

3-5-1975

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 03/05/1975

Esther Peterson

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Peterson, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 03/05/1975" (1975). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 884.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/884>

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, 5 March 1975  
Presiding Officer: Duncan McQuarrie, Chairperson  
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 Jay Bachrach, Louis Bovos, Lee Fisher, Roger Garrett, Ramon Mercado, Derek Sandison.

Visitors Present: Donna Campbell, Bill Floyd, Fred Cutlip, James Alexander, Jim Nylander, Don Cummings, Bernard Martin, Donald Schliesman, and Jim Green.

### AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairperson suggested the following be added:

1. Insert between II and II Legislative Report from President Brooks.
2. Under "Communications" add
  - B. Letter from James Brooks
  - C. Letter from Roger Winters
  - D. Letter from James Alexander
  - E. Letter from Edward Harrington

### LEGISLATIVE REPORT

President Brooks presented a report on the legislature.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 23, January 31, and February 5 were approved as distributed.

### COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

- A. Letter from Charles Greenwood, dated February 18, 1975, notifying the Senate that Walter P. Thompson has been elected to serve as the new Faculty Senate alternate for Aerospace Studies.

- B. Letter from James Brooks, dated March 3, 1975, requesting the Faculty Senate not to take action on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Evaluation of the Presidency until he has time to draft a response. In addition, he thinks the Senate should request the Board of Trustees chairman, Mr. Frank, to respond to the report.
- C. Letter from Roger Winters, dated February 27, 1975, requesting the Faculty Senate undertake a review and evaluation of the College's programs in English composition, with a view to trying to improve the general competence in English language writing skill among our undergraduates. An article was enclosed from the Daily Record of February 26, 1975, regarding the pre-literacy among today's undergraduates. The Executive Committee is asking John Herum of the composition clinic to report to the Senate on April 9 in regard to the composition clinic's work and to make some general comment on the problem.
- D. Letter from James Alexander, dated March 3, 1975, requesting the Senate, in response to the adoption by the Board of Trustees of the new faculty code, to give serious consideration to the following course of action:  
(1) Accept no further business which will require formal Senate action;  
(2) Proceed in an orderly manner to dispose of those items of business to which it is already committed; (3) Upon completion of Item 2, dissolve itself. This will be on the Agenda at the next Senate meeting.
- E. Letter from Edward Harrington, dated January 17, 1975, saying that at the time of the last full accreditation by the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, the recommendation was made by the Association that the Faculty Senate study grade distribution to determine whether it is consistent with the expected performance of the student body. That study has been completed and has been distributed and a copy of the full report has been distributed to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Each department will also receive a copy of the report in addition to the specific print-out relating to them. The Executive Committee is studying the report and will make recommendation at a later date.

#### CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

- A. Proposals approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on pages 402 through 407. On page 404 a correction should be made under Marketing Management, on next to the last line should read "At least four additional hours..."

MOTION NO. 1249: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Mr. Purcell, that the Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals on pages 402 through 407 be approved. Voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote and with 2 abstentions.

#### REPORTS

- A. Chairperson's Report--Mr. McQuarrie announced that the Executive Committee had decided to move the Senate meeting that was scheduled for two weeks

from this meeting up to next Wednesday, March 12. This was changed in anticipation for business to be continued from the present meeting. Also, the possible strike could interfere with the original date. The final reason for the change is to avoid the meeting coming during the final week of the quarter.

Mr. McQuarrie reported that he attended the hearing on state retirement where he testified on behalf of CWSC faculty. The important idea is that of portability, the idea that new employees coming in can bring a retirement system (TIAA/CREF) with them from other institutions. This includes some 2,200 institutions of higher education around the country that are under the TIAA/CREF plan. If the proposed consolidation of state retirement systems were accomplished it would make it difficult for future faculty members who might wish to move on to do so. They would have to leave their state retirement behind. He urged those concerned to write letters to the appropriate committees.

