MINUTES
Faculty-Staff Council
California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo
Meeting No. 2
October 25, 1966

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Anderson at 3:15 p.m.


READING OF MINUTES

MSP -- Minutes of the September 27 and October 4 meetings of the Faculty-Staff Council and Faculty Sub-Council of the Faculty-Staff Council respectively be accepted as mimeographed.

BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Consultative Procedures (Attachment to October 25 Agenda) -- Robert Frost, Chairman

   MSP -- That the Guidelines for Consultative Procedures be adopted by the Faculty-Staff Council as a guide for evaluating the procedures of the Council and procedures which may be recommended to the council to carry out the consultative process and that the Faculty-Staff Council recommend these Guidelines to the administrative officers, faculty, and staff of the college for use in all areas of the college as a means for most effectively solving problems of mutual concern and promoting harmonious relationships.

   MSP -- Amendment to guidelines: Add the following underlined words to the first sentence under item 1 -- All who are concerned about an important issue should be provided with the opportunity to discuss it in open meetings, with the possible exception of the discussion of personnel matters.

   A call was made on the original motion -- Passed.

2. Report of Curriculum and Instruction Committee regarding General Education as this Relates to Junior Colleges. -- Rodney Keif, Chairman

   MSP -- That the Faculty-Staff Council adopt as its official position on this matter the recommendations made in this proposal. (Attachment)
MSP -- Amendment to recommendation: VI. A. be amended as follows:

A. Certification by the JC on the transcript of completed G. E. courses shall be binding on the State College up to 31 basic units. Distribution and acceptance of the 14 supportive units shall remain the prerogative of the State College.

MSP -- Amendment to main motion: The Faculty-Staff Council recommends that Dr. Andrews vigorously oppose the October proposal. Add A. of II. to VI. The Recommendation.

A call was made on the original motion -- Passed.

3. Report of Personnel Committee (Academic) -- The Consultative Procedure for Appointments to Deans of Instructional Divisions (School) -- Corwin Johnson, Chairman (Attachment)

MS -- The Personnel Committee (Academic) moves that this proposal be recommended as a procedure for the appointment to Deans (Instruction) to Vice President Andrews.

MS -- Amendment -- Item 4, d., Second sentence read: In this election each member of a division will vote for one to five of the candidates from his division.

Motion withdrawn.

MS -- Amendment -- Item 4, d., Second sentence read: In this election each member of a division will vote for not more than five of the candidates from his division.

MSP -- This item be tabled until the next meeting.

DISCUSSION

1. No formal presentation has been received from the ASI for representation on the Faculty-Staff Council and committees.

2. Dr. Hyer, Academic Senator, reviewed the October meeting of the Academic Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Mr. Gary Whitney, a Cal Poly student, and co-chairman of the student committee in charge of working out an evaluation procedure for the faculty, spoke to the Faculty-Staff Council on the basic concepts of the faculty evaluation booklet to be published by the ASI. They hope to accomplish two main goals:
   1.) to provide the instructor with a positive feedback device through which he can improve his teaching.
   2.) guide for students to know most effective instructors to best fulfill their own academic objectives.
   The main decision of the committee now is whether to evaluate every instructor or only those who desire to be evaluated. At the present time the opinion of the student committee is that the evaluation should cover all instructors.

2. Next regular meeting of the Faculty-Staff Council -- Tuesday, November 8, 1966, Staff Dining Room - 3:15 p.m.
TO: Faculty-Staff Council

FROM: Curriculum and Instruction Committee:
R. Frost, D. Grant, G. Ikenoyama, J. Langford, H. Rhoads,
and R. Keif, Chairman

SUBJECT: Transfer of Junior College General Education Courses

I. THE ASSIGNMENT

Dr. Dale Andrews, as Cal Poly's Chief Instructional Officer, asked the
Faculty-Staff Council to react to two proposals, dated July, 1966 and
October, 1966, by a Committee on General Education appointed by the
Chancellor's Office. The proposals concern the transfer of General
Education credits from the Junior Colleges to the State Colleges and
the University of California.

II. THE RESULTS

After studying the proposals in terms of their effects on Cal Poly's
operations, aims, and objectives, the committee feels that:

A. The October proposal places serious limitations on Cal Poly's
prerogative to tailor the General Education courses to support
its philosophy. The Faculty-Staff Council is urged to recommend
that Dr. Andrews vigorously oppose the proposal's adoption.

B. The July proposal should be modified as mentioned below before
being considered acceptable. The Faculty-Staff Council is urged
to offer these modifications as necessary additions to the proposal
before its support be considered by Dr. Andrews.

III. THE PROBLEMS

A recent staff report to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education
identified the following problems in the transfer of Junior College
students to the State Colleges or the University of California:

A. Enrollment limitations on some state college campuses have forced
some students to attend a campus of their second choice, which
may have a different articulation agreement with their Junior
College than does the campus of their first choice.

B. Variations in programs and differences in emphasis of the General
Education requirements from campus to campus result in courses
being accepted for full credit at some schools, but partial credit
at others, or for General Education credit at some, but elective
credit at others. (See attachments 1 and 2).

C. Although a course may satisfy the General Education requirements of
a particular State College curriculum, it may not satisfy the pre-
requisite requirements for advanced work in that curriculum.

D. The rapidly increasing number of Junior Colleges and State Colleges
makes the development and updating of articulation agreements and
the counselling of students increasingly difficult.
Recent enrollment trends at Cal Poly reveal that one-half of first-time students are transfers, of which two-thirds come from the California Junior Colleges. At our present size, this represents almost 900 JC transfer students. The other one-third of transfers come from other State Colleges and from out-of-state.

