

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

April 6, 1987

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order on Monday, April 6, 1987, at 4:00 p.m., with President Callahan presiding.

Senators not in attendance were: David Ames, Lee Anderson, Norman Brown, R. Byron Pipes, David Saunders

Senators excused were: H. Perry Chapman, Frank Dilley, Helen Gouldner, Robert Hampel, Betty Haslett, Thomas Leitch, John Morgan, Richard Murray, Mark Noll, Wallace Pill, Stuart Sharkey, James R. Soles, Carolyn Thoroughgood, E. Arthur Trabant, Peter Warter, John Weiss, L. Craig Wilson

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved as distributed.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved as distributed.

III. REMARKS BY PRESIDENT TRABANT AND/OR PROVOST CAMPBELL

There were no remarks by either President Trabant or Provost Campbell.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate President Callahan made two announcements:

1. President-elect Russel Jones will speak at the April 20 General Faculty Meeting in Room 120 Smith.
2. New senators will be seated at the May 4 Faculty Senate Meeting.

V. OLD BUSINESS

Item A was a resolution from the Committee on Committees (A. DeHaven, Chairperson) altering the charge of the Committee on Budget Review. The following resolution was unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the charge to the Committee on Budget Review as it appears in Section III, page I-16, paragraph 2, of the Faculty Handbook be changed to read:

This committee shall consist of five members of the faculty, the majority of whom must be tenured. The Committee on Committees shall appoint the members to five-year terms, staggering the initial appointments such that

one member's term will expire each year. From this group the Committee on Committees shall annually select a chairperson. Two additional members of this committee shall be appointed by the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

Item B was the following resolution, introduced by Senator Mark Noll (Graduate Student) at the March Senate meeting, on revision of the plus/minus system.

RESOLVED, the current plus/minus grading system should be revised to a plus system only.

Grading under the proposed system would be as follows:

Letter Grade	Quality Points
A	4.0
B+	3.5
B	3.0
C+	2.5
C	2.0
D+	1.5
D	1.0
F	0.0

The distributed agenda included the following rationale for the resolution:

This system will allow faculty the greater latitude in grading which is desired while eliminating most of the serious conflicts. An average grade of 2.0 would remain as the minimum required for graduation at the undergraduate level and 3.0 at the graduate level.

It is the intention of this system to equitably distribute grades while eliminating grade inflation. Using the example cited on page 37 of the Report of the President's Commission on Undergraduate Education, Final Report of the Subcommittee on the Undergraduate Academic Program, (Attachment 1) those students with averages of 77, 78, 79 will, under the proposed system, receive a grade of C+ whereas previously they may equally have received a grade of C or B. This rewards them for somewhat better than average performance, yet doesn't inflate their grade and preserves the integrity of the system.

Senator Leo Taske, speaking for Senator Noll, elaborated on the above points. He ended his comments by indicating that the undergraduate and graduate senators continue to bring issues regarding the plus/minus grading system to the Senate because of student concerns.

President Callahan recognized Charles Marler, Chairperson of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. Professor Marler quoted three items from the recent Washington State report. These included (a) except for a "small group of superior scholars," the students are pleased with the system; (b) the plus/minus system allows "grading flexibility;" and (c) faculty "who favor plus/minus grading

may award the symbols ... and those who oppose such specificity will never be forced to use (+) (-) marks." He concluded, "The plus/minus suggestions made to you in May of 1985 properly should remain the agenda of the Senate."

The discussion following Professor Marler's presentation raised the following concerns: the proposal for plus grades only could be grade inflationary; the original purpose for suggesting the plus/minus system was to provide more latitude in grading graduate students (five grades instead of the current two); the resolution reduces the latitude to three grades; and the proposal does not correct any potential abuse of the plus/minus system that might occur.

Senator Edward Schweizer proposed the following amendment:

"RESOLVED, that the plus/minus grading system voted into being in May 1985 be applied only to the graduate program."

President Callahan ruled that the amendment was substantive and would need to be proposed at a later time.

Senator Schweizer and Senator David Bellamy attempted to explain their thinking on the amendment. President Callahan restated that the amendment was a substitute motion and should be presented later.

Senator Bellamy proposed an amendment:

"RESOLVED, the current plus/minus grading system should be revised for the undergraduate program to a plus system only."

The point stressed by Professors Bellamy and Schweizer was that the system proposed in May 1985 is better for graduate students than the current resolution as presented by Senator Noll.

