The Faculty Senate was called to order by Robert Greenberg, Chair, on Thursday, April 1, 1999, in FSHN, T101, at 3:30 p.m. Forty-three (43) members were present, thirty-six (36) members were absent with three (3) vacancies. Eight (8) nonvoting members were present.

Minutes of March 4, 1999 Meeting were approved as circulated.

Announcements (Information Items).

1. Faculty Senate officers met with the Provost on March 23, 1999.
2. Senate officers met with President Smith on March 12, 1999.
3. Minor Change Bulletin #9 Exhibit B is as follows:

   **MEMORANDUM**
   
   TO: Deans and Chairs  
   FROM: Becky Bitter, Academic Governance Coordinator, Registrar’s Office  
   DATE: 15 March 1999  
   SUBJECT: Minor Change Bulletin No. 9

   The courses listed below reflect the minor curricular changes approved by the catalog editor since approval of the last Minor Change Bulletin. All changes are underlined. Deletions are crossed out. The column to the far right indicates the date each change becomes effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMT 215</td>
<td>Textile Fundamentals</td>
<td>4 (3-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic textile components including natural and manufactured fibers, yarns, fabric construction, dyes, and finishes. Cooperative course taught by WSU, open to UI students (HEC 215).</td>
<td>1-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT 216</td>
<td>Apparel Product Development I</td>
<td>3 (0-6)</td>
<td>Prereq c// in AMT 215.</td>
<td>Problem solving approach to textile and apparel production; comparison of methods, production methods, and costing for consumer-end use. Cooperative course taught by WSU and UI (FCS 223).</td>
<td>1-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT 218</td>
<td>Apparel Product Analysis I</td>
<td>3 (2-3)</td>
<td>Prereq AMT 216.</td>
<td>Analysis of garments and textile products, product performance, quality control, mass production principles, and consumer value. Cooperative course taught jointly by WSU and UI (FCS 223).</td>
<td>1-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT 311</td>
<td>Pattern Making</td>
<td>3 (1-6)</td>
<td>Prereq AMT 216.</td>
<td>Development of apparel design from a basic pattern. Cooperative course taught jointly by WSU and UI (FCS 324).</td>
<td>1-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Prerequisites</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT 318</td>
<td>Apparel Merchandising</td>
<td>1-00</td>
<td><strong>Prereq:</strong> Cpt S 105.</td>
<td>Overview of apparel retailing, merchandise planning and buying, application of planning and buying principles, preparation for professional experience. Cooperative course taught jointly by WSU and UI (FCS 429).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT 490</td>
<td>Cooperative Education Experience</td>
<td>1-00</td>
<td><strong>Prereq:</strong> c// in AMT 491.</td>
<td>Full-semester experience with business, industry, or government unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT 491</td>
<td>Professional Development Seminar</td>
<td>1-00</td>
<td><strong>Prereq:</strong> AMT 490 or c/.</td>
<td>Integrated seminar focusing on issues related to cooperative education experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anth 316</td>
<td>Gender and Culture in Cross Cultural Perspective</td>
<td>8-99</td>
<td><strong>Prereq:</strong> Anth 101, Psych 105, Soc 101, or W St 200; sophomore standing.</td>
<td>Cross-cultural examination of the status and roles of women and men, the institution of marriage, and symbols of gender valuation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Ad 578</td>
<td>Higher Education and the Law and Ethics</td>
<td>8-99</td>
<td><strong>Prereq:</strong> AMT 490 or c/.</td>
<td>Legal and ethical aspects of higher education with special reference to administrators, faculty, and students in universities, colleges, and community colleges. higher education institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl 108</td>
<td>Reading Introduction to Literature</td>
<td>8-99</td>
<td><strong>Prereq:</strong> AMT 490 or c/.</td>
<td>Reading for pleasure, appreciation, and enlightenment: short stories, novels, plays, and poetry by diverse voices; role of conventions, culture, history in interpretation of literature. Credit not granted for both Engl 108 and 199.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl 209</td>
<td>Readings in English Literature in English Through the 18th Century</td>
<td>8-99</td>
<td><strong>Prereq:</strong> AMT 490 or c/.</td>
<td>Selected major works by diverse voices from different eras of English literature; importance of conventions, cultural contexts, for interpretation and understanding. genres, and conventions of the literary tradition in English from Medieval to early Romantic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl 210</td>
<td>Readings in American Literature in English Since the 18th Century</td>
<td>8-99</td>
<td><strong>Prereq:</strong> AMT 490 or c/.</td>
<td>Selected major works by diverse voices from different eras of American literature; importance of conventions, cultural contexts, for interpretation and understanding. genres, and conventions of British and American literary tradition from Romantic to modern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl 216</td>
<td>Main Currents in American Culture</td>
<td>8-99</td>
<td><strong>Prereq:</strong> AMT 490 or c/.</td>
<td>Introduction to the interdisciplinary study of American cultures and the field of American studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enl 302  [W] [M] Writing About Literature 3 Prereq Engl 101; one college-level literature course or c/. Stylistic, Rhetorical, and problem-solving skills in writing analysis and argument; explication of literary texts; critical approaches, theories of interpretation, use of research.

Enl 380  American Literature to 1855 3 Prereq Engl 209, 210, 302 or substitutions approved by advisor. American writing from Settlement and Revolution through the times of Irving, Poe, Emerson, Hawthorne, Fuller, Thoreau, and Melville.

Enl 381  American Literature 1855-1916 3 Prereq Engl 209, 210, 302 or substitutions approved by advisor. American writing in an era of expansion, social and literary ferment: Whitman, Dickinson, Frost, the literature of realism and naturalism.

Enl 382  Modern American Literature 3 Prereq Engl 209, 210, 302 or substitutions approved by advisor. Major literary movements and alternate voices in American poetry, fiction, and drama from WW I to the present.

Enl 383  Chaucer and Medieval Literature 3 Prereq Engl 209, 210, 302 or substitutions approved by advisor. Chaucer's Canterbury Tales in the context of Medieval culture and literary tradition.


Enl 385  Milton and English Literature of the 17th Century 3 Prereq Engl 209, 210, 302 or substitutions approved by advisor. Nondramatic literature from the Metaphysicals and Jonson through Milton, against background of scientific revolution, religious controversy, and civil war.

Enl 386  English Literature of the Restoration and 18th Century 3 Prereq Engl 209, 210, 302 or substitutions approved by advisor. Neo-classical literature from 1660 to the Romantic era: Dryden, Swift, Pope, Johnson, Gray, Goldsmith, Burns, and others.

Enl 387  English Romantic Literature 3 Prereq Engl 209, 210, 302 or substitutions approved by advisor. Major works by Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, Keats, and others during Romantic literary revolt, especially 1798-1832.

Enl 388  Victorian Literature 3 Prereq Engl 209, 210, 302 or substitutions approved by advisor. Major works by Tennyson, Dickens, Browning, Swinburne, Wilde, and others in a dynamic age of change in Britain, 1832-1901.
**Engl 389**  
*Modern British Literature* 3 Prereq Engl 209, 210, 302 or substitutions approved by advisor. Fiction, drama, poetry in age of conflict, artistic experimentation: Joyce, Woolf, Lawrence, Murdoch, Shaw, Pinter, Yeats, Eliot, Auden, and others. 8-99

**Entom 426**  
*Population Analysis* 1 8-99

**Entom 429**  
*Population Theory* 1 8-99

**Entom 526**  
*Population Analysis* 1 Same as NATRS 526. Credit not granted for both Entom 426 and 526. 8-99

**Entom 529**  
*Population Theory: Principles of Population Dynamics* 1 Same as NATRS 529. Credit not granted for both Entom 429 and 529. 8-99

**Hist 216**  
[H] *Main Currents in American Culture* 3 Same as Engl 216. 8-99

**Hist 423**  
*American Social and Intellectual History: Radicals, Reformers, and Romantics: The Impact* 3 Social and intellectual developments; Changing thought and its impact in the United States from colonial times to the present. Credit not granted for both Hist 423 and 523. 8-99

**Hist 523**  
*American Social and Intellectual History: Radicals, Reformers, and Romantics: The Impact* 3 Graduate-level counterpart of Hist 423; additional requirements. Credit not granted for both Hist 423 and 523. 8-99

**I D 201**  
*Perception and Communication I Laboratory* 4 (1-9) Prereq Arch 101, 103; I D 101, 102, or c//. Application of design concepts into micro environments; design vocabulary and skill development. Credit not granted for both I D 201 and I D 200. 1-00

**I D 203**  
*Perception and Communication II Laboratory* 4 (1-9) Prereq Arch 103, I D 201. Development of interior design problem-solving techniques and methods for application in environments of increasing complexity. 1-00

**I D 321**  
*Fundamentals of Planning and Design I* 4 (1-9) Prereq I D 203; c// in I D 321. Design investigations of personal space of specified size and complexity for people of varying social, economic, and cultural backgrounds. 1-00

**I D 322**  
*Interior Programming* 1 Prereq I D 203; c// in I D 321. Introduction to interior programming including space requirement analysis, organizational relationships, and functional diagrams. 1-00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 325</td>
<td><strong>Interior Building Systems</strong> 3 Prereq ID 203. Analysis, planning, and application of interior lighting; introduction to HVAC and plumbing systems.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ID 203</td>
<td>8-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 396</td>
<td><strong>Beginning CAD Computer Applications for Interior Design</strong> 3 (0-6) Prereq ID 201-321 or c//. Design problem solving using the computer as a tool.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ID 201-321 or c//</td>
<td>1-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 412</td>
<td><strong>Interior Design Theory</strong> 2 Prereq ID 321 333. Theory, principles, and determinants of interior design applied to current practice.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ID 321 333</td>
<td>1-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 425</td>
<td><strong>Advanced Planning and Design I</strong> 5 (0-10) Prereq ID 333. Design problems and presentations emphasizing the bridges between theory and practice. Interdisciplinary research and design that explores interior design as a vital part of the urban landscape.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ID 333</td>
<td>1-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 426</td>
<td><strong>Advanced Planning and Design II</strong> 5 (0-10) Prereq ID 425. Interdisciplinary research and design that explores interior design as a vital part of the urban landscape. Design problems and presentations emphasizing the bridges between theory and practice.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ID 425</td>
<td>1-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 400 102</td>
<td><strong>(400) Introduction to Computer Graphics in Landscape Architecture</strong> 3 (2-3) Applications and techniques in computer graphics; 2-D and 3-D computer-aided design, animation, and paint systems; basics in operating systems. Computer-aided analysis, design, graphic techniques using AutoCAD, IntelliCAD, LandCADD, to gain 2-and 3-D design, analysis, drafting, rendering, and web format skills.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE 320</td>
<td><strong>Metallography Materials Structure – Properties Lab</strong> 2 (0-6) Prereq MSE 301 or c//; major in MSE. Principles and techniques of optical metallography and other laboratory methods used in modern materials science and engineering.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MSE 301 or c//; major in MSE.</td>
<td>8-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus 362</td>
<td><strong>[H] History of Jazz</strong> 3 History of jazz in chronological sequence from early Dixieland to jazz-rock combinations of 1980s; stylistic and improvisational developments; social and political contexts of the African-American origins of jazz; stylistic developments.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATRS 426</td>
<td><strong>Population Analysis I</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATRS 429</td>
<td><strong>Population Theory I</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NATRS 526 Population Analysis 1 Graduate-level counterpart of NATRS 426; additional requirements. Credit not granted for both NATRS 426 and 526. Prereq NATRS/Entom/Zool 529, biometry. Analysis, diagnosis, interpretation, and forecasting of population change.

NATRS 529 Population Theory Principles of Population Dynamics 1 Graduate-level counterpart of NATRS 429; additional requirements. Credit not granted for both NATRS 429 and 529. Prereq general ecology. Development of the theory of population dynamics from Mathus to the present.

