

AGENDA

SLO FACULTY-STAFF COUNCIL
Tuesday, February 14, 1967
Meeting No. 6

3:15 p.m. - Staff Dining Room

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- I. Approval of minutes of regular meeting Jan 10, 1967. Approval of minutes of meeting of Faculty Sub Council, January 17, 1967.

II. Business

passed
Tabled business - Fairness Board - attachment to January 10 minutes

passed
Tabled business - Natural Resources Management Proposal - Report attached

passed as amendment
Position paper on International Education - attachment for Faculty Staff Council members

Ad Hoc Committee to study possible work week changes - Report attached

Election of member to Executive Committee - Dr Noble (Election Committee)

III. Discussion

General Education - Meeting of Educational Policies Committee
Academic Senate - February 22, 1967

Faculty Evaluation - Report by Dr. Tellev - statement attached

Faculty Staff Council - Evaluation

Communications Committee Report

Other Committee Reports

IV. Announcements

Grievance procedure being reviewed by Faculty Personnel Committee.

Program Budgeting - report in Faculty-Staff Reading Room

Motions and seconds at meetings

General Education Committee established

El Corral College Store Advisory Committee

Interim Management Plan for combined operation of ADP installation and computer center

Registration Procedure

"E" Grade (attachment)

*OK well
General C.
4:00 long
to clarify
2/15/67*

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE
San Luis Obispo

TO: Roy Anderson, Chairman
Faculty-Staff Council

DATE: January 17, 1967

FROM: Curriculum and Instruction Committee
Frost, Grant, Ikenoyama, Keif (Chairman), Langford, Rhoads

SUBJECT: Request for Approval of a New Degree Program in
Natural Resources Management

COPIES: Dave Cook, Stechman, Lamouria, Leighty, Struass, D. Thompson,
G. Noble

In December our committee studied the request for approval of a new program leading to the Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture, with a major in Natural Resources Management. We held an open meeting, attended by several of the interested persons invited.

Recommendation

We request the Faculty-Staff Council recommend approval of this proposal.

The Proposal

Here are some of the pertinent features mentioned in the twenty-page formal request dated November 1, 1966. The full request is on file in the Faculty-Staff Council area of the Faculty Reading Room in the Library.

1. The request was developed by John Stechman (Chairman), James Merson (to June 1965), Lloyd Lamouria (from June 1965), Raymond Leighty, Harry Strauss, and David Thompson.
2. Initially, the program will be administered by the Ornamental Horticulture Department. Ultimately, a separate NRM Department will be set up.
3. The program's objective -- train students in ... the knowledge and skills essential to the general vocational objective of private and public land management for recreational uses
4. Eleven NRM courses totalling 32 units will be required, plus two new courses in other departments. 198 units required for graduation, in either Naturalist or Administration concentration.
5. Identical program does not exist in any other State College. UC at Davis offers faintly similar degree, as do a few of the State Colleges. Program within the educational objectives of the College. There are no accreditation requirements as such.
6. Expected enrollment five years after starting program is 75 students.

Roy E. Anderson, Chairman
Faculty-Staff Council
Page 2

7. One full time equivalent faculty member will be required to teach specialized and serve as coordinating administrator.
8. Library holdings are judged adequate to initially support the program.
9. Approximately \$6,500.00 will be required to augment existing equipment to teach Photogrammetry.
10. No special classrooms, laboratories, or other capital outlay facilities are required.

The request appears to be written in the format requested by the Chancellor's Office.

MEMO

To: Faculty-Staff Council

Date: 2-8-67

From: Executive Committee, Faculty-Staff Council

Subject: Tentative Position Paper on International Education

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE

SAN LUIS OBISPO

The Executive Committee of the Faculty-Staff Council met on Tuesday, February 8, 1967, and after review of the subject position paper, recommends to the Faculty-Staff Council the approval of the Tentative Position Paper on International Education as revised 1-20-67.

MEMO

Date: February 6, 1967

To: Dr. Roy Anderson, Chairman, Faculty Staff Council

From: Ad Hoc Committee to Study Possible Work Week
Changes

Subject: Final Report

Copies to:

I. Members of the Committee:

W. Anderson, M. Gold (Chairman), T. Meyer, L. Schmidt,
R. Tartaglia

II. Purpose

The Faculty-Staff Council Ad Hoc committee was formed on October 29, 1965 to complete the study started by the Facilities and Fiscal Affairs Committee (April 30, 1965) concerning "Possible work week changes in the Service Offices of the College."

III. Methods Used

The committee met several times for discussion, did some interviewing on their own, and went over the work done by the F&FA Committee. In addition to this there was a meeting with Dr. Dale Andrews and continued liaison with the Administration's General Services Ad Hoc Committee through the serving of two members (M. Gold, T. Meyer) on that group.

With this close association, the Ad Hoc Committee did not feel the need to duplicate the actions of the other group but relied on discussion and interpretation to react to its findings.

