    C Motivation and interest in work  
 2 Less                                    D Maturation of ideas  
 1 Much less                              E Independence  
     F Grasp of general information about the various fields

\*The mean is the average value of a given set of measurements. In this case, it has been calculated by assigning a weight to each kind of response (much more = 5, etc.) in every category measured (amount of work, etc.), multiplying the weights by the frequency of responses of kind, totaling all values in the category and dividing the sum by the total number of responses. Calculation of the mean for both student and faculty ratings helps to simplify the comparison between the two groups by reducing ten various numbers to two standardized ones.

Both students and faculty agree that the program induces more motivation and independence than the regular curriculum. The most marked areas of disagreement concern the amount of work done and the general grasp of information: the tutors rate these areas much lower than do the students. On the other hand, the students place the quality of work in last place, whereas the faculty places amount of work in last place. This suggests that the program attracts students who place a high premium on quality of work. However, since there is no control data, we cannot say this absolutely.

Table II, which summarizes the student ratings of their tutors, indicates a problem which was present last year. Although last year's evaluation gave high marks to the tutors in the natural sciences, two members of the present committee who read the former questionnaires know that the natural science faculty was uncomfortable in the program. This year, at its suggestion, small groups instead of individual studies were formed in some of the natural science tutorials. There is some correlation between these groups and the ratings of the natural science faculty; those students in the groups tended to rate their tutors low.

TABLE II

Student Ratings of Tutors

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Humanities	13	5		
Social Sciences	11	6		1
Natural Sciences	7	7	4	

The student ratings suggest that the tutorials are highly successful in the humanities and the social sciences and less so in the natural sciences--at least

when the tutorials occur in groups.

Table III indicates the students' evaluation of the honors evenings and the special events (field trips, etc.). It also points out that the honors evenings are the least successful part of the program. Since the honors evenings were also a problem last year, the honors director participated more actively in their organization this year and unified them around a central theme. While the ratings improved, the evenings are still the weakest part of the program.

TABLE III

Student Ratings of Honors Evenings and Special Events

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Honors Evenings	7	6	5	
Special Events	13	5		

Despite weaknesses, Table IV demonstrates that both students and faculty think the achievements of the program, in terms of its objectives, are good. Students were asked to rate the General Honors Program in the overview. Faculty were asked to rate the program in terms of its results for the students involved.

TABLE IV

Student and Faculty Rating of Total Program

	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Number	Mean
Students	21(54)	2(6)			18	3.89
Faculty	24(96)	14(42)	11(22)	5(5)	54	3.06

Key - see Table I.

Once again, the students value the program more highly than does the faculty.

\* \* \*

The following lists of strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations were compiled from the comments of the students, the tutors, and former student participants as listed in their questionnaires and letters written to the honors director.

#### STRENGTHS

1. For the independent student, the program provides a better outlet for his intellectual and creative energies than does the regular curriculum.
2. It provides a good foundation for later, advanced study.
3. For the independent student, it provides contacts with others of similar interests and temperament. Former honors students praised this aspect of the program more frequently than any other.
4. It suggests innovations in the regular curriculum. A few tutors intend to incorporate some aspects of the program into their larger classes.

#### WEAKNESSES

1. Some students experience initial confusion and loss of direction in a self-directed program. For some, the period of adjustment impedes the amount and quality of work done for the whole quarter or even for the entire year.
2. Many tutors are uncomfortable and inflexible in the individual-study situation; they either give too much or too little direction. Also, many tutors are irresponsible; they skip scheduled meetings or fail to do the work necessary to discuss the students' ideas satisfactorily and to suggest further development. Of all student complaints, the most common was lack of time and interest on the part of the tutor.
3. The program is least satisfactory in the natural sciences. Small study groups tend to be anarchic or restrictive; the individual study for elementary science



is boring and time-consuming for the instructor.

- 4. Students tend to bite off more than they can chew. Either they choose a subject for which there is little material available, or they formulate a project inadequately.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Advertise the program better. Through this means, it should be possible to increase the total applicants and hence insure a better selection of students. This year, there were 29 applicants from which 22 were selected. Many student participants thought the program would increase the interest of high-school students in the college. The honors director could encourage high-school faculty and senior counselors to inform high-school students about the program and to recommend suitable students to him. Some recruiting could be done at freshman orientation, and college faculty could be encouraged to suggest suitable students for the program.
- 2. Although the program's drop-out rate in 1969-70 was lower than last year's, the selection of students could still be refined. A common complaint of both students and tutors was the student's lack of preparation for the project selected. Sometimes this took the form of ignorance of elementary knowledge in the field studied. This is particularly a problem in the natural sciences, but occurs in other fields also. At other times, lack of preparation stemmed from the student's failure to find out whether or not materials for his project are available. The committee strongly recommends that students selected for the program demonstrate a basic knowledge of the field chosen for individual study and indicate that he has given some initial time and thought to his project. At the same time, the committee would like to stress that selection has already been much improved.