The question on Senator Bellamy's amendment was called and the amendment carried 23 to 18, with 4 abstentions.

The discussion returned to the resolution. Senator David Ermann noted that if the resolution is passed there will be two systems for grading--one for graduate courses and one for undergraduate courses.

After further discussion, the resolution was defeated 38 to 5 with 3 abstentions.

Item C was a resolution, introduced by Senator Annette Burton (Undergraduate Student), for a trial period of the plus/minus system. After a brief discussion, the following resolution was approved, 43 to 2 with 3 abstentions:

WHEREAS: The University will be implementing a new grading system in the near future, be it

RESOLVED: That this new grading system be implemented for a trial period of four years. At the end of the four years, this system will be evaluated to determine its effects on the University. At this time the system will either be modified, continued or eliminated.

Item D was a recommendation from the Committee on Student Life (J. Beer, Chairperson) to change the automatic "F" sanction for academic dishonesty in courses carrying five or more credits. [This recommendation was originally on the March agenda, discussed and returned to committee.] The resolution follows:

WHEREAS, the current minimum mandatory sanctions for academic dishonesty include, "A guilty finding for academic dishonesty will result in the student receiving an 'F' in the course in which the offense occurred"; and

WHEREAS, this represents a particular inequity when courses carrying five or more credits are involved; and

WHEREAS, most of these large credit courses are sequential in nature so that an "F" can substantially retard a student's progress toward graduation, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the sanction for academic dishonesty in any course carrying five or more credits be changed to allow the judicial hearing officer to impose a lesser sanction that might not automatically include an "F" for the entire course.

Any sanction less than an "F" in the course must be justified in writing to the Council on Student Judicial Affairs. The justification would become part of a cumulating record of such exceptions to be used as precedents for rulings in analogous cases which may arise in the future.

All other sanctions (listed in the Student Guide to Policies, page 9, paragraphs K. 2. through K. 6.) would apply in these cases.

Under this resolution the Student Guide to Policies section on "Academic Dishonesty Sanctions" (K. 1., page 9) would read:

"A guilty finding for academic dishonesty will result in the student receiving an "F" in the course in which the offense occurred. In courses carrying five or more credits the judicial hearing officer may impose a lesser sanction that might not automatically include an "F" for the entire course."

Professor John Beer explained that at the March Senate meeting the Committee on Student Life was directed to consider whether or not a judicial hearing officer could impose a lesser sanction than an automatic "F" for an entire course regardless of the number of credit hours that course had and to provide specific information on the number of courses on campus that carry five or more credits and on the circumstances which resulted in some courses having to carry up to ten credits.

According to Professor Beer, "The Records Office provided a list of all the courses which could carry five or more credit hours. ...There are 1485 such courses, ranging from five to twelve hours. Most departments have several such courses.... The six cases of academic dishonesty which [resulted in] the resolution ... involved students in the Nursing 305, Determinants of Wellness."

Dean Edith Anderson explained why it is necessary for the College of Nursing to offer ten credit courses and the problem which resulted in the resolution. She indicated that "on two occasions [the College has] used the judicial system and found that the penalty far exceeded that of the usual situation in which a student who has an 'F' in a three credit course can simply repeat the course. Our courses are built upon one another so that a ten credit 'F' course means not only a disaster to your grade point average, but it also means you are dropped out of the College of Nursing for one year."

The discussion included suggestions that all persons convicted of academic dishonesty should receive at least three credits of "F"; that the grading system is being corrupted by connecting it with academic dishonesty--an "F" should mean that the student doesn't know the subject matter; that the transcript of a student charged with academic dishonesty include a note, "Student was found guilty of academic dishonesty in this course at this time" (quote from Dean Frank Murray); that if the above note suggestion was adopted, a means of removing the note must be specified; and that there is no inequitableness in the system--if you cheat, you earn the benefit of your dishonesty. A question regarding whether or not the student earns an "F" for the entire course or some credits received the response that there was no way to divide the ten credits, so it is a ten credit "F." A second question asked for clarification of what sanctions were possible. Dean Brooks responded that, "The typical sanction now in an academic dishonesty case is the 'FX,' plus deferred suspension for first offense. For a second offense, it's either suspension or expulsion."

Senator Robert Dalrymple proposed the following amendment:

"In courses carrying five or more credits, the judicial hearing officer may impose a less sanction which includes three credits or more of 'F'."

