The Faculty Senate was called to order by David Stock, Chair, at 3:40 p.m. on Thursday, September 18, 1997, in FSHN T 101. Forty-four (44) members were present and thirty-five (34) members were absent with three (4) vacancies. There were nine (9) non-voting members present.

Tribute was paid to Richard W. Crain Jr., Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate from 1992 until his death on August 27, 1997. Dorene Branson, Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant and Douglas Baker, Faculty Senate Chair 1994-95, shared memories about Dick’s life and his work with the Senate. A plaque, honoring Dick, was presented to his wife Carolee and his daughter Ruth; it will hang in the Senate office.

Minutes of May 1, 1997 meeting were approved as circulated.

Announcements (Information Items).

1. Faculty Senate officers and administrators met in joint meetings on May 6, 14, June 17, July 8 and 15, August 12, and September 9, 1997.

2. Faculty Senate officers met with President Smith on May 21, June 13, July 29 and August 26, 1997.

3. Responses from Provost Gamble on Faculty Senate Actions of March 6, April 3 and 17, and May 1, 1997, are in Exhibit B is as follows:

May 14, 1997
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Geoffrey L. Gamble
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Actions
The actions taken by the Faculty Senate at its March 6, 1997 meeting are noted as follows:

1. The recommendation from the Graduate Studies Committee for Graduate Major Changed Bulletin #8 and Addendum #1 is noted.

2. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee for Revision to Rule 90 Grades is approved.

3. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee for Undergraduate Major Change Bulletin #17 and Addendum's #1, 2, and 3 is approved.

4. The recommendation from the Research and Arts Committee for the Center for Non-Thermal Processing of Food is noted.

cc: K. DePauw S. Savage R. Smith
    S. Giffen M. Nielsen S. Smith
    T. Purce K. Kravas E. Madison
May 14, 1997
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Geoffrey L. Gamble
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Actions

The actions taken by the Faculty Senate at its April 3, 1997 meeting are noted as follows:

1. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee for Goals and Outcomes within the WSU Baccalaureate Programs is approved.

cc: K. DePauw S. Savage
    S. Giffen M. Nielsen
    T. Purce K. Kravas
    R. Smith E. Madison
    S. Smith

May 14, 1997
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Geoffrey L. Gamble
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Actions

The actions taken by the Faculty Senate at its April 17, 1997 meeting are noted as follows:

1. The election of officers is noted as follows:
   David Stock, Professor of Mechanical and Materials Engineering as Chair of the Faculty Senate for 1997-98;
   Robert Greenberg, Associate Professor of Accounting and Business Law as Vice Chair for 1997-98;
   Carolyn Clark, Associate Professor of Economics as Legislative Representative for 1997-99.

2. The resolution for Faculty Senate Budget Committee participation in Budget Review Hearings needs further discussion between faculty leadership and administration.

3. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee for a B.S. in Neuroscience is noted.

4. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee for a B.A. in Sport Management is noted.

5. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee for a B.A. in Earth Science is noted.

6. The recommendation from the Research and Arts Committee for a Center for Multiphase Environmental Research is noted.
7. The recommendation from the Research and Arts Committee for a Center for Reproductive Biology is noted.

8. The recommendation from the Graduate Studies Committee for Conditions for Program Residency for Doctor of Philosophy Degrees is noted.

9. The recommendation from the Graduate Studies Committee for a Master in Nursing at WSU Vancouver is noted.

cc:   K. DePauw     S. Smith     M. Nielsen
     S. Giffen     R. Smith     K. Kravas
     T. Purce     S. Savage     E. Madison

August 19, 1997
TO:   Faculty Senate
FROM: Geoffrey L. Gamble
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Actions

The actions taken by the Faculty Senate at its May 1, 1997 meeting are noted as follows:

1. The recommendation from the Research and Arts Committee for A Center for Teaching and Learning is noted.

2. The recommendation from the Organization and Structure Committee for Steering Committee Summer Authority is noted.

3. The recommendation from the Steering Committee for the Faculty Senate Calendar for 1997-98 is noted.

4. The recommendation from the Graduate Studies Committee for Graduate Major Change Bulletin #1 and Addendum is noted.

5. The recommendation from the Graduate Studies Committee for a Master of Nursing in Yakima is approved.

6. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee for Undergraduate and Professional Change Bulletin #1 and Addendum #1, 2, 3, and 4 is noted.

7. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee for New Rule 23 Requirements for Make-up Hours for University Holidays is approved with the following wording change:

   The presence of one-day holidays in the academic calendar leads to fewer days of instruction for certain classes. Instructions have the authority to require students to make-up lecture and laboratory contact hours, including scheduling such hours on evenings and Saturdays, whenever university holidays create unequal opportunities and time demands for students enrolled in the course. The make-up hours for a given course or section must be identified in the WSU Time Schedule and also in the course syllabus.
The wording change is based on a ruling from the Attorney General's Office.

cc:  K. DePauw  S. Smith  S. Savage  T. Purce
     S. Giffen  M. Nielsen  E. Madison  K. Kravas

* * * * *

4. Faculty Senate calendar for 1997-98 is in Exhibit C is as follows:

Senate Meetings September 18 October 9 and 30 November 13 December 11 January 29
February 12 March 5 April 2, 16 and 30

*****

5. Faculty Senate Committee’s Annual Reports are in Exhibit D is as follows:

May 7, 1997
TO:  James Evermann, Chair Academic Affairs Committee
FROM:  Susan Swan, Chair
       Academic Advising and Reinstatement Subcommittee
RE:  Annual Report, 1996-97

During the 1996-97 academic year, several policies were reviewed and decisions reached regarding them.

Students denied reinstatement being allowed, or not, to enroll in Extended University Services courses: In general, it was agreed that students may continue to enroll in correspondence courses as a method of receiving a passing grade in a repeat enrollment and then reapply for reinstatement. AARS continues to need to address the issue of whether or not to continue to recommend flexible enrollment/correspondence courses to all students denied reinstatement.

