

5-19-1976

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/19/1976

Esther Peterson

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Peterson, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/19/1976" (1976). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 792.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/792>

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, 19 May 1976  
Presiding Officer: David Lygre, 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 Paul Kuroiwa and Robert Miller.

Visitors Present: W. W. Newschwander, Don Caughey, Larry Lawrence, L. A. Danton, David Wasser, Marci Baker, David Anderson, Odette Golden, Charles McGehee, Al Lewis, Lou Bovos, Barney Erickson, Bill Floyd, Dale Comstock, Don Schliesman, and James Alexander.

#### AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman suggested the following changes:

1. Under "Communications" add

- G. Letter from Lou Bovos
- H. Letter from Martin Kaatz
- I. Letter from Jim Applegate
- J. Letter from Richard Alumbaugh
- K. Letter from Kent Richards
- L. Letter from Al Lewis
- M. Letter from David Anderson
- N. Letter from Don Cummings
- O. Letter from Warren Street

2. Under "New Business" add

- E. Proposed Policy on Award of Undergraduate Degrees With Honors

3. Under "New Business" change Item "C" to "A" and change the other items accordingly.

MOTION NO. 1465: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Mr. Alumbaugh, that the adjournment time for this meeting and all subsequent regular Senate meetings for the remainder of the academic year be changed to 5:30 p.m. Passed with a majority hand vote of 26 yes, 4 no and one abstention.

MOTION NO. 1466: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Mr. Winters, to add to the Agenda the item "Collective Bargaining Agent Election" and that this item be considered immediately after the recess for the special meeting for review of Senate Motion No. 1459.

Mr. Bennett explained the motion was put on the agenda to give an opportunity to discuss any business relative to collective bargaining agents which may be left over from consideration of that motion.

Motion No. 1466 was voted on and passed with a voice vote.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION NO. 1467: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Linda Klug, that the minutes be approved as distributed. Passed with a unanimous voice vote.

*of May 5, 1976*

COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Letter from Al Lewis, dated May 5, 1976, notifying the Senate that Hazel Dunnington was elected as Senator to represent the Communications Department. Jim Goodrich was elected to serve as her alternate.
- B. Letter from Wilbur Johnson, dated May 5, 1976, notifying the Senate that Robert Mitchell was elected to represent the Geology and Physics Department. No alternate has been elected.
- C. Letter from Charles McGehee, dated May 6, 1976, informing the Senate of the AAUP's intention to initiate a formal faculty review regarding Senate Motion No. 1459. This will be the agenda item for the Special Senate Meeting to be held at 4:00 p.m. today.
- D. Letter from Robert Yee, dated May 4, 1976, regarding a Resolution approved at a meeting of the Political Science Department. They are requesting help in stopping the use of the Faculty Activity Analysis forms. This has been referred to the Senate Personnel Committee.
- E. Letter from Ron Frye *et al*, dated April 30, 1976, with a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Competency-Based Requirements. This will be discussed under New Business.
- F. Letter from Don Schliesman, dated May 10, 1976, regarding recent action taken by the Undergraduate Council regarding the awarding of undergraduate degrees with honors. This will be discussed under New Business.
- G. Report from Lou Bovos, pertaining to the letter from Don Schliesman, providing statistical data.
- H. Letter from Martin Kaatz, dated May 14, 1976, requesting that the Code's terminal degree requirement for rank of Professor, be waived for Dee R. Eberhart. This has been referred to the Senate Personnel Committee.
- I. Letter from Jim Applegate, dated May 10, 1976, reporting on charges given to the Senate Budget Committee.
- J. Letter from Richard Alumbaugh, dated May 13, 1976, notifying the Senate of his resignation, effective June 15, 1976.
- K. Letter from Kent Richards, dated May 14, 1976, notifying the Senate that Gordon Warren has been elected to replace Beverly Heckart as Senator for the History Department. No alternate has been elected yet.
- L. Letter from Al Lewis, dated May 18, 1976, requesting special consideration to waive the Code's rank requirement for Hazel Dunnington concerning her eligibility for promotion. This has been referred to the Senate Personnel Committee.
- M. Letter from David Anderson, dated May 17, 1976, notifying the Senate that his term as a member of the CFR will expire this summer. He suggests the Senate elect a CFR member and an alternate also.
- N. Letter from Don Cummings, dated May 14, 1976, enclosing a report on the Off-Campus Liberal Studies program.
- O. Letter from Warren Street, dated May 12, 1976, regarding a proposed Honors College and requesting evaluative comments on the proposal.

REPORTS

- A. Chairperson--Mr. Lygre reported on the Board of Trustees meeting held last Friday, May 14. One of the issues discussed was the distribution of salary increase funds to be made available on the first of July. At the last Senate meeting the Senate approved using most of the available funds for transition on to the new salary policy and schedule and an additional one step movement. The administrative position had been distributed to the Senate by a letter two weeks ago. The Board of Trustees approved

the proposal that was advanced by the administration. The reason that was given primarily was that the timing of the request by the faculty was not appropriate in view of the uncertainty that it would be funded by the legislature. The proposal from the administration was, of the approximately \$370,000 which would be available, approximately \$25,000 to \$30,000 would be used for salary inequities, about \$35,000 would be used for merit, probably about \$10,000 to \$20,000 would be used for promotion. The remainder of the money, roughly \$300,000 is to be distributed as provided in the Code, that is, scale adjustment or step increases or some combination of these two factors. The Senate now needs to develop a position as to how monies should be distributed. The Senate Budget Committee will be asked to bring a recommendation to the Senate.

Mr. Applegate mentioned he would like some input from Senators. He commented he is talking about 3.9 increase per faculty member, if the member is not on one of the promotions, inequities or merit lists.

- B. Executive Committee Report--Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Alumbaugh to give a report on nominations for the Executive Committee. Mr. Alumbaugh listed names of Senators who have agreed to be candidates for the various positions in the Executive Committee.

Mr. Bennett reported briefly on the Contingency Plan for Collective Bargaining Elections which has been distributed to the Senate.

C. Standing Committees

1. Budget Committee--No report at this meeting.
2. Curriculum Committee--No report at this meeting.
3. Personnel Committee--Mr. Vifian presented the report of the Personnel Committee concerning adjunct appointments. The recommendations of the Committee are as follows:
  - I. Code change. Appointment to adjunct positions shall be for no more than one year. Appointments may be renewed.
  - II. Administrative policy.
    - A. Adjunct professors will be used only when no regular faculty member possesses the necessary expertise or cannot be released. This policy should be very closely supervised by Deans and Department Chairman.
    - B. Adjuncts should not be appointed without consideration and approval of a department. In no case should the chairman alone act for the department. A written policy should be created by each department and program.
    - C. Whenever possible adjuncts should be replaced by full-time faculty members with full faculty rights even though the bulk of their teaching is off-campus.
    - D. To avoid education "jobbing," requests for off-campus courses should be approved without designating any instructor. Then after department discussion, a suitable instructor should be chosen either from our regular or adjunct staff.
  - III. Curriculum policy.
    - A. Programs will not be based on an adjunct staff. New programs should be instituted only when the majority of the program will be taught by full-time staff members.
    - B. Course designations and control should be placed in existing departments whenever possible. New courses should be created in conjunction with departments and whenever possible should carry a department title and be taught by department staff.

MOTION NO. 1468: The Personnel Committee moved for the adoption of their report.



After considerable discussion, Motion No. 1468 was passed with a unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1469: The Personnel Committee moved that Richard Fairbanks and David Burt be considered exceptions to the Code requirement for promotion and that they be considered eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

MOTION NO. 1470: Mr. Hawkins moved, seconded by Mr. Grossman, that the vote be conducted by ballot. Voted on and failed by a majority nay vote.

MOTION NO. 1471: Mr. Jensen moved to separate the motion. Failed for lack of a second.

Mr. Vifian explained that the Personnel Committee does not feel adequate to judge the equivalencies of the faculty members in question relative to the rank requirements listed in the Code. Consequently, the Personnel Committee has examined the supporting data of the Faculty members to determine whether reasonable assessments of the equivalencies had been made by their respective departments. If this process appeared to be complete and reasonable, the Personnel Committee has decided to ask the Senate to approve such persons as exceptions to the rank requirements in the Code.

Motion No. 1469 voted on by roll call vote:

Aye: Jay Bachrach, Curt Wiberg, Richard Jensen, Robert Bennett, Stan Dudley, Dick Alumbaugh, Duncan McQuarrie, Beverly Heckart, Milo Smith, Rosella Dickson, John Vifian, Linda Klug, Roger Garrett, Otto Jakubek, Nancy Lester, Roger Winters, Jim Applegate, Thomas Yeh, Owen Dugmore.

Nay: George Grossman and Joe Schomer.

