The Faculty Senate was called to order by the Chair, Greg Hooks, on Thursday, March 14, 1996, in FSHN, T101, at 3:40 p.m. Forty-eight (48) members were present, twenty-three (23) members were absent with one (1) vacancy. Eight (8) non-voting members were present.

Minutes of February 29, 1996, meeting were approved.

Announcements (Information Items).

1. Faculty Senate officers and administrators met in a joint meeting on February 27, 1996.

2. Responses from Provost George on Senate Actions of February 29, 1996, are in Exhibit B as follows:

March 4, 1996

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Tom George
RE: Faculty Senate Actions, February 29, 1996

The actions taken by the Faculty Senate at its meeting of February 29, 1996 are noted as follows:

1. The recommendation from the Research and Arts Committee approved by the Faculty Senate for Procedures for Name Change for an Institute, Center or Laboratory is approved.

2. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee approved by the Faculty Senate for a Guaranteed Four-Year Degree Agreement available to first-time freshman enter WSU beginning the incoming fall 1996 class in a participating program is approved.

3. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee approved by the Faculty Senate for a Program in Hotel and Restaurant Administration in Switzerland is approved.

4. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee approved by the Faculty Senate for a BA in English at WSU Vancouver will be submitted to the Higher Education Coordinating Board for approval.

5. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee approved by the Faculty Senate for Undergraduate Major Change Bulletin 8 is approved.

6. The recommendation from the Graduate Studies Committee approved by the Faculty Senate for Graduate Major Change Bulletin 3 is approved.
3. Faculty Senate Standing Committees reported committee consideration on the following issues (agenda and previously reported items not included) at the March 7, 1996, Steering Committee meeting:

**Academic Affairs Committee:** BA in Human Development at WSU Vancouver.

**Faculty Affairs Committee:** Ethics Legislation and Consulting.

**Graduate Studies Committee:** Professional Courses.

**Research and Arts Committee:** Extended Learning Centers.

Reports.

1. Remarks by the Chair.--G. Hooks

   Hooks stated that the next Senate agenda would contain an information item on the progress of improving pedestrian traffic on Stadium Way.

2. Report from Legislative Representatives.--C. Clark, P. Chevalier

   Chevalier reported that the legislature funded 1,045 students for the WSU system including 984 for the Pullman campus, 44 for Spokane and 17 for Tri-Cities; the WHEN system, pesticide and wine/grape research was funded; $450,000 was funded for the WSU portion of the library project; and $45 million for capital operating funds. C. Clark was able to lay a good foundation for salary increases for the next biennium.


   Les Purce was unable to attend due to a meeting with the Regents.

   J. Zuiches discussed the following handout with the Senate:

   **LEARNING Centers: Increasing Access for a Life of Learning**

   WSU Learning Centers will be one-stop educational locations in the community. WSU’s Cooperative Extension, in collaboration with counties, community colleges, and other partners, will provide an array of educational programs building on the strengths of each institution. At these local sites, citizens will
have access to professional development workshops, pursue non-credit and certificate programs, enroll in WSU credit courses and the Extended Degree Program, access other higher education programs from participating partners, and tap the resources of the Internet and World Wide Web.

Washington State University has a 100-year history of providing educational programs to the people of the state, including 80 years of educational outreach through Cooperative Extension. In the last decade, to increase educational access, the University has developed branch campuses, created the Washington Higher Education Telecommunication System, and established the Extended Degree Program. As Washington’s population has grown and as the educational requirements of an information economy have increased, the educational needs of citizens have continued to change. More and more, because of financial considerations, family obligations, and work requirements, people need to pursue life-long learning offered within their own communities. Recognizing this need for access, WSU has undertaken a new technology-based initiative to develop the WSU Learning Centers.

Programs: The array of programs offered at a special Learning Center will reflect local priorities. These could include:

- **Cooperative Extension programs** in agriculture, family, youth, community development, and environmental stewardship.
- **Non-credit continuing education, recertification, or credential requirements** for professionals involved in criminal justice, engineering, business, health, natural resources, education, and public administration.
- **Credit education leading to an undergraduate degree** in social sciences is currently available. Future courses will include: business administration, agriculture, organizational development, natural resource management, and human development.
- **Non-formal education on topics of community interest**. Examples include: using the Internet, leadership development, small business development, alternative dispute resolution, parenting skills, and organizing volunteer programs.
- **Computer on-line information services** with access to WSU admissions and registration information, libraries, databases, publications, other cooperating education providers, and the Internet including the World Wide Web.