Concerns about university standards, particularly regarding the Athletic Department, since it was reported that, over the last six years, 100% of all Rule 39 athletes have been reinstated. The possibility of a perceived laxity in reinstatement processing jeopardizing the students with the NCAA was raised. Concern about university standards revolve around three issues:

1. How long will we let a student not meet the minimum university standards?
2. The incurring of a large debt load
3. Not enforcing our own rules, allowing students to persist

Transfer of responsibility for Senior and Transfer Petitions from the AARS to the General Education Committee: Since Richard Law, Director of the General Education Program, already reviews these petitions, it was unanimously proposed by the AARS that this transfer take place, with a recommendation to this effect being sent to the AAC to be passed on to the Faculty Senate for final action.
Allowing academic advisors to make changes in Reinstatement Conditions: It was unanimously decided that such modifications might be allowed as long as the Office of Academic Standing is notified of these changes either by a notation on the Advisor's Interview Confirmation Form or by memo. These modifications would then become a permanent component of the students Academic Standing File.

More effective alternatives to late semester reinstatement workshops: since students tend to leave these requirements until the end of the semester instead of taking them at the beginning, when they might be more beneficial. Over the summer, Committee members will continue to investigate means of encouraging students to attend the early semester workshops.

In a final motion of the year, William Mincks was unanimously elected as ARS Chair for 1997-98.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Richard W. Crain, Jr., Executive Secretary, Faculty Senate
FROM: R. Wes Leid, Chair, Committee on Committees
DATE: 28 July, 1997
SUBJECT: Annual Report

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES FINAL REPORT - 1996-1997

Although this committee was busy throughout the year, as per usual, the heaviest load was during the Spring Semester of 1997. The committee proposed names to the Faculty Senate, the President of the university and other administrators to fill committee vacancies on Faculty Senate, Presidential and university committees. This total included 43 faculty on 19 different Faculty Senate committees, 21 faculty on 10 different presidential committees and 26 faculty for 11 different university committees. In addition, we proposed members to serve on the faculty excellence awards selection committees and we replaced faculty who resigned or left the university and left committee spots open throughout the year. This year was one in which there was high turnover of faculty on many Senate committees, as more than a usual number of faculty resigned their committee assignments during the year. Indeed, several committees were stalled for a short period of time in their Faculty Senate work for a lack of a quorum, and we hope that this lack of faculty commitment does not continue into the new academic year.

The other members of the committee are to be congratulated for their diligence and work ethic, as I asked much of them in a short span of time in Spring, 1997. These members include: Ahmed Ahmedullah, John Crane (who resigned in mid-year), Barb Hammond, Larry Hiller, Nancy Magnuson, Tom Ruff, Terry Umbreit, and David Yonge. Ahmed Ahmedullah, Tom Ruff and Wes Leid finished their terms on the committee and Tom and Wes agreed to run again and were elected for a second three year term. All members of the committee are to be given a special thanks for a job well done. All members of the committee were forthright in their assessment of the candidates proposed and all were willing to do whatever it took to get the job done. A special thanks and kudos is to be given to David Stock, the incoming Faculty Senate Chair. He was the first vice-chair of the Senate in my memory who actively participated in the committee, calling prospective candidates, as well as submitting names for discussion.
His assistance was simply invaluable and he should be so recognized for his work. The new members starting in Fall, 1997 are: Ray Sun, Tom Ruff and Wes Leid. The chair for 1996-1997 is Wes Leid.

Our goal continues to be the involvement of more highly qualified faculty, of diverse backgrounds, in the committee structure of the university. We have sought a mixture of those faculty with extensive committee experience and those who heretofore have not been involved in university and faculty senate committee work. I believe we have made a good start in this direction over the past several years and we will continue these efforts in 1997-1998.

Finally I would like to extend my deepest personal thanks to Elizabeth Beckham and Dorene Branson for their outstanding service to the committee. They certainly made my job easier and I am grateful for their excellent assistance.

MEMORANDUM
TO: Dorene Branson
FROM: Louis P. Mallavia Chair, Distinguished Faculty Address Committee
DATE: May 1, 1997
SUBJECT: Annual Report - Distinguished Faculty Address Committee

The Distinguished Faculty Address Committee met several times to review nominations for the Distinguished Address speaker. The nominations were first narrowed to five candidates. After solicitation of further documentation and support for these five, and review by the Committee, Dr. John N. Thompson, Professor, Department of Zoology/Botany was chosen. Dr. Thompson presented The Distinguished Faculty Address titled, "Coevolution and Biodiversity" on February 12, 1997.

All members of the committee were present at each of the meetings, with the exception of the undergraduate member who was difficult to contact. I would suggest that students in the future be advised of the importance of their participation and availability.

At the final meeting of the committee, Dr. Michael Griswold, Professor, Biochemistry and Biophysics, was unanimously elected as Chair of the Committee for the 1998 Address.

GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 1996-97

Actions taken and items considered by the Graduate Studies Committee during the 1996-97 academic year included the following:

*Initiated a review, of the following graduate degree programs:
   --Accounting (Master of Accounting)
   --Biology (Master of Science)
   --Business Administration (Master of Business Administration/Doctor of Philosophy)
   --Nursing (Master of Nursing)
*Appointed the following subcommittees:
  --Subcommittee to Review Requests to Change 400-Level Courses to 500-Level or Conjoint-Listed
  --Subcommittee to Review Intellectual Property Policy
  --Subcommittees to Review Graduate Programs in . . .
  Nursing  Materials Science
  Business Administration  Foreign Languages and Literature
  Plant Physiology  Accounting
  Biology

Completed reviews and recommended continuation of the following graduate degree programs:
--Communication (Master of Arts) - January 21, 1997
--Apparel, Merchandising and Interior Design (Master of Arts in Apparel, Merchandising and Textiles and Master of Arts in Interior Design) - January 21, 1997
--Civil and Environmental Engineering (Master of Science in Civil Engineering, Master of Science in Environmental Engineering, and Doctor of Philosophy (Civil Engineering) - March 25, 1997 --Fine Arts (Master of Fine Arts) - April 22, 1997
--Speech and Hearing Sciences (Master of Arts) - April 22, 1997

Recommended approval of the following extended degree programs: --Master of Nursing to WSU Vancouver [Approved by Senate 4/17/97] --Master of Nursing to Yakima [Approved by Senate 5/1/97]