Abstain: Dolores Osborn, Craig Allen, Pearl Douce, Ed Harrington, John Gregor, Kathy Kingman, Richard Doi, Ruth Vogel, Betty Hileman, Charles Hawkins, Charles Brunner, John Purcell, and Jay Forsyth.

The vote passed with 19 Aye, 2 Nay and 13 Abstain.

#### RECESS

The Senate recessed at 4:00 p.m. to hold a special meeting on Motion No. 1459.

#### RECONVENE

The regular Senate meeting reconvened at 4:50 p.m.

MOTION NO. 1473: Ms. Heckart moved, seconded by Ms. Lester, that the Contingency Plan for a collective bargaining election, as proposed by the Executive Committee, be adopted with the following change: That in the event that a run-off election is required after June 10, the ballots for such run-off election be sent to the faculty on June 15.

Ms. Heckart explained that the intent of the motion is that there be a separate run-off election.

MOTION NO. 1474: Mr. Winters moved, seconded by Craig Allen, to amend by striking the change Ms. Heckart has suggested. Voted on and passed by a hand vote of 14 Aye, 12 No, and 3 Abstentions.

MOTION NO. <sup>1475</sup>1485: Mr. Alumbaugh moved, seconded by Mr. Jakubek, to amend to strike under "Eligibility to Vote" the sentence "Persons mentioned in Sections 1.01 A(2) and 1.01 B are excluded." and strike the next statement and replace it with the statement, "Persons eligible to vote are those described in 1.01 A and 1.01 B of the Faculty Code."

Mr. Alumbaugh explained the intent of the motion is to spell out who is going to vote and establish rationale.

MOTION NO. 1476: Ms. Klug moved, seconded by Ms. Hileman, to amend the amendment so that the replacement sentence would read, "Persons eligible to vote are those described in Section 1.01 A of the Faculty Code." Voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

Discussion resumed on the amendment as amended.

Motion No. 1475, as amended, was voted on by roll call vote:

Aye: Nancy Lester, David Burt, Joe Schomer, Owen Pratz, Dolores Osborn, Curt Wiberg, John Vifian, Milo Smith, Rosella Dickson, Dick Alumbaugh, John Gregor, Betty Hileman, Pearl Douce', Otto Jakubek, Charles Hawkins, George Grossman, Jay Bachrach and Owen Dugmore.

Nay: Beverly Heckart, Kathy Kingman, Jay Forsyth, Linda Klug, Jimmie Applegate, Roger Winters, Ruth Vogel, Richard Jensen, Robert Bennett, Thomas Yeh and Roger Garrett.

Abstain: Craig Allen and Stan Dudley.

Motion No. 1475 passed with 18 Aye, 11 Nay and 2 Abstain.

Motion No. 1473, as amended, was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote and one abstention.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

## A G E N D A

FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, May 19, 1976  
Room 471, Psychology Building

(Note: This meeting will recess temporarily at 4:00 p.m. to conduct the Special Senate meeting scheduled for that time)

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of May 5, 1976
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
  - A. Letter from Al Lewis
  - B. Letter from Wilbur Johnson
  - C. Letter from Charles McGehee
  - D. Letter from Robert Yee
  - E. Letter from Ronald Frye et al
  - F. Letter from Don Schliesman
- V. REPORTS
  - A. Chairperson
  - B. Executive Committee
  - C. Standing Committees
    1. Budget
    2. Curriculum
    3. Personnel
    4. Student Affairs
    5. Code
- VI. OLD BUSINESS
  - A. Code Committee Proposals
  - B. President's Code Proposals
- VII. NEW BUSINESS
  - A. Proposed Policy on Nonmatriculated Students
  - B. Proposed Policy on Undergraduate Program Review and Evaluation
  - C. Code Committee Proposals
  - D. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Competency-Based Requirements
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

1975-76

4:00

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF

Regular Meeting May 19, 1976

ROLL CALL

SENATOR

ALTERNATE

Allen, Craig  
 Alumbaugh, Dick  
 Applegate, Jimmie

Phil Tolin  
 Neil Roberts

Bachrach, Jay  
 Bennett, Robert  
 Brooks, James  
 Burt, David

Peter Burkholder  
 Robert Bentley  
 Edward Harrington  
 Richard Johnson

Dickson, Rosella  
 Douce', Pearl  
 Doi, Richard  
 Dudley, Stan  
 Dugmore, Owen

Margaret Lawrence  
 Joan Howe  
 Constance Speth  
 Gerald Brunner  
 Robert Nuzum

Franz, Wolfgang

Charles Brunner

Garrett, Roger  
 Gregor, John  
 Gulezian, Allen

Lynn Osborn  
 Bill Hillar  
 Jay Forsyth

Hawkins, Charles  
 Heckart, Beverly  
 Hileman, Betty

David Kaufman  
 Gordon Warren  
 Deloris Johns

Jakubek, Otto  
 Jensen, J. Richard  
 Keith, Art  
 Kingman, Kathy  
 Klug, Linda  
 Kuroiwa, Paul

Joel Andress  
 Bonalyn Bricker  
 George Grossman

Lester, Nancy  
 Lygre, David

Dieter Romboy  
 Helmi Habib

McQuarrie, Duncan  
 Miller, Robert  
 Dolores Osborn  
 Purcell, John  
 Samuelson, Dale  
 Smith, Milo

Owen Pratz  
 Wallace Webster  
 Blaine Wilson  
 Kent Martin  
 Lee Fisher  
 A. James Hawkins

Vifian, John  
 Vogel, Ruth  
 Wiberg, Curt  
 Winters, Roger

Keith Rinehart  
 Thomas Thelen  
 Robert Yee

Yeh, Thomas  
 Young, Madge

William Craig  
 Joe Schomer

RANDOM  
ROLL CALL VOTE.

*Motion 1469*  
*May 14*  
*Regular meeting*

<u>SENATOR</u>	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	<u>ALTERNATE</u>
Jay Bachrach	✓			Peter Burkholder
Curt Wiberg	✓			Thomas Thelen
Dolores Osborn			✓	Blaine Wilson
Art Keith		✓		George Grossman
Richard Jensen	✓			Bonaly Bricker
Robert Bennett	✓			Robert Bentley
Craig Allen			✓	
Pearl Douce			✓	Joan Howe
Stan Dudley	✓			Gerald Brunner
James Brooks			✓	Ed Harrington
Dick Alumbach	✓			Phil Tolin
Madge Young		✓		Joe Schomer
John Gregor			✓	Bill Hillar
Kathy Kingman			✓	
Duncan McQuarrie	✓			Owen Pratz
Beverly Heckart	✓			Gordon Warren
Paul Kuroiwa				Don Woodcock
David Burt				Richard Johnson
Milo Smith	✓			A. James Hawkins
Richard Doi			✓	Constance Speth
Rosella Dickson	✓			Margaret Lawrence
Ruth Vogel			✓	
John Vifian	✓			Keith Rinehart
Betty Hileman			✓	Deloris Johns
Dale Samuelson				Lee Fisher
Linda Klug	✓			Clayton Denman
Charles Hawkins			✓	David Kaufman
David Lygre				Helmi Habib
Wolfgang Franz			✓	Charles Brunner
Roger Garrett	✓			Lynn Osborn
Otto Jakubek	✓			Joel Andress
Robert Miller				Wallace Webster
John Purcell			✓	Kent Martin
Nancy Lester	✓			Dieter Romboy
Allen Gulezian			✓	Jay Forsyth
Roger Winters	✓			Robert Yee
Jim Applegate	✓			Neil Roberts
Thomas Yeh	✓			William Craig
Owen Dugmore	✓			Robert E. Nuzum

19

2

13

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

H. H. Newschwander

Don Coughy

Ray P. Lawrence

L. H. Dutton

David Wasser

Marcia Baker

David Anderson

Albert Speder

Charles W. Heber

Al Lewis

Lou Bovos

Barney Erickson

Bill Floyd

Alec Cowstock

Donald M. Schluener

James Alexander



RANDOM  
ROLL CALL VOTE*Note on amendment**Motion 1475*

SENATOR				ALTERNATE
	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	
Beverly Heckart		✓		Gordon Warren
John Purcell				Kent Martin
Nancy Lester	✓			Dieter Romboy
David Burt	✓			Richard Johnson
Paul Kuroiwa				Don Woodcock
- Madge Young	✓			- Joe Schomer
- Duncan McQuarrie	✓			- Owen Pratz
Dolores Osborn	✓			Blaine Wilson
Curt Wiberg	✓			Thomas Thelen
John Vifian	✓			Keith Rinehart
Milo Smith	✓			A. James Hawkins
Rosella Dickson	✓			Margaret Lawrence
Dale Samuelson				Lee Fisher
Dick Alumbaugh	✓			Phil Tolin
Kathy Kingman		✓		
- Allen Gulezian		✓		Jay Forsyth
Linda Klug		✓		Clayton Denman
John Gregor	✓			Bill Hillar
Jim Applegate		✓		Neil Roberts
Robert Miller				Wallace Webster
Roger Winters		✓		Robert Yee
Ruth Vogel		✓		
Betty Hileman	✓			Delores Johns
Richard Jensen		✓		Bonalyne Brickers
Robert Bennett		✓		Robert Bentley
Wolfgang Franz				Charles Brunner
Thomas Yeh		✓		William Craig
Pearl Douce'	✓			Joan Howe
David Lygre				Helmi Habib
Craig Allen			✓	
James Brooks				Ed Harrington
Stan Dudley			✓	Gerald Brunner
Otto Jakubek	✓			Joel Address
Roger Garrett		✓		Lynn Osborn
Richard Doi				Constance Speth
Charles Hawkins	✓			David Kaufman
Art Keith	✓			- George Grossman
Jay Bachrach	✓			Peter Burkholder
Owen Dugmore	✓			Robert Nuzum

