

AGENDA

SLO FACULTY-STAFF COUNCIL
Tuesday, February 8, 1966
Meeting No. 5
3:15 p.m. - Staff Dining Room

VICE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

RECEIVED

FEB 4 1966

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

ORDER OF BUSINESS

I. READING OF MINUTES

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Drop-out Rate (Attachment) - Vice President Kennedy
2. Final Examinations on Saturday - Dean Chandler
3. All-Year Operation (Attachment) - Robert H. Frost

III. BUSINESS

1. Ad Hoc Consultative Committee on Presidential Selection
(Attachment) - Dave Grant

IV. COMMITTEES

1. Personnel (Faculty)
2. Personnel (Non-Faculty) (Attachment) - R. Tartaglia
3. Curriculum and Instruction (Attachment) Robert H. Frost
4. Communications
5. Student Affairs (Attachment) - Fuad Tellew
6. Professional Ethics
7. Facilities and Fiscal Affairs (Attachment) - Marcus Gold
8. Research - William Thurmond

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Faculty-Staff Council Elections Committee: L. Bucy, Chairman
C. Hanks
L. Philbin
F. Hapgood
W. Curtis
2. Report on Conference on Educational Philosophy - Glenn Noble
3. Distinguished Teaching Award -- Awards and Publications

Drop-out Rate:

Now that higher admission standards have been put into effect at the state colleges, it should follow that students admitted would be better prepared than in the past and would, therefore, survive the first year and subsequent years at a higher rate than previous classes did. However, a generally expressed fear is that faculty with large classes will continue to grade on the same curve used in the past and the result will be a continuation of the general pattern projected from our past Cal Poly experience:

1. Only 2/3rds of the freshmen make it to the second year.
2. Only 1/2 of them make it to the third year.
3. Only 1/3 make it to the fourth year.
4. About 1/8th graduate in four years.
5. Another 1/8th graduate in five years.

The fact that a freshman who enters Cal Poly doesn't graduate, doesn't make him a failure, of course. We don't know for sure what happens to our so-called dropouts because we haven't been able to afford the kind of costly follow-up study which would tell us where they went and what they are doing. We don't really know, for example, although it would be easier to follow-up than some other leads, how many of our "dropouts" go on to other colleges and universities and successfully complete work leading to a degree.

Even though we may be able to justify, by logical inference, the probability that many or most of our so-called dropouts are better off for having gone one or two years to college, most of us feel, I'm sure, a certain degree of agreement with Assemblyman Monagan's charge that it is a "waste" to have too high a "flunk-out" rate. With present admission standards bringing us students in the top 1/3rd of their high school graduating class, our persistence rate should increase. If it doesn't, then we need to consider seriously the possible causes.

If an excessively high dropout rate is caused primarily by academic failure, then our faculty, through their own Faculty-Staff and Faculty Senate Committees, need to study the problem and reassess their grading standards. In a way, it will be good, if the issue becomes a system-wide problem. Otherwise, faculty members at one campus may assume that they are proving to their colleagues that their institution is "tougher" and therefore "better" if it has the highest rate of academic failure in the system. Surely this is one area in which the Statewide Academic Senate ought to function to prevent any such unjustified conclusion being drawn.

If we knew for certain that only students with a 2.5 or a 3.0 GPA were headed for "success" and that those with a 1.99 GPA or less were bound for "occupational and a citizenship failure," we could be somewhat more certain that it was justified to "flunk out" three-fourths of our students before giving the remaining one-fourth the institutional stamp-of-approval in the form of the B.S. degree. Now we are learning that there may be no positive correlation between college grades and post-college success--depending, of course, on how we measure "success." We have generally assumed that there was a positive correlation, and most educators will stake their reputations on it--probably because the whole system of higher education seems to have accepted the concept.

State of California

California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo Campus

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Dr. Glenn A. Noble
Chairman, Faculty-Staff Council

Date: 1-25-66

From: Robert H. Frost

Subject: All-year Operation

Although an ad-hoc committee of the Faculty-Staff Council considered guidelines for the proposed all-year operation of the College, apparently no committee of the Council is now considering the plans for the implementation of these guidelines. The plans for the coming summer are not intended to represent a permanent arrangement; however precedents may be established if only because there exists little other experience with year-round operation in the State College system. Eventually decisions about the implementation of all-year operation may have far-reaching effects on such things as the instructional program, the effective work load of the faculty, etc., for the entire State College system.

For these reasons it is recommended that the F. S. Council should be involved in the planning for the all-year operation, It is suggested that the Executive Committee consider the constitution of a committee for this purpose, or place the question on the agenda for the next F.-S. Council meeting as a discussion item.

TO: Faculty Staff Council

January 27, 1966

FROM: Ad Hoc Consultative Committee on Presidential Selection
(George Hasslein, Robert Holmquist, Richard Johnson, Henry Marquez,
Gene Rittenhouse, David Grant, Chm.)

On October 1, 1965, this committee was formed "to prepare procedures for securing a list of recommended candidates." The scope was broadened by Staff Council action on November 9. Thus the committee accepted as its charge the preparation of recommended procedures for the election of an Advisory Committee.

A. Certain principles underlie the formation of any such advisory committee:

1. It shall be campuswide in its membership, similar in principle to the present Faculty-Staff Council and re-affirmed in the vote of November 9, 1965.
2. The advisory committee structure and procedures shall reflect in the best possible manner the unique educational objectives of the San Luis Obispo campus.
3. Once the committee has been elected, it shall have freedom to carry out its work in an atmosphere of complete confidentiality.
4. The "Criteria for President and Vice President," developed by the Faculty Personnel Committee (November 3, 1964) and approved by the Council, shall be used plus other criteria which may be appropriate. In the event that the Advisory Committee shall be asked to serve in a consultative capacity in the recommending of an Acting President, additional criteria may be devised.

B. The membership of the Advisory Committee shall be as follows:

1. Members shall have been employed by the College or its Auxiliary Enterprises for at least four years and be tenured where applicable; deans and other administrative personnel of equal or higher rank are not eligible for membership.
2. Eleven members shall constitute the committee: two each from Agriculture, Engineering, Applied Sciences, and Applied Arts; one each from Business Management, Student Personnel, and Auxiliary Services.

C. The following procedures shall be followed in electing the Advisory Committee:

1. Committee candidates shall be nominated by and elected within each division.
2. Nomination shall be by department or by petition with at least 10 signatures on a statement which certifies the nominee's willingness to serve if elected.

3. Each division shall vote on at least three nominees.
4. The Election Committee of the Staff Council shall serve as the supervising election committee, receiving nominations, supervising elections in each division, distributing and counting ballots, supervising run-off elections, and such other duties as necessary.
5. Each staff member who is eligible to vote in Faculty-Staff Council elections shall receive a ballot and shall have one or two votes, depending on his division's representation on the Advisory Committee.
6. Once elected, the committee shall choose its own chairman, provide a sub-committee structure if desired, and formulate its own methods of conducting its business.

Working within the scope of confidentiality, the Advisory Committee shall correlate its work closely with the Chancellor's Office, securing applications, interviewing applicants, reviewing qualifications, and otherwise screening the applicants. Upon an agreed date or time confirmed by the Advisory Committee and the Chancellor's Office, the Advisory Committee shall be ready to submit to the Chancellor's Office a list of five names, unranked, which represents the consensus of the committee. The Advisory Committee shall notify the Executive Committee of the Staff Council when such action is taken. Upon presentation of the names to the Chancellor's Office, the Advisory Committee's work shall be completed unless the Chancellor's Office recommends other duties which are within the sphere of the Committee or requires the submission of additional names of nominees.

D. Suggested Time Table for Election of Advisory Committee:

1. Deadline for submitting nominations: Tuesday, February 22
2. Date of division elections: Tuesday, March 1
3. Date of run-offs, if necessary: Thursday, March 3
4. Announcement of Advisory Committee membership: Tuesday, March 8 or earlier if possible.

TO: FACULTY-STAFF COUNCIL

January 27, 1966

FROM: NON-FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - R. TARTAGLIA, CHAIRMAN

The following proposed handbook changes are being submitted to the Faculty-Staff Council for its recommendation:

405.2 Pregnancy and Maternity Leave:

Pregnancy is not a conclusive reason for absence on sick leave. With permission of the supervisor, an employee may use vacation credits for additional rest. Frequent absences during pregnancy will not be approved unless a physician certifies that because of a complication in the course of the pregnancy, the absence is necessary.

An employee may not work beyond the seventh calendar month of her pregnancy. The seventh month will be determined by a physician certification furnished by the employee. An exception to the seventh-month restriction may be allowed upon recommendation of the supervisor and approval by the division head or dean. A physician's statement concerning the physical condition of the employee may be required.

Absence after childbirth is authorized as sick leave up to ten days for the amount of time the mother is physically incapacitated for work if the employee is on work status. A leave of absence may be granted to employees needing time off during or immediately after pregnancy.

Justification -- It is the general prevailing attitude and practice in private industry, some city and county government agencies, some state agencies and state colleges in particular, to urge an employee not to continue to work beyond the seventh calendar month of her pregnancy as a health precaution.

Generally, during the eighth and ninth month of the pregnancy, the employee is uncomfortable, cannot sustain an eight-hour day standard work level of performance, and in the public service areas does not present an appearance that is compatible with public attitudes.

We feel this policy change is not unreasonable considering the over-all or broad viewpoint concerning pregnancy and maternity leave and its effect on public attitudes of state employment practices. We have considered the fact that the college does hire a good number of student wives, and this policy change may create a financial hardship to these families if the employee is unable to continue her work through the full term of her pregnancy and use sick leave and vacation credits for childbirth from the time of delivery of the child.

On one hand, we are considering the sick leave regulation objectively and on the other hand, we are considering the issue subjectively in terms of student wives' employment. In either instance we cannot apply a double standard, and this one policy would affect all female employees or none.

We are recommending that this revision become effective September 1, 1966.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Dr. Glenn A. Noble
Chairman, Faculty-Staff Council

DATE: February 2, 1966

FROM: Robert H. Frost
Chairman, Curriculum and Instruction Committee

SUBJECT: General Education Study

California State Polytechnic College

San Luis Obispo

Members of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee have consulted with staff members and heads of departments offering general education courses, with faculty members who have previously taken part in studies of the general education requirements, and with administrative staff members. The Committee's study of the general education requirement has been called to the attention of the faculty generally, both through the Faculty-Staff Council and through a notice in the Staff Bulletin.

The Committee has not found any general desire for change in the basic framework of the general education requirements. A number of changes have been recommended for specific courses used to satisfy the general education requirements. Some of these changes are natural results of past additions to, or deletions from, the catalog, and further changes of this nature will probably be required by course and curricula changes proposed for the 1967-8 catalog which are now being considered by the Division Deans. Changes have been studied to improve the attainment of the aims of the general education requirements. These would decrease the student's freedom of choice in meeting the general education requirement, and will be considered in connection with other curricular changes which will be proposed for the 1967-8 catalog.

Proposals have been relayed to the Committee by Dean Andrews and others for changes in the general education requirements for transfer students. The impetus for such proposals comes from the junior colleges which would like to see a common set of general education requirements for all of the state colleges. It appears that it might be desirable that we study this problem before other proposals are made from outside the state college system. The Committee has examined the general education requirements of the individual state colleges and finds great differences among them. This problem appears to deserve further study.

It is recommended that:

- I. No changes be made in the framework of the general education requirements for the 1967-8 catalog.
- II. Changes in individual courses acceptable for meeting the general education requirements be given further consideration in relation to other course and curricula changes proposed for the 1967-8 catalog.
- III. Consideration be given to changing the general education requirements for transfer students in the 1968-9 catalog (or alternately, that a proposal be formulated and forwarded to the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges).

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE

Minutes of the Student Affairs Committee of the Faculty-Staff Council
January 26, 1966 at 4:00 P.M. - Health Center

Members present: O. Casey, J. Pricot, D. Thomson, F. Tellev

Members absent: E. Chandler, A. James, J. McCombs, C. Nolan.

Matters Discussed:

1. The first matter discussed was the question of establishing a mechanism to review complaints of students about unjust grading. Each member present read the ten letters thus far received from various colleges and universities in California in response to my inquiry of January 12, 1966.

Mr. Thomson suggested that a summary of main ideas contained in each letter be prepared by the Chairman and made available to members of the committee. This is to be done within two weeks when, hopefully, all or most of the anticipated responses are at hand.

2. Members present spent a few minutes discussing the matter of "Faculty Evaluation by students".

It was suggested by Mr. Thomson that the chairman contact the ASB and the Chairman of the Faculty Senate of Los Angeles State College to inquire about their recent experience with reference to faculty evaluation by students as published in the Prof-ile. Jim Pricot suggested that we also contact San Jose State's and San Diego State Colleges as they may have experience in this area.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45

Copy to: Dr. Glenn Noble, Chairman of Faculty-Staff Council - For information
Dr. LaVerne Bucy - For information
Dr. Robert A. Mott - For information

M E M O

To: Dr. Glenn Noble, Chairman
Faculty-Staff Council

Date: January 25, 1966

From: Facilities and Fiscal Affairs Committee
M. Gold

Subject: Monthly Report

Copies To: R. Williams, J. Hampl, B. Fitzgerald, R. Johnson

California State Polytechnic College

San Luis Obispo Campus

The Facilities and Fiscal Affairs Committee met with Douglas Gerard, Campus Building Coordinator, and discussed two of the current problems under investigation. These are: 1. Campus airport and its future and 2. Use of visitor parking spaces.

Present indications are that no changes will be recommended, however, additional information is being sought and the subject will be discussed further at a future meeting.

More data concerning Mandatory Salary Savings and its current status in the state college system was distributed for study by the committee.

Meetings are held Mondays at 1:00 in the Staff Dining Hall.