Review of the following graduate degree programs are pending:
  --Mechanical and Materials Engineering (Master of Science in Materials Science and Engineering, Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering, and Doctor of Philosophy, Mechanical Engineering)
  --Botany (Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy)
  --Chemical Engineering (Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy) --Plant Pathology (Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy)
  --Business Administration (Master of Business Administration and Doctor of Philosophy) --Foreign Languages and Literatures (Master of Arts)
  --Plant Physiology (Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy) --Materials Science (Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy)
  --Accounting (Master of Accounting) --Biology (Master of Science)
  --Nursing (Master of Nursing)
  --individual Interdisciplinary Doctoral Degree

Recommended approval of the following centers, institutes, labs:
--International Business Institute [Approved by Senate 1/30/97]
--Center for Reproductive Biology [Approved by Senate 4/17/97]
--Center for Nonthermal Processing of Food [Approved by Senate 3/6/97]
--Center for Multiphase Environmental Research [Approved by Senate 4/17/97]

Recommended approval of the following academic rule requests:
--Rule 92 - Grade Records (new) [Approved by Senate 11/14/96]
--Rule 98 - Correction of Grade Errors (revision) [Approved by Senate 11/14/96]
Continued review of conditions of doctoral residency, specifically with respect to the level of support for libraries at the branch campuses and the commitments on behalf of the campus deans, and forwarded revised Conditions to Senate [Approved by Senate 4/17/97]

Approved request for CD-ROM-supplemented master's thesis - February 4, 1997

Approved revised draft of Graduate Student Code - April 22, 1997

Accepted progress report submitted by the Department of Genetics and Cell Biology – January 21, 1997

Accepted strategic plan submitted by the Department of Genetics and Cell Biology as a follow-up to the graduate program review - April 22, 1997

Recommended professional course designation (P) for professional courses

Reviewed Intellectual Property Policy revisions (no action taken)

Reviewed requests for proposed new sites for WSU Learning Centers (no action required)

Reviewed proposal for a formally recognized graduate certificate program in Engineering Management based on coursework (no action taken)

Discussed a proposal to include on the Graduate School application form questions concerning conviction and arrest record, disciplinary action, and unethical conduct of a graduate student applicant (no action taken)

Reviewed policies and procedures related to extended academic issues (no action taken)

Reviewed procedures for approving off-campus programs/degrees (no action taken) – Discussed establishing a definition of a professional course (no action taken)

*Discussed with Chair, Department of Agricultural Economics, the Jacklin Seed Company controversy regarding the study on the benefits and costs of a proposed reduction in grass seed field burning in Washington (no action taken)

Participated in focus group meetings scheduled to provide feedback and comments on stresses on research and education at WSU and on the draft document- Graduate Student Code--Rights, Responsibilities, Conduct and Grievances

Held two retreats to discuss in depth a number of issues of concern to the Committee

Approved five (5) proposals for interdisciplinary doctoral degrees

Approved thirteen (13) requests from faculty/staff wishing to pursue graduate degrees

Approved two (2) third extension of doctoral degree requests
Approved request for exception to policy to waive the two-year residency requirement

-Approved courses for graduate credit

The following discussion items are carried over to 1997-98:
--Veterinary Clinical Science follow-up review
--Policies related to Extended Academic Issues
--Intellectual Property Policy Revisions

Legislative Affairs Subcommittee of the Steering Committee, Annual Report, 1996-97

The committee met occasionally during the fall and weekly (except for holidays or vacations) during the spring semester. Pending issues were discussed so that our Legislative Representatives could take account of the views expressed in the committee in their lobbying.

The committee had also provided, during the summer, suggested questions for inclusion in their constituent questionnaires to our state House members, Larry Sheahan and Mark Schoessler.

Committee discussions provided guidance to the Council of Faculty Representatives members in formulating the position of the WSU faculty as it would be articulated at meetings of that group.

The committee noted with great pleasure the superb presentation on the need for faculty salary increases and justifications therefore developed by Carolyn Clark and presented to a very receptive audience of legislators, who extended her time generously and applauded at the conclusion. It is widely perceived that it is to Professor Clark's presentation that the faculty owes the increases budgeted or allowed for the next biennium.

At its last meeting the committee elected Erica Austin chair for 1997-98.
Mary Gallwey
Chair, 1996-97

Annual Report
Faculty Senate Library Committee
1996-1997 Academic Year

Report Submitted by: Joe Powers, Chair
Members:
Ken Kardong
Ingrid Mifflin
Michael Myers
David Benson
Susan Vetter (Graduate Student)
Debra Sanders
Gustavo Barbosa-Canovas
Robert Speth
Kevin Skillestad (Undergraduate Student)
Lynn Duprel (Undergraduate Student)
Nancy Baker (ex-officio)

A. The Committee reviewed a number of proposals for centers and institutes as well as new academic programs (see attached list). A continuing problem is lack of use of the library impact statement guidelines by those preparing proposals resulting in delay of approval by the committee.

B. An ongoing concern of the Library Committee was budgetary problems especially with regard to inflation of serial subscription costs. As a result, the Committee revised the "Procedures for Submitting Proposals to the Faculty Senate Library Committee for New Centers, New Degrees, Programs Etc." to reflect concern over budgeting of serials. (See attached revised guidelines).

C. The Committee provided input to the Provost's Library Steering Committee including review of a library survey of faculty and selected students. Late in the Spring semester, changes in allocation of Library funds were considered by the Steering Committee and this issue will need to be examined by the FSLC.

D. The Committee reviewed various approaches to the use of technology as a means to reduce the impact of increasing serials costs. Included in these discussions were the impact of on-line journals and the recently instituted pilot program in which reprints are taxed to requesting faculty.

E. New members of the Committee for the next academic year are Marilyn Von Seggern (Library) and Stan Linden (English). Ingrid Mifflin and Joe Powers are completing their terms as members of the Committee. David Benson will be on sabbatical during the upcoming year, a replacement should be appointed. Mike Meyers and Debra Sanders agreed to co-chair the Committee during the upcoming year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Degree Proposals</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A. Earth Science</td>
<td>Approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. Sport Management</td>
<td>Approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. Neuroscience</td>
<td>Approved - Note that subject librarian has some concern about adequacy of collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Nursing - Vancouver</td>
<td>Approved - with minor budget correction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master of Nursing - Yakima
Approved.