*18 11**2*

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON 98926

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

PHONE 509 963 1066

COMMUNICATIVE DISORDERS  
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

MEMO

TO: David Lygre, Chairman  
Faculty Senate

FROM: Albert Lewis, Chairman  
Department of Communication

RECEIVED  
MAY 6 1976  
FACULTY SENATE

DATE: May 5, 1976

RE: Election of Faculty Senator and Alternate

At the Department of Communication faculty meeting held May 4, 1976, Hazel Dunnington was elected as Faculty Senator and Jim Goodrich was elected as Alternate for the 1976-79 term.

wh



CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND PHYSICS

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

May 5, 1976


RECEIVED  
MAY 6 1976  
FACULTY SENATE

Richard V. Alumbaugh, Secretary  
Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
Campus

Dear Dr. Alumbaugh:

At a regular department faculty meeting held on May 4, 1976, Dr. Robert C. Mitchell was elected senator from this department for the coming term. Since Dr. Mitchell was the only member consenting to nomination, there is no alternate.

Sincerely,



Wilbur V. Johnson  
Chairman

WVJ: 1b



AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS  
ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON 98926

May 6, 1976

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1976  
FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David Lygre, Chairperson  
Faculty Senate  
Central Washington State College  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Dear Dr. Lygre:

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the AAUP I want to protest in the most vigorous fashion the action taken by the Faculty Senate on May 5 concerning delay of the proposed election for a collective bargaining agent. It is appalling that an election for a collective bargaining agent would be approved without any consideration for the most commonly accepted and basic rules of collective bargaining. For example, to require faculty to sign petitions supporting prospective agents before the results of the election to determine whether or not the faculty desires such a vote is a patently unfair labor practice. An even more unfair labor practice is the Senate's stipulation of a deadline for submission of petitions which will not allow organizations reasonable time to consult their memberships, not to mention plan and conduct an adequate campaign. The fact that this schedule was initiated by a prospective participant in the election, the AFT, and continued over the objections of other participants only compounds the unfair quality of the practice.

The AAUP is prepared to participate in an election to select a collective bargaining agent provided (1) that proper standards and procedures exist and are adhered to, and (2) that the chapter membership authorizes such participation. Our organization, being democratic and rule-oriented, requires (1) that only the membership and not the Executive Committee can commit the organization to participation in a collective bargaining election, and (2) that meetings can only be called upon ten days advance, written notice. Thus the earliest a meeting could be called would be May 17, the day before the scheduled election. Such a meeting is being called to determine the will of the membership in this matter.

In the meantime, I wish to make two points quite forcefully: (1) Under no circumstance is the name of the AAUP to be included on any ballot by anybody for any purpose without specific written permission by me on behalf of the chapter. And (2) because we feel strongly that the interests of the faculty in general and the AAUP in specific will be damaged by this irresponsible and frivolous action, we have contacted our National Office of the AAUP and received legal advice. Moreover, since we believe that our rights



AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS  
ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON 98926

Dr. David Lygre  
May 6, 1976  
page 2

as faculty members have been violated, we will also initiate a formal faculty review of this action according to the provisions of Section 1.145 of the Faculty Code.

Very truly yours,

Charles L. McGehee  
Chapter President

C O P Y

Date: 4 May 1976

TO: Burt Williams, Dean  
David Lygre, Faculty Senate Chairperson  
Department Chairpersons, School of Social &  
Behavioral Sciences

FROM: Robert Yee

RE: Resolution approved at the 28 April 1976 meeting of  
the Political Science Department

As chairperson, I have been instructed by the department staff to forward to you the following resolution for your consideration, to ask you to inform others of its contents, and to urge you to take other appropriate action:

The Department of Political Science, believing that the Faculty Activity Analysis forms do not measure anything relevant to higher education, urges other Departments, the Faculty Senate, and the Administration to undertake immediate steps to help stop the use of these forms by means of the following procedures:

1. Inform and educate the legislature to their inutility
2. Use existing intercollegiate machinery to protest the use of the forms
3. If necessary, the Administration and Board of Trustees should take the lead by refusing to submit the forms.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Competency-Based Requirements  
Ronald M. Frye, Chairman  
Don Cummings  
Barney Erickson  
Jim Goodrich  
Leslie Mueller  
Donald Schliesman  
Dan Unruh

RE: Committee Report

DATE: April 30, 1976

According to the charge given to this committee on January 5, 1976, the committee was to:

1. Investigate the desirability and feasibility of adopting competency-based requirements in English composition and if the committee considers it appropriate in other areas as well,
2. To determine whether and how reasonable and valid standards of evaluation could be implemented,
3. Whether and how students could receive adequate coursework and other assistance to meet any requirements which are adopted, and
4. What impact the adoption of such standards would have on the college and on specific departments.

Before the above charges could be addressed, the committee found it necessary to define basic competencies. For the purpose of this report, the committee considered basic competencies to be: (a) English usage to include both the written and spoken word, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) basic arithmetic computation.

This committee believes that Central Washington State College as an institution of higher learning has not only the right but also the responsibility to establish standards of achievement in the above areas. This committee believes that the basic responsibility for student competencies rests with the faculty. Student competencies, among

other things, include the demand the faculty is making on students. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to see that students demonstrate writing of basic English in his or her particular field of endeavor. The committee also believes that the best place to check student competencies is in the classroom by examination papers and assignments made to students by individual faculty members. We believe that each course is a series of checks to see whether or not the individual is competent in basic skills as well as a check of subject matter competency.

We must assume that students have been taught to do proper writing, spelling, and arithmetic computation, but the demand has not been put on these students to check on these competencies. Each department must accept the responsibility for ensuring that each student meets general competencies for that particular discipline.

The committee reviewed a report to the Dean of the School of Behavioral Sciences regarding English proficiency. Much of the following material is taken from that report. We commend Richard Alumbaugh, Roger Garrett, James Goodrich, Robert Jacobs, Thomas Kerr, Phil Tolin, Gordon Warren, and Roger Winters for the fine work they did on this committee. A copy of the report is attached.

While it is easy to blame the public school teachers, one should remember that these teachers are a product of their own college training. If they are not forced to write literate, organized compositions and write them often, they will neither expect nor require the same from their own students. We have good evidence that people teach like they are taught. The faculty of four-year colleges and universities which graduate semi-literate teachers share the responsibility for problems faced today. Professors on this campus as well as others have come to rely on exams which do not require students to display and sharpen their skills of organizing and communicating the materials they have assimilated. In many cases, term papers disappeared long ago and those professors who do require papers usually emphasize research in content over syntax, grammar and spelling. If semi-literacy is acceptable to college professors, it may be unreasonable to expect public school teachers to seek better from their own students.

We must also emphasize the legalistic aspect. Simply stated, that is, it is easier to justify a grade for an objective test than it is to justify a grade for an essay exam. Faculties should understand that if an essay exam is properly written and properly administered, it can be just as thorough as the so-called objective test and can assess many of the competencies to which this committee is making its report.

Because of funding and because of the emphasis attached to "numbers," many faculty members on this campus and others have made an interpretation that the administration as well as the state legislature is interested in quantity and not quality. The academic administration at Central Washington State College insists that they do not want to



cheapen the qualitative aspects of education. They do not want Central Washington State College to function as a factory, to become little more than a diploma mill. Even though emphasis is placed on enrollment and class size in relationship to institutional budget, quality can still be emphasized. The committee realizes that in order to require remedial work of students the administration as well as funding sources from the state legislature must realize that college graduates, in order to be proficient in basic competencies, will need remediation and that some method of funding must be provided if that remedial work is going to be offered. Also, measures must be approved which allow faculty members to devote more time and effort for students' writing, spelling, and arithmetic problems.