On the salary issue, more lobbying needs to be done and not just leave it to the organizations on campus and the Committee of 1,000. Letters should be written to the appropriate committees. Mr. McQuarrie said he will be writing a letter on behalf of the faculty as chairperson of the Faculty Senate.

Prior to the Board of Trustees meeting on February 28, the Executive Committee and the Code Committee met in study session with the Board of Trustees. At that time the Executive Committee and the Code Committee identified three areas to concentrate on, as items that seemed to be of primary importance and ones that could be attended to in the few hours available. Those areas were (1) the first section, The Amendment Procedure; (2) the reasons for dismissal for cause; (3) considerations of the formal hearing procedure, particularly the Hearing Officer section. A revised first section came out of that meeting. This was a modification of the position the Senate took and provides for an Impasse Committee, but only as advisory to the trustees. The trustees agreed to be bound to an amendment procedure that requires all amendments to go through a series of steps that culminate, if there is no agreement, in the formation of an Impasse Committee that is selected as follows: two members selected by the president of the college, two members selected by the faculty senate, and those four people select a fifth as chairperson of the committee. If the four can't agree on a chairperson within a set time then that committee is automatically dissolved and a new committee is to be selected. The Board still holds the power to take emergency action and all emergency action so taken is subject to automatic processing through the amendment procedure. They have still held the right to act unilaterally and the Impasse Committee is advisory to them. They also reaffirm in that first section the right to unilaterally amend that policy at any time.

The second area pertained to dismissal for cause. Under the reasons for dismissal for cause the phrase "limited to" was removed and thus the reasons are limited to those specified. Also the phrase "moral turpitude" was deleted.

The final area was that pertaining to selection of Hearing Officers. This section was changed to make the selection of two faculty members "mandatory if a faculty member so desires."

At the evening meeting the Board adopted the Code to become effective March 15, 1975. Addendums to the President's Code have been run off and will be distributed as soon as they are ready. The complete new Code will be re-issued next September.

The chair at this time opened the floor for discussion and introduction of relevant motions concerning the Code.

Mr. Floyd was recognized for the purposes of discussing the Code. Mr. Floyd commented that he represented the National Society of Professors affiliated with the W.E.A. and the N.E.A. and the Association of Higher Education. He remarked that their contention with the Code has not only been with certain sections of that Code but the very philosophy on which the Code is based, the unilateral action of the Board.

Mr. Floyd introduced Donna Campbell, who is the campus coordinator for the National Education Association and the Washington Education Association and has been working closely with the NSP on campus. With respect to legislative action he said he wanted to make available the hot line numbers so that not only can letters be written, but calls made. One is a recorded message and gives any up-to-date information on any legislation related to Higher Education (0-800-562-8956); the second one has a message taker who will take any messages that you want to leave with any of the legislators, (0-800-562-6000). Mr. Floyd commented he had placed a call through the hot line Tuesday to encourage the legislature to take official action against an amendment requiring that supplemental salary increases be based on merit.

Mr. Floyd announced that the National Society of Professors has decided to take official legal action against the Board and as soon as possible are going to file for injunctive relief in Superior Court asking that there be an imposition placed saying that a restraining order be served and that the Board cannot impose the Code on this faculty at this time and may not impose the Code on the faculty until it has been ruled legal and appropriate in a variety of ways. Because of the unilateral action of the Board, the NSP chapter and certain members yet to be named, but now being contacted, are bringing legal action against the Board contending a breach of contract and they are going to ask for that restraining order through their attorney. The tentative date is Monday and if it cannot be filed then, at least a summons will be served Monday and the injunctive relief sought as soon thereafter as possible. They feel they must take this legal action because there are things wrong legally and language wise and philosophically with the code. The NSP is encouraging the Senate's support. They are proposing to the Senate that they side with them and join forces with them as a legal body and become parties to the suit on behalf of the Faculty Senate and the Senate be so named in this suit. The lawyer has suggested the suit be filed in the name of the NSP and name at least four members of the Senate. The attorney has asked for copies of the employment letters that say the code is a part of our contract. Mr. Floyd explained that

the NSP is going to file the suit on behalf of their membership and they are asking that the Senate take official action as a faculty group so that the suit could eventually become a class action.