PharP 451 Pharmacy Practice I 1 Basic clinical skills, interpretation of patient data, problem-solving skills, professional communications, professionalism and pharmacy ethics.

PharP 561P Acute Care Advanced Practice Experience V 1 (0-3) to 5 (0-15) May be repeated for credit; cumulative maximum 12 hours. Prereq Pharm.D. didactic coursework complete. Advanced practice experience in acute care settings.

PharP 562P Ambulatory Care Advanced Practice Experience V 1 (0-3) - 5 (0-15) May be repeated for credit; cumulative maximum 12 hours. Prereq Pharm.D. didactic coursework complete. Advanced practice experience in ambulatory care settings.

PharP 573P (473) Pharmaceutical Care Laboratory II 1 (0-3) Prereq PharP 551P or c//. PharP 572P. Practicum designed to integrate classroom-acquired knowledge, behaviors and values into professional skills.

PharP 574P (474) Pharmaceutical Care Laboratory III 2 (0-6) Prereq PharP 552P or c//. PharP 573P. Practicum designed to integrate classroom-acquired knowledge, behaviors, and values into professional skills.

PharP 575P (475) Pharmaceutical Care Laboratory IV 2 (0-6) Prereq PharP 553P or c//. PharP 574P. Practicum designed to integrate classroom-acquired knowledge, behaviors and values into professional skills.

PharP 576P (476) Pharmaceutical Care Laboratory V 2 (0-6) Prereq PharP 554P or c//. PharP 575P. Practicum designed to integrate classroom-acquired knowledge, behaviors and values into professional skills.

SHS 202 (469) American Sign Language II 4 Prereq SHS 201. Sign language systems; vocabulary and skill development in signing and interpreting signs; intermediate conversation skills.
4. Faculty Senate Standing Committees reported committee consideration on the following issues (agenda and previously reported items not included) at the March 25, 1999, Steering Committee meeting:
   Academic Affairs: Math Placement Exam
   Budget: BS and MS in Agriculture; BS in Computer Engineering in Spokane
   Graduate Studies: Definition of attendance at oral exams
   Student Affairs: Student grade pressures

Announcement (Reports).

1. Remarks by the Chair.—R. Greenberg

Greenberg announced the visitation of the Accreditation Team on April 14 and 15. Jane Sherman, Accreditation Liaison Officer talked about what the committee would be looking at and what all goes into accrediting a university. Senate officers will be meeting with the Accreditation Team on April 14.
2. Report from Legislative Representatives.—C. Clark, M. Carroll

There was no report.

3. Report from George Hedge, Vice Provost of Research, and Bev Lingle Assistant to the President for Government Affairs.

Hedge and Lingle stated that rules proposed by the Office of Management and Budget would require public disclosure on any research data if the research is being conducted with federal funding. They requested faculty write letters as soon as possible expressing concern over this proposal. Hedge stated this bill would have impact on the confidentiality of research. At this point, data are not clearly defined, and when asked they have been told raw data would have to be turned over if requested. Hedge handed out a copy of the letter he is sending to OMB, and Lingle encouraged senators to write letters immediately as they need to be in Washington DC by April 5. Greenberg stated there is a direct link on the Senate homepage where senators can get information.

Additions or Changes to the Agenda.

There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

Agenda Items (Action Items).

1. Nominations from the Committee on Committees to fill Faculty Senate Committee vacancies Exhibit C is as follows:

   FROM THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

   The Committee on Committees submits the following name to serve on the following Senate committees with terms beginning August 15, 1999 and ending on the year indicated. Senators are encouraged to study the Committee Manual along with the vitae of the nominee, prior to the meeting of April 1, 1999. Senators desiring to nominate additional persons from the floor MUST PROVIDE written information about the nominees for distribution before the meeting.

   **Academic Advising and Reinstatement**

   THOMAS, Bobbie, Academic Advisor, Extended Degree Programs, Faculty, WSU 6.5 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: 16 Years academic advising experience in the post-secondary level.
**Academic Affairs**

F – 2001 **FOWLER, Shelli,** Associate Professor, Comparative American Cultures and English, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 7 Years. **Relevant Experience and Qualifications:** Chair, Curriculum Diversity Committee, American Cultures, Area of Coherence, General Education Subcommittee; Admissions Subcommittee; Diversity Assessment Committee; Various Department Committees, GSC, CAC Curriculum Committee, etc.

F - 2002 **FOLWELL, Ray,** Professor, Agricultural Economics, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 30 Years. **Relevant Experience and Qualifications:** Past committee memberships have been primarily in the areas of Teaching and Curriculum. Academic Affairs; Catalog Subcommittee; Budget Committee; Chair of Departmental Undergraduate Advising.

**Admission Subcommittee of AAC**

F – 2002 **BROWN, Christopher L.**, Academic Counselor, SALC, Faculty, WSU 15 Years **Relevant Experience and Qualifications:** Academic Counselor to Freshmen through senior students working in the Student Advising and Learning Center and the Transfer Center. Former member of the Academic Advising and Reinstatement Subcommittee.

F - 2002 **KAWAMURA, Noriko,** Assistant Professor, History, Faculty WSU 6.5 Years **Relevant Experience and Qualifications:** SALC Advisor; World History Committee; Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum and Instruction.

**Budget Committee**

F – 2002 **LISHNER, Kris,** Associate Professor, College of Nursing, Faculty, WSU 10 Years. **Relevant Experience and Qualifications:** Former Senator for 2 years; former RAC member and Chair.

F - 2002 **SCHREKHISE, R. Gene,** Associate Professor, Environmental Science and Regional Planning, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 4 Years: **Relevant Experience and Qualifications:** WSU Tri-Cities Budget Advisory Committee, Chair; Five Year Review of Campus Dean Committee; Environmental Science and Regional Planning Policy Committee; Tri-Cities Health, Safety and Environment Committee; Tri-Cities Site Planning Advisory Committee.

**Committee on Committees**

F – 2002 **SPITZER, Alice,** Librarian, Libraries, Faculty, WSU 24 Years **Relevant Experience and Qualifications:** Familiar with WSU Faculty; Served as Faculty Senator; Arboretum Committee; VPLAC; General Education Committee; Museum Subcommittee.
Distinguished Faculty Address

F – 2002 MITTELHAMER, Ron, Professor, Agricultural Economics, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 21 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Numerous Ad Hoc Search Committees; Graduate Travel Awards Committees, CAHE Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee; Ad Hoc Committee on the Establishment of a Program in Statistics.

F - 2002 HAZELBAUER, Gerald L., Professor and Chair, Biochemistry and Biophysics, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 18 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: 1999 Distinguished Faculty Address; Biosafety Committee; Faculty Search Committee Chair; Chair’s Advisory Committee; National Advisory General Medical Sciences Council.

Extended University Affairs

F – 2002 OSTROWSKI, Terese A., Director, New Student Programs, Faculty, WSU 9.5 Years Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Financial Aid Counselor Selection Committee; Council on Undergraduate Excellence; Admissions Counselor Search Committee; Judicial Procedures Committee, Residence Life; University Wellness Committee; Freshmen Year Experience Committee; Committee on Women in math, Science and Engineering.

F – 2000 PEABODY, Sue, Assistant Professor, History, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 3 Years Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Development of the History and Honors programs on the Vancouver Branch Campus, WSU Vancouver, History Department Liaison Committee; WSU Diversity Self-Assessment Committee; Graduate Student Representative to History Department Faculty Meetings, University of Iowa.

Faculty Affairs

F - 2002 FARISS, Marc W., Associate Professor, Pharmaceutical Sciences, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 4 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Faculty Affairs Committee; Intellectual Property Committee; Executive Committee, College of Pharmacy; Search Committee, College of Pharmacy; MD/Ph.D. Program Committee, Medical College of VA.

F – 2002 OMOTO, Charlotte K., Professor, Genetics and Cell Biology, Faculty, WSU 14 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Faculty Senate Library Committee; Presidents Commission on the Status of Women.
Graduate Studies Committee

F – 2002  BENDER, Donald A., Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Director, Wood materials and Engineering Laboratory, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 2 Years Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Search committee for Vice Provost for Research; CEE Graduate Program Committee, chair; CEE Tenure and Promotion Committee; Graduate Committee, Texas A&M.

F - 2002  JOHNSON, Kristen A., Associate Professor, Animal Sciences, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 9 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: CAHE Scholarship Committee; AgriScience Leadership Experience Planning Committee; CAHE Dean’s Merit Scholarship Selection Committee; Teaching Portfolio Committee; Beef Committee; Department Chair Selection Committee; Honors Program Facilitator.

F – 2002  ROSENMAN, Robert. Professor, Economics, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 16 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Graduate Studies Committee; Council on Undergraduate Education; Various Senate and Presidential Committees.

F – 2001  KALE, Steven, Associate Professor, History, Faculty Graduate Faculty, WSU 8 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Graduate Faculty Committee; History Department Graduate Studies Committee.

Legislative Affairs

F – 2002  O’ROURKE, A. Desmond, Director, IMPACT Center, Faculty, WSU 28.7 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Professor of Agricultural Economics and Director of the IMPACT Center; President, Food Distribution Research Society; Member, Governor’s Economic Advisory Council.

F - 2002  WALKER, Libby, Assistant Director, University Honors College, Faculty WSU 15 Years Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Candidate for the Washington State Legislature; University Honors College Advisory Board; VPLAC; Presidents Commission on the Status of Women; National Organization for Women; Area of interest in Political Science is American politics.

Organization and Structure

F – 2002  BLACKWELL, Fritz, Associate Professor, Faculty Graduate Faculty, Senator, Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Ombudsman, Honors Council; New Student Orientation Subcommittee; Admissions Subcommittee; Committee on Committees.
VYHNANEK, Kay, Head Interlibrary Loans and Extended Campus Library Services Librarian, Libraries, Faculty, Faculty Senator, WSU 20 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Extended University Affairs Committee; University Planning Committee; Library Administration and Management Association.

Parking and Traffic

MINCKS, William R., Associate Professor, School of Architecture, Faculty, WSU 12 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Subcommittee on Advising and Reinstatement, Physical Facilities Committee; Facilities Use Committee; School of Architecture Chair, Admissions and Academic Affairs Committee.

Physical Facilities Committee

KESSLER, Gregory A., Associate Professor of Architecture, Faculty, WSU 11 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Architecture selection committees; Masters Thesis on Planning; Assistant Director School of Architecture; School Planning Committee; Academic Affairs.

Planning Review Committee

CLARK, Charlene, Professor and Associate Dean for Instructional Resources and Extended College Activities, ICNE/College of Nursing, Faculty, WSU 28 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Committee on Committees, Faculty Excellence Award; General Ed. Committee; Fee Committee; Undergraduate Curriculum, College of Nursing; Academic Affairs Council, Whitworth College; Library/Instructional Media Center, EWU.

Research and Arts

MASSEY, Linda, Professor, Human Nutrition, Food Science and Human Nutrition, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 22 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Fifty research publications using many varied styles of investigation: human studies, animal studies, tissue culture, epidemiological, mail and telephone surveys. CAHE Promotion and Tenure Committee; FSHN and Riverpoint Health Science Building Planning Committee; Faculty Senator; CAHE Dean Search Committee; FSHN Graduate Studies Committee; Several Library Advisory Committees.

MOUNT, George H., Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 2 Years Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Received Ph.D. in 1975 in Physics, postdoc Johns Hopkins University, Government Research NOAA Environmental Research Laboratories/Aeronomy Laboratory. Many years experience in scientific research.
F – 2002  **SIAS, Richard,** Associate Professor, Finance, Insurance and Real Estate, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 7 Years. **Relevant Experience and Qualifications:** CBE Strategic Planning Committee; Curriculum Committee; Extended General Business Degree Program Committee; Faculty Search Committees; College of Business and Economics, Computer Users Committee; Advising Evaluation Committee; Committee to Restructure Math 201/202.