B.A. Business Administration Learning Centers - Proposal returned for lack of detail in description of library resources (budget) needed to support 250 students (steady state number in proposal).

B. Center, Institute Proposals

Center for Non-thermal Food Processing
Approved.

Center for Teaching and Learning
Returned due to lack of completion of library impact analysis.

Center for Multiphase Environmental Research
Approved.

Center for Reproductive Biology
Approved - Suggested that four key journals be funded by start-up funds for center.

Intentional Business Institute
Approved.

Center for Entrepreneurial Studies
Approved.

New Sites for Learning Centers
Reviewed - See B.A. Business Administration comments.

PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTING PROPOSALS TO THE FACULTY SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE FOR NEW CENTERS, NEW DEGREE PROGRAMS, ETC.

The Faculty Senate Library Committee reviews all proposals for new degree programs, new centers, etc., for adequacy of library holdings and services. To assist the committee in its deliberations, please address the topics below in your proposal in collaboration with the librarians responsible for collection development in your discipline(s). The names of appropriate librarians are available from the Director of Libraries.

1. The adequacy of existing library collections, services, etc.:
   a. Comment on the adequacy of existing library collections, equipment, personnel and services in terms of the proposed program/center/etc. (A declaration of adequacy is not sufficient; please indicate how your conclusion was derived).
b. How do you propose to fund existing serials in light of ever increasing subscription costs?

2. The need for new library collections:
   a. Serials (e.g., journals or indexes in print, electronic format, microform, etc.):
      1) List new serial titles (and costs) that will be needed.
      2) What funds have been designated for these titles and for the ongoing serials subscriptions?
      3) Can any of your current serials subscriptions be cancelled to purchase the new titles?
      4) What additional library equipment will be needed and how will it be funded (e.g., terminals, CD-ROM readers, etc.)?
   b. Monographs (e.g., books in print, electronic format, etc.):
      1) Will monographs need to be purchased?
      2) Have continuing funds been designated for these and future purchases?
      3) What additional library equipment will be needed and how will it be funded (e.g., terminals, CD-ROM readers, etc.)?
   c. Media (e.g., films, videotapes, sound recordings, etc.):
      1) Are media materials needed?
      2) Have funds been designated?
      3) What additional multimedia equipment will be needed and how will it be funded?

3. The need for new library personnel:
   a. Will specialized expertise, e.g., knowledge of specific languages or a specific discipline, be required to serve your new program/center/etc.?
   b. Will additional library staff or faculty need to be hired?
   c. If so, how will the position(s) be funded?

4. The need for additional library services:
   a. To what extent will additional library services (e.g., interlibrary loan service, online networked access, reference service or library user education) be required?
   b. Have funds been designated for this purpose?

5. For Branch Campuses/Extended University Proposals:
   a. To what extent will collections and services be provided from Pullman?
   b. To what extent will they be provided by the branch campus?
   c. Are there other local libraries (non-WSU) that will be serving these needs?
   d. What arrangements have been made with these local libraries?

6. For Centers, Institutes and Laboratories:
   a. Identify those serials currently received by the WSU Library that are primary to the function of the proposed center, institute or laboratory.
   b. Identify in the budget funding to defray increased costs of serials listed in a. (above) for a period of five years. A 10% inflation factor is suggested for preparation of the budget.
The Student Affairs Committee accomplished three primary activities for the 1996-97 academic year: (1) re-established the purpose and productivity of the Committee; (2) provided feedback to Gus Kravas on the University's Alcohol Abuse Task Force Recommendations (see attachment); and (3) provided feedback to the Faculty Senate on the WSU Multicultural Student Retention Strategy Draft (see attachment). I will continue to serve as Chair of the Committee for the upcoming 1997-98 academic year and look forward to being of continued service to the University academic community,

As you are aware, the Student Affairs Committee has met on several occasions to review the recommendations from the Alcohol Abuse Task Force. This memo provides you with a summary of our reaction to the recommendations. First of all, we as a committee commend the Task Force for acknowledging the significance of the residence hall experience, new student orientation, and Greek system in acclimating new students to WSU and in shaping behavioral patterns around the issue of substance use and abuse.

Overall, the committee strongly supports the Task Force recommendations and agree such steps are necessary for residence halls to become communities that promote lifestyle intervention and education. The committee is particularly supportive of Recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4. As advanced by Recommendation 1, we encourage you to provide residence hall staff with the necessary training to become key players in an overall effort to curb substance abuse. Without such training, staff are often handicapped to deal with highly complex situations dealing with the unpredictable nature of human behavior in a college social setting. Coherent and easily understood substance abuse intervention protocol is so important that we ask that Recommendation 2 include added sources of dissemination in addition to the Student Handbook (i.e., internet, flyers, etc.) and the information guide; the message must be delivered in a variety of ways to ensure its readied access to all the residence hall community at any given time. We support the spirit of Recommendation 3 in that students should be introduced to substance use policies at the first floor meeting of the year; however, we hope residence hall staff are sensitive that such a message should be delivered in a manner that is respectful to students (e.g., not using the "riot act' tone). As for Recommendation 4, we also feel it is important to have a prepackaged substance abuse education program but we wonder how effective it is to "require" participation and instead hope that "encouraging" students to participate will be as helpful.

We also support Recommendations 5, 6, and 7. In reference to Recommendation 5, we agree that there will always be a critical mass of college students who should have available a voluntary substance-free living community from which to choose as a housing option when they are here at WSU. In terms of Recommendation 6, it is a good
idea to have positive role models but prior experience warns us that upper-class students can sometimes be put in situations to guide students down the wrong path, and so we caution the use of this strategy with some consideration that residence life attract upper-class students that have some experience in complying with and supporting the spirit of the Alcohol Abuse Task Force recommendations. The committee feels strongly that Recommendation 7 is at the heart of both forming the Task Force and shaping behavioral patterns around the issue of substance use and abuse and that is to enhance the intellectual environment in the residence halls.