IV. Recommendations

On December 30, 1966 Dr. Dale W. Andrews issued a memo on the subject in which he stated "Over varying periods of time a number of individuals and committees have been studying facets of the work week patterns and staffing of service offices in the Business Management, Student Personnel and Applied Arts Divisions, the stenographic/clerical needs of instructional departments, and the general service needs of the faculty. These individuals and committees have included

division heads and department heads in the Business Management, Student Personnel and Applied Arts Divisions, instructional deans and department heads, an Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty-Staff Council, a subcommittee of the Instructional Department Heads' Council, and, most recently, the General Services Ad Hoc Committee with representation from the Faculty-Staff Council, the Instructional Department Heads' Council, and the college's administration.

It is possible from the various studies and the recommendations resulting from these studies, to draw a number of general conclusions. The most significant of these are:

(1, 2 & 3 omitted here)

4. That the work week for most service offices in the Business Management, Student Personnel and Applied Arts Divisions should include the noon hour, and for certain of these offices, Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon. (Staffing on Saturday mornings in the open offices should be at a minimum level.)
5. That in the case of item 4, records should be maintained of the service provided during the noon hour and on Saturday mornings as the basis for re-evaluating the actual service needs of the various publics served by these offices during these periods.

...

Staff review and analysis of the various studies and recommendations have resulted in the development of a number of specific courses of action which are listed below. A number of these can and will be implemented as defined in the latter portion of this memo effective with the winter quarter, while others will require further study and consultation primarily between instructional deans and the various departments involved. The recommended courses of action submitted to me by the staff are as follows:

(items 1 through 16 omitted)

17. Work Week Patterns and Staffing of Service Offices.
 - a. It is recommended that the following service offices be open from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and staffed during the noon hour to meet necessary workload requirements:

Business Management

Accounting Office, including Cashiering
Personnel Office, in addition to 7-8:00, Monday and Tuesday
General Office I, including the Duplicating and Reproduction Section
Purchasing Office
Switchboard and Information Section

Student Personnel

Admissions Office
Records Office
Evaluations Office
Activities Office
Counseling and Testing Office
Housing Office
Placement Office
Health Center

Applied Arts

Audio-Visual Service Office

- b. It is recommended that the following service offices be open from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon on Saturday and staffed with appropriate personnel to meet necessary workload requirements:

Business Management

Personnel Office
General Office I, including the Duplicating and Reproduction Section
Switchboard and Information Section

Student Personnel

Admissions Office
Activities Office
Health Center

Applied Arts

Audio-Visual Service Office - staffed by student assistant

February 6, 1967

- c. In addition to the above, it is recommended that the rotational administrative coverage system currently operating on the first, second, third, and fourth floors of the Administration Building be continued. It is also recommended that provisions be made for opening other service offices on Saturday mornings and other times for special occasions and during particularly heavy workload times, i.e., Housing Office just prior and during fall quarter registration, as determined by the responsible division heads.
- d. It is further recommended that records of service rendered from 12:00 noon to 1:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and Saturday 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon be maintained as a basis for evaluating continuing service requirements of these offices.

I have reviewed the above 17 recommendations and am authorizing by means of this memorandum the following effective with the beginning of the winter quarter or as soon as they can be implemented:

(Those recommendations concerning items 1 through 16 omitted)

- 17. a., b. (request reaction from Business Manager and Dean of Students concerning opening of other service offices in their divisions on Saturday mornings), c. and d. I am asking the Business Manager, Mr. Donald Nelson, by means of this memorandum with the assistance of the Personnel Officer and the supervisor of General Office I to coordinate the implementation of the actions authorized. In the case of the other recommendations, I will appreciate the department(s) and division(s) reviewing the recommendation(s) applicable to them and submitting to me their reactions. I would welcome joint reactions where applicable and where a consensus has been reached. In the case of a number of the recommendations authorized effective with the winter quarter, they involve further study and cut across divisional lines, i.e., 11.c., 12, etc. I would welcome reactions from other divisions in addition to those who have primary responsibilities for the functions. In the case of any of the 17 recommendations - whether implemented or referred for study or reactions prior to implementation - the various divisions, the Department Heads' Council, and the Faculty-Staff Council should feel free to submit any comments which are felt to be applicable."

The Committee has gone over these recommendations and agrees fully with those which pertain to its charge. It endorses the action of the administration (Recommendation 17) and feels that it fulfills the purpose for which the Ad Hoc Committee was formed and the function with which it was charged.

It is recommended that the opening of these service offices during the noon hour be publicized as widely as possible.

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE
San Luis Obispo Campus

To: Dr. Roy Anderson, Chairman
Faculty-Staff Council
From: Fuad H. Tellew, Chairman
Student Affairs Committee - Faculty-Staff Council

Date: December 9, 1966

Subject: Faculty Evaluation by Students

In recent weeks the Student Affairs Committee of the Faculty-Staff Council has been meeting every Wednesday afternoon. The purpose of these meetings is to review in detail a student proposal for a Faculty Evaluation Plan. The proposed "Plan" has been prepared nearly completely by students. They have obtained materials and information from a sizeable number of other colleges having such plans. Probably because the students who are working on the "Plan" have spent so much time and effort on it, they are obviously impatient with the detailed review being done by the Student Affairs Committee. It is the frequently stated desire of the students to have the Evaluation in effect this academic year. They would like to have the blessing of the Faculty-Staff Council, but appear ready to go whether or not there is such blessing.