**Student Affairs**

F – 2002  **ARNOLD, Donna,** Academic Advisor, Student Advising and Learning Center, Faculty. WSU 7 Years. **Relevant Experience and Qualifications:** Assistant Chair, Facilitating Job Search for Career Services, Chair Admissions Subcommittee; Faculty Excellence Awards; Committee on Status of Women; Committee, Multicultural Student Services, Women’s Resource Scholarship.

F - 2000  **WEIST, Lori J.,** Associate Professor, School of Music & Theatre Arts, Faculty Graduate Faculty, Current Senator, WSU 8 Years. **Relevant Experience and Qualifications:** WA State Board of American Choral Directors Association, NW Regional board member of American Choral Directors, Assn.; Scholarship Committee, School of Music and Theatre Arts; Curriculum Committee; Professional Education Advisory Board for WSU.


2. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee Revision to Rules 74 and 76. **Exhibit E** from 3/4/99 agenda is as follows:
MEMORANDUM
TO: Thomas Brigham, Executive Secretary
Faculty Senate
FROM: Academic Affairs Committee
DATE: 25 February 1999
SUBJECT: Proposed Revision to the Policy Governing Evening Classes, and Revision to Academic Regulations 74 and 76

At its 24 February meeting, the Academic Affairs Committee approved a proposal to rescind the policy that requires departments to secure special permission from the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for scheduling lower-division lecture courses during evening hours. The proposal was submitted by the Department of English and Summer Session, and is supported by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. AAC members agreed that there was no compelling reason to require departments to go through the step of securing special permission to offer lower-division evening courses.

In practical terms, eliminating the policy necessitates revising the rules governing final exams and night exams, Rules 74 and 76. Revising Rule 74 would allow for a time slot to be established for departments requiring a final examination in an evening lecture course. Revising Rule 76 changes the night examination times slightly so that a time block from 7:00-8:15 p.m. may be established for scheduling evening lecture courses. With this revision, no class offered during the evening would conflict with night exams.

74. FINAL EXAMINATIONS WEEK. The final examination week will span five days, from the Monday through the Friday begin immediately on Saturday following the fifteenth week of the semester and last through the following Friday. Saturday final examinations will be reserved for lecture courses taught during evening hours, except for classes that combine sections and give examinations during common reserved times between Monday and Friday. Special examinations will be scheduled for the Saturday following the Friday of final examination week.

76. SCHEDULING ALL COMMON MORNING/EVENING EXAMS. Undergraduate (100-400-level) courses having an enrollment of at least two percent of the total student body or courses with multiple lecture sections may schedule not more than three examinations each semester at the periods of 7:00 to 8:00 a.m., 6:00 to 7:00 p.m., 5:45-6:45 p.m., and 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, with the exception of Monday morning and Friday evening. If permission is to be granted for a large group exam, all sections of the course must give the exam on the same day and within the same time block unless given during the regular scheduled class time. One class lecture period shall be omitted to compensate for each hour of examination. Proposed examination dates must be submitted to the Registrar's Office not later than the first week of each semester so that a schedule for the entire semester may be circulated and posted. A class lecture period lost to Labor Day, Veterans Day, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, and/or Presidents Day holiday(s) may be counted toward this compensation for an evening exam. (NOTE: Officially approved and scheduled night examinations have priority over all other academic and non-academic evening activities.)
The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the proposal to rescind the policy requiring special permission for scheduling lower-division lecture courses during evening hours. In order to facilitate this change, the AAC also recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the revisions to Academic Regulation No. 74 and 76, to be effective summer 1999.

Motion carried.

3. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for the formation of the School of Biological Sciences. Exhibit F from 3/4/99 agenda is as follows:

MEMORANDUM
TO: Thomas Brigham, Executive Secretary
    Faculty Senate
FROM: Becky Bitter, Academic Governance Coordinator
FOR: Academic Affairs Committee
DATE: 25 February 1999
SUBJECT: Proposed School of Biological Sciences

At its 24 February 1999 meeting, the Academic Affairs Committee approved the proposal for the new School of Biological Sciences, to be effective fall 1999.

Members of the AAC approved the proposal to merge the Program in Biology, Department of Botany, and Department of Zoology to form the School of Biological Sciences following discussion with Ronald Brosmer, College of Sciences Associate Dean, John Paznokas, Biology Chair, Richard Mack, Botany Chair, and Gary Thorgaard, Zoology Chair. A majority of faculty in these departments supports the proposed merger and there is no budgetary requirement for implementation.

At this time, Faculty Senate review and approval is recommended.

MEMORANDUM
December 1, 1998
TO: Faculty Senate Office
FROM: Leon Radziemski, Dean - College of Sciences
SUBJECT: Establishment of a School of Biological Sciences which integrates the Departments of Botany, Zoology, and the Program in General Biology within the College of Sciences

In the context of the College of Sciences “Positioning Effort of 1997,” it seemed quite appropriate to revisit the issue of Life Sciences reorganization. A team of three distinguished biologists was brought in to comment on our organization and potential. They delivered their report in May of 1997, recommending several changes. I forwarded their report to a College-level ad hoc Life Sciences Reorganization Study Committee, co-chaired by Michael Griswold and Howard Grimes. That group studied the recommendations vis a vis the local context, generated a Statement of Principles and, in January 1998, a set of recommendations. The essence was 1) to proceed with the
formation of a School of Molecular Biosciences, 2) perform a thorough study of the Biology teaching program during the 1998-99 academic year (currently under way), and 3) continue to encourage Botany, Zoology and Biology to discuss their own reorganization. On October 14, 1998, the College submitted item (1). The present submission results from an extended discussion of item (3).

Ballots taken last May indicated support for the reorganization of Botany, Zoology, and Biology. As a result the Chairs of the three Departments, in August of 1998, appointed an implementation committee. The attached proposal was developed by the committee, and was shared with the Departments. Additional faculty ballots were held, and final faculty approval given in a ballot held in mid-November. As with the Molecular Biosciences unit, the College of Sciences has committed a modest amount of resources to help the new unit achieve its goals.

The Statement of Principles for reorganization provides a strong argument for moving forward. Students, both undergraduate and graduate, will find a more uniform yet more flexible entry point into organismal, ecological and integrative biology. The unified approach will improve our success in recruiting students and faculty. Strategic placement of a modest amount of new resources will help the new unit to improve its quality and reputation, to the benefit of faculty and students.

I strongly support this grass-roots faculty effort towards reorganizing these three departments in the life sciences. As the document states, this is a common trend in biology throughout the country. Success in these moves can lead to even more sweeping coordination of life sciences throughout Washington State University.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Merger of the Departments of Botany and Zoology and the Program in Biology
Fall, 1998

11/9/98
FORMATION OF A SCHOOL OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES AT WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

BACKGROUND

The biological sciences (here defined to encompass the strengths in plant and animal physiology, cell biology, ecology, evolutionary biology, and systematics found among members of the current departments of Botany, Zoology and the Program in Biology) have long traditions of teaching and research excellence at Washington State University. This tradition is reflected in an extensive teaching obligation and historical excellence in instruction, and in research strengths in plant physiology, animal physiology, ecology, and evolutionary and systematic biology (EEB). There are immediate opportunities for strengthening instruction and research in the biological sciences through the merger of the Departments of Botany and Zoology and the Program in Biology, if additional resources are forthcoming. Benefits include more effective undergraduate education,
flexible graduate programs, long-term research enhancement through coordinated faculty hirings, and larger programs potentially able to develop a strong state-wide as well as national/international reputation.

An essential teaching mission rests with faculty in the biological sciences. Biologists from these units hold major responsibility for introductory undergraduate courses (e.g., BioSci 102, BioSci 103, BioSci 104, BioSci 201, Bot 120), for service courses (e.g., Human Physiology and Anatomy), and for large 300 and 400-level courses (e.g., General Ecology, Plant Physiology, Evolution). These courses represent a large portion of student credit hours used in evaluating College of Sciences accountability. Fulfilling our teaching commitment requires a faculty with broad training and ensures diverse representation of research interests within the biological sciences.

To date, the research reputation achieved by the biological sciences faculty at Washington State University has largely been achieved through the faculty’s hard work. Yet, the potential return on investment in this group of researchers is enormous. A core of biologists is already in the college who have collectively received the highest national ranking among WSU sciences programs in a recent National Research Council survey of doctoral programs. With a commitment to this group from the administration, the potential exists for making this the “high profile” research group on campus. A commitment to biological sciences also provides the setting for establishing a Center in Biodiversity. A grass roots effort has already resulted in a group of evolutionary biologists in Population Biology, Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics (PEES) from WSU and UI that meets monthly. Other groups, such as the Plant Physiologists, EcoEvo lunch group, Ecology and Evolution Group Reading (EEGR), and systematic biologists, are meeting weekly.

Hence, the core is in place for a research center that spans both campuses. Another productive line of research in biological sciences is the study of adaptations to abiotic factors including climate change and responses to stress at the organism, structural, biochemical, and molecular levels. This approach requires faculty with expertise at varying levels, and there is in place a core of physiologists who are vital to this area. New faculty hires (e.g. including an ecosystem ecologist studying global climate change, a cell biologist, and a molecular evolutionist as proposed in the Botany positioning document, and a molecular ecologist and developmental biologist as proposed in the Zoology positioning document) are needed to strengthen the biological sciences. Hence, the advantages of strengthening the biological sciences are great, but some resources are needed; these are “replenished” resources in the sense that they help make up for the drastic cuts Zoology and Botany have experienced during the past decade.

This document offers suggestions for strengthening the biological sciences at WSU, while building upon current excellence. We propose an organizational structure, outline resources required for successful implementation, suggest a timetable for implementation, outline on-going concerns, and offer rejoinders to those concerns.
PROPOSAL
ADMINISTRATION/ORGANIZATION

We propose a “School of Biological Sciences” to address effectively issues of common concern (e.g., undergraduate and graduate curriculum, long-term faculty development). We propose some coordination among the current units for a period of time to ensure continuity and maintain the diverse research programs that logically fall under the umbrella term, Biological Sciences. Four organizational issues addressed here are administration, faculty development, student training, and access to resources.

Administration

Three tiers of organization are envisioned: a coordinating School Director acting in consultation with unit (Botany, Zoology, Biology) coordinators; committees with equitable representation from each current unit, and a mechanism for direct faculty participation designed to balance interests of participating units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Biological Sciences (Director)</th>
<th>Botany (Coordinator)</th>
<th>Zoology (Coordinator)</th>
<th>Biology (Coordinator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Degrees</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degrees</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>EEB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The “School of Biological Sciences” will be composed of members mostly representing the current units of the Departments of Botany and Zoology and the Program in Biology.
2. The interim Director of the School will be chosen according to the faculty manual procedure.
3. Committees addressing those issues assigned to the School (e.g., undergraduate recruitment, undergraduate curriculum, graduate affairs, faculty hires) will for the first five years contain equitable representation of each component unit, with membership determined using current unit protocol.
4. School issues requiring direct faculty approval (e.g., election of School Director, appointment of new faculty, promotion of faculty hired by the School) require simple majority approval.
5. Current unit staff will remain. New assignments will be determined by the Director in consultation with the Dean of the College of Sciences. The long-term objective is for a single School office.
6. The School takes responsibility for initial activities aimed at strengthening identity and interaction, including a School-wide brochure and web site and seminar program.
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**Faculty development**

Faculty from the entire School take responsibility for developing long-term coordinated direction.

7. The School will consist of faculty with partial or full FTEs in Botany, Program in Biology, or Zoology. Faculty currently in Botany, Zoology, or Program in Biology may have the option of being in either Biological Sciences or Molecular Biosciences, or may elect to have a split appointment.

8. Faculty of the School together with the Dean of the College of Sciences may elect new members or associates from outside the School.