The amendment failed for lack of a second.

The question was called. The original resolution was defeated 29 to 13 with 1 abstention.

VI. New Business

Item A was a recommendation from the Committee on Undergraduate Studies (C. Marler, Chairperson) on an extended drop period for first semester freshmen.

Professor Burnaby Munson elaborated on the rationale for the resolution for the Committee on Undergraduate Studies. The goal of the resolution is, "To have the drop period extended to that point where the students [would] have received some indication of their performance." In response to a question, Professor Munson noted that the passage of the resolution would permit first semester freshmen to drop a course after eight weeks without academic penalty but is not extending the two-week free drop/add period. Dean Peter Rees questioned the definition of first semester freshmen. Chairperson Marler indicated that the language in the resolution was used at the request of Mr. Joseph DiMartile, University Registrar.

Senator Schweizer proposed an amendment, substituting "students" for "first semester freshmen" in the resolution. Comments from Chairperson Marler and Provost Leon Campbell indicated that approval of this amendment would encourage course shopping. Senator Bellamy indicated that he did not believe course shopping would be a problem because of the surcharge for taking in excess of 16 credits. The amendment was voted upon and failed, 39 to 6.

The following resolution was approved 46 to 1 with 1 abstention:

WHEREAS: Freshmen do not receive comprehensive grades until the semester's seventh week; and

WHEREAS: Freshmen often have not learned quickly to match their abilities and/or interests with the multiple possibilities offered by a major university; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That first semester freshmen shall be allowed to drop courses without academic penalty for the first eight weeks of the semester. (Any changes in registration after the eighth week will demand the approval of the dean;) further be it

RESOLVED: That this policy shall go into effect as of September 1, 1987.

Item B was a recommendation from the Committee on Student Life (J. Beer, Chairperson) for revision of the University policy on excused absences for religious holidays. (A copy of the present policy is at Attachment 2.)

The recommendation came to the Committee on Student Life from the Hillel Foundation. Senator David Ermann and Professor Norman Schwartz noted that it is difficult to inform students who are not members of Hillel that they must alert their professors in writing during the first two weeks of each semester that they will not be attending class on a particular religious holiday and that this recommendation applies only to those religious holidays listed on the University calendar. The following resolution was then approved, 41 to 1 with 6 abstentions:

WHEREAS, faculty are told dates of certain excused religious absences in all University calendars and also in an annual memorandum from the Provost, and therefore do not need to be individually informed of these holidays and dates by their students, and

WHEREAS, incoming freshmen cannot be practically informed in a timely manner of the current requirement for written notification, particularly for religious holidays coming early in the school year, and

WHEREAS, commuters and other students who are unaffiliated with campus religious organizations do not receive guidance on this matter from those organizations, and accordingly may not know of the current absence policy, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the policy on students informing faculty of absences for religious holidays (Student Guide to Policies, "Student Class Attendance," page 30) shall be changed to create separate rules for (a) religious holidays listed in University calendars [religious holidays currently listed on University calendars are Rosh Hashona, Yom Kippur, Good Friday, and Passover] and (b), (c), (d) for other excused absences. The proposal would alter the University policy on "Student Class Attendance" as follows:

- a. Absence on religious holidays listed in University calendars is recognized as an excused absence. Nevertheless, students are urged to remind the instructor of their intention to be absent on a particular upcoming holiday.
- b. Absences on religious holidays not listed in University calendars, as well as absences due to athletic participation or other extracurricular activities in which students are official representatives of the University, shall be recognized as excused absences when the student informs the instructor in writing during the first two weeks of the semester of these planned absences for the semester. Absences due to similar events which could not have been anticipated earlier in the semester will be recognized as excused absences upon advance notification of the instructor by an appropriate faculty adviser or athletic coach.
- c. Absences due to illness requiring medical attention and serious illness or death within a student's family shall also be recognized as excused absences. The student shall see that the instructor is notified as soon as possible. The instructor may require the student to present evidence such as a note from a doctor, to substantiate his or her excuse.
- d. Students are not to be penalized if absent from an examination, lecture, laboratory, or other activity because of an excused absence. However, students are fully responsible for all material presented during their absence and faculty are encouraged to provide

opportunities, when feasible, for students to make up examinations and other work missed because of an excused absence.