We are pleased to see the Task Force address the issue of New Student Orientation given that the Committee's position is to begin early and stay consistent in the development and enforcement of policies related to alcohol abuse. As stated in Recommendations 1 and 2, we agree this means involving both students and their parents as well as providing prevention information prior to enrollment at the University. In Recommendations 3, 4, and 5, we are also made more aware of the need to maintain an agenda, wisely scheduling academic classes, and ensuring widespread participation in University sponsored events during the first week on campus.

All the policy recommendations pertaining to the Greek system are laudable. Taken together, these recommendations set forth an ambitious but necessary step to supporting a living-learning environment conducive to a quality academic experience. Policy recommendations are difficult to realize unless there are reasonable implementation recommendations set forth. Here, again, the Task Force has been right on target. The implementation recommendations are wise to take into account policies and procedures that are familiar to all parties concerned. We feel, however, that additional emphasis should be made for concerned parties to work closely with each other and collaborate on achieving the spirit and intent of the policy recommendations, and that is to encourage responsible social and personal behavior promoting healthy living-learning environments. As for university support, the Committee understands that the University has limitations to providing public funds to the Greek system. Nevertheless, we are pleased that there are recommendations that allow the University to offer guidance in form of encouraging the WSU Foundation to act in consultation status with the Greek system, developing a Blue Ribbon panel of influential alumni, establishing an incentive program rewarding meritorious activities among the Greek chapters, and training for Greek Affairs staff. The Committee wants you to know that in supporting these recommendations, we are endorsing a movement to support the African American Greek system as well. As for Recommendation 8 to establish a University-wide programming board, we suggest that you explore how responsibilities can be funneled through existing committee structures and to utilize better coordination.

In closing, we applaud the Task Force for its work and the University for its sincere efforts to improve the living-learning experiences of students. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 5-7075.

Date: March 5, 1997
To: Richard W. Crain, Jr., Executive Secretary Faculty Senate
From: Michael Pavel, Chair, Student Affairs Committee
Re: Feedback on WSU Multicultural Student Retention Strategy draft report
Per your request, here is the Student Affairs Committee review of the WSU Multicultural Student Retention Strategy draft report submitted by The Council on Multicultural Student Retention. If you have any questions, please contact me by phone at 5-7075 or by e-mail at mpavel@wsu.edu.

Overall, we are pleased that the draft report was completed and appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback. Based on the form included in the draft report, we offer feedback on four areas.

**Overall Thoughts**

Overall, we found the draft report easy to use, well organized, and feel that the information supporting the five-year plan is an important compilation. We do offer several suggestions for improvement.

- We feel the Council should engage in a more thorough review of the literature to better inform the overall intent of the report. The review of literature for critical issues is sparse and does not reflect the depth and scope of published commentary on multicultural student retention (and recruitment). Contrary to the statement, "Research has only begun to examine the subtle effects of disjunction on the success of multicultural students as they separate from, yet try to maintain connection with their cultural heritage" (p. 15), there is a wealth of literature on retaining various multicultural student populations in various types of institutions.
- The section on Racial Climate at WSU Campuses provides a useful summary but the summary itself made the findings difficult to read and lacked a substantive conclusion to inform the reader about the implications of the findings; a revision of this section would greatly improve our understanding of the racial climate at WSU.
- The section on WSU Retention Programs is incomplete and we urge the Council to continue using every possible means to identify programming, activities, or services that specifically address multicultural student retention.

**Views on Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives of the Plan**

The vision and mission of the plan are reasonable, and the plan does cover most of the salient issues WSU will need to address if progress is to be achieved--university climate, supportive academic structures, financial support, and ongoing monitoring.

- The plan should also address issues of: developing partnerships with high schools, coordinating with community colleges and working with recognized institutions in the various multicultural communities to ease the transition and improve persistence during the critical first and second years. Here, the literature is informative about the need to see retention holistically and not simply an issue to be addressed while the student is on a college campus.
- In addition to broadening the scope of the plan, more thought and consideration should be given to the Strategies to each of the Goals and Objectives. For example, Objective 1.2 states the need "To increase incrementally each year the number of faculty and staff of color--How?" It is the "how" question that must be answered in order for the Objectives to be met to achieve the Goal, and these strategies must be concrete.
Thoughts About the Data

The draft report provides a broad and comprehensive overview. The data might be aggregated by department where there is the greatest potential impact. A breakdown of minority students by major may offer a more insightful comparison for various departments to gauge their own progress.

Additional Comments

In closing, this report represents a significant step by the University. We applaud the Council and all involved for putting forth such an admirable effort. Given our recommendations and the changes that have already been made to the draft report, when completed, it should serve as an excellent resource for the WSU community.

To: Richard W. Crain, Executive Secretary, Faculty Senate
From: Frances K. McSweeney, Chair, Research and Arts Committee
Date: May 6, 1997
Re: 1996-1997 Annual Report from the Research and Arts Committee

The Research and Arts Committee served as the lead committee on the following actions that were sent to the Senate:
1. The name of the Communications Disorders Clinic was changed to the Speech and Hearing Clinic. This was presented to the Senate as an Information Item on December 12, 1996.

2. The proposal for an International Business Institute passed the Senate on January 30, 1997.

3. The proposal for a Center for the Non-thermal Processing of Food passed the Senate on March 6, 1997.

4. The proposal for a Center for Multiphase Environmental Research passed the Senate on April 17, 1997.

5. The proposal for a Center for Reproductive Biology passed the Senate on April 17, 1997.

6. The proposal for the Center for Teaching and Learning passed the Senate on May 1, 1997.

The following items were also discussed by the committee:

1. 5-year Review of Organized Research Units - Approximately 5 organized research units will be reviewed per year according to the policies and procedures established last year by the Senate. The process should have begun this year, but the short staffing in the Graduate School made that impossible. Reviews will begin in Fall, 1997.
2. Review of the Radiation Safety Office - The committee discussed the process and results of the recent review of the Radiation Safety Office. The discussion centered on how to reduce costs for radiation waste disposal.

3. Intellectual Properties Policy - The committee listened to a presentation about the University's Intellectual Properties Policy. Suggestions were made for revisions. As a result of discussion in the Senate Steering Committee, the final revision of the policy was referred to a committee consisting of members from several different Senate Committees. The committee is chaired by Dr. Ray Huffaker.