3. There will, unless the selection of tutors. Students seem to have complained much more frequently about the irresponsibility of tutors than tutors about the irresponsibility of students. Tutors who have time should be chosen. Mere interest or promise of willingness to take time is insufficient. Reduction of regular load by 2-3 load points would be ideal. Increasing the prestige of the program so that a participating tutor can substitute it for committee assignments may be one way around the problem of reduced load. For some faculty, participation in the program is equivalent to one whole course; a tutor, if conscientious, does as much work for one student as for 20, 30, or 100 -- and sometimes more.
4. Initiate a short orientation meeting to inform both student and faculty participants about such problems as initial confusion in independent study and joint responsibilities of tutor and tutee in fixing meetings, arranging kinds and amounts of work, and grading.
5. There are possibly two ways to decrease the weaknesses of the honors evenings. The first way would be to decrease their importance for the program as a whole by meeting less frequently. More time could then be devoted to planning the evenings or to planning additional special events which have proven successful in the past. The second way would be to initiate joint responsibility between the honors director and the students for the organization of the meetings. Some combination of these two suggestions might be attempted.

Respectfully submitted,  
*Beverly Heckart*  
 Beverly Heckart  
 Chairman

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: James E. Brooks, President  
John A. Green, Dean of Education

DATE: January 8, 1971

SUBJECT: ROTC Contract: For your information

We have recently completed negotiations with the U. S. Air Force personnel for a revised Reserve Officers' Training Corps Contract and are enclosing a copy of the agreement for your information. The renegotiation of this contract came as a result of the recommendations of the ad hoc faculty-student committee which reviewed the program last year. The changes indicated in the contract are desirable, and we intend to sign the agreement.

The essential elements of the new program are as follows:

1. All junior enrollees will be required to complete a six quarter credit, year-long sequence (AFROTC Studies 331, 332, 333, Growth and Development of Aerospace Power).
2. All senior enrollees will be required to complete a nine quarter credit, year-long sequence (AFROTC Studies 441, 442, 443, Concepts of Air Force Leadership and Management).
3. Students may be advised to complete AFROTC Studies 351, Six-week Field Training, but will receive no academic credits for this course.

Some civilian instruction will be used in each of the two required courses.

The two year-long courses required of all students total 15 credits; in addition, however, those qualifying for flight instruction will take two additional courses (AFROTC Studies 444, Professional Airmanship, and AFROTC Studies 445, Professional AFROTC Flight Instruction) for six more hours.

While the present program requires 21 to 30 hours in the AFROTC Studies, the new program requires only 15-21, permitting students to complete the minor with selected civilian courses.

We have been pleased with the Air Force's willingness to accept our proposed changes and feel that they will strengthen the AFROTC campus program.

JAG:bfm

cc: Broad of Trustees  
Deans' Council



MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE COMMANDANT,

AIR FORCE ROTC, AND CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE, ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

1. The signators hereto agree to the adoption of the following principles for the conduct of the AFROTC courses at Central Washington State College:

To require each student enrolled in any of the programs to devote the number of class hours to Aerospace Education prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force. Students in AFROTC Studies will be required to have a minimum of 198 contact hours in the two AFROTC Studies courses cited in (1) and (2) below. They will be required to earn a minimum of 15 academic hours specifically in AFROTC Studies courses. Students attempting qualification for Air Force flight instruction will take appropriate flight and ground instruction. Three effective credits toward graduation will be awarded for AFROTC Studies 444, Professional Airmanship, and AFROTC Studies 445, Professional AFROTC Flight Instruction.

(1) Additional civilian faculty taught courses, as agreed upon by the Senior Air Force faculty member, will be available to complete a minor in AFROTC if such a minor is desired by an AFROTC student.

To grant appropriate academic credit applicable toward graduation for the successful completion of courses offered by Air Force ROTC Studies, except Six-week Field Training and Corps Training will be continued as a required part of the program, although they will not receive academic credit.

(1) First year students in AFROTC Studies will be required to take a year long course, Growth and Development of Aerospace Power, for which they will receive two (2) academic credits applicable toward graduation for each quarter.

(2) Second year students in AFROTC Studies will be required to take a year long course, Concepts of Air Force Leadership and Management, for which they will receive three (3) academic credits applicable toward graduation for each quarter.

(3) Where appropriate, cooperative arrangements will be made with civilian instructors to teach portions of the AFROTC studies courses cited in para (1) and (2) above. It will be the responsibility of the Air Force faculty members to arrange and coordinate the use of civilian instructors in the appropriate sub-topic areas.

\_\_\_\_\_  
COMMANDANT, AIR FORCE ROTC

\_\_\_\_\_  
INSTITUTION OFFICIAL

\_\_\_\_\_  
(DATE)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(DATE)