Students on this campus as well as other campuses have large blocks of time for passive entertainment, because evidently they are not being challenged in their classwork. If these students were required to read materials pertinent to their coursework and then were held accountable for failure to complete assignments, we would undoubtedly see a rise in literacy. Presently, we are operating under a non-punitive system of grading because society is demanding it. But, on the other hand, colleges and universities are falling into disfavor because we are not demanding that students demonstrate basic competencies in their classrooms. This is a dichotomy. Tougher standards will not be applied, either in the public schools or on the college and university campuses, until instructional staff members as well as parents demand a return to established educational principles which have fallen into disfavor with the present generation of so-called "educators."

All of the following is either directly quoted or para-phrased from the report to the Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences with the English Department Composition Curriculum Committee's response in brackets.

This committee feels that corrective steps must be taken to halt the steady erosion of English proficiency at Central and throughout the entire state educational system. Curricula must be shaped to require students to write extensively. We see nothing extreme in our proposals. Indeed, we view the following recommendations as essentially conservative, the minimal measures necessary to roll back the deepening gloom of semi-literacy:

1. Require all matriculating students to take a remedial class (English 099) which emphasizes basic grammar, spelling, punctuation, usage rules, vocabulary building, and similar skills. Students would be able to challenge the class by taking a combination objective and written exam which would test basic skills as well as expository writing ability. Passage of the exam would exempt the student from taking the course, but no credit would be given.

[In-coming students who score low on the relevant sections of the Washington Pre-College should be required to complete English 100, Basic English Skills (a new course being developed by the Comp Committee) before they are allowed to take English 101. Students who still appear in English 101 with serious deficiencies could be referred into the remedial course, perhaps via an Incomplete in 101, or some such--the logistics remain unclear. Also, we are thinking in terms of some mini-courses in the Writing Center, courses that would deal with specific problems, such as spelling, or syntax and style, or usage, or vocabulary-building. Students would be referred into appropriate mini-courses. Students in other composition courses who prove to have persistent, specific problems with their writing would also be referred into these mini-courses.]

2. Return to a three-quarter English composition sequence (101, 102, and 103, each worth 4 credits). A shorter program, like the present system, is quite inadequate. It should be a true composition sequence and not be geared to students needing remedial work. While the exact content of these courses would be determined by the English faculty, acting in consultation with a committee of the whole faculty (to be discussed below), we hope that the structure would introduce skills in rhetoric, organization of expository writing, additional grammar study and vocabulary building, elements of style, research writing skills, and development of a more polished style through frequent rewriting of assignments.

The three composition classes would have to be taken in sequence and as soon as possible after admission to Central. Each segment would have to be offered and staffed each quarter with adequate sections of sufficiently small size to provide individual attention. It would mean hiring additional staff solely for this purpose in some cases. More money would have to be appropriated, and not at the expense of other programs, because large composition classes are self-defeating.

[The 101-102-103 sequence produces all kinds of problems for the English Department and is probably of questionable value to the student. We like the idea of something going on in the junior year that can serve as a sort of 10-week literacy exam and that can also get beyond the standard freshman composition kinds of writing concerns. What the Comp Committee is evolving is this: A remedial course; then an English 101 required of all students; then an English 102 required of students who do not do well enough--say, get an "A"--in 101; then there would be a 301, or more accurately, a cluster of 301 options.]

3. Abolish English 301 as a required class if a three-quarter composition sequence is instituted. English 301 should be



transformed into an elective advanced composition class and not used as a last-minute attempt to remedy students' literary incompetence.

4. An All College Committee on English Composition--on which faculty from many departments, including English, would serve--should be established to: (1) assess the purposes and goals of present composition classes in order to determine how they might better serve the needs of the rest of the college community beyond the English Department; and (2) assess the overall impact of the recommended program upon the college in order that enrollment (which, today, is the name of the game) may not suffer as a result of it. The committee should explore the possibility of insuring equality of standards through coordination with all four-year public colleges and universities.

This committee should become a permanent overseer of the English composition program to make certain that common expectations and goals are being achieved. Entrusting this task to the English Department alone would both create a conflict of interest and make it the scapegoat if difficulties develop. All faculty have a stake in literate students and no department has a monopoly on usage of the English language or setting standards of competence.

[The All-College Committee on English Composition seems a good idea--though the term overseer is perhaps needlessly threatening in tone. To the functions listed in your report for this group we might consider adding "overseeing" the things mentioned in points 5 and 6. Also this group might begin to explore ways of getting something like an in-service program set up for talking with faculty about setting up writing assignments and responding to the students' written work. Also, they might be involved in liaison with public schools and Central's policies concerning English composition. They might even begin to look at the official "written voice" of the College--that is, writing that goes out in official publications and even letters from administrative offices, and does so much to establish a kind of public tone for the school.]

5. Since proper use of the English language is the coin of the realm in higher education, professors should be encouraged where possible to give essay exams and to require term papers or similar expository work. Both exams and papers must be graded on more than just content. Work done outside the classroom should be done over and over until it meets acceptable English standards. Students learn to write by writing, and develop writing skill at a much faster rate when the method of instruction is "carefully supervised

practice." "Modern English, especially written English," George Orwell has stated, "is full of bad habits which spread by imitation and which can be avoided if one is willing to take the necessary trouble."

Professors who feel that certain students have not acquired basic writing skills should refer them to the Writing Resource Center for examination to determine if they need only temporary remedial work or if they should be remanded to one of the first-year English composition classes. The option of WRC referral is already available but insufficiently exercised. An immediate effort should be made to remind faculty of the WRC program and to encourage its use.

6. The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction should investigate the teaching of English in the public schools with a view to determining how it is taught, who establishes requirements (besides paying lip service to legal descriptions), and why semi-literate students are allowed to graduate.

We concur with the recommendation of the preceding report and commend it to you for consideration as a part of this committee's report.

The following motion was passed by the Teacher Education Council on April 25, 1976, and was directed to this committee for consideration: "The Teacher Education Council urges the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Basic Competencies to seriously consider recommending that the Testing Center administer the California Test of Basic Skills to all new students enrolling at CWSC, for the purpose of establishing norms."

This committee has chosen to add this motion to its report.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON  
98926

RECEIVED

MAY 12 1976

May 10, 1976

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David Lygre, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
C.W.S.C.  
Campus

Dear Dr. Lygre:

This letter transmits recent action taken by the Undergraduate Council regarding the award of undergraduate degrees with honors. To be in concert with most other four-year colleges and universities in Washington state as well as across the nation and to reestablish meaning and credibility to honors degrees, the Council approved unanimously the following motion:

.....that the Undergraduate Council accept the Bovos proposal to adopt the Latin terms and raise the g.p.a. requirements as:

- cum laude.....3.4
- magna cum laude.....3.6
- summa cum laude.....3.8

to be effective for all students fall quarter, 1977.

We request that the Faculty Senate approve this recommendation. Mr. Bovos and I would be pleased to provide data or answer questions.

Sincerely yours,



Donald M. Schliesman  
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

la

cc: Vice President Harrington

SUMMER 1974

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u> -----		297	
Honors	3.25 - +	64	21.5
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	38	12.8
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	22	7.4
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	4	1.3
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u> -----		161	
Honors	3.25 - +	41	25.5
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	22	13.7
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	16	9.9
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	3	1.9
<u>B. A.</u> -----		131	
Honors	3.25 - +	22	16.8
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	16	12.2
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	5	3.8
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	.8
<u>B. S.</u> -----		5	
Honors	3.25 - +	1	20.0
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	1	20.0
<u>NEW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u> -----		39	13.1
cum laude	3.40	25	8.4
magna cum laude	3.60	12	4.0
summa cum laude	3.80	2	.7

FALL 1974

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<hr/>			
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>	-----	224	
Honors	3.25 - +	64	28.0
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	37	16.5
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	20	8.9
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	7	3.1
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>	-----	140	
Honors	3.25 - +	45	32.1
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	27	19.3
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	12	8.6
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	6	4.3
<u>B. A.</u>	-----	83	
Honors	3.25 - +	19	22.9
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	10	12.0
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	8	9.6
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	1.2
<u>B. S.</u>	-----	1	
Honors	3.25 - +	0	
<u>NEW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>	-----	36	16.1
cum laude	3.40	18	8.0
magna cum laude	3.60	13	5.8
summa cum laude	3.80	5	2.2

WINTER 1975

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<hr/>			
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>	-----	240	
Honors	3.25 - +	75	31.3
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	44	18.3
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	26	10.8
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	5	2.1
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>	-----	124	
Honors	3.25 - +	44	35.5
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	25	20.2
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	14	11.3
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	5	4.0
<u>B. A.</u>	-----	110	
Honors	3.25 - +	26	23.6
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	16	14.5
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	10	9.0
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	0	0.0
<u>B. S.</u>	-----	6	
Honors	3.25 - +	5	83.3
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	3	50.0
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	2	33.3
<u>NEW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>	-----	49	20.4
cum laude	3.40	27	11.3
magna cum laude	3.60	18	7.5
summa cum laude	3.80	4	1.7