9. Evaluation and promotion
   a. Annual review will be the responsibility of the Director.
   b. Faculty in tenure-track positions will be evaluated for tenure and promotion under the rules dictated during their hiring and in the letter of job offering, and by School faculty with appropriate Department affiliation in the fall of 1999.
   c. Promotion of tenured faculty will be considered by the entire faculty of the School, starting in the 1999-2000 academic year.
   d. All faculty hired by the School will be considered for tenure and promotion by faculty of the School.

10. Future hiring will be determined by a committee appointed by the Director and consisting of equitable representation from the current units (Botany, Zoology, and Biology).

**Student training**

Faculty of the School take responsibility for coordinating undergraduate and graduate training.

11. The School will coordinate undergraduate training through an undergraduate curriculum committee. The School in collaboration with the School of Molecular Biosciences will offer the introductory and service courses currently offered by the Departments and the Program in Biology. The School may identify and develop curricula for a single undergraduate degree in Biological Sciences.

12. Undergraduate recruitment initiatives become the responsibility of the School, with initial direction for such efforts identified by a committee with equitable representation from each Department. The 100-200 level courses of the Biology Program will be operated in conjunction with the School of Molecular Bioscience.

13. Undergraduate curriculum and activities (e.g., undergraduate clubs) are the responsibility of the School, under the guidance of a committee.

14. Responsibility for graduate recruitment and admission belongs with the School, and will be executed by a committee with equitable representation of the Botany and Zoology core groups.

15. The School will be responsible, through a graduate affairs committee, for existing graduate programs in Botany, Plant Physiology, Zoology, and Biology, and for development of new programs in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology.
Access to resources

16. Faculty remain in their current physical space, unless all parties agree otherwise.
17. The extent of access to facilities (LBB, EMC, Plant Growth Laboratory, rooftop outdoor aviaries on Science Hall, etc.) remains unchanged. A list of all facilities now maintained by Botany, Zoology, and Botany will be prepared by the Implementation Committee (see below). Staff of these facilities will remain within the School of Biological Sciences.
18. All endowments retain their current unit associations; these funds are irrevocably locked into the agreement under which they were obtained, according to the regulations of the WSU Foundation. Additional funds should be provided by both WSU and UI to support several intercampus speakers in Organismal Biology per year; this seminar program will help foster the growing connections in Biological sciences between the two campuses.

CONCERNS THAT HAVE BEEN EXPRESSED REGARDING THIS PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

1. Merging Botany and Zoology is a top-down approach to reorganization that could leave some parties disaffected. The departments of Botany and Zoology usually do not compete for a common pool of graduate students in these areas, so there is little benefit from combining recruitment effort.
2. Reorganization could result in an EEB graduate degree, but this could be done without merging departments.
3. This scheme requires a major commitment of new resources, yet no evidence of such commitment can be found in the recent (past 10 years) budget policy of the administration. Reorganization seems likely to fail without adequate financial support.
4. Part of the logic of reorganization is an attempt by other units to acquire on TA positions and ultimately FTEs long associated with the Biological Sciences units.
5. Plant Biology, one of the traditional strengths of this campus, will suffer. This has happened nationwide in case after case when Botany departments are merged with what are invariably much larger Zoology departments.
6. The recent loss of Dr. Mary Murphy’s position has eroded faculty confidence in the administration. That decision sent a clear message that the administration is not willing to implement a meaningful reorganization that will result in an enhanced unit of Biological Sciences.
7. The plant physiologists are a vital pan of the Biological Sciences, without them the new school will be less successful. Although these faculty have also been approached by the MB school, it is critical that they remain associated with the new School of Biological Sciences. It will be important that a reasonable presence be maintained in this segment of the school in the future so that these teaching and research areas are adequately covered within the College of Sciences. There is an inter-college Plant Physiology Program which is recognized as a graduate degree offering program through the College of Sciences, which is sup-ported by our Dean. This is listed as a degree option in the school and TAs will be needed for some of the plant-physiology
courses taught in the school. Therefore, graduate student applicants to the Plant Physiology Program who will work with faculty of the new school consideration should be given equal consideration for TA appointments during recruitment along with the pool of students applying to other graduate degree programs offered through the School of Biological Sciences.

8. Museum support. Support for the Herbarium and the Conner Museum should not be eroded as part of the reorganization process. For example, the Curator position in the herbarium was cut in 1993 and not replaced (see Resources)

BENEFITS

1. A properly orchestrated merger could enhance all the disciplines within Biological Sciences: plant physiology, ecology/evolution, structural biology, etc. Once again, this is where resources play a critical role.
2. Both Botany and Zoology identify, in their positioning documents, areas of expertise and growth that transcend organismal bounds.
3. Ecology and evolution are prominent in the positioning plans of Botany and Zoology. Combining departments allows effective, non-overlapping exploration of this shared vision.
4. Faculty in the Biological Sciences meet a substantial portion of their obligation to the University through undergraduate teaching. Strengthening the connection between Botany and Zoology reinforces this contribution, encouraging consolidation of undergraduate curricula into a progression of logically related, non-overlapping programs of study.
5. The breadth of teaching and research obligation in a School of Biological Sciences requires corresponding breadth of faculty interests and abilities, ensuring the long term persistence of all groups currently represented in the separate departments.
6. This encourages both stronger ties between Botany and Zoology, and active support for diverse research programs within Biological Sciences.
7. An effective and coherent vision of a vigorous School of Biological Sciences represents our best opportunity to demonstrate to the administration the importance and vitality of the contribution we make to the University.
8. The merger will make the strengths in organismal biology, physiology, ecology, evolutionary biology, and systematics more readily evident to prospective graduate students, undergraduates, granting agencies and potential donors. Currently those strengths are diffuse, spread among too many departments.

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES AT WSU

I. THE CENTRAL ROLE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES AT WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

An essential teaching mission rests with faculty in biological sciences. Integrative biologists hold major responsibility for introductory undergraduate courses (e.g., BioSci 102, BioSci 103, BioSci 104, BioSci 201, Bot 120), for service courses (e.g., Human Physiology, Plant Physiology), and for large 300- and 400-level courses (e.g., General
Ecology, Evolution). These courses represent a large portion of student credit hours used in evaluating College accountability. Fulfilling our teaching commitment requires a faculty with broad training and ensures diverse representation of research interests within biological sciences. The commitment to instruction of bioscience is, and will remain, an essential part of biological sciences at WSU.

II. CURRICULUM

The missions and curricula of the undergraduate programs in Zoology and Biology and the graduate programs in Zoology, Biology, and Botany are described in a separate document (a complete description of the curriculum can be obtained upon request). As of now, these missions and curricula are unchanged from those prior to reorganization. During the reorganization process, a curriculum committee will be appointed to determine, among other things, teaching responsibilities of both the new Molecular School and the new Biology School, and changes to the curricula within the new Biology School.

III The current status of WSU’s biological sciences in teaching and research:

Teaching:

Faculty in biological sciences have a long tradition of teaching and research excellence at WSU. This is reflected in extensive teaching obligation and historical excellence in instruction, and in areas of research strength such as ecology, evolution, and systematic biology (EEB), plant physiology, and animal physiology. Presently integrative biologists are associated with the Departments of Zoology or Botany and the Program in Biology. These faculty share the responsibility for major introductory undergraduate courses (Program in Biology), service courses (e.g. Human Physiology, and Mammalian Physiology), and large (greater than 100 students) 300 and 400 level courses (e.g. General Ecology, Plant Physiology, Evolution). These courses have a strong emphasis on integrative and organismal biology.

Research:

The EEB group, which includes ecologists, systematists, evolutionary biologists, and physiologists from the Departments of Botany, Zoology, and Genetics and Cell Biology has a worldwide reputation for research excellence and is one of the highest ranking research groups on campus. Plant Physiology has been a traditional area of research excellence. Research in these areas could be strengthened by a properly implemented merger of departments and the establishment of a formal program within a School of Biological Sciences.
Faculty:

Present faculty in the Biological Sciences have partial or full FTEs in the Departments of Botany or Zoology, or the Program of Biology. Both departments are small with 13 and 15 faculty respectively. The Program of Biological Sciences consists of 12 faculty, 8 of these with partial appointments in Zoology or Botany. The Department of Zoology has lost 10 faculty members since 1991, most of them organismal biologists. Only 4 of these faculty have been replaced to date. Although these new hires were according to the mission statement of the Zoology Department to focus on environmental, ecological, and evolutionary biology, the downsizing in faculty had a very negative impact on the representation of organismal biology at WSU. The Department of Botany did not experience such an attrition of faculty but there was considerable reduction in support resources such as the loss of 3 staff members (in the Department of Botany alone the operating budget has fallen from $44,00 to $27,000 since 1990). Overall, Biological Sciences suffered considerably due to a reduction in resources.

External funding:

External funding for research in Zoology and Botany have been moderate (FY 1996-1997: Zoology: $503,769; Botany: $653,340) and could be enhanced by the establishment of School of Biological Sciences, if accompanied by the hiring of new faculty.

Other resources:

Summer support and research assistantships for graduate students are presently not adequate, reducing our ability to compete with other institutions for highest quality graduate students in the fields of integrative and organismal biology.

Major points of criticism by the external Life Sciences Reorganization Study Committee (LSRC) of the current status of Biology/Zoology/Botany:

1) Few cross-departmental educational and research programs.
2) Insufficient support for graduate student research.
3) Heavy teaching load for faculty in the Program of Biology.
4) Low external funding.

Recommendations by the LSRC:

1) Create interdepartmental graduate programs.
2) Merge Zoology and Botany into a single unit (Biological Sciences).
3) Maintain strong undergraduate Biology teaching (Program in Biology), but distribute FTEs to home departments.
4) Increase efforts to obtain extramural funding.
5) Commit funds to attract strong chairs and lead faculty for the departments within life sciences.
IV. Strategies to strengthen Biological Sciences at WSU

It is proposed to merge the Departments of Zoology, Botany, and the Program in Biology into a new unit: a School of Biological Sciences (approximately 30 faculty).

This merger will have the following advantages:
1) Biological Sciences at WSU gets greater visibility and a critical mass of faculty with the same interests and vision for teaching and research.
2) A single undergraduate curriculum and degree in Biological Sciences can be developed, while introductory and service courses offered by the previous departments can be maintained.
3) Undergraduate recruitment efforts can be coordinated and enhanced.
4) Graduate recruitment and admission can be coordinated and enhanced.
5) While retaining existing graduate programs in Botany, Plant Physiology, and Zoology, a new program in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology can be developed.
6) Botany and Zoology have chosen Ecology and Evolutionary Biology as major directions in their positioning plans. Combining these departments will allow effective, non-overlapping exploration of this shared vision.
7) Faculty replacement can be coordinated to fulfill the joint vision of the old departments to focus on Biological Sciences. A School of Biological Sciences may attract high-profile applicants for vacant positions, who would not consider a position in the “old”, rather small units.
8) Greater visibility of organismal biology at WSU via a School of Biological Sciences will enhance the chances to obtain external funding.
9) A merger can enhance grant-seeking efforts of all faculty via multi-investigator proposals.
10) Forming a School of Biological Sciences allows us to develop a consistent and compelling undergraduate program.
11) Strong teaching (under the umbrella of Biological Sciences) requires breadth in faculty interests and abilities, which can be provided by previous Botany/Zoology/Biology faculty.
12) An effective and coherent vision of a vigorous School of Biological Sciences will make a vital and important contribution to WSU’s national and international reputation.
13) A merger (if coupled with adequate resources) may help to return to previous strength the Biological Sciences at WSU in terms of FTEs and other resources.