4. Research Stress Study - WSU participated in Phase II of a study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences to assess research stresses at Universities. Dean Smith wrote the University's report after conducting six noon focus groups with faculty members. Dean Smith and Sayed Daoud attended a meeting to discuss findings of the study.

5. Natural Resource Conservation Endowment Fund - A committee was established to distribute money from this fund. A call for proposals will be issued in Fall, 1997. OGRD will coordinate proposals and field questions.

6. WSU Research and Technology Park - The Committee heard a report about the WSU Research and Technology Park which is in the process of expansion.

7. Review of the Science and Engineering Research Infrastructure Group (SERIAG) - The committee conducted a two-year review of SERIAG. SERIAG is a subcommittee of the Research and Arts Committee that makes recommendations about University priorities in requesting grant funds for large equipment purchases. We recommended that SERIAG be continued and that it submit annual reports. Membership on SERIAG should be extended to include unrepresented parts of the campus that have large equipment needs.

8. Center for Entrepreneurial Studies - The Committee passed the proposal for a Center for Entrepreneurial Studies with minor stipulations. The proposal will be discussed by the Senate next fall.

9. Summer Graduate Research Assistantships - Twenty students were awarded summer research assistantships. Members of the Research and Arts Committee served on the selection committees for the awards.

10. Learning Centers - The committee discussed the proposal to open new Learning Centers. Concerns were expressed about the lack of funding for the centers and the lack of information about the success of existing centers. No action was required on this proposal.

11. Reports - The committee heard periodic reports from our representative on the Planning and Review Committee. Dr. Belakavadi Ramaprian will continue to serve as our representative for 1997-1998.
12. Election of a Committee Chair - Dr. Kris Lishner from the ICNE will serve as Committee Chair for 1997-1998.

TO: Richard Crain, Executive Secretary, Faculty Senate  
FROM: Marshall McClung, Chair, Parking and Traffic Committee of the Faculty Senate  
SUBJECT: 1996-97 Parking and Traffic Committee Report  
DATE: May 13, 1997

Summary of Issues and Accomplishments

1. The PATC spent significant time and effort discussing the pedestrian safety issue on campus. Some improvements are being made, including the application of a new crosswalk marking material that is highly visible and lasts much longer than paint. Two pedestrian activated flashing lights have also been purchased and will be installed on a trial basis in the late summer or early fall of 1997. The purpose of these lights is to test the effectiveness of this type of pedestrian crossing solution. Additionally, John Shaheen talked to Pullman Transit in an effort to get bus drivers to stop substantially before crosswalks so buses don't block the visibility of those using the crosswalks. A change in this practice will eliminate a serious hazard.

2. Jay Becker of Facilities Development talked to the committee about the resurfacing of Stadium Way. Phase I of this project will take place this summer. The committee recommended that the University capitalize on this project to incorporate several possible pedestrian safety enhancements. They included the incorporation of bus turnouts, moving street light posts farther away from the curb, widening to include a bike lane, and the alignment of street lights and crosswalks. The committee also fully supports the addition of traffic loops to the current traffic light system at the time this project is done. The addition of these loops will provide for smoother traffic flow and will increase options for controlling pedestrian crossings. It appears that none of these improvements will be incorporated into the project at this time due to lack of funds.

3. Pete Grigas and Tom Fleming from Facilities Development spoke to the committee about current parking, plans as related to the comprehensive plan, which is currently being revised. The committee desires to be involved in this planning effort as it progresses.

4. The committee discussed the implementation of the city's residential parking permit system on several streets close to campus. Three members of the committee attended meetings with the city to foster collaboration on the issue. Effective discussions took place regarding how the University and the city can work together to solve parking problems.

* * * * *
Reports.

1. Remarks by the Chair.—D. Stock

Stock introduced Greg Russell, Political Science, as the new Senate Parliamentarian. Stock stated the IT Reconfiguration Committee is meeting. Stock stated that he has met with Les Purce to discuss the golf course issue and Les is willing to come to the Senate and give a presentation. Stock announced the following items: The Ombudsman’s position is going to be filled but the Provost wants to make sure the office is set up well, and that there is training for the position; Geoff Gamble will be coming to the Senate to make a presentation on the Radiation Center closing and discuss his role as acting Vice Provost of Research. The Provost is considering merging the Senate Library Committee and the Library Steering Committee. With the merger of the Provost’s Council and President’s Cabinet into a Leadership Council, the issue of Senate representation in budget hearings will have to be reconsidered. Stock has formed an ad hoc committee to look at faculty roles and rewards and in particular what is happening across the nation on post-tenure review; Gus Plumb will chair this group. Stock stated possible use of Martin Stadium by University of Idaho was discussed by Senate officers and the Provost. Stock stated that the Steering Committee held a retreat before the start of the academic year and he is in the process of sorting out areas for the Senate to focus on in the coming year.

2. Report from Legislative Representatives.—E. Austin, C. Clark (Exhibit E)

C. Clark presented part of the presentation she used in discussing faculty salaries with the legislature this past year. Clark stated that she presented facts to the legislature about workload for faculty and dispelled the myth that faculty only spend a few hours a week “working.” On the average WSU faculty spend 53 hours a week working. Almost 20 of those hours involve student contact in and out of the classroom (this includes answering questions, advising, job counseling, directing independent study projects, etc.). Another 20 hours are directly related to instruction: lecture preparations, paper grading, exam writing, as well as class-related research. Clark also discussed the serious restraints placed on new spending by the legislature due to initiative 601; and she discussed budget outcomes. The legislature gave higher education a greater increase in the budget than any other area; so from their point of view they were very good to higher education. The share of the state’s general fund budget allocated to higher education increased for the first time in many years. The two areas that were funded were salary increases and enrollment increases. The legislature also authorized 4% tuition increases in both years. Clark stated that there would be major competition for funding in the next year or so from transportation and from K-12.

D. Stock stated that C. Clark is doing a great job in presenting the faculty’s case to the legislature and she is quite effective.