SPRING 1975

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<hr/>			
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>	-----	650	
Honors	3.25 - +	209	32.2
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	114	17.5
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	65	10.0
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	30	4.6
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>	-----	328	
Honors	3.25 - +	122	37.2
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	75	22.9
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	36	11.0
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	11	3.4
<u>B. A.</u>	-----	310	
Honors	3.25 - +	83	26.8
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	39	12.6
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	26	8.4
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	18	5.8
<u>B. S.</u>	-----	12	
Honors	3.25 - +	4	33.3
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	3	25.0
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	8.3
<u>NEW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>	-----	135	20.8
cum laude	3.40	67	10.3
magna cum laude	3.60	49	7.5
summa cum laude	3.80	19	2.9

SUMMER 1975

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<hr/>			
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>	-----	239	
Honors	3.25 - +	34	14.2
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	21	8.8
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	11	4.6
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	2	.8
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>	-----	126	
Honors	3.25 - +	22	17.5
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	12	9.5
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	9	7.1
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	.8
<u>B. A.</u>	-----	109	
Honors	3.25 - +	12	11.0
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	9	8.3
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	2	1.8
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	.9
<u>B. S.</u>	-----	4	
Honors	3.25 - +	0	
<u>NEW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>	-----	23	9.6
cum laude	3.40	16	6.7
magna cum laude	3.60	5	2.1
summa cum laude	3.80	2	.8



FALL 1975

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<hr/>			
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>	-----	181	
Honors	3.25 - +	51	28.2
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	27	14.9
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	18	9.9
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	6	3.3
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>	-----	94	
Honors	3.25 - +	25	26.6
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	14	14.9
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	9	9.6
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	2	2.1
<u>B. A.</u>	-----	85	
Honors	3.25 - +	26	30.6
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	13	15.3
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	9	10.6
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	4	4.7
<u>B. S.</u>	-----	2	
Honors	3.25 - +	0	
<u>NEW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>	-----	32	17.7
cum laude	3.40	16	8.8
magna cum laude	3.60	11	6.1
summa cum laude	3.80	5	2.8

WINTER 1976

PERCENTAGE OF HONOR STUDENTS PER GRADUATING CLASS

	GPA Range	Total Students	% of Class
<hr/>			
<u>TOTAL GRADUATES</u>	-----	213	
Honors	3.25 - +	52	24.4
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	28	13.1
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	18	8.5
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	6	2.8
<u>B. A. EDUCATION</u>	-----	84	
Honors	3.25 - +	29	34.5
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	16	19.0
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	9	10.7
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	4	4.8
<u>B. A.</u>	-----	125	
Honors	3.25 - +	21	16.8
Distinction	3.25 - 3.49	12	9.6
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	8	6.4
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	.8
<u>B. S.</u>	-----	4	
Honors	3.25 - +	2	50.0
High Distinction	3.50 - 3.74	1	25.0
Highest Distinction	3.75 - 4.00	1	25.0
<u>NEW PROPOSAL - HONORS</u>	-----	32	15.0
cum laude	3.40	20	9.4
magna cum laude	3.60	6	2.8
summa cum laude	3.80	6	2.8

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

May 14, 1976

RECEIVED

MAY 14 1976

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David Lygre  
Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
CAMPUS

Dear Dr. Lygre:

Members of the Department of Geography and the Dean of the School of Social & Behavioral Sciences join with me in requesting that the terminal degree requirement for the rank of Professor, Faculty Code Sec. 2.10C (4) (a), be waived for Dee R. Eberhart.

In support of my request are appended copies of:

1. My letter of recommendation to Dean Williams;
2. Data from Dee Eberhart's Professional Service Record;
3. Letter of November 8, 1967 concerning Dee's terminal status at the time of consideration for tenure.

I would be pleased to amplify the data in any of the above in person should the Personnel Committee so desire.

Sincerely,

  
Martin R. Kaatz  
Chairman

MRK:lj1

# CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

May 10, 1976

RECEIVED  
MAY 11 1976  
FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David G. Lygre, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
CWSC

Dear Dr. Lygre:

Two specific charges were given to the Senate Budget Committee in your October 1, 1975, memorandum. The charges were as follows:

1. To develop a salary schedule proposal which incorporates the principles adopted by the Senate on February 19, 1975 (copy of Senate Motion No. 1245 enclosed), and which attempts to coordinate this effort with those at WWSC and EWSC. To develop a clear, simple report of the proposed schedule including rationale for the specific suggestions, and to propose a strategy for implementation of the schedule.
2. To review the budgetary trends at the College, particularly the budgeting of academic programs relative to support areas, and to propose budget priorities.

The committee developed a salary policy and schedule incorporating the criteria in the first charge. The policy and schedule was accepted without modification by the Faculty Senate and put in the hands of the Council of Faculty Representatives for state-wide action. President Brooks described clearly at the April 21, 1976 Faculty Senate meeting the state-wide position of the proposal at that time.

Action on the second charge has been limited and, if the charge is to be completed, considerable effort by next year's committee will be required. I have suggested for the past two years that the Faculty Senate chair delegate some responsibilities to the Standing Committee chairpersons. The Senate Budget Committee chair could, for example, be delegated responsibility to represent the Faculty Senate chair at budget meetings. Unless the committee chair is involved with the

Dr. David G. Lygre  
page 2  
May 10, 1976

budgetary process, it is my feeling that a charge such as number two will never be fully met.

The Senate Budget Committee also studied the administration's salary priorities, developed a committee position, and recommended it to the Faculty Senate on May 5, 1976. The Committee's recommendation was accepted without modification by the Senate.

On behalf of the Senate Budget Committee, thank you for the assistance you provided as we met throughout the year.

Sincerely yours,



Jimmie R. Applegate, Chairman  
Senate Budget Committee

cc: Betty Hileman  
Stan Dudley  
Tom Thelen  
George Fadenrecht

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

RECEIVED  
MAY 17 1976  
FACULTY SENATE

May 13, 1976

David Lygre, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
Campus

Dear Dr. Lygre:

As a result of being assigned to teach off-campus for the 1976-77 academic year, I am submitting my resignation as Senator as specified in the faculty code. My resignation will be effective June 15, 1976.

Sincerely,

*Richard V. Alumbaugh*  
Richard V. Alumbaugh

RA/lmj

cc: Joe Rich  
John Silva

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

May 14, 1976

RECEIVED  
MAY 18 1976  
FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David Lygre, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
Campus

Dear David:

The Department of History has elected Gordon Warren to serve as the department's faculty senator during the 1976-77 year. He will replace Beverly Heckart who will be on leave. The department will elect an alternate at its first meeting fall quarter when several faculty now on leave will be back on campus.

Sincerely,



Kent D, Richards  
Chairman

bd

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION  
COMMUNICATIVE DISORDERS  
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON 98926  
PHONE 509-963-1086

May 18, 1976

RECEIVED  
MAY 19 1976  
FACULTY SENATE

Professor David Lygre, Chairperson  
Faculty Senate  
Central Washington State College

Dear Dave:

The Department of Communication voted unanimously to request the Faculty Senate to waive the educational requirement for full professor for Professor Hazel Dunnington. Under the old faculty code Professor Dunnington has been eligible for promotion to full professor for several years and we were informed only last week that she has lost that eligibility. Such a change may well be the altering of a contract comparable to the extension of tenure probation from four to six years. Consequently, we request the Senate to waive the new requirement.

Cordially,



Albert Lewis  
Chairperson

ALL/wh



CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

90926

RECEIVED

May 17, 1976

MAY 19 1976

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David Lygre  
Chairman, Faculty Senate  
Edison Hall  
Campus

Dear David:

This summer will complete my term as a member of the Council of Faculty Representatives. The terms of Central's other representatives, Helmi Habib and Wolfgang Franz, continue for one and two years respectively.

When the Senate elects a faculty member to the CFR it may elect an alternate as well. I would recommend that an alternate be selected although the experience of the last two years has shown that it is not essential to elect an alternate.

Sincerely,

*David R. Anderson*

David R. Anderson

DRA:lp

# CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAM

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

May 14, 1976

RECEIVED

MAY 18 1976

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David Lygre, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
CWSC

Dear David:

The following is my valedictory report on the Off-Campus Liberal Studies program. I'm also enclosing some copies of last year's report, since much of its narrative and descriptive material is still germane.

## What happened last year and what we learned:

1. We continued to offer elective courses and the Independent Seminar units to FAA people in the program. The Independent Seminar Sequence seems to offer an effective and efficient way of getting coursework to adult students who are working full time and are spread out geographically. It seems to be superior to the more common approach: filling the highways with professors as we try to replicate off-campus our on-campus structures and techniques. The ISS approach has worked well with the students we got from the FAA. Whether it would work well with other students, perhaps people not so highly trained as are those in the FAA, I don't know. My feeling--unsubstantiated with data though it may be--is that the ISS approach might well work better with certain average and even below average adult students who do not operate well within the forms of the traditional classroom.