V. Implementation

To coordinate the merger of Departments to form the School of Biological Sciences, an implementation committee will be appointed by the Chairs of Botany, Zoology, and Biology. They will establish a timetable for the entire process.
VI. Replenished Resources for the School of Biological Sciences

In order to optimize the chances of success for the proposed merger, resources beyond the simple merger of the budgets of the Departments of Zoology and Botany and the Program in Biology will be needed. As noted, these resources will help to make up for the severe cuts of recent years. These units have been surprisingly successful in spite of the attrition of resources in recent years. However, replenished resources are required to achieve the level of excellence we seek and to achieve the potential that is clearly evident for the new group. Some of these items are one-time costs and some represent ongoing costs. These items are listed in Appendix 1.

APPENDIX 1. REPLENISHED RESOURCES

Costs Associated with Director and Coordinator Positions

The director of the new school should have at least an administrative stipend of 11%, plus a month of summer salary. Coordinators/associate directors of the Zoology, Botany and Biology instructional units within the school are expected to have a month of summer salary each. These stipends should roughly equal the stipends currently provided to the chairs of Zoology, Botany and Biology. To help these individuals maintain active research programs while assuming these duties, the director should be provided with funding for a postdoctoral fellow and the coordinators should each be provided with funding for a graduate research assistant.

*Director and coordinator costs* $75,000 additional costs, annually

New faculty positions

To strengthen the new School of Biological Sciences, to carry out essential teaching and to increase national and international reputation, two new faculty positions should be made available to the School for searches to be conducted during the 1999-2000 academic year. In addition, it is imperative that vacant positions be replaced in a timely manner. It is essential that these searches be conducted during 1999-2000 in order to facilitate integration of the units into a new, combined school with its own character.

*Two new faculty FTEs* $90,000 (ongoing)

*Start-up costs* $250,000 (one-time)

Advertising the new school

In order to inform prospective students about the new unit, a comprehensive brochure and web site for the new School of Biological Sciences need to be developed.

*Brochure and web site costs* $10,000 (one-time)
Budgetary restoration for essential instructional functions

The 03 (supplies) budget for the school needs to be increased. The school will be responsible for the majority of life sciences instruction. This represents a partial restoration of cuts experienced by the Zoology, Botany, and Biology in recent years; the supply budgets for these component units have gone down while costs have increased. As noted, in the Department of Botany alone the operating budget has fallen from $44,000 to $27,000 since 1990.

**Increased supply budget** $10,000 (ongoing)

A Zoology teaching assistantship was recently lost due to a budget cut in the Honors Program. This 1/2-time TA needs to be restored on a permanent basis or it will be impossible to perform essential teaching.

**Half-time teaching assistantship** $13,000 (ongoing)

The current Ag Res Tech I position in Botany which is responsible for the work at Smoot Hill needs to be elevated from a nine-month position to a full-time position.

**0.25 Ag Tech I position** $8,000 (ongoing)

Graduate student enhancements

One of the goals of the School is to compete successfully for graduate students with peer institutions. To attract promising students, the School needs three annual research assistantships for recruiting purposes and 3-month summer RA salaries for three additional graduate students.

**Research assistantships for recruitment** $50,000 (ongoing)

To enhance graduate student training, funds are requested to allow five advanced students to attend at least one national scientific meeting in their final year.

**Travel funds for outstanding students** $6,000 (ongoing)

Enhanced seminar program

One of the most effective means of fostering identity and visibility for the new school is to develop a vigorous seminar program, focusing on areas of common interest to the former zoologists and botanists. The School proposes to invite about 9 “cutting edge” integrative/organismal Biologists for seminars each year, beginning in fall 1999. This seminar program will also help identify highly visible areas of research in connection with future hirings. Some of the seminars will also host speakers jointly with the University of Idaho to foster inter-campus communications.

**Seminar support** $8,000 per year (ongoing)
Organization for Tropical Studies

Most universities in the US with departments that are well-known for research in Biological Sciences are members of OTS; WSU is not. To increase visibility and the quality of graduate student training funds should be made available to join the OTS.

**OTS membership**  \$10,000 (ongoing)

**Curator for the Herbarium**

Funds are needed for a curator in the Herbarium. This position was eliminated because of budget constraints in 1993; however, replacing the position is needed to accomplish the future goals and objectives of the herbarium, such as maintaining an active role in education both within the university and in K-12, conducting outreach that includes assisting Agricultural Extension services and fulfilling requests from citizens of the state (which is part of our land grant role), aiding the herbarium’s expanded activities in databasing and research on the regional flora, and ongoing curation needs.

**Cost**  \$30,000 per year

* * * * *

Motion carried.

4. Recommendation from Academic Affairs for Addendum #3 to Undergraduate and Professional Major Change Bulletin #8 Exhibit D is as follows:

**ADDENDUM NO. 3 TO UNDERGRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL MAJOR CHANGE BULLETIN NO. 8  Spring 1999**

The requirements and courses listed below reflect the undergraduate major curricular changes approved by the Catalog Subcommittee since approval of the last Undergraduate Major Change Bulletin. All new and changed courses are printed in their entirety. New and dropped courses are identified under the course prefix and number. Other changes are underlined. The column to the far right indicates the date each change becomes effective.

**Business**

Revise the requirements for the Real Estate minor: R E 305, 306; Fin 409 or R E 409; three of: B Law 414, R E 405, 406, 407, or 408.

**C E  474 Intermediate Transportation Engineering** 3 (2-3) Prereq C E 322. Fundamentals of geometric design and traffic engineering for urban and rural highways. Cooperative course taught by UI (CE 474), open to WSU students.

**CropS new  317 Golf Course Management** 1 Prereq CropS 301. Specific management practices for golf courses in the Pacific Northwest.
Hist  new  473  [T] The Middle East and the West 3 Prereq completion of one Tier I and three Tier II courses. To develop an understanding of the east-west tensions in the context of historical relations between the Middle East and West Europe since the rise of Islam.

Hort  new  317  Golf Course Management 1 Same as CropS 317.


Motion carried.

5. Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for Addendum #2 to Graduate Major Change Bulletin #8 Exhibit E is as follows:

ADDENDUM NO. 2 TO GRADUATE MAJOR CHANGE BULLETIN NO. 8
Spring 1999

The requirements and courses listed below reflect the Graduate Major Curricular Changes approved by the Catalog Subcommittee and the Graduate Studies Committee since approval of the last Graduate Major Change Bulletin. All new and changed courses are printed in their entirety. New and dropped courses are identified under the course prefix and number. Other changes are underlined. The column to the far right indicates the date each change becomes effective.

A S  504  Special Topics V 4-12 1-4  May be repeated for credit; cumulative maximum 12 hours. Cooperative course taught by UI (AVS 504), open to WSU students.

A S  new  520  Preparation of Scientific Literature in Animal Sciences 2 Prereq graduate standing. Preparation of grant proposals, manuscripts, and literature reviews on research topics.

BC/BI  580  Protein Targeting in Plant Cells 3 Same as Pl Ph 580.

E E  new  514  Optoelectronics Lab I V 1 (0-3) to 3 (0-9) Same as Phys 514.

E M  new  530  Applications of Constraints Management 3 Prereq graduate standing. Understanding and applying proved solutions developed by the Theory of Constraints in areas of production, project management, finance, and distribution.
### Systems Engineering Management (EM 565)
Prereq: Graduate standing. Design manufacture, operation of complex system development for engineering managers; project planning, organizing, and controlling tools for engineering system constraints. 

### Organizational Leadership of Multicultural Change (Ed Ad 567)
Prereq: Graduate standing. Reflection on experience and examination of the theory of practice of organizational leadership in the context of diversity. 

### Protein Targeting in Plant Cells (GenC 580)
Prereq: BC/BP 563; Graduate standing. The biochemistry and cell biology involved in protein traffic among organelles in eukaryotic cells, with emphasis on plant cells. Cooperative course taught by WSU, open to UI students (XX XXX). 

Motion carried.

6. Recommendation from Planning Review Committee for Policies and Procedures to Review Graduate and Undergraduate Degree Programs *Exhibit G* (3/4/99) is as follows:

#### Proposed Policy and Procedures for Review of Existing Graduate and Undergraduate Degree Programs

Comprehensive, objective reviews of WSU degree programs periodically evaluate the programs’ quality, effectiveness, efficiency, and relevance to University, state and national needs. Academic program reviews provide verifiable data to establish priorities and set future directions. Such reviews are a primary basis for the allocation of resources to academic units by the central administration.

The purpose of an academic program review is to improve WSU’s graduate, undergraduate and professional education by:

- Determining whether the objectives and goals of the academic program are consistent with those of the institution;
• Determining whether the program is meeting significant needs of the student, University, state and nation;
• Evaluating the program’s curricula, instruction, and learning outcomes;
• Assessing the quality and extent of the scholarly activity in the program;
• Assessing the program’s effectiveness and efficiency;
• Comparing the quality of the program with that of similar programs at other institutions;
• Assessing relationships among various academic programs at WSU;
• Proposing changes to improve the program’s quality, effectiveness, or efficiency.

Reviews will balance consideration of undergraduate, graduate, and professional curricula with the scholarly activity of the faculty and with student success and satisfaction. The general review procedure is as follows:

1. The review should include both undergraduate and graduate programs at the same time, if possible. Reviews for professional programs should follow the same process as that conducted for undergraduate and graduate programs.

2. Program reviews will be conducted on a ten-year rotating basis. One year prior to the review, notification will be given to Dean(s) and Chair(s) so that they may plan and organize the self-study.

3. The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) will be the lead committee for the program review. It will be a standing committee of the Faculty Senate and will have nine members elected to staggered three-year terms. The members of the APRC are to represent the entire university faculty, rather than their colleges of origin. The Academic Affairs Committee, Graduate Studies Committee, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School may each appoint one ex-officio member to the committee to serve as liaisons.

4. The program review should consist of an internal self-study, a required external review and written report, and a subsequent internal review of both documents by the APRC. The APRC will evaluate the self-study and may ask for revisions before making it available to the external reviewers. Prior to the review, the APRC, in consultation with the Provost’s Office, should develop a set of questions to be answered by the area in its self-assessment and by the external reviewers. These questions should address the role of the program at WSU, and its quality, effectiveness, and efficiency in relation to other similar programs.

5. The APRC will consult with the Provost, and with affected Dean(s) and Chair(s), to determine how a review will be conducted. It is expected that this will be decided on a case by case basis. To minimize duplication of effort, the APRC may determine that an accreditation self-study or final report is suitable for use in the WSU program review process. Whenever possible, reviews will be done in conjunction with accreditation or other external reviews; the APRC may adjust the scheduling of a review if appropriate.
6. When no appropriate accreditation reviews are available, the APRC will select external reviewers who will evaluate the program. The Provost and the affected Dean(s), Chairs(s) and faculty will be consulted in the selection of reviewers, but the APRC is not committed to the administration's or faculty's nominations. Reviewers will be chosen for their expertise in the relevant discipline.

7. Upon completion of the external review, the APRC will assess the resulting report and will prepare advisory recommendations for the Provost. The APRC's recommendations will be referred to the Academic Affairs Committee, Graduate Studies Committee, and cognizant Dean(s) and Chair(s) for comment, then forwarded to the Steering Committee for transmission to the Senate and to the Provost.

8. The Provost will respond to the report and transmit recommendations and decisions to the faculty of the program reviewed and to administrators of other units affected. The Provost may also provide information from academic program reviews to the HECB.

9. One year after the completion of the program's review the Provost will schedule a meeting with the Dean, Chair and faculty of the reviewed program and representatives of the Academic Program Review Committee, Academic Affairs Committee and Graduate Studies Committee to discuss the progress the unit’s progress in implementing any recommendations that resulted from the review. Further action may be decided at that time.

10. The Academic Affairs Committee, Graduate Studies Committee and Planning Review Committee should examine the efficacy of the program review process on an annual basis. In addition, the process should be thoroughly examined after a five-year period to determine whether it should be continued.