**Delivery Methods:** Learning Center programs will be delivered using a variety of traditional and distance education methods including on-site teaching, satellite, microwave, videotapes, computer video-conferences, computer on-line courses, and telephone conferences.

**Staffing:** Center staff will be educators proficient in facilitating self-learning, program development, distance education technologies, and extramural funding development.
Pilot Learning Center Locations and Community College Partners: The six pilot sites are located in Stevens County with Community Colleges of Spokane; Jefferson County with Peninsula College; Wenatchee Valley College; Yakima with Heritage College and Yakima Valley Community College; Cowlitz County, Longview/Kelso with Lower Columbia College, and WSU Vancouver; and Tacoma with Bates Technical College and Tacoma Community College.

Partners: Each WSU Learning Center will have a variety of local partners, including county and/or governments, community colleges, tribal nations, community non-profit organizations, business/industry partners, local school systems, technical colleges, other four-year institutions of higher education, and state or federal agencies.

Funding Sources: Local, state, and federal government funding; grants and contracts; gifts; fees associated with workshops, educational materials, and online services.

Zuiches reported that the Senate will be looking at a proposal for a model of the centers so that as each center comes on board it will not have to go through the entire process. However specific details will be sent to the Senate for approval. He stated that the legislature was asked for money for equipment and support staff since the 6 pilot centers are already set up in areas where cooperative extension has facilities. The expectation is for additional learning centers in the next biennium. There are gaps in the state where there is no access to higher education that will be prime areas for learning centers. When asked who decides what degrees will be offered Zuiches stated that it will be based on the what the communities request and then the faculty in those departments will put the course work together. A question was asked about what these centers will be officially called and Zuiches stated that he thought Extended Learning Centers would be the title.

Additions or Changes to the Agenda.

Discussion item 5 from Faculty Affairs on Contact with State Officials was removed from the agenda.

Agenda Items (Action Items).

1. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for “Repeal of Rule 30” Exhibit F from 2/15/96 agenda is as follows and New Exhibit C is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

TO: Richard Crain, Executive Secretary Faculty Senate
FROM: Julia Pomerenk, Assistant Registrar
FOR: Academic Affairs Committee
DATE: 9 February 1996
SUBJECT: Repeal of Rule 30, Correspondence or Extension Transfer Credit
Following approval by the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) and the Catalog Subcommittee (CSC) and based on a recommendation from the Correspondence Task Force, the Faculty Senate is requested to review and approve the repeal of the following academic rule:

**Rule 30, Correspondence or Extension Transfer Credit**

Correspondence or extension work in lower-division courses from universities and colleges accredited by the regional accrediting association shall yield transfer credit if completed with a grade of C or better. Upper-division extension courses or courses from non-accredited institutions must be validated by examination or other appropriate means to be determined by Washington State University.

Though WSU offers upper-division correspondence courses, currently upper-division transfer courses are accepted only by exception. The repeal of Rule 30 would allow WSU to accept upper-division correspondence courses as transfer credit.

In earlier discussions, CSC committee members questioned whether repealing Rule 30 would allow students to transfer course work completed with a grade below C. Michael Reilly, Assistant Director of Admissions, noted that another rule stipulates that a C average or better is required for graduation, as follows:

**Rule 114, Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees**

(a) 2. Earn twice as many grade points as the number of hours enrolled in graded course work, in this or any institution for which a grade has been received.

Any transfer grades below C that were accepted by WSU would need to be combined with sufficiently higher grades to achieve a minimum C average prior to graduation.