2. We registered perhaps a half dozen new students from the FAA people in Washington State. We worked quite hard to see what interest there would be in the program among FAA people in Oregon and Idaho. There was not enough interest to warrant expanding out of state. There are not enough potential students left in the FAA in the northwest to sustain the program beyond the current group of students. Thus, to let any new students into the program at all would entail expanding outside the FAA. We were not able to get students in the Edmonds business program interested in Liberal Studies as a General Education option. We found no other group of potential students outside the FAA for future expansion of the program--except for some in the Gray's Harbor area who have expressed some interest in a degree program structured like Liberal Studies.

3. We began to feel the bumping together of our off-campus programs. For instance, courses offered by Law and Justice and by Liberal Studies in the Seattle area are beginning in a certain sense to compete. There is clearly need for more coordination of our

Dr. David Lygre, Chairman  
May 14, 1976 Page 2

off-campus efforts to avoid needless duplication and actual erosion of program by program. This coordination can only come from a level above the program directors.

My recommendations for the next two or three years:

1. We should continue to offer the necessary Independent Seminar units for people now in the Liberal Studies program.

2. We should coordinate the electives offered for Liberal Studies students with courses being offered by other off-campus programs, especially Law and Justice and the Edmonds program in Business Administration. This would mean identifying certain courses that would be appropriate for both or all three programs, and scheduling them in at times and places that would make them convenient for our FAA people.

3. We should not allow new people into the program from the FAA, unless the program expands outside the FAA. I recommend this because there will not be enough new students showing up in the FAA to support courses and units of the Independent Seminar Sequence once we get through the group now in the program. Unless we get a large number of students who could be combined with any new FAA people, we would end up with an awkward and uneconomical trickle of new FAA students.

4. If there is any further expansion of the program outside the FAA, responsibility for directing that expansion should be given to the new Assistant Vice-President for Off-Campus Programs, who should be able to speak more tellingly to department chairmen, deans, and other program directors. We will need for next year a Director of Liberal Studies to continue with our commitment to the FAA, but after next year finishing up the FAA program could probably be taken over entirely by the Assistant Vice-President. The present directorship of Liberal Studies should perhaps evolve into something like a Curriculum Advisor or Coordinator, with the assistant to the Vice-President's office handling the actual administration.

Sincerely,

  
D. W. Cummings, Director  
Off-Campus Liberal Studies

DWC:jp

FIRST YEAR'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFF-CAMPUS LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAM  
TO THE FACULTY SENATE

March 1975

B. W. Cummings

CONTENTS AND SUMMARY

- pp. 1-3, Needs of the FAA: Our first year has demonstrated that the off-campus Liberal Studies program as presently designed can satisfy the needs of the FAA personnel it was designed for, and it has suggested two further groups in the FAA who could be involved in the program: technical personnel in Oregon and Idaho, and non-technical clerical and administrative personnel.
- pp. 3-8, Needs at Central: Our first year has demonstrated that the program is helping us meet the four needs the program was originally designed to respond to here at Central: (i) the need to attract new kinds of students to help offset declining enrollments; (ii) the need to confront the present and future wearing away of liberal education by students' increasing insistence on vocational and career training; (iii) the need to provide access to the College to a wider range of potential students, especially older adults; and (iv) the need to define what liberal, or general, education means to Central.
- pp. 9-12, Design and Operation: The original design of the three units of the Independent Seminar Sequence appears to be sound and effective, though we've learned some useful variations this first year and are anticipating some help from material produced by the British Open University. The additional regular courses offered as part of the off-campus program apparently can be designed and scheduled so that they not only satisfy the needs of students within the program but also can attract additional students who are not in the program and could not otherwise be expected to take courses from Central.
- pp. 12-15 Requests and Recommendations: The director of the Program recommends:  
(i) that the off-campus Liberal Studies program be continued for a second year of active trial;  
(ii) that during the second year the director be authorized to work to expand the program along the five lines of growth outlined on pages 2-3 and 5-8;

(iii) that as soon as feasible the Senate consider the question of how deeply central should be involved in such off-campus degree programs;

(iv) that faculty be detached from their home departments and loaned to the Liberal Studies program on a year-by-year, half-time basis while serving as preceptors;

(v) that we establish three 400-level courses with a Liberal Studies prefix to accommodate the three units of the Independent Seminar Sequence;

(vi) that we establish two additional Liberal Studies courses--LS498, Special Topics, and LS490, Contracted Field Experience.

pp. 15-16, Afterword by Justice William O. Douglas  
pp. 17, Letter of Evaluation from the FAA Education Committee  
pp. 18-32, Letters of Evaluation from the Preceptors in the Program  
pp. 33-35, Statement of Grading Practices in the Program  
pp. 36-37, Description of Humanities 498, The Arts in Seattle Today

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

School of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
Office of the Dean

98926

May 12, 1976

RECEIVED  
MAY 13 1976  
FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David Lygre, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
Campus  
CWSC

Dear Dave:

While academic achievement is a prime goal of CWSC, there is much we could do to encourage true excellence in the intellectual development of our students. It has been suggested that the college should support the formation of a semi-autonomous Honors College whose policies and curriculum are compatible with those of CWSC but are generally more academically rigorous.

A small faculty committee has been developing such an Honors College proposal for the past few months. We have selected courses for our proposed curriculum and have made other tentative decisions regarding our proposed admission standards, staffing, and graduation policies. We have recently contacted the college's academic departments to ask for reactions to our proposed curriculum and to inform them of our plans. We are hopeful of broad support for our goal of attracting and nurturing intellectually talented students of a wide range of scholastic and career interests.

I have enclosed a sample of one of these letters for your information. You will also find enclosed a copy of our proposed curriculum and a brief description of our proposal. If this brief outline leaves you with unanswered questions, I am eager to talk with you or bring your questions before the Honors College committee for discussion. We would also like to receive any evaluative comments you may have, whether they are positive or negative.

Thank you for the attention you have given to our Honors College proposal.

Sincerely,



Warren R. Street, Psychology  
Chair, SSBS Honors College Committee

WRS:mm

Attachments

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF A  
PROPOSED CWSC HONORS COLLEGE

The Goals and Purposes of an Honors College

One obvious goal is that the college must foster conditions most favorable to the pursuit of academic excellence. The proposed selection of students, faculty, and physical setting will all be influenced by this consideration. Second, the Honors College will serve the rest of the campus by attracting and retaining high school graduates of the highest academic quality, many of whom are now going to other colleges.

Admission Requirements

The Honors College will consider applicants from the top ten percent of those taking the Washington Pre-College test, or its SAT or ACT equivalent. Candidates for admission as freshmen are expected to have high school backgrounds typical of a college preparatory course of study, including three years of high school English, two years of foreign language, two years of mathematics, two years of social science, one year of laboratory science, and three additional years elected from these subjects. A high school grade point average of 3.0 in these required courses is normally expected of students we would wish to consider.

Transfer students should be required to have the same high school course background as freshmen, or their college equivalents, comparable achievement test scores and college course work equivalent to their class level on the Honors College curriculum.

Curriculum

Our conception of an Honors College curriculum is divided into lower-division and upper-division segments. The lower-division student will take required and elective courses from a list of approved courses offered by CWSC (see attached list). We have chosen a curriculum of fundamental subjects in the Arts and Sciences that emphasize personal intellectual growth regardless of individual career goals. The upper division student will complete the requirements for a major and minor as outlined in the CWSC catalog and may select a multidisciplinary minor. All honors students and faculty will participate in weekly colloquia of readings, speakers, and discussions.

Faculty Staffing

We propose that departments, in cooperation with an Honors core committee, designate sections of their courses appearing on the Honors curriculum for Honors students (but not restricted to Honors students). The core committee will also have responsibility for reviewing applications for admission from students, selecting courses for the honors curriculum, staffing colloquia and

multidisciplinary seminars, and tending to the details of public relations and maintenance of the physical facilities of the college.

#### Requirements for Graduation

A graduate of the Honors College will have maintained a 3.0 g.p.a., reflecting distinctly superior work. Honors courses should stress English language skills, and grades should partly reflect English proficiency. The senior Honors College student will be required to write a thesis and present it orally before the Honors College.

Recognition during the graduation ceremony, on the student's transcript, and among his letters of recommendations will serve to mark the honor student's accomplishments.