Mr. Winters recognized Mr. Al Lewis for the purpose of explaining some other legal action. Mr. Lewis said both the AAUP and the AFT have retained lawyers to go after a declaratory judgment. He explained that the injunctive action is the stronger action. An injunction shows probable damage or some kind of irreparable harm being done. With a declaratory judgment they are simply asking for a clarification of the meaning so they know where they stand. Declaratory judgment is the logical first step to be followed by injunction and perhaps all can be done at one time.

Ms. Campbell was asked to respond to this. She commented that they have been advised that if they will receive only a declaratory judgment and later a permanent injunction, they have a weaker chance of winning a permanent injunction if they don't go for a preliminary one now. If they go for a preliminary injunction now and lose they still have the right to request an early hearing date for a permanent injunction which they will most likely be granted. If they go for only a declaratory judgment and then sought permanent injunction, they are talking about several months of time passing and it is speculated that they would be able to say "you have been living under this code for x number of months or years and it is working and therefore an injunction isn't needed." They feel they have a case on two grounds (1) that the Board did indeed have a contract with this faculty in the code (it is mentioned as such in individual letters of employment) and that individuals that received such contracts are being irreparably damaged because of the lack of opportunity to have input into decisions or amendments to the code. (2) the whole level of negotiations.

There was considerable discussion on the subject.

Without objection, the chair called a recess at 4:45 p.m. to allow the senators to discuss the various proposals.

The meeting reconvened at 5:00 p.m.

MOTION NO. 1250: Mr. Thelen moved, seconded by Mr. Hansen, that the Faculty Senate join with the NSP, AFT and AAUP in bringing legal action against the Board and its unilateral adoption of the Faculty Code.

After considerable discussion a roll call vote was called for on Motion No. 1250:

Aye: David Lygre, Thomas Thelen, Art Keith, Thomas Yeh, Gerald Brunner, Roger Winters, Robert Bennett, George Stillman, Allen Gulezian, David Canzler, Nancy Lester, Otto Jakubek, John Vifian, David Anderson, Patti Picha, Betty Hileman, Linda Klug, J. Richard Jensen, John Gregor, Earl Synnes, Jim Applegate, Russell Hansen, Madge Young, and Darwin Goodey.

Nay: None

Abstain: John Purcell, Edward Harrington, Pearl Douce', Robert Miller, Milo Smith, Zolton Kramar.

Motion No. 1250 passed with a unanimous vote of 24 Aye, 0 Nay, and 6 Abstain.

MOTION NO. 1251: Mr. Winters moved, seconded by Mr. Thelen, that  
WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate does not recognize the legitimacy of the  
"Proposed Code," imposed by the Board of Trustees at their meeting of  
February 28, 1975. Therefore, the Faculty Senate shall continue to  
conduct its business under provisions of the Faculty Code of Personnel  
Policy and Procedures, Revised 1970.

Mr. Winters explained the reason for this motion is that he feels that it is the Code of 1970 which gives the faculty its authority at least until March 15 and he doesn't think that the vast majority of faculty recognizes that the new code is a legitimate action and that it is legally questionable and that it would be a mistake to ratify the code by default by beginning to operate after March 15 under its provisions.

There was considerable discussion on the motion.

MOTION NO. 1252: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Ms. Young, to postpone consideration of the motion until the next meeting. Voted on and passed by a majority voice vote and 2 abstentions.

MOTION NO. 1253: Mr. Jakubek moved, seconded by Mr. Bennett, to adjourn. Voted on and failed by a majority nay voice vote.