Some of the members of the Committee feel as though they are being pushed. While recognizing the desire of the students for action and even in some varying degrees of agreement with them on the project, the Committee does not want to be placed in the position of merely ratifying the student developed and proposed plan. As a result, the delay and detailed questioning on the part of the Committee members is to make certain that any report from the Committee is basically one which would be workable and acceptable to both students and faculty.

It is my feeling that the students' desire to implement the "Plan" will cause them to request an early presentation to the entire Faculty-Staff Council. In fact, I have been asked to have it before the Council in their January meeting.

Should the students make this request firm, I will comply with their request, but I believe that the Student Affairs Committee will take a position of neutrality. In other words, the Committee will not condemn the basic idea, but will not endorse a "Plan" which has not had a complete and thorough review in the minds of the Committee members.

My purpose in calling this to your attention is to alert you concerning the present status of this item and to prepare you for a possible late request to get on the agenda in January.

We appreciate the students' desire to accomplish their tasks as soon as possible, but the Committee feels that an evaluation of this sort deserves the deliberation and care which only time and experimentation can permit.

The Committee is basically concerned in helping the students to prepare an evaluation procedure which will anticipate and resolve most of the concerns which the faculty have relative to this evaluation process.

MEMO

To: Dr. Roy E. Anderson

Date: 1-31-67

From: Dale W. Andrews

Subject: Catalog Statement for "E" Grade

Copies To: Messrs. Kennedy, Cook, Chandler, Cummins, Fisher,
Hirt, Smith

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE

SAN LUIS OBISPO

As a result of a communication from Thomas H. McGrath of the Chancellor's Office and discussions held during meetings of Deans of Students, Dean Chandler recommended to the Executive Council a change in the statement regarding the "E" grade on page 31 of the current catalog. Dean Chandler's recommendation was Attachment 17-1 to the Agenda for the December 12, 1966 meeting. The Deans of Students discussions were subsequently confirmed in IRSA 67-02, dated January 10, 1967, a copy of which is attached.

Following discussion of Attachment 17-1, the Executive Council amended the proposed statement slightly, and, except for the wording of the last paragraph, the Executive Council's recommendation is reproduced below. (the wording of the last paragraph is intended to be a clarification of that which appeared in the attachment.)

"It is recommended that the appropriate section in the catalog under grading system relating to "E" grades be modified as follows:

1. Under the heading of 'grade points are assigned. . .' delete the reference to E grades.
2. Rephrase the explanation of E grades in the paragraph describing it as follows:

Grade E indicates incomplete work. Grade E may be given to a student for either of the following reasons:

1. Passing in classwork, but unable to take final examination.
2. Passing in classwork completed and in final examination, but some assigned work not completed.

'Grade E may be removed within one year from the time it is recorded by completing all unfinished work as the instructor may determine. The removal of grade E entitles the student to the number of units and grade points assigned to his completed grade. A student may not within a period of one year from the time the grade is recorded retake for credit a course for which a Grade E is recorded. If not removed within the one-year period, the grade E remains on the student's permanent record and credit for the course may be obtained only by repeating it.

'No units or grade points will be assigned for the course in which grade E is assigned unless and until the grade is changed.'"

While it could be argued that the assignment of grade "E," since it isn't an evaluation of a student's work, is really an administrative procedure, I feel that the faculty should probably be involved in approval of a change in the statement on page 31 since it is the faculty members' judgment which determines whether or not a grade "E" is assigned. I would like to ask, then, that you discuss this proposed change with members of your Executive Committee and/or of the Committee on Standards, and let me know their reactions as soon as is feasible. We are expecting that the galley proofs for the 1967-68 Catalog will be here at any time. They will be on campus for approximately one week, and it would be appropriate for any change of this statement to be made before returning those proofs.

Attachment

The rationale for examining policies and practices regarding the grade of "incomplete" received from Thomas H. McGrath, Acting Dean of Institutional Relations and Student Affairs, opens with the following statement:

"The symbol I or E used to indicate that a student has not completed all assignments and/or examinations for a course is not, in the narrow sense, a grade indicating quality of performance. Instead, it is a symbol meant to communicate the fact that, at the time of reporting, it was not possible to complete an evaluation. Usually, this situation prevails for reasons beyond the control of the student, or because evaluation is withheld until completion of the second part of a course. In addition, while official policy statements seldom make such a provision, it may at times be used when an instructor feels that the opportunity to complete a meaningful piece of work is more important than adherence to a calendar deadline.

"Many institutional policies include statements concerning the quality of work previously evaluated to mitigate against use of the "Incomplete" to escape a low grade. Limited available evidence suggests that the majority of incompletes when removed result in a grade of "C" or better, and that there is at best a tenuous relationship between poor quality of previous work and unremoved incompletes.1/

"If one is willing to accept the premise that an incomplete is not strictly a grade, but rather an administrative symbol, and that there is little or no consistent or necessary relationship between unremoved incompletes and poor academic performance, there would seem to be little justification for either treating it as an "F" or changing it to an "F" after a stated period."