11. All funding for the external review, including travel costs and consulting fees for reviewers and staff time to arrange details of the process, will be provided by the Provost’s Office.

Motion carried.

* * * * *

7. Recommendation from Faculty Affairs Committee for Electronic Publishing Policy. Exhibit H 3/4/99 agenda is as follows:

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Wes Leid, Chair, FAC
DATE: February 26, 1999
SUBJECT: Electronic Publishing Policy
On February 16 the Faculty Affairs Committee met with Ray August, Professor of Accounting, Information Systems and Business law. Ray is also a lawyer and his area of expertise is electronic publishing. Ray has gone through this policy and he told the Committee he sees no problems with it for faculty. He stated that in light of the state ethics law, which we cannot change, this policy is fine. Each area has the option of writing its own protocol for access. After a long discussion the Committee recommends approval by the Faculty Senate.

MEMORANDUM

February 11, 1999
TO: Thomas A. Brigham, Executive Secretary
Faculty Senate
FROM: Jennifer Hubbard Geller, Assistant Attorney General
Washington State University Division
SUBJECT: Electronic Publishing and Appropriate Use Policy

Thank you for your January 29, 1999, memorandum regarding the most recent Faculty Senate discussion of the proposed Policy on Electronic Publishing and Appropriate Use. I have provided a brief response below to the questions and issues raised in your memorandum.

Role of the Attorney General’s Office

The lawyers in the WSU Division of the Attorney General’s Office are part of an independent state agency and are responsible for providing legal services to Washington State University and the state of Washington. In the process of serving a large institutional client, the Office of the Attorney General does not represent the rights of any particular individual or group of employees, whether administrative, staff, or faculty. However, the rights of all groups and/or individuals are taken into account in order to give quality legal advice.

University of Washington Electronic Policy

Prior to the January 28, 1999, Faculty Senate meeting, I contacted Dave Green, the Assistant Attorney General who advises the University of Washington Division on computer and network issues. The interpretation of the University of Washington (UW) policy was provided by the UW Division of the Attorney General’s Office. The UW reserves the right to access electronic files on employees’ computers without employees’ permission. The only time that UW may give employees notice prior to monitoring or accessing is if a public records request is received.

In the process of discussing the UW policy, I queried Mr. Green about the following statements in the UW policy: “Privacy Guidelines” (Page 4 of the UW “Guidelines for Use of C & C Computer and Network Resource); “Privacy of Email and Files”; and “Your Account May be Monitored.” Both the “Privacy” and the “Monitoring”
statements include broad provisions allowing the UW to monitor accounts. The UW does not interpret the “Privacy Guidelines” statement barring access to “private files or passwords” as limiting the separate “Privacy” or “Monitoring” statements. The UW takes the position that the “Privacy” and “Monitoring” statements provide notice to employees that they do not have privacy expectations in their electronic mail or electronic files. The statement barring access to “private files or passwords” is interpreted to bar a user of computers and networks from accessing information for which that particular user does not have authority to access.

Other Four-Year Institutional Policies

Policies from Central Washington University, Eastern Washington University and Western Washington University are attached. Note that Eastern Washington University’s electronic mail policy is in draft form. Western Washington University also is in the process of drafting a companion policy to its brief “Policy for Responsible Computing.” Evergreen apparently has not yet adopted a policy.

Federal Laws Protecting Electronic Files

Some additional language has been added further limiting when faculty files may be accessed if those files include proprietary information or client files.

The federal laws referenced in your memorandum are always relevant; however, they do not always negate a University need to access files or relieve the University from public records obligations:

- Buckley Amendment/Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA): FERPA includes exceptions for internal sharing of student records and does not limit public disclosure of all student records.
- Federal Ethics Laws: The University is bound by all federal rules and regulations, as well as state law, which govern human research data. Limitations on internal access have been included in the proposed policy. While information is almost always protected from public disclosure, the University must review public records requests and related documents to determine whether records are disclosable.
- Federal Disclosure Laws: I am uncertain what laws are specifically referenced. However, whether something is disclosable to the public is not determined solely by who owns certain records. Under most grants, if not all, research results are owned by the grantor or the university. Any disclosure clauses in such contracts are made subject to public records law. Exemptions may apply, but internal review is required to make that determination.

Federal Communications Act

The Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA), 18 U.S.C. § 2701 et seq., does not apply to access of electronic files by the University or the public via a public records request. The ECPA prohibits those “providing an electronic communication service to
the public” from disclosing the contents of stored electronic communications. 18 U.S.C. § 2702 (emphasis added.) Those providers governed by the ECPA are permitted to access the electronic communications stored on their own systems. 18 U.S.C. § 2701(c)(1).

I hope this information has answered some of your concerns and demonstrated that the Attorney General’s Office has listened to the faculty’s concerns and tried to reconcile those concerns with the law to develop a policy that works for all groups on campus.

rmh
cc: Gretchen M. Bataille, Provost and Academic Vice President
    Douglas D. Baker, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
    John W. Crane, Associate Professor
    Robert R. Greenberg, Faculty Senate Chair
    Antoinette M. Ursich, Senior Assistant Attorney General, WSU Division

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

POLICY ON ELECTRONIC PUBLISHING AND APPROPRIATE USE OF COMPUTING RESOURCES, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES, AND NETWORKS

GENERAL POLICY STATEMENT

In support of academic instruction, research, public service, and administrative functions, Washington State University (WSU) encourages the use of, and provides access to, information technologies and network resources. This enables WSU users access to global information resources, as well as the ability to communicate with other users worldwide. In keeping with its role and values, WSU supports the use of electronic communication for the conduct of official WSU business and for individual professional purposes related to an official WSU purpose.

This Appropriate Use Policy governs the use of WSU computing resources, information technologies, and networks. This includes, but is not limited to, computers, computing staff, hardware, software, networks, computing laboratories, databases, files, information, software licenses, computing-related contracts, network bandwidth, usernames, passwords, documentation, discs, CD-ROMs, DVDs, magnetic tapes, and electronic mail.

Users of WSU’s computing resources, information technologies, and networks are responsible for using those resources in accordance with the law and with WSU policy. Use of WSU computing, information technologies, and networking resources is a privilege that depends upon appropriate use of those resources. Individuals who violate the law or WSU policy regarding the use of computing resources, information technologies, and networks are subject to loss of access to those resources as well as to WSU disciplinary and/or legal action.
FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

WSU respects the First Amendment rights of freedom of speech, including academic freedom of artists and scholars. Therefore, WSU does not restrict the contents of electronic mail of staff, faculty, and students or the contents of faculty, staff, and student individual World Wide Web (Web) pages linked to the official WSU Web pages beyond the restrictions inherent in complying with the law.

These individual Web pages represent the work of the individual artists, scholars, and authors who created them and not WSU. All such pages are required to contain an appropriate disclaimer indicating that WSU is not responsible for the creation of, or the content of, these Web pages.

APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to all WSU employees, students, visiting faculty, and volunteers who use computing resources, information technologies, and networks owned or managed by WSU. All such individuals, by virtue of their use of WSU computer resources, information technologies, and networks, accept the responsibility for using these resources only for appropriate WSU activities. Computer network users are responsible for reading, understanding, and behaving in a manner consistent with this policy.

Separate policies apply to the use of information technologies and networks that are made accessible to the public in the ordinary course of WSU business. For example, WSU makes computer monitors available in its libraries to all library users. Policies governing the use of such information technologies and networks shall be posted in the general locale of the public access facilities or be made available to users of those technologies and networks. The use of publicly accessible information technologies and networks by a WSU employee acting within the scope of the employee’s employment shall, however, be governed by this Appropriate Use Policy.

APPROPRIATE USE

WSU’s computer resources, information technologies, and networks may be used for legitimate WSU purposes only. Thus, appropriate use of WSU’s computer resources, information technologies, and networks includes:

**Students:** All appropriate use by students related to completion of WSU class assignments or their education at WSU; and

**Employees:** All appropriate use by faculty, administrators, and staff directly related to instruction, research, and scholarly, professional, and administrative endeavors on behalf of WSU or within the scope of WSU employment. Students while working in their WSU employment capacities will be governed by policies for employees.
INAPPROPRIATE USE

WSU computer resources, information technologies, and networks shall not be used for:

- Supporting, establishing, or conducting any private business operation or commercial activity;
- Conducting personal activities unrelated to any WSU or student educational purpose unless otherwise allowed by this policy;
- Attempting to gain unauthorized access to any portion of the system or using WSU computer resources, information technologies, and networks as a staging area to attempt to gain unauthorized access to any other system or account;
- Violating WSU’s policy of prohibiting discrimination against individuals on the basis of race, sex (including sexual harassment), religion, age, color, creed, national or ethnic origin, physical, mental, or sensory disability, marital status, sexual orientation, and status as a Vietnam-era or disabled Veteran;
- Intentionally disseminating, accessing, or providing a hyper-link to obscenity, as that term is defined by the law, unless such activities are directly related to an employee’s legitimate research or scholarship purpose or to a student’s completion of an academic requirement;
- Sending unsolicited electronic mail (e.g., “spam”) in violation of Washington law or in quantities that interfere with WSU’s or another’s server. Senders who anticipate sending large numbers of unsolicited electronic mail messages at one time are responsible for consulting with the appropriate server administrator prior to determine whether or not the sending of the mail is likely to cause a malfunction in a server;
- Engaging in political activities that violate state law (state law prohibits the use of state facilities or public resources for the purposes of assisting in an election campaign or for the promotion or opposition to a ballot proposition);
- Destroying, altering, compromising the integrity or security, or making inaccessible WSU computer resources, information technologies, and networks when such uses are not authorized;
- Utilizing WSU resources with the purpose of intentionally interfering with others’ use of computing resources, information technologies, or network resources or conduct of WSU business;
- Compromising the privacy of users of the computer resources, information technologies, and networks;
- Violating copyright law (thus, information technology and network users who do not hold the copyright on a work must have permission to publish information, graphics, cartoons, photographs, or other material, or the publication must be otherwise permitted under copyright law);
- Violating trademark law;
- Violating any federal, state, or local law;
- Copying of software in violation of a license or when copying is not authorized; or
- Violating WSU policy. Expressing opposition to any WSU policy using computer resources, information technologies, and networks is not a violation of WSU policy.
ADDITIONAL POLICIES APPLYING TO WSU EMPLOYEES

Computer resources, use of information technologies, and networks by WSU employees is governed by Washington State’s Ethics in Public Service Law (Ethics Law), RCW 42.52. Students, while working in an employment capacity for WSU, are also governed by the Ethics Law. WSU employees must comply with the Ethics Law and with any rules adopted by the Executive Ethics Board. Computer resources, use of information technologies, and networks by WSU employees are subject to the Executive Ethics Board’s rule on Use of State Resources, WAC 292-110-010.

Employees shall use WSU’s information technologies and networks primarily for the purpose of conducting WSU business. Employees may use WSU’s information technologies and networks to conduct other business within the scope of their employment, such as communicating with members of professional organizations about their area of expertise, or visiting Web pages of such professional organizations.

Employees may use WSU’s electronic mail system to send personal messages, provided that such messages are insignificant in cost and resource usage, and provided that all such messages comply with the statements in this policy. Examples of permissible uses of WSU electronic mail include:

- Communication for those who are hearing impaired (rather than using the telephone);
- Notices of social and public service events, (e.g., blood drives, shared leave requests, etc.);
- Notices of gatherings (e.g., lunches, birthdays, receptions);
- Agency-wide or unit-wide notifications that are used for communicating good will among employees (e.g., holiday greetings, congratulatory messages, etc.);
- Communications for purposes related to employee benefits when WSU has determined that such communications will contribute to staff efficiency;
- Personal electronic mail messages to friends or family, provided that such messages:
  * do not interfere with the performance of job duties;
  * do not result in an additional cost to WSU;
  * are brief in duration and do not disrupt or distract from the conduct of state business due to volume or frequency; and
  * do not compromise the security or integrity of state information or software.