- B. Executive Committee--David Lygre reported that the Executive Committee, the President, Vice President and other administrators met with Ray Ryan who is executive coordinator of the state productivity program. He met with the above to explain the state's concern over measuring productivity of this and all state agencies. By productivity he means both efficiency and effectiveness of utilization of resources, which includes quality. He suggested the college should devise their own proposal for productivity.

The Liberal Studies Program is an item on the agenda for this meeting. Last summer the program was brought to the Senate Executive Committee for a decision authorizing a pilot program. Since the Senate was not functioning at the time, the Executive Committee made the decision to authorize the program on a pilot basis with the stipulation the program come back in the spring of this year for further review and a decision by the Senate whether it should be extended. Don Cummings, director of the program, has prepared a lengthy report of which an abstract has been distributed. The Executive Committee hopes to present to the Senate at the next meeting a recommendation concerning this report. Mr. Lygre said there is a problem in terms of formal review of this program by existing curricular bodies. Hopefully the curriculum policy handbook matter will be decided soon so that the current policy will be established there. The Undergraduate Council is setting up a committee to develop procedures for the regular review of all campus programs.

- C. C.F.R. Report--Mr. Anderson announced the C.F.R. will meet Saturday in Seattle.

- D. Ad Hoc Committee to Study Evaluation of Presidency--Jim Nylander, chairperson of the committee, presented the report. He pointed out the committee's recommendation on page two of the report.

MOTION NO. 1254: Mr. Anderson moved, seconded by Mr. Goode, to adopt the report.

The report was discussed considerably.

MOTION NO. 1255: Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Mr. Canzler, to postpone consideration of the motion until the next Senate meeting.

The motion to postpone was discussed. Miss Hileman said that the Personnel Committee has been given the charge of looking into evaluation of administrators and faculty in general and are in the process of doing this. She suggested the motion be postponed until the committee can come up with recommendations.

Motion No. 1255 was voted on and passed with a majority voice vote and one abstention.

MOTION NO. 1256: Mr. Purcell moved to adjourn. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.



A G E N D A  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, March 5, 1975  
Room 471, Psychology Building

- I. ROLE CALL
- II. CHANGES OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF Jan 23, Jan. 31, and Feb. 5 meetings
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
  - A. Letter from Charles Greenwood
- V. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
  - A. Undergraduate Proposals, pages 402 through 407
- VI. REPORTS
  - A. Chairperson
  - B. Executive Committee
  - C. C.F.R.
  - D. Ad Hoc Committee to Study Evaluation of Presidency
  - E. Don Cummings on Liberal Studies Program
  - F. Jerry O'Gorman--Insurance Proposal
  - G. Otto Jakubek--C.H.E. Report
  - H. Standing Committees
    - 1. Personnel
    - 2. Curricula
    - 3. Code
    - 4. Budget
    - 5. Student Affairs
- VII. OLD BUSINESS
- VIII. NEW BUSINESS
  - A. Withdrawal Policy
- IX. ADJOURNMENT

CULTY SENATE MEETING OF

March 5

ROLL CALL

SENATOR

ALTERNATE

✓ Anderson, David  
 ✓ Applegate, Jim  
 ✓ Backrach, Jay  
 ✓ Bennett, Robert  
 Bovos, Louis

William Cutlip  
 Frank Carlson  
 Peter Burkholder  
 Robert Bentley  
 James Hollister

✓ Brooks, James  
 ✓ Canzler, David  
 ✓ Douce', Pearl  
 ✓ Brunner, Gerald *Stan Dudley*  
 Fisher, Lee  
 ✓ Garrett, Roger  
 ✓ Goodey, Darwin  
 ✓ Gregor, John  
 ✓ Gulezian, Al *Alan*  
 ✓ Hanson, Russell  
 ✓ Hileman, Betty  
 ✓ Jakubek, Otto  
 ✓ Jensen, J. Richard  
 ✓ Keith, Art  
 ✓ Kramar, Zolton  
 ✓ Lester, Nancy