(Parts IV and V available from Rod Keif, AC and R.)

VI. THE RECOMMENDATION

The committee strongly feels the following changes and clarifications must be made before the July proposal can be accepted.

A. Certification by the JC on the transcript of completed G.E. courses shall be binding on the State College only for part-of-all-of-the up to 31 basic units. Distribution and acceptance of the 14 supportive units shall remain the prerogative of the State College.

B. Acceptance of courses for G.E. purposes shall not prevent the State College from requiring suitable prerequisites for work in the student's chosen curriculum. (For example, although a transfer student to Engineering may have completed a physics course comparable to Physics 121, which satisfies the G.E. list, the student shall be required to take Physics 131 as a prerequisite for advanced work in an Engineering curriculum).

C. The JC student must plan his program so that he takes G.E. courses which will also serve, where necessary, as prerequisites for required courses in his State College major.

D. The October proposal places serious limitations on Cal Poly's prerogative to tailor the General Education courses to support its philosophy. The Faculty-Staff Council is urged to recommend that Dr. Andrews vigorously oppose the proposal's adoption.
THE CONSULTATIVE PROCEDURE FOR APPOINTMENTS TO
DEANS OF INSTRUCTIONAL DIVISIONS (SCHOOL)

1. When a vacancy occurs in a Dean position the President (chief administrative officer) will make a formal announcement of the vacancy and will follow the usual personnel practices in giving notice of professional position openings.

2. The President (chief administrative officer) will seek the informal advice and counsel of deans, administrative officers, individual faculty members, his staff and others on potential candidates.

3. The President (chief administrative officer) will send a notice of the position vacancy to the chairman of the Faculty-Staff Council.

4. Upon receipt of the notice of the position vacancy the chairman of the Faculty-Staff Council will initiate the formation of a consultative committee using the following procedure:

   a. The committee will be composed of tenured members - not more than 5 voting members from the division where the vacancy occurs and one non-voting member from each of the other instructional divisions.

   b. Each department in the division where the vacancy occurs will nominate not more than two candidates for the consultative committee and forward these names to the chairman of the elections committee of the Faculty-Staff Council.

   c. Each department in the other instructional divisions will nominate one candidate for the consultative committee and forward these names to the chairman of the elections committee of the Faculty-Staff Council.

   d. The elections committee of the Faculty-Staff Council will conduct an election in each of the instructional divisions. In this election each member of a division will vote for one of the candidates from his division. The five candidates receiving the most votes in the division where the vacancy occurs and the candidate with the most votes in each of the other instructional divisions will be the members of the consultative committee except that there will be no more than one member of the committee from any one department.

5. The President (chief administrative officer) or his designee will receive all applications and develop a list of acceptable candidates. This list will be forwarded to the consultative committee along with the full information available on each candidates educational and professional qualifications.

6. No appointments to Instructional Dean positions will be made except from such lists.

7. The President (chief administrative officer) or his designee will meet with the consultative committee in order to hear their advice on each candidate.
8. Every effort must be made to reduce the list of candidates to those who are mutually acceptable and it is not anticipated that a candidate will be considered for appointment unless he is deemed acceptable to the consultative committee; however, the final responsibility is given to the President (chief administrative officer) in Title 5 of the Administration Code, Section 42702, paragraph f.

9. The Committee will be free to report their deliberation to the Faculty-Staff Council in a manner appropriate to the handling of professional personnel matters.
TO: Dr. Roy E. Anderson, Chairman
Faculty-Staff Council

FROM: Ad Hoc Committee on Consultative Procedures (LaVerne Bucy, Donald Coats, David Grant, Kenneth Schwartz, and Robert Frost, chairman)

SUBJECT: Proposed guidelines for consultative procedures

The proposed guidelines have been revised to include suggestions received by the committee. The committee recommends that these guidelines be adopted with the following resolution:

Be it resolved that the following Guidelines for Consultative Procedures be adopted by the Faculty-Staff Council as a guide for evaluating the procedures of the Council and procedures which may be recommended to the council to carry out the consultative process.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty-Staff Council recommend these Guidelines to the administrative officers, faculty, and staff of the college for use in all areas of the college as a means for most effectively solving problems of mutual concern and promoting harmonious relationships.

Guidelines for Consultative Procedures

Consultation is the process of bringing to bear on issues collective knowledge and advice prior to the rendering of decisions on policy and personnel matters at all levels of the college. Regular procedures for consultation should be developed incorporating the following principles:

1. The consultative process is broadly based.
   All who are concerned about an important issue should be provided with the opportunity to discuss it in open meetings.

   Where committees are necessary due to the involvement of great numbers, these committees should represent the various areas of concern and should be constituted by democratic processes.

2. The consultative process is candid and creative.
   Consultees should be free to express their views and to seek and recommend new solutions to problems.

3. The consultative process is deliberate.
   Adequate time should be allotted to permit (1) definition of the issue, (2) formation and meetings of committees when necessary, (3) collection and dissemination of information, (4) discussion and debate, and (5) formulation of pertinent majority and minority viewpoints.

4. The consultative process includes communication.
   There should be communication between the administration and consultative committees; such committees should have access to pertinent information.

   Committees should communicate the results of their deliberations to their constituencies before final decisions are made, except that in the case of personnel matters only information deemed appropriate by the committee may be communicated. On matters of college-wide concern this will normally be accomplished through reports to the Faculty-Staff Council, which in turn will report to those it represents.

   Administrative decisions based on consultative recommendations should be reported to the recommending group.