While employees may send electronic mail messages that comply with the above, employees may not make personal use or use not associated with official duties of state computers or other equipment to access computer networks or other databases, including electronic mail networks, listserves, or databases.
ADDITIONAL POLICIES APPLYING TO STUDENTS

In addition to this policy, the Standards of Student Conduct govern students while enrolled in WSU. The Standards of Student Conduct include a provision prohibiting computer abuses, WAC 504-25-085. Students who wish to use computer labs also sign a User Agreement with Student Computing Services.

ADDITIONAL POLICIES FOR WEB ELECTRONIC PUBLICATIONS

The quality of information published and communicated by WSU plays an important role in maintaining the strong reputation and image of WSU. Members of the WSU community create electronic Web pages, publication pages, or other electronic publications that carry out official WSU business in support of WSU’s mission. Because all Internet users may view electronic publications, the quality of electronic publications reflects upon all members of the WSU community. In general, electronic publications are subject to the same WSU policies and standards as print publications.

Unit Web Pages and Other Electronic Publications. Unit Web pages and other electronic publications are the equivalent of printed publications or official communication. They are official WSU publications. WSU Web graphic identity guidelines are available and all academic and administrative units are encouraged to use them. Each unit Web page, cluster of linked pages, or other electronically published information will contain:

- The unit name;
- An electronic mail address for the unit’s Web page creator or administrator;
- The date of the page’s development or revision;
- The page’s expiration date when appropriate;
- A link to WSU’s Copyright, Disclaimer, and Freedom of Expression Policies; and
- A link to WSU’s main or home page.

Units publishing their own electronic information may set additional requirements, such as the inclusion of the equal opportunity statement. A unit may decide whether it is of benefit to link the individual electronic pages of their faculty, staff, or students to the unit Web page.

Individual Web Pages. Individuals may create Web pages and other electronic publications that provide information relevant to that individual’s role at WSU. The work on individual Web pages and electronic publications represents the work of individual artists, scholars, and authors who created them, and they are not intended to represent WSU. As such, WSU bears no responsibility for the content of individual Web pages.

Each individual page, cluster of linked pages, or other electronically published information will display by a browser:

- The individual’s name;
• The individual’s position or affiliation with WSU;
• The individual’s electronic mail address; and
• A link to WSU’s Copyright, Disclaimer, and Freedom of Expression Policies.

Individual pages are the responsibility of their developers.

WSU respects the First Amendment and does not restrict the content of employee and student Web pages or other electronic publications beyond the restrictions of WSU policy and applicable law. WSU, however, reserves the right to remove from any WSU server a Web page or electronic publication that is found to be in violation of the law or WSU policies.

**PRIVACY**

WSU respects the privacy of users and does not routinely inspect or monitor use of computing and networking resources. However, WSU does not guarantee the security and privacy of any user’s electronic mail and/or electronic files. Electronic mail can easily be misdirected or forwarded to others. For these reasons, it is not advisable to send information in electronic mail that you would not want to be distributed to others.

WSU may access such electronic mail or files in a number of situations:

• **Requests for Public Disclosure.** All electronic records and all electronic mail messages are potentially public records subject to disclosure.

  The state’s Public Records Act (RCW 42.17) requires that electronic mail or files containing information relating to the conduct of WSU business is made available for public inspection and copying. If WSU receives a request for public disclosure of electronic mail or other electronic files, WSU staff will access electronic mail and files to determine whether such material must be disclosed under the law. If WSU’s public records officer determines that electronic mail and/or files are public records, such records will be provided to the individual who makes the public records request.

• **Retention of Electronic Mail.** Electronic mail is backed up and retained in accordance with record retention requirements of state law and WSU policy. See RCW 42.17, WSU BPPM 90.01. Additionally, users are advised that electronic messages and other files are not removed from their hard drives when erased by the individual. Material that continues to exist on a hard drive, or on another’s computer, also may be subject to disclosure.

• **Access During Routine System Maintenance.** Responsible system maintenance may require that files are backed up, data cached, activity logs kept, and overall system activity monitored. In the process of these activities, WSU staff may see an individual user’s electronic mail and files.
• **Access of Faculty Files.** When WSU or its employees have reason to believe that the electronic files or electronic mail on a faculty member’s computer include proprietary research or scholarship or client information, WSU or the authorized employee seeking or granting access shall reasonably attempt to obtain the faculty member’s permission prior to accessing those files for business purposes, absent unusual circumstances, such as investigation of misconduct of an employee by law enforcement.

• **Access for WSU Business.** WSU employees may access all electronic mail or files on another employee’s computer with that employee’s permission, or with a supervisor’s approval, when that employee is unavailable and access is for a legitimate business purpose. **However, in the interest of faculty collegiality, WSU or the authorized employee seeking access to the electronic files shall reasonably attempt to inform or seek approval of the faculty member whose files are being accessed for business purposes.** A supervisor may access electronic mail or files within his or her unit for legitimate business purposes without seeking approval. Supervisors who access electronic files or give permission to access individual files shall do so in a manner that is consistent with any research and/or confidentiality agreements which may apply to those files. **In the interest of faculty collegiality, individual units may develop unit protocols for sharing of and access to electronic files and mail.** Any access by a supervisor or co-worker for a legitimate business purpose shall be limited to that purpose and **must be consistent with other provisions of this policy.**

• **Access in investigation of misconduct.** A supervisor may only access electronic files to investigate an employee’s misconduct when the access is consistent with all legal requirements, including reasonableness under the circumstances. Such access may only be done with the approval of the appropriate dean or director and in a manner consistent with other provisions of this policy. If the person doing the search is dean/director-level or higher, that person must seek approval from the appropriate next-level administrator. This provision applies to monitoring of employee accounts when the monitoring is done because of suspected illegal activity or policy violations.

• **Monitoring of Accounts.** An account may be inspected or monitored when:
  * activity from an account prevents access to computing or networking resources by others;
  * general usage patterns indicate that an account is responsible for illegal activity;
  * there are reports of violations of policy or law;
  * it is necessary, in the judgment of WSU administration, to do so to protect WSU from liability;
  * WSU receives a public records request or a valid subpoena; or
  * it is required by, and consistent with, any other law.
User’s Responsibility for Maintaining Privacy

System users are responsible for maintaining appropriate access restrictions for their files, as well as protecting their passwords. An employee or student who knowingly allows another person to use his or her username or password may be found responsible for any inappropriate use on the part of that person.

SANCTIONS

Evidence of illegal activities or policy violations will be turned over to the appropriate authorities as soon as possible after detection. WSU-imposed sanctions for inappropriate use of WSU computer resources, information technologies, and networks will depend upon the nature of the abuse in question. Inappropriate use includes failure by supervisors or co-workers to adhere to provisions governing access to others’ electronic files in this policy. Such sanctions may include restrictions on access, suspension of the individual’s user account, or revocation of the individual’s user account. WSU-imposed sanctions may also include disciplinary measures, including expulsion from WSU and/or termination of employment. Any such disciplinary action will be taken in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Faculty Manual, the student code or personnel policy, including any collective bargaining agreement.

* * * * *

The following wording was added under Access for Business page 7:
However, in the interest of faculty collegiality WSU or the authorized employer seeking access to the files shall reasonably attempt to inform or seek approval of the faculty member prior to accessing files for business purposes.
The next sentence replaces sentence four of the same paragraph.
In the interest of faculty collegiality individual units are encouraged to develop unit protocols for sharing of and access to electronic files and data.

Motion carried.

8. Recommendation from Research and Arts Committee for Approval of a Position Statement on OMB Circular A-110 Exhibit F is as follows:

Research and Arts Committee

Position Statement on the proposed Revision to OMB Circular A-110
(Passed at the RAC meeting on March 25, 1999)
The Research and Arts Committee, in principle, endorses the need for open dissemination and sharing of research data and even regards it as crucial for maintaining the integrity of research. However, the Committee has deep concerns that the revision, as proposed, can have several serious adverse impacts on the conduct of research at Washington State University. In this regard, we share the concerns expressed by the Council of Government Relations (of which WSU is a member), in its letter to OMB of March 16, 1999 (copy attached). These concerns include:
(i) Negative impact on the quality of research caused by the pressure to release raw data prematurely
(ii) Confusion about what data, how much data and in what form to release
(iii) Prejudicing professional journals against publishing the research results that have prematurely been disclosed
(iv) Intellectual property rights and Fifth Amendment violations
(v) Reluctance of human subjects to participate in research, out of fear that their privacy may not be protected
(vi) Reluctance of industries to collaborate in research projects
(vii) Complexity and cost associated with the dissemination of all research raw data

Some of the above concerns have also been expressed by the National Institutes of Health, the National Sciences Board and the National Academy of Sciences, through their public statements. It has also been pointed out that the proposed revisions and their consequences have neither been studied nor debated adequately either by the scientific community or by the Congress.

Conclusion

The Committee while supporting the concept of open sharing of research data in the spirit of FOIA, has several serious concerns with the revisions as proposed currently by OMB. The Committee concurs with COGR in recommending that the above concerns and the implication of these revisions should be thoroughly studied by the scientific community, federal agencies sponsoring research, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Congress of the United States. OMB should defer rule making until such studies are conducted and necessary safeguards are incorporated to insure that a just and viable policy is put in place.

B.R. Ramaprian
Chair, Research and Arts Committee
March 25, 1999

COGR Response to OMB

March 16, 1999
Mr. F. James Charney
Policy Analyst
Office of Management and Budget
Room 6025
New Executive Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20503

Dear Mr. Charney:

This letter presents the comments of the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), an association that includes in its membership 144 research intensive universities in the United States. We are responding to the proposed revision to OMB Circular A-110,
published in the Federal Register on February 4, 1999. The proposed rulemaking reflects a statutory mandate for broad access by the general public to data created with federal support, with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) to serve as the implementing vehicle.

Commenting on this proposal is an extraordinarily complex task. Concerns about the possible consequences which could result from the statute as well as from OMB’s proposal for its implementation should not be misunderstood as opposition to the basic goal of sharing data with the public. The COGR member universities strongly endorse sharing of research data. However, in view of the many serious adverse impacts which could result from proceeding as proposed, we urge OMB to defer implementation of the proposed rules until a comprehensive assessment of the possible impact of this proposal has been made, involving the Congress, federal agencies and researchers, who are likely to be most seriously affected. This is the only way to forestall many dangerous, unintended consequences of using FOIA as a mechanism for sharing research data.

Endorsement of Data Sharing

Ironically, it is because of the strong commitment to sharing and dissemination of research results for the benefit of the general public, that the universities in our membership oppose this particular Congressional mandate as well as the proposed OMB rulemaking implementation. The generation and dissemination of new knowledge is one of the fundamental principles of academic institutions. The freedom to publish is strongly defended by universities every day in negotiations of research agreements. Closely tied to this is our obligation to protect the freedom to publish and share data on behalf of students whose education is enriched as they participate in research. These examples show that our member universities are committed to act as well as speak in the strongest terms to assure public accountability for research results irrespective of whether those results were obtained with federal or private support.

Concerns About the Broad Statutory Mandate

There is unanimous agreement in our membership, reflecting the convictions of scientists from a variety of different disciplines and their administrative support staff, that the statutory language is too broadly stated and that the use of FOIA procedures is not the right tool. Employing FOIA to access underlying research data will result in substantial changes to the conduct of research. These consequences were not explored when the statute was adopted and cannot be mitigated by the narrower proposed implementation as proposed by OMB. The deep concerns of the scientific community have been eloquently articulated in public statements by the National Science Board, the Academy of Sciences and others. We endorse their comments. Because indiscriminate and premature release of raw data is not an unqualified public benefit, we anticipate problems will result in three areas: negative impact on scientific research, serious loss of protection of individual privacy, and noticeable decreases in public-private partnerships in research. Each of these points is further elaborated below.
a) Impact on Scientific Research - Scientists cannot be expected to work on the controversial issues which are important to society without the ability to protect their raw data throughout all stages required for proper evaluation and peer review. The early forced release of raw data may result in external pressures which would place the very integrity of scientific research at risk; permit misrepresentations which mislead the public; result in premature reactions which could create public health and safety hazards; disrupt the continuity of federal agency research mission; and unfairly attack the reputation of individuals involved in research and thereby discourage scientists from continuing cutting-edge research.