Edward Harrington  
 Richard Johnson  
 ✓ Joan Howe  
 ✓ Stanley Dudley *Stan Dudley*  
~~Robert Cooper~~ *Walter Thompson*  
~~Starla Drum~~ *Clara*  
 James Klahn  
 Bill Hillan  
~~Don Cochran~~ *Wolfgang Franz*  
 Charles McGehee  
 Helen McCabe  
 Joel Address  
 Bonalyn Bricker  
 George Grossman  
~~Gordon Warren~~  
 Dieter Romboy

✓ Lygre, David  
 ✓ Klug, Linda  
 ✓ McQuarrie, Duncan  
 ✓ Mercado, Ramon  
 ✓ Miller, Robert

Helmi Habib  
 Clayton Denman  
 Owen Pratz  
 Wallace Webster

✓ Piccha, Patti  
 ✓ Purcell, John  
 Sandison, Derek  
 ✓ Smith, Milo

Kent Martin  
 A. James Hawkins

✓ Stillman, George  
 ✓ Synnes, Earl  
 ✓ Thelen, Thomas  
 ✓ Vifian, John

Christos Papadopoulos  
 Mike Madison  
 Glen Clark  
 Keith Rinehart

✓ Winters, Roger  
 ✓ Yeh, Thomas  
 ✓ Young, Madge

Robert Yee  
 William Craig  
 Robert Carlton

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

Donna Campbell (WEA/NEA)

Bill Floyd WEA-NEA-NSP

Fred Cutlip

James Alexander

Jim Nylander

Don Cummins

Bernard Martin

David McCallum

Jim Green

Last person signing please return to the Recording Secretary.

NDOM  
 LL CALL VOTE

SENATOR

ALTERNATE

AYE

NAY

ABSTAIN

Lygre, David ✓

Helmi Habib

Garrett, Roger

Starla Drum

Bovos, Louis

James Hollister

Thelen, Thomas ✓

Glen Clark

Keith, Art ✓

George Grossman

Yeh, Thomas ✓

William Craig

McQuarrie, Duncan

Owen Pratz

Sandison, Derek

Gerald Brunner

x Dudley, Stanley ✓

Robert Yee

Winters, Roger ✓

Bennell, Robert ✓

Robert Bentley

Stilman, George ✓

Christos Papadopoulos

Mercado, Ramon

Gulezian, Al (Don) ✓

~~Don Cocheba~~ *Wolfgang Franz*

nzler, David ✓

Richard Johnson

Purcell, John ✓

Kent Martin

Lester, Nancy ✓

Dieter Romboy

x Brooks, James ✓

Edward Harrington

Douce', Pearl ✓

Joan Howe

Jakubek, Otto ✓

Joel Address

Fisher, Lee

~~Robert Cooper~~ *Walter Thompson*

Vifian, John ✓

Keith Rinehart

Anderson, David ✓

William Cutlip

Piccha, Patti ✓

Hileman, Betty ✓

Helen McCabe

Miller, Robert ✓

Wallace Webster

Bachrach, Jay ✓

Peter Burkholder

Smith, Milo ✓

A. James Hawkins

McKlug, Linda ✓

Clayton Denman

Jensen, J. Richard ✓

Bonaly Bricker

Kramar, Zolton ✓

~~Gordon Warren~~ *Robert Richards*

Gregor, John ✓

Bill Hillar

Synnes, Earl ✓

Mike Madison

Applegate, Jim ✓

Frank Carlson

Hanson, Russell ✓

Charles McGehee

Lang, Madge ✓

Robert Carlson

Goodey, Darwin ✓

James Klahn

24

6

MEMORANDUM

RECEIVED  
FEB 20 1975  
FACULTY SENATE

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Charles D. Greenwood, <sup>ex</sup> Chairman, Aerospace Studies

DATE: 18 February 1975

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Alternate

This is to notify you that Capt Walter P. Thompson, Assistant Professor of Aerospace Studies, has been elected to serve as the new Faculty Senate Alternate from Aerospace Studies. He replaces Capt Robert J. Cooper, who is no longer on campus.