At this time, the Faculty Senate is requested to review and approve the repeal of Rule 30, Correspondence or Extension Transfer Credit, effective fall 1996.

cc: R. Folwell
    M. Nielsen
    M. Reilly
    J. Washburn

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Richard Crain, Executive Secretary, Faculty Senate
FROM: Julia Pomerenk, Assistant Registrar
FOR: Academic Affairs Committee
DATE: 7 March 1996
SUBJECT: Repeal of Rule 30, Correspondence or Extension Transfer Credit
In response to questions raised at the 29 February 1996 Faculty Senate meeting regarding the requested repeal of Rule 30, Correspondence or Extension Transfer Credit, I direct the Faculty Senate to the following academic rules which address WSU’s policy of accepting transfer credit from accredited institutions exclusively.

Rules 4 and 6 confirm that WSU accepts transfer credit from accredited institutions only.

**Rule 4, Transfer Requirements**
(a) Applicants with at least 27 semester hours of transferable credit from an accredited post-secondary institution must present a grade point average of at least 2.00

**Rule 6, Transfer Credit**
(b) The maximum transfer credit allowed from accredited two-year junior or community colleges shall be 60 semester hours toward a baccalaureate degree irrespective of when those hours were earned provided that the courses are essentially equivalent to those in the nonprofessional lower-division curriculum (those numbered at the 100 or 200 level) at WSU.

Rules 14 and 29 explicitly state that WSU does not accept transfer credit from non-accredited institutions, high schools, and business colleges:

**Rule 14, Credit from Non-Accredited Institutions**
Special examination for advanced standing credit for work done in non-accredited institutions will be allowed only by permission of the Admissions Subcommittee.

**Rule 29, High School and Business College Work**
No university credit shall be given for high school or business college work.

I suggest that the above rules are sufficient to assure WSU’s policy of accepting transfer credit from accredited institutions exclusively. The repeal of the Rule 30 would not compromise that policy.

* * * * *

Motion carried.

2 Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for “Graduate Course and Graduate Credit” New Exhibit D is as follows:

March 8, 1996

MEMORANDUM
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Lynda Carey, for Graduate Studies Committee
SUBJECT: Graduate Courses and Graduate Credit

At its meeting on December 12, 1995, the Graduate Studies Committee completed its review of 400- and 500- level courses, conjoint-listed courses, and graduate credit, and recommended the following for approval by the Faculty Senate:
a) Eliminate the distinction between 400-level courses with and without graduate credit
b) Limit the number of non-graduate credit (excluding 100- and 200-level) for use on the program of study to 6 credits (master’s) and 9 credits (doctoral); and
c) Allow conjoint-listed courses

c: Karen P. DePauw, Associate Dean, Graduate School
Diane Sylvester, Chair, Graduate Studies Committee

At the request of the Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate, the following information taken from the Graduate Studies Committee minutes is offered for clarification:

The effect of the above proposal would be to:

a) Increase the number of 500-level credits required from 9 to 15 on a master’s with thesis and from 12 to 20 on a master’s without thesis, from 17 to 25 for a Ph.D., from 17 to 33 for an EdD. And from 17 to 36 for the Doctor of Arts.
b) Increase the number of non-graduate credit (excluding 100- and 200-level) usable on a program from 3 to 6 for master’s degrees and from 6 to 9 for doctoral degrees; use of these courses is at the discretion of departments and programs.
c) Allow for the use of conjoint-listed courses on a program of a study at the discretion of the departments and programs. (GSC has review and approval authorization). This would allow conjoint-listed courses with and across departments and programs.
d) Eliminate confusion about the distinction between 400-level courses being used like conjoint-listed courses.
e) Eliminate the practice of non-conjoint listed 400-level courses being used like coinjoint listed courses.
f) Examine 400-level courses currently offered for graduate credit and 1) offer them as undergraduate courses and eliminate graduate credit 2) offer them as graduate courses (new 500-level only), and 3) offer them for both undergraduate and graduate credit (i.e. develop 500-level counterpart and offer as conjoint-listed courses).
g) Continue to allow departments and programs to use conjoint-listed courses which are necessary in selected units for budgetary reasons (e.g., limited enrollments in selected emphasis areas, limited faculty resources).

CHRONOLOGY

Fall 1992: Graduate students expressed concerns to GSC about the level of graduate instruction in 400 level graduate courses and conjoint listed courses. (Some students indicated that they had graduated without taking any graduate classes comprised only of graduate students.)