# HONORS COLLEGE CURRICULUM

## LOWER DIVISION

English 301 - 4 cr. (English 101 exempt)	4
Physical Education - 3 cr.	3
History 101, 102, 103 - 15 cr.	15
Foreign Language - 15 cr.	15
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">OPTIONS: Any 3 quarters, non-literature courses, commonly 151, 152, 153, 251, 252, or 253</p>	
Mathematics - 10 cr.	10
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">OPTIONS: 163.1; 163.2; 171.1; 171.2</p>	
Natural Science - 15 cr., not in major	15
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">OPTIONS: Bio. Sci. 111; 112; 113 Chem. 181, 181.1; 182, 182.1 Geol. 145, 145.1 Physics 211; 212; 213 Comp. Sci. 177</p>	
Fine Arts and Humanities - 10 cr., not in major	10
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">OPTIONS: Music 100 Art 100 Drama 107 Phil. 207; 260 Foreign Language (approved literature courses) Approved courses in English or American literature</p>	
Social Science - 10 cr., not in major	10
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">OPTIONS: Geog. 100 Hist. 143; 144; 301 Pol. Sci. 100; 210 Psych. 100 Soc. 107 Anthro 100; 110; 120; 130 Communication 207 Econ. 100; 201; 202</p>	
College Colloquium - 2 cr./qtr.	12 <hr style="width: 100%; border: 0.5px solid black;"/> 94

## UPPER DIVISION

Requirements of a department major or major and minor or interdisciplinary minor	60 - 65
College Colloquium (readings, speakers and discussion): 2 cr./qtr.	12
Upper division electives.	9 - 14 <hr style="width: 100%; border: 0.5px solid black;"/> 180

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ELECTIONS

If the Senate position on Motion No. 1459 were not reversed, either by the Senate or by the subsequent faculty referendum, it is the conclusion of the Executive Committee that most faculty would then prefer a collective bargaining election this Spring Quarter. Thus it is necessary to have a contingency plan should such a situation occur. Such a plan has been developed, but it should not be construed as a recommendation by the Executive Committee as to whether the Senate position on Motion No. 1459 should (or should not) be reversed.

### Eligibility to vote

Persons eligible to vote are those described in Sections 1.01 A(1) and (3) of the Faculty Code. Persons mentioned in Sections 1.01 A(2) and 1.01 B are excluded. The basis for excluding certain administrators reflects a value judgment as to who is reasonably considered a part of "management." The CFR-proposed collective bargaining bill specifically excludes "...presidents, vice presidents, deans, and their principal and administrative assistants, and other supervisors." A list of those judged eligible to vote has been distributed by the Senate Executive Committee to the President of the College and the respective Presidents each of the NSP, AFT, and AAUP. Any disagreements on these eligibility rulings must be presented to the Executive Committee by May 26. The Executive Committee will then decide, by May 28, the eligibility of the person(s) in question.

### Entries on ballot

A petition with at least 35 signatures of persons eligible to vote will be needed to place each entry on the ballot, including "no agent." In addition, the entry "Other (specify)" will be placed on the ballot. To date, appropriate petitions have been received from both AFT and NSP. In order to provide an opportunity for other entries to be placed on the ballot, the original due date for such petitions will be extended from May 7 to May 28.

### Balloting

Ballots will be mailed to eligible voters on June 1. Ballots coming through campus mail will be due in the Senate office June 9. Ballots from off-campus must be postmarked no later than June 8 (in U.S.) or June 10 (outside U.S.). The ballot will consist of two parts. The first section will contain each of the entries as provided in the preceding paragraph. The second part of the ballot will contain each of the possible two-entry combinations, excluding "Other (specify)," listed in the first part of the ballot. Voters will be asked to indicate their preference for each combination. The votes will be counted at 2:00 p.m. on June 10. Section one of the ballot will be counted first. If no entry receives a majority

of the valid votes cast, the two entries with the greatest numbers of votes will comprise the two-entry combination listed in the second part of the ballot for which votes will be counted. If a specific designation under "Other (specify)" qualifies for the run-off election, part two of the ballots will not be counted and the run-off election will be conducted next Fall Quarter. The entry receiving a majority of the votes cast will be designated the collective bargaining representative for the CWSC faculty.

Each entry on the ballot may be represented by two persons during the counting of the votes. Any challenged ballots will be placed in a separate envelope and will not be counted unless they might change the results of the election. If the challenged ballots could alter the results, the Senate Executive Committee will decide in each case whether the ballot should be counted.

#### Decertification

Requests that the Senate conduct a decertification election may be filed not less than six months after the completion of an election to designate a bargaining representative. The Senate will consider such a request on its merits.

Report of the Personnel Committee on the use of adjuncts and regular faculty in off-campus teaching.

The committee was instructed to address the following problems:

- a. Are there clear guidelines as to what constitutes an "adjunct" situation so that there is no reasonable possibility that a regular position might be termed (or eventually become) an "adjunct" position?
- b. May regular faculty members be required to teach off-campus classes as a part of their regular load? If so, are there adequate provisions that extra time involved in such an assignment are credited toward the computation of a "normal" load for such an individual?
- c. Are adjunct personnel treated fairly in terms of compensation and employee rights?

We have concluded that the problems of off-campus expansion and the use of adjuncts are interrelated. The problems resulting from assigning regular faculty off campus loads and the problems surrounding the use of adjuncts are also closely related. Our financial, staffing, and legislative problems combine to further confuse the issues, but the nature and use of adjunct professors at Central does pose several serious problems. It is difficult to address many of these problems without understanding Central's long range goals. However, the problems which emerged in our study of the situation are these:

1. "Pools." In some cases there are oceans of adjuncts ready and willing to meet any anticipated teaching need. Such "pools," while useful, seem at times to exist either because of exaggerated expectations or external pressure for adjunct status for prestige reasons. Even though the creation of adjuncts for "status reasons" is specifically prohibited by the code, it does seem to occur.

2. Quality control of adjuncts, both of their qualifications and of their performance. This seems to vary from department to department. Some faculty members feel that they are losing contact with a major part of their program. Others fear a general cheapening of standards.

3. "Moonlighting." There is concern over the quality of education offered by those who are presently holding full time jobs. One of the effects of the increased use of adjuncts was to make visible the extent and nature of the continuing education program. It is the feeling of this committee that any program largely based on a part-time faculty has inherent weaknesses and should either be avoided or limited. Efforts should be made to allow our own faculty to teach overtime whenever a "moonlighting" staff member is needed. Our faculty have more involvement with the college and existing programs and, where they have the knowledge and skills, they should have the opportunity to teach on an overload basis. The removal of this restriction should become a major legislative goal of the administration. But the development of programs that will depend primarily on part-time faculty, whether adjuncts or our own staff, should be discouraged. As programs develop every effort should be made to staff



at present with permanent, full-time employees whose main interest is their disciplines, programs, and the institution.

4. Education "jobbing." Courses are created or existing courses are used to provide a part time job for a teacher who guarantees an adequate number of students. In such cases control seems minimal, but the advantages are great. Students get college credit (often graduate credit), the teacher gets a part-time job, and the department and the college meet needed student credit hours. All that is sacrificed are the minor atoms of academic and intellectual integrity, and the institution's control of its programs.

5. Adjuncts have, and should have, few rights. Since most of the adjuncts are employed full time elsewhere, job right, tenure, representation in the Senate, and similar issues do not seem to apply. However, in order not to cheapen the profession they should be compensated fairly in terms of their tasks, experience, background, and education. Their remuneration is at best minimally adequate and should be raised as high as possible. It is to everyone's advantage if there is no financial advantage to the college in hiring adjuncts.

The adjunct deserves all the assistance given a regular faculty member. He should have library privileges, secretarial help, and other aids as needed to complete his assignments. In case he feels wronged by the administration, he should have access to the faculty grievance procedures.

6. If a suitable appointment exists, no currently employed regular faculty member should be forced to accept an off-campus assignment. New faculty members should be informed in their contracts that they could be assigned off-campus teaching.

While no faculty member in a department or program should be allowed to be a special case and refuse to share the off-campus burden that the department must assume, the principles of seniority and rank should be weighed heavily in making decisions as to who goes on the longer treks.

Extra pay, expenses, and reduced loads should be expected and provided for the extra efforts involved. This area seems inadequate and should be studied by the appropriate committee next year.

A number of changes would help correct these problems.

(1) Limit the term of appointment for all adjuncts to a maximum period of one year. If the program warrants the term could be extended, but positive action would have to be taken in order for the position to be continued.