CDG:sj

2/25/75

## Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Evaluation of the Presidency

The Committee met soon after its formation to elect its chairman, consider its "charge," and outline its strategy to carry out the "charge." Several meetings ensued in which general and specific concerns about the "charge" were expressed. Meetings with Dr. Brooks (about two hours) and the Board of Trustees (about 20 minutes) also took place. After this another meeting or two was held to consider the Committee's report to the Senate.

In its separate meetings with Dr. Brooks and the Board of Trustees, the Committee learned that neither Dr. Brooks nor the Board rejected having the president of the College evaluated. Dr. Brooks has very specific ideas and motives concerning evaluation and the role of the Presidency. The Board seems to be in favor of an evaluation, but there is really very little enthusiasm and interest. The meeting, very brief, seemed perfunctory. Perhaps its failure was due to its brevity.

The Committee cannot fulfill the Senate's first charge: "review the role of the presidency with the Board of Trustees, providing a faculty view of his proper responsibilities and rights" for these reasons:

- (a) The Board of Trustees appears unwilling to engage in a detailed discussion of the role of the presidency. Board members made it very clear that "the president is in complete charge" which may be an oblique signal for the faculty to begin to function autonomously.
- (b) Dr. Brooks and the Committee are at odds on the role and definition of the presidency. Dr. Brooks feels strongly that entities other than the president should define the priorities for the office. It should be pointed out that Dr. Brooks's position is forceful and worthy of consideration. The Committee seems more inclined to agree with the position taken by Dr. Hogness, President of the University of Washington: "the president must sense what his priorities are and shift them as circumstances demand."  
(Seattle Times, December 8, 1974)
- (c) The Committee does not feel qualified to consider "rights" of the presidency, except to say that any holder of the office of the presidency at Central should have strong academic affiliation and qualify for tenure in his academic discipline on initial appointment. Furthermore, the committee thinks that the office holder must retain full academic membership in his discipline as he continues in the office regardless of the administrative pressures.

In regards to the second charge, the Committee considered a detailed evaluation of performance in terms of priorities. First, we think such an evaluation reduces the position of the presidency to "measurable behavioral factors." The Committee thinks that there is much more to such an important position.

Second, we feel that any itemized evaluation has to be total and complete-- superficiality in this important matter would be worse than no evaluation at all. But when we weighed the time and energy involved in setting up a detailed evaluation against the lack of weight the work would seem to receive from the Board of Trustees, we decided against this alternative. The Committee, however, recommends that the Senate hold a vote of confidence every four years much as it is presently held for departmental chairmen, that this vote be held for faculty only at a time to be determined by the Faculty Senate, and that the result of the vote be sent to the Board of Trustees.

James G. Nylander, Chairperson

Anthony Canedo

William B. Owen

Linda Klug

Floyd Rodine

Duncan McQuarrie

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

March, 1975

D. 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

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
AND MUSEUM OF MAN

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

Ellensburg, Washington 98926

March 3, 1975

RECEIVED

MAR 3 1975

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. Duncan M. McQuarrie  
Chairman  
CWSC  
Faculty Senate

Dear Dr. McQuarrie:

On Friday evening, February 28, 1975, the Central Washington State College Board of Trustees formally adopted a new "Faculty Code," to become effective March 15, 1975. Under the new "Code" the Central Washington State College Faculty Senate will be relegated to nothing more than an advisory role. The Faculty Senate, as we have known it for nearly thirty years, will be dead. The only thing yet required is to give it a decent burial.

I request that the Senate give serious consideration to the following course of action.

1. Accept no further business which will require formal Senate action.
2. Proceed in an orderly manner to dispose of those items of business to which it is already committed.
3. Upon completion of Item 2, dissolve itself.

This request is made in the sincere belief that under the new code the Senate will no longer be able to provide me (or any other faculty member) reasonable professional representation with the administrative officers and/or Board of Trustees of Central Washington State College. To continue the pretense of doing so would be a travesty.