The OMB proposal, which is based on access by the public only to data from published studies, which have been used for agency purposes of policy or rulemaking, offers only limited reassurance. Too many questions remain unanswered, including fundamental issues like: When do data have to be released? What constitutes publication? How would data archives be affected? How much related information would have to be released in order to make the requested data understandable? How are currently differing definitions of data to be reconciled? What would be the guiding principles for such revision?

In addition, legal questions regarding ownership of data arise. OMB has been directed to turn over privately held data, created with federal assistance - but not in form of federal procurement - to the total discretion and disposition of federal agencies. At a substantive level, this charge to OMB may be interpreted as an unfair taking of intellectual property, in violation of the Fifth Amendment.

Data are building blocks for innovation. In passing the Bayh-Dole Act, Congress realized the value of research and placed the producer of the research results in control over their disposition with respect to their reasonable release and future use by the public. The Act protects against premature release of data, which would undercut that purpose. Unless this conflict between Congressional policy regarding technology transfer and policy regarding data dissemination is resolved, the resulting uncertainty and loss of protection might well persuade scientists to avoid federal funding for certain kinds of cutting edge research. The federal agencies’ research mission would clearly suffer from such developments.

b) Impact on the participants in research - The statute raises grave concerns regarding the privacy rights of US citizens. The rights to personal privacy clash with the rights to public access. Research subjects will be discouraged from joining clinical trials and research protocols because of the legitimate fear that their personal data may not be adequately protected, even if exemptions under FOIA were invoked. The current trust between federal agencies and individual citizens participating in federally funded research studies will be fatally damaged if promises of confidentiality were abrogated.
We are also concerned about the negative impact on the continuity of medical research studies. The turning over of data in human subjects’ studies, for which universities have promised confidentiality, constitutes a devastating breach of good faith with research subjects, collaborators, and private sector partners. The National Institutes of Health, with its vast array of clinical trials and wide range of studies in human diseases involving human subjects, has addressed the complications arising from the legislation. We share NIH’s concern that, if the new legislation is allowed to stand, the privacy of human subjects is not assured.

FOIA exemptions protect individuals, in cases where release of personal data might constitute a violation of privacy. However this protection does not extend to groups, communities and institutions. We believe that all participants in medical research must be protected not only for the sake of their personal privacy, but also because their participation makes medical progress possible and thereby serves an important public purpose. Alternate ways need to be found to allow interested parties to examine data underlying published research reports, without loosening the protections of the research participants without whom the studies could not be carried out.

c) Loss of collaborative partnerships - A major victim of unintended consequences may be the current collaboration between universities and its many partners in research. These include not only private industry, but also a variety of Foundations, charitable organizations and voluntary health groups. The States have invested increasing resources in university research, much of which is co-mingled with federal sources, or expressly leveraged in new Federal-Industry joint programs.

During the past decade, federal policy has changed to involve public-private cooperation. Examples include the Engineering Research Centers, consortia, Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) and Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) initiatives. Private parties will not agree to cooperate with public institutions if this means that the data they bring to the cooperative effort, or the data that results from that effort, can be subject to arbitrary and premature release. The likely loss of intellectual property protection is a severe drawback and if the statute were allowed to stand, would substantially undercut existing federal policy.

We believe that adverse consequences in all these areas are inevitable. The community has neither reliable studies nor practical experience to assure that, if applied in this expanded manner, the exemptions of FOIA would provide sufficient protection for its legitimate concerns. Finally, there is no reassurance that the more narrowly focused OMB implementation would survive a legal challenge on grounds that it is not sufficiently responsive to statutory intent.

**Consideration of FOIA**

The academic community’s assessment of the effectiveness of FOIA is based on the Act’s current purpose and scope, which is limited to providing access to federal “agency
records.” It seems unlikely that prospective use of FOIA as a vehicle for dissemination of raw research data could be accomplished without a fundamental restatement of purpose and restructuring of its provisions.

Since the FOIA law and exemptions were not crafted with the intent to cover university research data, in the possession of university grantees, an untested application of the current Act would be a risky undertaking. It will create enormous uncertainty regarding the relevance and applicability of the exemptions. More importantly yet, it will place the grantee universities completely at the mercy of agency interpretations after the raw data are transmitted.

The need to review the nature of the exemptions is reinforced when one considers the wide range of items currently referred to as data. The more traditional forms include writings in notebooks, in medical records, computer drawings, and records of interviews, printouts from machines, photographs, films or slides. In addition however, there is computer code and there are databases and videotapes of family studies. There is software and in the biological sciences, a variety of cells, biological materials and chemical compounds. NIH and scientists have repeatedly failed to arrive at a comprehensive, mutually satisfactory definition of data. Even if the definitional issues were resolved, how are these types of data to be treated by the existing categories of exemption? To what extent is explanatory documentation to be provided with the data?

Equally worrisome challenge faces the federal agencies: Questions will have to be answered regarding how much data would have to be requested from the principal investigator? From collaborating parties? Would interim results to be included? Data not in tangible form but disseminated at public meetings? Data on which grant applications are based? Data referred to in progress reports to the government? Which of these data would be protectable and with which justification?

Another element of uncertainty is added because the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Foresham v. Harris, will no longer govern. It had determined that data generated by federally funded grantees are not “agency records” and therefore not subject to FOIA disclosure. The true impact of the new expanded application of FOIA, mandated by the legislation, will emerge slowly, as case law builds up, testing the strength of the exemptions with regard to disclosure of scientific data. In addition, we have little confidence that OMB’s proposal to limit disclosure to “published” data will withstand legal challenges under FOIA. A 1996 D.C. Circuit Court decision held that data could not be withheld until after publication had occurred. (87 F.3d 508, 521).

The Scope and Cost of Compliance

The attempt by OMB to focus these releases to data from published research used in developing policy or rules in turn raises questions. In a long-term study, there may be no logical boundaries for data release. What data are reasonably considered related to publication: all data, related to developing the hypothesis, or only those supporting the experiment?
The cost of compliance cannot be assessed until questions regarding the nature of data and agency responsibility have been settled. In the long run, the greatest expense may not be the duplication of data, nor the evaluation process that precedes decisions regarding the appropriateness of release, but the impact on the willingness of scientists to subject their data to such controls.

Alternatives

We conclude that if sharing is not conducted in an appropriately structured manner, substantial adverse consequences for research could result. These consequences were not fully considered during the adoption of P.L. 105-277 because the legislation was not subjected to the usual deliberative legislative process. The need for such careful deliberation had been recognized in a prior version of the legislation, which contained a mandate for a one-year study of the implications of the amendment as proposed. We agree with Senator Shelby, the main proponent of the legislation that such a study is needed. Therefore, OMB should defer rulemaking until the results of such a study are available. The National Academy of Sciences would be well equipped to undertake this assessment. By structuring it to involve the entire scientific community, especially as represented by scientific societies and their many disciplines and their traditional differences, the study would enable a thorough debate about the best way of sharing information with the public, to the satisfaction of both providers and recipients of scientific results.

In addition, we urge that OMB support an administration request for hearings on P.L. 105-277 so that Congress can learn first hand about the grave concerns in the academic community. We also urge that the federal agencies and the Office of Science and Technology Policy be involved in the assessment. As supporters of research in a variety of academic disciplines, they combine an intellectual overview and a public service perspective that is essential to help shape policy for access to and dissemination of data developed with federal support.

In Conclusion

We appreciate the efforts of OMB to be sensitive to the needs of sound scientific research policy as it struggles to try to find ways to implement this complex and significant legislative mandate. Nevertheless, as the foregoing discussion shows, COGR’s membership concludes that, although well intended, implementation of the legislation cannot be structured to protect the public’s interest in sound scientific research. We therefore strongly urge that the current regulatory process be redirected, in order to allow members of the scientific community, the federal agencies and the Congress an opportunity to develop alternative proposals to achieve the mutually desired public policy goal.

We thank you for this opportunity to express our comments.

* * * * *
Motion carried.

Agenda Items (Discussion Items.)

1. Recommendation from Faculty Affairs Committee for A Resolution on the Retirement Plan (Exhibit G).—W. Leid

   B. Johnston, Director of Benefit Services pointed out that 100% Cashability is based upon the rules of the fund sponsor and the funding vehicles. He stated if 100% of the money was in TIAA it allows you only to withdraw 10% a year. So if a faculty member wished to cash out all funds upon retirement they would have to move 10% a year over 10 years into CREF. This proposal has the support of the administration.

2. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for Revision to Rule 109 Petitions (Exhibit H).—K. Struckmeyer

   Brown asked “Whose signatures would be appropriate for this form?” It was noted the chair’s and dean’s were still required. Greenberg asked “Why take out chair and dean and add appropriate then?” Bitter stated “They would go back to the original wording about signatures on the form.” It was suggested to add the title director after chairperson.

3. Recommendation from Academic Affairs for Revision to Rule 104 and New Rule 57 (Exhibit I).—K. Struckmeyer

   On rule 57 why allow 2 years time limit? Bitter stated “That as it stands now there is no time limit.” For EDP students it is possible that the two year limit would be reasonable. In the revision to Rule 104 the first underlined sentence that starts “if not resolved” it sounds like the if refers to the student and not the complaint and a better word than resolved could be used. An objection was raised to charging student fees to file a petition. Bitter stated “There are costs involved in filing petitions. Petition fees would help cut down on petitions that are not very thoughtful.” It was suggested that the deadlines be specified in an addendum to the rule as a clarification. The last sentence in rule 104 is not clear as to who would solve a problem at a branch campus.

4. Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for Core Course Requirements for Doctoral Programs (Exhibit J).—R. Rosenman

   This change would allow programs to petition through the Graduate Studies Committee and the Faculty Senate to reduce the graded course requirements and replace them with research requirements. It was asked if this was done elsewhere. Rosenman stated “It is and in the case of Biological Sciences WSU is at a competitive disadvantage.” It was suggested that there be a minimum number of core course credits. Rosenman stated “Students will still need the same number of credits to get a PhD they are not changing that number.”

5. Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for Receipt and Submission of Digital Dissertations (Exhibit K).—R. Rosenman
What format will this be accepted in? Rosenman stated “He believes it is Adobe pdf files.” Concern was expressed that there be a paper copy maintained in the archives. On the last page it talks about 4 versions who pays for them? Does it comes out of the graduation fee? Burke stated “He sat on a committee with an electronic version with slides, video, audio and it added a great deal of help in seeing and understanding what was being done.” Burke stated “It is a great idea but there is a problem with obsolescence of the media.” There was confusion over whether there was to be both printed and electronic copies and people felt it was not stated clearly. There needs to be a clear cut system for archiving in the library.

6. Recommendation from Parking and Traffic Committee for a New Parking Fee Structure (Exhibit L).—J. Shaheen

Shaheen went through a handout he distributed to senators which showed where the revenue comes from and how it is distributed. He also discussed the new Teaching and Learning Center garage and the revenue it will generate. Why are the orange permits going up so much more then the others? The Parking and Traffic Committee felt that the value of parking in the garage was that much higher then parking in a surface lot. Do people with disability parking pay the same for structure parking? Shaheen stated “They are only charged the blue permit rate.”

Constituents' Concerns.

There were no constituents’ concerns.

Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 5:50.

Thomas Brigham
Executive Secretary