Spring 1993: a) Subcommittee made recommendations including limiting number of 400 and conjoint courses. GSC recommend “no more than 50% of graded courses taken to fulfill requirements for master’s or doctoral degrees can be 400 with graduate credit or 500 credit in conjoint (400/500) course”. The recommendation was not approved by the Faculty Senate.
b) GSC approved “to obtain approval for 500-level credit in a conjoint course after May 1993, the course application must detail both how the additional work required of graduate students will provide additional depth in several areas covered in the course and how it will provide for significant time for graduate students to interact with the instructor.”

c) GSC approved that “during graduate program reviews, conjoint courses will be explicitly reviewed to determine their appropriateness for graduate education in the field.”

Fall 1993 to present: Members of the GSC (including graduate students) have continued to be concerned about the quality of graduate course work; reviewed and approved very few conjoint listed courses; questioned approval of 400 level courses for graduate credit; developed working definition of graduate course; recommended the proposed changes currently before the Faculty Senate.

POLICIES REGARDING GRADUATE COURSES AT SELECTED PEER AND WESTERN REGION INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Policy Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Requires all 500 or 600 level graduate courses (MS and Ph.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>All credits should be at the graduate level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>All credits at graduate level, 20 of 36 must be graded graduate credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ AZ</td>
<td>Max 6 credits at undergraduate level, 50% graded credits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW</td>
<td>All credits at graduate level, minimum 18 graded (of 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>All graduate level course work; limit 6 hr independent study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>All graduate level course work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>May take maximum of 1/3 course requirements at 400-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland St</td>
<td>All credits at graduate level (500 master’s, 600 doctoral); School of education allows max of 6 credits of non-graduate credit on master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>All graduate level course work required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- Most schools required graduate level course work exclusively
--WUS: minimum of 9 credits of 500 level course work (including conjoint)

The following resolution was presented by GPSA:

Resolution passed by GPSA Senate, March 11, 1996:

Whereas, 400-level courses are undergraduate courses;

and whereas, 400-level courses for graduate credit are so designated in order to indicate that a course is being simultaneously taught at both the graduate and undergraduate levels;

and whereas, 400-level courses for graduate credit are so designated in order to indicate a substantive difference from regular 400-level undergraduate courses;

be it resolved that the Graduate and Professional Students of Washington State University find that distinctive 400-level courses for graduate credit should be abolished, and that these should be replaced by either 500-level courses or 400/500-level conjoint courses; for, despite the nomenclature of “400g” for alleged 400-level course for
graduate credit, too often this description is insufficient to describe the graduate work done; further, if indeed such 400-level courses are for graduate credit, for simplicity’s sake they should be designated as such, ergo 500-level courses.

Be it further resolved that the Graduate and Professional Students of Washington State University find that such a move is required in order that graduate study at this university be credited appropriately and precisely on our transcripts.

* * * * *

This resolution was presented to the Senate in support of this action item.

Motion carried.

3. Recommendation from Faculty Affairs Committee for a statement on ”Academic Integrity” for the Faculty Manual New Exhibit E is as follows:

Memorandum
TO:   Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM:  Mary Gallwey, University Ombudsman
DATE:  March 4, 1996
SUBJECT: Faculty responsibilities Related to Academic Integrity

Because of questions and comments at the Faculty Senate meeting of February 29, I want to clarify a few points.

The most important is that there is absolutely no new policy in this statement. Everything in it summarizes policies or procedures previously approved by the Faculty Senate and by the Board of Regents where such approval was required. The policy and procedures have been incorporated into the Washington Administrative Code following public comments received during the 1994-95 academic year.

I have urged the Faculty Affairs Committee to include such a statement in the Faculty Manual because one of the most important elements of due process for faculty is that they be notified of the policies to which they must adhere. Consistency among faculty members in the definition of academic integrity violations is also important because it provides the necessary notice to students; this is the reason for referring to the definition in the Student Handbook.

Faculty will still be handling the violations “informality” in that they will conduct the necessary investigations, weigh the evidence, and decide on academic consequences, which will vary from one instructor to another. The only new element is the required report to Student Affairs. This report does not go on a student’s academic record unless the instructor, chair, or dean requests a formal proceeding because of the seriousness of the offense or unless a formal proceeding has been triggered by multiple reports that the same student has violated the standards and a formal determination has confirmed this.