Regretfully yours,



James M. Alexander  
Associate Professor

JMA/me

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

RECEIVED

March 3, 1975

MAR 4 1975

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. Duncan McQuarrie  
Faculty Senate Chairman  
Campus


Dear Duncan:

I wish to request that the Faculty Senate not take action on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Evaluation of the Presidency until I have time to draft a response. In addition, I believe that you should request the Board of Trustees Chairman, Mr. Frank, to respond to the report. Mr. Frank was unaware that a report had been made when I visited with him about the matter just prior to the board meeting on February 28. Although I have not polled the other board members, it appears that they have not received the report.

The President and the Board Chairman should respond to this report for the Committee has attempted to interpret our positions.

I will be unable to attend the Faculty Senate meeting on March 5, 1975. The Council of Presidents will be meeting on March 4 and the Council of Higher Education will be meeting on the evening of March 4 and again on March 5.

Sincerely,

  
James E. Brooks  
President

cc: Mr. Frank  
Dr. Harrington  
Dr. Nylander

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

27 February 1975

Duncan McQuarrie, Chairperson  
Faculty Senate  
C.W.S.C.

Dear Duncan:

I am writing you to request formally that the Faculty Senate undertake a review and evaluation of the College's programs in English composition, with a view to trying to improve the general competence in English language writing skill among our undergraduates.


The enclosed article from yesterday's Daily Record speaks well to the general problem of "pre-literacy" among many of today's undergraduates. I think it important to have the Senate as a whole to examine the extent to which these problems persist at Central, and to consider appropriate actions for improving our ability as a faculty to work together in solving them.

In my own introductory political science course, a large number of students have shown basic inabilities to write essays in acceptable English. I take this as an indication of a lack of any rigorous training in fundamental language skills at the pre-college level, and as an indication of the need for such training to be supplied more effectively here. While we do have the Writing Resource Center, it is not necessarily reaching all the students who need aid, and I have had students who have suggested that the Center was not of much use to them. The work of the Center should be reviewed with a view to improving its effectiveness wherever possible.

I would also be interested in our considering the wisdom of promoting study in etymology for all students wishing to gain practical aid in promoting vocabulary growth and expansion. I do not know of such a course of study being offered here at present, but I have suggested to many of my students that etymological training would equip them with an extremely valuable language skill, of use in all sorts of writing activity, as well as reading.

If the appropriate Senate committee could begin to look into this crucial matter, perhaps fruitful suggestions for improvement might be instituted as early as Fall Quarter, 1975.

Sincerely,



Roger L. Winters  
Senator, Political Science

# College frosh English deficient

By JAMES RUSSELL

**EUGENE (UPI)** — There is a growing recognition across the country that a genuine crisis has developed in English writing skills according to Nathaniel Teich, director of composition at the University of Oregon in Eugene.

Thousands of entering freshman, says Teich, are deficient in the basic skills of English composition. This deficiency, he says, is most evident on the college level.

Teich recently sent a letter to secondary school English teachers and administrators to "let them know the magnitude of our writing problem and suggest increasing instruction in basic writing skills."

In 1970, the University reduced the number of required composition courses from three to two quarters. Since that time, says Teich, the writing proficiency of entering freshmen has declined at an alarming rate.

"This whole transition, this decrease in English proficiency," says Teich, "was part of the times. It came with the culture. It came with the feeling of individuality. Everything had to be 'relevant'."

Restrictions and requirements like those lifted for comp in 1970, says Teich, often evolved, from an administrative standpoint, because of a "search for instructional freedom and the fear, that many had, of telling students what to take or what to do. It was but another of the great revolutions of the sixties," he says.

Students didn't see the need, Teich speculates. They felt, perhaps, that other courses were more beneficial, he says.

What many students, teachers and administrators did not realize, says Teich, is that education can continue to teach skills and still keep content 'relevant.'