3. Report on Accountability Measures.—J. Sherman

J. Sherman is the new Associate Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and most recently worked for 8 years on the HECBoard. She stated that she is working on accountability as well as assessment and accreditation for the University. Sherman said that in the past the legislature’s inclination was to give higher education their money and to assume they were doing their job. Things have begun to change, in a lot of ways, all over. The
The legislature thinks higher education is doing a good job, but they don’t know for sure; they don’t think higher education cares a whole lot about whether or not higher education is cost effective for students or the state; and they don’t think sometimes that you spend enough time doing the things that the legislature thinks are good things to do.

The legislature is no longer willing to give the money to higher education and assume they are using it wisely. They want some assurances. This is a trend around the country, as over half the states now have in place some type of performance measures. In South Carolina the legislature mandated 39 different measures and tied 60% of the funding to achieving these measures. Part of the problem has been that for years higher education has pushed aside efforts to develop accountability measures.

The legislature put into the 1997 budget guidelines 3 very specific accountability measures and goals they wanted to see 8 years out. They also asked the institutions to develop 2 additional measures: one that would measure faculty productivity and one that would measure an institutional characteristic that each institution felt was unique to its own institution. Also included in the guidelines was an invitation to work with the HECB to recommend new measures or direct toward different targets and goals.

Sherman stated that the legislature was trying to tell higher education to get serious. One way to get higher education’s attention was to attach money to the measures. About $3.1 million of WSU’s money is attached to this process. For the first year WSU has to develop a plan that includes the additional measures, their targets and goals and some of the strategies to be used in meeting the goals. Next year, we have to show that we have met the first years targets. WSU’s plan was presented to the HECB on Wednesday and was accepted, which means that the monies for the first year have been released to WSU. A summary of the plan is in the agenda for today. The first 3 measures are student outcome measures that were mandated by the legislature. The goals for 8 years out are extremely aggressive goals and will need to be discussed to see if they are appropriate. The faculty productivity measures were the ones WSU had to come up with that would satisfy the legislature. Those measures had to be generated from data that was already there because of the extremely short timeline. But the measures had mean something to faculty and WSU and somehow represent our priorities. Faculty are encouraged to go on line and read the whole accountability report. Some questions that will need to be answered over the next year are: Are these the right measures? Are these the right targets and goals? What other measures would better help to express our priorities and values as an institution? How can we avoid unintended consequences that result from pushing any one measure too far? How does accountability fit in with assessment in the upcoming accreditation review? The legislature is very serious about wanting to see evidence that higher education understands the realities. The world is changing rapidly; and we no longer have the luxury of saying higher education doesn’t need change. Our job is to use our considerable talent and skills and our organizational skills and experience to first identify and then design the changes we need to make and then figure out how best to measure the results. This year we will need to show we can make real progress and that we can make a real contribution in finding appropriate measures and goals. Sherman expressed interest in obtaining input from faculty on this issue.
A question was raised about quality and standards and how do we assess these issues? Sherman stated she is not sure how to assess these and asked for suggestions from faculty. Institutions need to be working on these and figuring out how to assess quality. Stock stated that the challenge as faculty is how do we bring assessment into this issue and make sure WSU keeps the quality while still satisfying the legislative mandates. A comment was made about faculty having a say in each college in defining scholarly output. Sherman stated that deans provided tentative definitions because of time constraints but would consult with faculty on a more definitive definition. Stock encouraged senators to discuss these issues with their senators. Sherman stressed that the money we get for doing these things is not new money it is money that is already ours that we will lose if we don’t perform.

Exhibit F is as follows:

SUMMARY OF WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY 1997-98 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN

WSU has two purposes for its accountability plans: (1) Evaluation that leads to improvement, and (2) Communication about its activities and accomplishments. The document summarized here represents a small part of WSU's larger accountability effort, and is intended to respond to the legislature's 1997-99 Operating Budget guidelines. $3.1 million of WSU's 1997-99 biennial state funding is tied to achievement of the goals that follow.

Undergraduate Graduation Efficiency Index (GEI) - The GEI is a ratio of credits required for a degree minus credits accepted in transfer, divided by total credits attempted.

Gradation Efficiency Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1995-96 Base</th>
<th>Gap to Goal</th>
<th>1996-97 (Interim)</th>
<th>1997-98 (Year 1)</th>
<th>1998-99 (Year 2)</th>
<th>2004-05 (Goal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>87.17</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>87.75</td>
<td>88.37</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>74.82</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>75.86</td>
<td>77.08</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interim year data will be provided as soon as it becomes available.

Undergraduate Student Retention - This measure counts the proportion of undergraduates who attend one fall and graduate or return the following fall.

Undergraduate Student Retention Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1995-96 Base</th>
<th>Gap to Goal</th>
<th>1996-97 (Interim)</th>
<th>1997-98 (Year 1)</th>
<th>1998-99 (Year 2)</th>
<th>2004-05 (Goal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall to Fall Undergraduate</td>
<td>84.60%</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>85.33%</td>
<td>86.16%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interim year data will be provided as soon as it becomes available.

Five-year Graduation Rate - This measure tracks a cohort of first time, full-time freshman to determine the proportion who have graduated after five years.
Five-Year Graduation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1995-96 Base</th>
<th>Gap to Goal</th>
<th>1996-97 (Interim)</th>
<th>1997-98 (Year 1)</th>
<th>1998-99 (Year 2)</th>
<th>2004-05 (Goal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>56.35%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating in 5 Years</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>56.35%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* interim year data will be provided as soon as it becomes available.

**Strategies** -- All three of the above measures are increased by encouraging and enabling students to move through the university with the fewest possible barriers, delays and digressions. Among efforts underway at WSU are: degree audit report system (DARS); telephone and web-based registration; four-year degree guarantee program; more articulation agreements; new course withdrawal policies; enhanced tutoring programs and supplemental instruction sessions; advising, peer advising, mentoring, freshman seminars, residence hall learning communities, pre-session orientation seminars, and newly targeted financial aid.

**Faculty Productivity Measures** -- The first teaching goal is to increase the average student credit hours generated per ranked faculty by 20% within eight years. The second is to double, by 2005, the amount of individualized academic work faculty members do with upper division students in the form of supervising research, practical internships, senior theses, lessons, and independent studies.