The academic integrity policy defines the “responsible instructor” as follows:

“…the person who assigned the grades, supervises students’ work, or is responsible for teaching operations in the course of study in which the alleged violation occurred. The term “responsible instructor” can include, but is not limited to,
instructor, graduate assistants, another instructor, and clinical supervisors. If the conduct does not relate to a particular course, the role of the instructor for these procedures may be a department chair or academic advisor.” WAC 504-25-310.

The Senate may wish to modify the first sentence of the third paragraph to incorporate this definition by reference. Wording such as the following might be substituted:

“When there is an allegation or evidence of an academic integrity violation, the cognizant faculty member (‘responsible instructor’ as defined in WAC 504-25-310) must conduct …”

Faculty Responsibilities Related to Academic Integrity

All members of the university community share responsibility for maintaining and promoting the principles of academic integrity. To guide execution of this responsibility, the university has set a policy defining academic dishonesty and the process to be followed when it is alleged, for the undergraduate and graduate students alike. The cognizant instructor, chair or dean may seek the advice of the University Ombudsman or the Office of Student Affairs at any stage of the process described below.

Academic Integrity violations include cheating, falsification, fabrication, multiple submission, plagiarism, abuse of academic materials, and complicity or misconduct in research. Definitions are found in the Student Handbook and in WAC 504-25-310. When there is an allegation or evidence of an academic integrity violation, the responsible faculty member must conduct a prompt and careful investigation. Physical evidence should be retained and interviews with persons who may have a knowledge of the events conducted. Students are required by the Code of Student Conduct to cooperate with such investigations and are prohibited from assisting in academic dishonesty (WAC 504-25-015, 504-25-120, 504-25-135). The accused must be afforded the opportunity to present evidence, preferably in writing, and the responsible faculty member may require other students to answer questions material to the investigation. The responsible instructor then determines, by the preponderance of the evidence, whether or not a violation has occurred. The instructor then assigns an appropriate academic consequence and notifies the student. The instructor must notify the Office of Student Affairs by memo of any finding that a violation has occurred, including the nature of the violation, student’s name and ID number, and the action taken. If there is an appeal to the department chair, the dean or provost, the burden shifts to the student to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the offense did not occur or that the academic sanctions were too severe. If the appeal is successful, a report must be filed with the Office of Student Affairs.

If the violation is the first offense, the Office of Student Affairs will take no further action unless requested to do so by the instructor, chair or dean. In that case, the student judicial process described in the Student Handbook is followed. Knowingly false statements by the accused or by any witness constitute additional violations of the Conduct Code.

One correction was made by Plumb, in the second paragraph the fourth line the word “responsible” was changed to “cognizant.”

*****
Motion carried.

Agenda Items (Discussion Items).

1. Recommendation from Planning Review Committee for “The Academic and University Cores of WSU” Exhibit J from 2/15/96 Agenda PLEASE BRING TO THIS MEETING).—G. Hooks

Concern was expressed at a previous meeting about accountability in graduate programs not being mentioned in this document. Concern was expressed that the document was developed as though WSU were not a land grant institution. Recognition was given to the fact that this is an institution where people are trained. Part of WSU’s mission as a land grant institution is to do research in the areas of agriculture and engineering and bring those results to the people in the state. Concerned was raised about the document causing division among the different colleges which will hinder the mission.

The following items were not discussed due to a lack of a quorum.

2. Nomination and elections of Faculty Senate Officers for 1996-1997 (Exhibit F). Nominees will be asked to speak to the Faculty Senate at the April 4, 1996 meeting, prior to voting.—D. Baker.

3. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for “Revision to Rule 6 Transfer Credit” (Exhibit G).—J. Washburn

4. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for “Undergraduate Major Change Bulletin #9” (Exhibit H).—J. Washburn

This item was pulled from the agenda.

Constituents' Concerns.

R. Greenberg brought an article from a Seattle newspaper about the admission requirements of the different universities in the state. In this article it basically stated that WSU has the second lowest entrance requirements in the state. Greenberg would like the Senate officers to write a letter of response to the newspaper.

Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned due to lack of a quorum at 5:30 p.m.

Richard W. Crain, Jr.
Executive Secretary