(2) The appointment of an adjunct should be for specific tasks in the immediate future. Few, if any adjuncts should be appointed in nearby areas such as Yakima if the present faculty has the knowledge and time to fill the position. Wishful thinking or possible expansion should not be reasons for appointing adjuncts. While some flexibility is needed in meeting the needs of the various communities we serve, a thoughtful planned program of development is needed to maintain academic standards and integrity. This would reduce the apprehension of those who fear we



Specific Recommendations:

- I. Code change. Appointments to adjunct positions shall be for no more than one year. Appointments may be renewed.
- II. Administrative policy.
  - A. Adjunct professors will be used only when no regular faculty member possesses the necessary expertise or cannot be released. This policy should be very closely supervised by Deans and Department Chairman.
  - B. Adjuncts should not be appointed without consideration and approval of a department. In no case should the chairman alone act for the department. A written policy should be created by each department and program.
  - C. Whenever possible adjuncts should be replaced by full-time faculty members with full faculty rights even though the bulk of their teaching is off-campus.
  - D. To avoid education "jobbing," requests for off-campus courses should be approved without designating any instructor. Then after department discussion, a suitable instructor should be chosen either from our regular or adjunct staff.
- III. Curriculum policy.
  - A. Programs will not be based on an adjunct staff. New programs should be instituted only when the majority of the program will be taught by full-time staff members.
  - B. Course designations and control should be placed in existing departments whenever possible. New courses should be created in conjunction with departments and whenever possible should carry a department title and be taught by department staff.

The Committee held a meeting with Pres. Brooks on April 26, in order to see what compromises might be worked out. We believe a workable compromise was achieved on the matter of the RIF policy. We are therefore submitting to the Senate a report containing the recommendations of the President and the Code Committee, and this report replaces the report of the Code Committee dated 2/15/76. It includes more items than the President's list of Feb. 17, 1976.

1. Recommend to rescind Section 3.78, in which the RIF machinery was to be put in motion if any person should be affected. (P. 64, 3.78 B). The reason we give for that line was: "Ideally, a faculty member should have the protection of RIF, or else "due cause" should be the reason for his departure. Between 0 and 10 lines a line. Practically, this may be stated in other ways, but until a solution is invented, perhaps the Faculty should push for full protection."

We believe we have found a solution:

2. P. 64, Sect. 3.78 B Introductory paragraph restated in two paragraphs:

Should a reduction-in-force be required, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be responsible for recommending directly to the President and the Board of Trustees all reduction-in-force that amounts to ten (10) or less full-time equivalent faculty positions. The ten (10) positions shall be exclusive of vacancies normally occurring, e.g., retirement, resignation, non-renewal of contract, non-completion of contract, and one-year contracts not being renewed.

In the case of the reduction-in-force for ten (10) or fewer positions, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall follow all policies listed below except Section 3.78 B (2). If the reduction-in-force must exceed ten (10) positions all procedures in the following section shall be observed.

Reason for change: Clarification. See further clarification proposed for 3.78 B (5).

Note: The above recommendation is from the President's list, with the exception of the redefined term "non-renewal," which replaces "termination." This change is agreeable to the President, and we recommend approval of it, provided that the following change is also approved:

3. 3.78 B (1). (pp. 64-66) Re-organization of the section to allow a reduced faculty member due process.

(1) to contain the first five paragraphs. B (2) to begin at the sixth paragraph:

B. (1) Any faculty member who disagrees with his termination of employment as provided in this section (3.78) must appeal in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs within ten working days from receipt of written notification from his department or section chairman or program director of the submission of the recommendations to the appropriate Dean, and the Vice President. A written response to the faculty member will be provided by the Vice President for Academic Affairs; the appeal and the response will be appended to the final recommendation going to the President.

Any faculty member may request an informal hearing on his case before the Faculty Grievance Committee. And, as provided for in this Code, any person who disputes



Code Committee, p. 2

the recommendations or decisions of the Faculty Grievance Committee or the decisions of the Faculty Grievance Committee or the Vice President for Academic Affairs may request a formal administrative hearing as to the termination of his appointment. Procedures for formal and informal hearings shall be those detailed in this Code. (See sections 3.84, 3.87).

(The rest of the material in 3.78 B would remain as written, except that it would be re-numbered: (2) becomes (3), etc.)

Reason: Under this re-organization, the College would not go into a full RIF for the first ten people affected. However, they would now be protected by the right of "due process" and especially "grievance." In view of the destructiveness of the RIF, the Code Committee recommends this solution.

Note: Our proposed amendments to 3.84 (Informal Hearings) also include specific reference to these hearings being available to rified persons. Therefore 3.84 should be considered with 3.78.

4. 3.73 (2) (p. 62) Also related to RIF.

(2) Where termination of an appointment is based upon financial exigency, faculty members ~~may~~ may, at their option, have the issues reviewed through the appeal procedures provided in this Code. In every case of financial exigency, the faculty members concerned will be given notice as soon as possible.

Reason: The addition of the phrase "at their option" makes it clear that the option lies with the teacher.

5. 3.84. Procedure for Informal Hearings: Dismissal of Faculty Member for Cause or Termination of Employment due to Reduction-in-Force.

(The underlined words in the title are new.)

1) The aggrieved faculty member shall apply for the informal hearing by filing his request for a hearing with the President or his designee within ten days after receiving written notice of the intention to recommend dismissal or termination due to reduction-in-force, and the hearing shall be granted. Upon receipt of the faculty member's request for an informal hearing, the President or his designee shall provide a copy of his notice to the faculty member and the faculty member's request for an informal hearing to the chairman of the Faculty Senate. A hearing will be scheduled as soon as possible.

2) The chairman of the Faculty Senate shall establish a date for an informal hearing by the Faculty Grievance Committee. Such notice shall be provided not more than ten days from the date of the Faculty Senate Chairman's receipt of the faculty member's request for an informal hearing and shall provide not less than ten (10) days notice to the faculty member of the date, time, and place of such hearing.

(3.8%, con't.)

3) The Faculty Grievance Committee, upon reviewing the case, may recommend that the case proceed directly to formal hearings.

4) The Faculty Grievance Committee may rule that it is impossible to conduct an informal hearing. The Committee may refuse to hear the case, or refer it to the President or his designee for formal hearings.

5) The faculty member may request a formal hearing according to the provisions of RCW 28B.19.110, as amended by Section 3.81 A (2) of this Code.

6) The informal hearing shall be conducted as expeditiously and as continuously as possible and on successive days if possible.

7) The grievant and any other parties the committee deems necessary for the hearing shall make himself or themselves available once the hearing begins unless he or they can verify to the Faculty Grievance Committee that his or their absence is absolutely necessary.

8) A member of the Faculty Grievance Committee shall remove himself from the case if he deems himself disqualified for bias or interest. Grievance Committee members who are members of the same department as the grievant or grievants shall not serve at the hearing. Each party shall have the privilege of one challenge without stated cause.

9) In informal hearings, the faculty member shall be permitted to have with him a Central Washington State College faculty member of his own choosing to act as advisor and counsel. The faculty member must be selected from those covered in Section 1.01 of this Code, provided that such faculty member is not a member of the Washington State Bar or any bar of the United States.

10) Any legal opinion or interpretation given to the Faculty Grievance Committee shall be shared with all other parties to the case.

11) Informal hearings will be closed to all except those personnel directly involved. All statements, testimony, and all other evidence given at the informal hearing shall be confidential and shall not be subject to disclosure or discovery and shall not be released to anyone including the parties involved. Such statements, testimony and evidence may not be used to question the veracity of any party to the case without permission of the person who divulged the information.

12) The Faculty Grievance Committee shall file its recommendations with the President of the College or his designee, the Faculty Senate Chairman and all principals to the case within five days after the conclusion of the informal review. There shall be no hearing before the Faculty Senate.

13) Within five days of the receipt of the recommendations of the Faculty Grievance Committee, the President or his designee shall inform all principals to the case, Faculty Grievance Committee and the Faculty Senate Chairman of his decision to approve or disapprove the recommendations. This action of the President or his designee shall constitute notice of the final decision in the informal hearing procedure.

(3.84, cont)

14) If the faculty member disagrees with the President or his designee, and/or the Faculty Grievance Committee he may request a formal hearing on the matter by directing a request for such hearing to the chairman of the Board of Trustees within ten days after notice of the final decision concerning the informal hearing.

Reason: The section is re-worded to conform as much as feasible with the section on informal reviews which we have already passed. Items 1-6 are the same as are presently in the Code. Items 7-14 parallel the new informal review section.

While RIF and "due cause" are two separate things, both can lead to the loss of employment, and "due process" should be available in either case.

This version of section 3.84 includes the last two items on the President's list of Feb. 17, and are agreeable to the Code Committee.

6. p. 68, Sect. 3.78 E (5) (Reduction in Force) (Re-submitted from President's list.)

If faculty members must be notified of termination of employment, under this reduction in force policy, notice shall be given according to Section 3.60 of this Faculty Code, with the exception that those who have served the college for three or more years shall be given twelve calendar months notice.

Reason: Section 3.60 A (4) (Non-Reappointment--Notice Requirements) could be interpreted to read twelve months before the end of an academic year, if an academic year is regarded as the normal "appointment." Thus, at any time after the end of an academic year, if notice is given it would have to apply to the end of the second academic year. If interpreted this way, this policy actually provides 12 to 24 months notice, depending on exactly when the notice is given. The problems of Reduction-in-Force (3.78 A,B) would be difficult to address under these conditions, given the fact that most of our faculty have served Central well over three years.