Item C was a recommendation from the Committee on Physical Planning and Utilization (K. Lomax, Chairperson) for a University smoking-area policy. Prior to voting on the resolution, Chairperson Lomax provided background information which described the development of the resolution. He briefly reviewed the proposed smoking policy and then introduced Crystal Hayman, Coordinator of the Employee Assistance and Wellness Programs.

Crystal Hayman noted that the Professional Advisory Council voted for a total ban on smoking and the Salaried Staff Advisory Council seemed to support the resolution. She added concern for where people could smoke. Senator Harry Hutchinson agreed, noting that Part A of the policy identifies where smoking is prohibited and Part B says, "Spaces may be made available." He later proposed an amendment, changing the "mays" to "shall" under Part B. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. After objection to the use of shall in B. 4. and B. 5., Senator Hutchinson accepted a revision of his amendment: the may in B. 1, 2, and 3 would become shall. Ms. Hayman spoke against the amendment, suggesting individual unit managers should have discretion to designate portions of their space for smoking. Senator Boorse suggested that he believed that B. 4. should read, "Individuals may designate their offices as smoking areas as long as the provisions of B. 3. are met." According to Senator Boorse, without this change whether or not a faculty member can smoke in his/her office is dependent on the decision of his/her supervisor.

The amendment to change may to shall in Part III, Item B., paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 was voted upon and defeated, 31 to 11, with 1 abstention.

Then the following resolution was voted upon and approved 33 to 9, with 2 abstentions. Chairperson K. Lomax noted that this policy would be presented to the Board of Trustees.

WHEREAS, there is increasing awareness and concern about the detrimental impact of smoke to the health of non-smokers; and

WHEREAS, a total ban on smoking in University facilities is not presently acceptable; be it

RESOLVED, that a smoking-area policy, as in attachment 3, be implemented to specify the locations, areas, and identification procedures for such smoking areas. Non-smoking and smoking areas both are to have appropriate signs.

Item D was a recommendation from the Committee on Research (P. Weil, Chairperson) for an addition to the Faculty Handbook on adoption of policy and procedures on research fraud.

Professor Sherry Kitto, speaking to the committee's resolution, defined the purpose of the resolution as, "To outline the guidelines for inquiry in cases of suspected research fraud before initiation of a formal investigation." Dr. Robert Varrin, Associate Provost for Research, noted that the key words in the guidelines are inquiry, suspected research fraud, and formal investigation.

Dean Eric Brucker identified an error in the guidelines: the last paragraph (III. 5.) should read (and now does), "If the Provost determines an investigation...." Senator Dalrymple questioned how these guidelines are applied in the case of plagiarism. Dr. Varrin responded that the "Minute it's determined to be plagiarism, then it's into the investigation mode." He further noted that the person who perceives the plagiarism has the right to proceed to the next step if he is displeased with the decision.

Following this discussion, the following resolution was approved, 42 to 0, with 3 abstentions:

WHEREAS, all research institutions receiving funding for research as designated by the Federal Health Extension Act of 1985 must prepare and follow written policies and procedures in conformity with guidelines promulgated pursuant to that Act by the National Institutes of Health; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Research Committee, working in collaboration with the University Office of Research and Patents, has developed written policies and inquiry procedures to ensure due process prior to a formal investigation of alleged research fraud; and

WHEREAS, the Research Committee has further modified those policies and procedures as a result of testimony presented by members of the University community in an open hearing held Thursday, March 12, 1987, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approve the policy and procedures on research fraud (see Attachment 4) for inclusion in Section II, page II-8 of the University Faculty Handbook. Such inclusion is subject to further approval by the University Board of Trustees.

Item E was such items as may come before the Senate. Dean Frank Murray proposed the following motion to revise Section K.1., page 9 of the Student Guide to Policies to read, "A guilty finding for academic dishonesty will result in the following statement on the student's transcript:

"Found guilty of academic dishonesty on (date) in (course number) and (title).

"The grade the student receives in the course will be determined by the instructor. The statement may be removed on petition to the Council on Student Judiciary Affairs when the Council, in its judgment, so orders."

President Callahan called for and received a motion to adjourn at 5:30 p.m.

Dutifully submitted,

Carol Vukelich

Carol Vukelich
Secretary
University Faculty Senate

CV:rg

Attachments:

1. Final Report of the Subcommittee on the Undergraduate Academic Program, Page 37
2. Student Guide to Policies, "Student Class Attendance," Page 30
3. Smoking Policy
4. Policy and Procedures on Research Fraud