Research productivity will track the percent of faculty members who produce high quality scholarly works. As a research institution, WSU expects all of its faculty to participate, and it values scholarship both in areas that generate large amounts of money and in areas that do not. Numerically, this measure will be largely composed of faculty publications in refereed journals, but it will also recognize that books, plays, musical compositions, artistic works, and other scholarly products make major contributions to research and scholarship.

**Faculty Productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1995-96 Base</th>
<th>Gap to Goal</th>
<th>1996-97 (Interim)</th>
<th>1997-98 (Year 1)</th>
<th>1998-99 (Year 2)</th>
<th>2004-05 (Goal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Teaching</strong> Ave. Student Credit Hours per Ranked Faculty</td>
<td>197.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>198.4</td>
<td>199.4</td>
<td>203.0</td>
<td>236.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Teaching</strong> Upper Division Individualized Enrollments per FTE faculty</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Research</strong> -- % of faculty completing scholarly work</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategies** -- The Provost's office, Deans, and Chairs will work together to begin a gradual shift of student credit hours toward the ranked faculty. As enrollments increase, SCHs generated per faculty member will also rise. Departments will review the
appropriateness of class sizes to maximize enrollment opportunities while protecting educational quality. The use of technology will gradually allow more students to take self-paced modules and courses.

There is widespread interest at WSU, as well as in the business community, in one-on-one research with faculty, in supervised internships, senior theses and projects, and in other academic activities that bring the students into closer interaction with faculty members. The university will encourage the development of these opportunities and will track their growth.

Each department will define what constitutes high quality scholarly works in that field and will provide a count of the number of its members who have completed such work during the baseline period. Together, the provost's office and the colleges will set targets. Using the methodology of Graham and Diamond (*The Rise of the American Research Universities, 1997*), timely completion of scholarly work is defined as an average of at least one every year in the sciences, every two years in the social sciences, and every three years in the humanities.

**Instructional Technology** -- WSU has selected the area of instructional technology as its unique institutional measure. Four measures will sample the degree to which technology is being integrated into the university. The number of student credit hours earned through distance technology will at least double from the baseline year to 2004-05. The number of different degree programs offered at a distance will increase from three to at least 12. By 2005, nearly 300 more courses will have been reengineered to be learner-centered, asynchronous, technology-based, for a total of approximately 30% of the curriculum. And, also by 2005, 90% of the university classrooms will be fully equipped to support technology-intensive teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1995-96 Base</th>
<th>Gap to Goal</th>
<th>1996-97 (Interim)</th>
<th>1997-98 (Year 1)</th>
<th>1998-99 (Year 2)</th>
<th>2004-05 (Goal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall to Fall</td>
<td>84.60%</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>85.33%</td>
<td>86.16%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategies** - The institution has placed a high priority on the deployment of the K-20 Network and the expansion of WSU's Extended Degree Program enrollments, and has incorporated these goals into its strategic planning and budgeting. WSU is actively supporting the development of new distance degree programs with a combination of grant, contract, and institutional funding.

WSU's strategic plan calls for rapid growth in the uses of technology on campus for teaching and learning. Courses initially targeted for transformation include high enrollment courses, clusters of upper division courses that lead to specific degrees, and individual courses that lend themselves to this format. WSU will place a high priority on fully equipping more classrooms through both funding requests and internal allocations as necessary to meet these targets.
DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS -- For the 1997-99 biennium, Washington State University proposes to assign the proportion of funds to each accountability measure, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 - Undergraduate Efficiency Index</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2 - Undergraduate Student Retention</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 3 - Five-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4 - Faculty Productivity</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SCHs per Ranked Faculty</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Enrollments / FTE</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Completing Scholarship</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 5 - Instructional Technology</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHs by WHETS, EDP, Web</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Degrees Offered</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus Courses Reengineered</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms Technology Equipped</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY - WSU believes that accountability is critical both to achieving its goals, and to meeting the expectations of the state. WSU also recognizes that each member of its community makes a different contribution to its success. In undertaking the actions that will enable WSU to reach these goals, no one person is expected to address all of them. Finally, to the extent that these measures do not fully assess the outcomes to which WSU is committed, the legislature has invited the universities and the HECB to recommend revisions before the next biennium. WSU intends to respond to this invitation.

Complete document at [http://www.wsu.edu/IR/accountability.html](http://www.wsu.edu/IR/accountability.html)

Additions or Changes to the Agenda.

There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

Agenda Items (Discussion Items)

1. Recommendation from Faculty Affairs Committee for revisions to the Faculty Manual, Section I (Exhibit G).—J. Crane

   J. Crane stated that this is not a major rewrite of the Faculty Manual; it is reorganization and an attempt to get a more cohesive document. Crane asked for input to take back to FAC to incorporate into this first section. Following are comments and suggestions:

   - Section should be shorter and more concise.
   - The section on teaching on the web could be added to styles of teaching or methods of delivery. (page 4)
   - The statements on learning centers should be removed; they do not have anything to do with the manual.
   - The term “current plan of action” has no place it should be removed.
   - The Mission Statement should be under history.
- Extended education is just one component of teaching, research and service.
- Some of this information looks like it belongs in a five year plan, not the manual.
- First three paragraphs under Extended Education are misplaced, because they talk about the relationship of teaching research and service, and belong under B of objectives.
- Go back to current manual and pick up teaching goals that are there and add them.
- On the last page the residency for doctoral programs needs to be reworded based on what was passed last spring by the Senate.
- The Senate needs to decide what the purpose of the manual is. The choices made about what goes in here ought to be based on the role we want the manual to play. All this needs to be articulated.
- Place the outline of the entire manual in the next agenda, along with the goals and objectives of the manual.

Constituents' Concerns.

Blackwell read a letter from Professor Hume expressing concern over the loss of grants funded through the graduate school for incoming assistant professors in liberal arts. Stock will look into the matter.

B. Speth would like someone to look into the possibility of life experience credits. Stock will look into getting this information to the appropriate committees.

P. Burke asked to have the area of asynchronous courses and the funding involved investigated. Once a course goes on line and students enroll there is no compensation for faculty and it is not counted in course load.

Senators expressed the wish to discuss important issues and provide serious input.

Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Dorene Branson
Secretary Pro Tem