Evidence of the current "crisis," says Teich, comes from objective results of the verbal scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), from the need for more remedial composition scores, as well as from impressions of instructors.

A "significant portion" of entering freshmen (perhaps 25-30 per cent), Teich claims, could be considered "disadvantaged" because they have not mastered basic skills and achieved facility in written communication.

In the past six years, pinpoints Teich, the number of freshmen entering with SAT verbal scores below 370, which places them in Writing 120 (preparatory comp), has increased steadily from 208 (10.8 per cent) in 1969 to 327 (15.4 per cent) in 1974. During the same period, Teich informs, the number of new freshmen scoring above 550, which exempts them from Writing 121 (freshman comp), dropped from 141 (8.2 per cent) in 1970 to 81 (3.9 per cent) in 1973.

"You can't sweep these scores under the rug," says Teich. "Rationalization, either for budget reasons or whatever the cause, just doesn't work. These kids just don't have the tools and something has to be done about it."

"Kids come in and say they want to be in such and such profession but they realize they need the writing skills to succeed and then they feel cheated," says Teich. "They realize they weren't provided with the basics in high school and junior high school and then some feel, it's too late."

Are there any alternatives?

The problem, says Teich, is not so much that these students

are "functional illiterates" but more "pre-literates" in writing, English and composition. Teich says they have the capacity but they just haven't been exposed.

Perhaps one escape, a solution with a twist, Teich speculates, might be the "alternative" of going back to the "Three Rs — reading, writing and arithmetic."

"Ironically," he says, "this may be the only alternative."

The problem is pervasive, he says.

There are many explanations offered for the decline, including general erosion of standard English, more attention to oral and non-verbal communication, emphasis on mini-courses elective programs, prevalence of objective tests, and large secondary school English classes which limit writing instruction, Teich says.

Whatever the cause, the crisis has at least forced the University of Oregon English and Composition Departments to react.

The number of sections offered in Writing 120, preparatory comp, which does not satisfy the writing requirement, increased from seven in 1970-71 to 18 in 1973-74. In the current academic

year, at least 22 sections for 350-400 student are being taught.

"By having to pay attention to and provide more remedial sections," informs Teich, "it means giving up other very important elective courses or bigger enrollments in other English classes. The whole program suffers."

The English department, in conjunction with the Oregon Council of Teachers in English (OCTE), plans to participate in a "solution workshop" in the spring to assist Secondary and University teachers of English.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON  
98926

January 17, 1975

RECEIVED  
FEB 28 1975  
FACULTY SENATE

Dr. Duncan M. McQuarrie  
Chairman, Faculty Senate  
CWSC, Campus

Dear Dr. McQuarrie:

At the time of the last full accreditation by the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools the recommendation was made that, "It is suggested that the Faculty Senate study grade distribution to determine whether it is consistent with the expected performance of the student body."

In February of 1973 I appointed an ad hoc committee to prepare an objective study of the "grade-point average" at Central (see attachment). The ad hoc committee under the leadership of Dr. William Owen has just completed this study; a task that turned out to be truly monumental!

It is with pleasure that I transmit the full report to you for consideration by the Faculty Senate.\* For informational purposes I am sending each department a copy of those portions of the report that relate to them. Please understand that this is "raw" data and interpretation must be made with caution.

The deans and I have reviewed the report and feel that a complete review of the grading practices and policies at Central is in order. We stand ready to work with the Senate to see that this review is completed no later than the end of this coming spring quarter.

If there are questions on the report the ad hoc committee is willing to meet with the Senate. In addition, each committee member has kindly volunteered to meet with the departments within his school to provide information or interpretation as necessary.

Finally, I would like to thank, on behalf of all of us, Drs. William Owen, Daniel Ramsdell, John Vifian and Roy Ruebel for their many hours of work in preparing this significant report.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

cc: Dr. Brooks, Chairmen  
Program Directors, Deans

\*One additional copy of the entire report is available in my office; each dean has a complete study for his school.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER