

2015-16 FACULTY SENATE
ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES October 2, 2015
Approved: October 16, 2015

October 6, 2015

Members Present: Escobar, Blumberg, Bradley, Schmidlein, Migliaccio, Irwin, Li, Hunt, Geyer, Fields, Trigales, Gonsier-Gerdin, Gonzalez

Members Absent: Bowie, Murphy, Taylor, Watson-Derbigny, Van Gaasbeck, Vogt

Guests Present: Malroutu, Slabinski, Wu, Hyson

Call to Order: Called to order at 2:07 p.m.

1. Open Forum:

* **E-Advising Tools (handout)**—D. Geyer passed around an e-advising handout which visually explains a number of new advising tools available to students, faculty and academic advisors. One of the new tabs is *My Progress to Degree*, which is an information tab that is based on the most recent degree audit for the student. Geyer explained that each month, the Registrar's Office does a batch degree audit is done each month for the students. He also explained the 'points' allocated for students' progress toward degree. *Phase 2* deals with "what if" scenarios (i.e., what if I change my major? The system can address that). There will also be a 'what if' scenario for Financial Aid (i.e., the system can look at the impact of changes of major, and other changes, on a student's financial aid situation). *Graduation Channel*... this is a portal channel designed to alert students to specific milestones and deadlines related to graduation. Alert messages are displayed depending on their graduation status. *Smart Planner software*: Registrar's Office will be moving forward very soon with a staff orientation.

* **Platinum Analytics** is coming soon as well.... L. Malroutu reported that it will tell us how many sections of a course are needed in order to meet student need/demand, and chairs and other staff will know 3 months in advance so that they can fill those slots with instructors, etc.

* **Advising tab in CMS**—S. Blumberg had asked about this and about new faculty getting access. It was shared that all new faculty will need to do FERPA training in order to be granted authorization to access that tab in CMS.

2. Agenda Approved: Approved 2:30pm

3. Minutes September 18th, 2015 Reviewed. Minutes approved, 2:35pm

4. Progress to Degree for High Unit Seniors Policy. Executive Committee requests comment and consideration of President Gonzalez's May 20, 2015 request for

modifications to this policy. The two requests are listed below, along with APC's response:

(1) The Registrar's Office, in consultation with the Dean of the student's college, or the Dean for Undergraduate Education for undeclared and expressed interest students, will review the student's academic record and develop an appropriate academic plan or consider other actions, including administrative disqualification, in accordance with Title 5 Section 41300.1 and Executive Order 1038.

The Committee questioned whether or not this request to have the Dean of the student's college, or the Dean of Undergraduate Education/Studies for undeclared and expressed interest students replaced the role of advising in this process, either by a faculty advisor or someone from the academic advising center. This policy was set up primarily as an intrusive advising policy specifically for students who had accrued a high number of units but who were not making progress toward degree completion. As explained in the transmittal document that accompanied the policy that went before the Senate in 2014, the role of the Registrar's Office will be to provide reports to colleges and academic departments identifying undergraduate students who have earned more than 150 units but who have not completed requirements for the primary major degree. Prior to the registration period, holds will be placed on these students' records, requiring them to seek guidance before they register for their classes. If the student identifies a primary major, the student will be referred to a Faculty Advisor in that program. If a student is Undeclared, or Expressed Interest, the student will seek guidance from an advisor in the Academic Advising Center.

The remainder of the procedures explains how the student will go about meeting with the advisor, developing an academic plan for graduation, and reviewing the consequences for not following that plan. The primary responsibility for working with the student and developing this appropriate academic plan is the advisor. The consequences for not following the academic plan toward degree completion and graduation is the current process in place for all students, per EO 1038 concerning administrative probation and disqualification. There is nothing in the procedures for this policy that deviate from what is already provided for all students who fail to make progress toward their degree (e.g., failing to maintain a certain GPA)

The Committee, including voices from the Registrar's Office, does not want advising or the role of the advisor in this process replaced with a College Dean or the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. As the Registrar expressed, advising students on an academic plan is not within the purview of the Registrar's Office. Therefore, the Committee is referring the Senate's approved policy back to Executive Committee for our new campus president, President Nelsen, to review, as he may have a different response than the former president, President Gonzalez.

(2) Outlining requirements for administrative disqualification, Executive Order 1038 also states that our campus is to have procedures whereby a student who is placed on probation or is administratively disqualified may appeal such action. I request that the Faculty Senate draft appropriate language outlining such an appeal process.

The Committee discussed this and agreed to include a reference to Executive Order 1038 after the policy language. The transmittal document clearly explains the procedures very thoroughly in terms of the consequences of deviating from their academic plan to graduate without consultation with and agreement from their advisor as well as the consequences for administrative probation and disqualification. The procedures that accompany the policy already explain the “appeal process” being sought, which is a student’s application for readmission to the university through the established policy and procedures for reinstatement. However, the Committee is fine with including a reference to EO 1038, which demonstrates Executive Order backing of this campus policy.

- 5. Repeat Policy.** The Committee discussed the proposed policy changes brought forward for review. Kris Trigales (Registrar’s Office) stated that she had consulted with Financial Aid to inquire as to whether or not there would be any negative impact on transfer students’ financial aid awards, and to her understanding, changing the repeat policy to apply to transfer students as well would NOT have a negative impact on their financial aid awards. In progress units would count but not course credit (units earned), as far as financial aid is concerned.

In terms of the policy itself, Trigales noted that per Executive Order 1037, grade forgiveness and averaging grades only apply to Sacramento State students, not transfer students. The only part of the policy change that can apply to transfer students is the following: “1. Undergraduate students may repeat courses taken at the University, or if they have taken an equivalent course at another university or college, only if they earned grades lower than a C (C-, D+, D-, F, WU, NC).” Trigales suggested that the policy change indicate, in item 5 of the policy, that if it is discovered that a student has repeated a course at another community college or university in which the student received a C or higher grade that the repeated course grade would not count. In other words, the amended policy would ‘kick in’ and catch those. [For additional information, see Executive Order 1037, which provides policies on repeating courses, among other things: <https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1037.html>]

The Committee also responded to two questions asked by the Executive Committee. The first question concerned the impact of the amended repeat policy on students returning to their studies after a lengthy hiatus (e.g., 10 years). The question asked was whether the same repeat policy would apply to those students. In a nutshell, the repeat policy would apply to these students as well; however, some programs, such as the School of Business Administration have in place what are called “currency of knowledge requirements,” where course requirements need to be completed within a 7 year timeframe. The second question was basically an inquiry about the rationale for why students simply could not go to a community college to repeat any course they wanted to retake, even if the grade in

the course being repeated was higher than a C-. The reason is that, by allowing students to repeat courses without any limits, is that it can delay their time to degree. Moreover, allowing students to repeat courses without limits can put a strain on individual campus resources. The changes in the repeat policy came about from a discussion about it and action done by the Statewide Academic Senate several years ago. [Additional research by Escobar: “Support for Campus-specific Policies for Repeating Courses to Improve Grades,” AS-2718-05/AA - September 16, 2005; approved November 3, 2005 <http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/records/resolutions/2005-2006/2718.shtml>]

6. Department/Division/Program Chairs’ or Directors’ Right to Deny Students

Admission into Major Policy, Establishment of. Bohsiu Wu, Chair of Sociology, and Dianne Hyson, Associate Dean of SSIS, were invited to attend the meeting at the request of Chair Escobar. As they both shared, Sociology has been experiencing an influx of students leaving other majors and requesting admission into Sociology, which currently is not an impacted program nor does it have pre-major criteria in place to stem the flow of students. According to Drs Wu and Hyson, the department is reaching a point where it does not feel it can appropriately service the students coming in and requesting to have their major changed to Sociology. Consequently, they are requesting a policy change be made that would give Chairs the discretion, at the point where students are requesting admission, to deny students into the major and to divert them into another more appropriate major.

The Committee noted that it already a draft of a policy that addressed this concern. The policy provides that specific criteria need to be met in order for a Chair to deny admission to a student into the major: if the student has completed or in excess of 90 units and has only completed 20% of courses in that major. Considerations for APC as the policy was being drafted were to give departments local control for growth and to put in place restrictions to students who were basically “shopping for majors” that they could complete quickly, but were not necessarily a subject matter or discipline in which they had a lot of interest.

APC had asked Drs Wu and Hyson about a pre-major option, and Dr. Wu shared that his department was planning to put something in place. There are, of course, philosophical and operational components to this issue, especially considering the push from the administration, beginning with President Nelsen, to have impaction completely disappear, if at all possible. But, for now, Drs Wu and Hyson are requesting that APC develop a policy to address this issue for the time being.

A motion had been made and seconded to put the policy draft to a vote. However, since the meeting time was up, and perhaps over time, Chair Escobar asked if the motion could be withdrawn and that the policy be considered at the next meeting, allowing for further discussion, if necessary, and a vote. The Committee agreed, and the meeting was adjourned.

7. Meeting Schedule for Fall 2015

~~September 4~~
~~September 18~~
~~October 2~~

October 16
November 6
November 20

December 4

8. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:35pm.

Sue C. Escobar, Committee Chair