

**2015-16 FACULTY SENATE**  
**ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES Sept. 18, 2015**  
*Approved: October 2, 2015*

Sept. 21, 2015

Members Present: Escobar, Blumberg, Van Gaasbeck, Bradley, Schmidlein, Vogt,  
Migliaccio, Irwin, Li, Hunt, Geyer, Fields

Members Absent: Bowie, Murphy, Taylor, Trigales, Watson-Derbigny,

Guests Present: Llamas-Green, Slabinski

**Call to Order:** Called to order at 2:05 p.m.

**1. Open Forum:**

\* **Online Evaluation Process**—S. Blumberg raised questions about it and wondered if faculty could individually decide when to release the evaluation to their students/classes rather than IT. It would be better if that decision were the faculty member's because, at the times when it is released, it's often not a great point in the semester where students could provide complete feedback. Migliaccio stated that a request for data had been made in the past, which centered on assessing response rates and scores and how those may have changed in units that have made the shift from paper to electronic evaluations. Migliaccio suggested that Escobar, as APC Chair have S. Bowie (Senate Chair) get in touch with Mark Rodriguez about this, as he was contacted in the past. Escobar will follow up with Bowie about this.

\* Irwin mentioned another issue concerning the switch to online evaluations, which was grade distribution data vs. response rates in those units that have made the switch.

\* **Grade Appeal Process, Amendments to.** Escobar provided a brief recap of what transpired at the Faculty Senate meeting on 9/17 regarding the 1<sup>st</sup> reading of the amended grade appeal process, highlighting some of the main concerns and questions raised by Senators and other audience members. These concerns were two-fold: (1) Academic Honesty Policy and concern with sanctions for cheating and students appealing those grounds (i.e., the perceived "disproportionate sanction" for cheating or plagiarism as grounds for a grade appeal violation); (2) Procedural Appeals Board amendments: composition (2 faculty, 1 student) and a requirement of a unanimous vote. Migliaccio pointed out that when Bill Dillon talked about the grade appeal process before the Senate in the past, he made a clear distinction between the 2 policies and processes: Academic Honesty and the Grade Appeal Process, neither of which is dependent on the other. Both are separate and have no bearing on the outcome of the other or impact whether or not either process actually takes place. Escobar noted that this item will likely appear on the next Senate meeting agenda, at 1<sup>st</sup> reading but that it likely would move to 2<sup>nd</sup> reading.

2. **Agenda Approved:** Approved 2:30pm

3. **Minutes September 4th, 2015 Reviewed.** Minutes were amended to correct the attendees (i.e., striking Evans and replacing with Murphy to reflect Academic Advising representation) and Trigales corrections. Amended minutes approved, 2:35pm

4. **Repeat Policy.** Llamas-Green reported on this, noting that Executive Order 1037 only speaks to Sac State course repeats and not to transfer courses. At Sac State, students are not allowed to repeat grades of C or higher. However, since the University has numerous transfer students, it is difficult to detect or prevent them from repeating courses with C grades or higher during their first semester of enrollment, even if degree evaluators investigate after they've enrolled in the course. Often, a transfer student will not have had their transcripts evaluated by the time they register for their first semester of courses at the University. At times, they enroll in a class and later realize, after the drop period, that they have already taken the class AND they are not allowed to retake a course (or transferrable equivalent) with a C grade or higher.

\* **Main question:** Should we apply our own, or the Sac State repeat policy, to these students OR do grade forgiveness OR average the courses? Llamas-Green mentioned that there are various practices going on since the Repeat Policy does not specifically state what to do with these students. Averaging the grades is typically what is done. The student is given credit for one course (i.e., they only get one-time credit, 3.0 units, even if there are multiple repeats). However, in terms of limits on the number of repeats, transfer courses are not counted in a student's "bucket" (i.e., don't count towards repeat limits here at Sac State). Ultimately, the issue is that if the evaluation isn't done ahead of time, before the student enrolls—which often it isn't because there are way too many transfer students compared with the number of evaluators to do this work—nothing is in place to prevent the student from enrolling in a class they already may have.

\* **Proposed Solution:** Do we apply the same principles to transfer students that we apply to our "native" Sac State students? (In the end, YES, that is what the Committee decided to do: Sac State repeat policy rules are in effect for ALL students, native and transfer alike).

\* **Short-term Fix:** A motion was made and seconded that we craft language to state that transfer courses will be treated the same as how Sac State course grades and course repeats are treated. Motion carried unanimously. Escobar will draft the policy amendments and bring it back to the Committee for review and eventually move it forward to ExCom.

\* **Long-term Fix:** Hunt discussed how the new data analytics technologies, specifically SmartPlanner, will eventually be able to help with respect to the "system-side" of the problem and catch the students who may be unnecessarily repeating courses they've already taken or in which they have a C grade or higher. For now, proactive advising and sending strong messages to new students will have to be used in order to minimize the number of students that will be impacted.

5. **Information Items:**

\* **Priority Registration.** Migliaccio provided the Committee with an update regarding discussions on the issue of Priority Registration, in the context of the Graduation

Initiative. The general question is whether moving graduating seniors to the front of the line, so to speak, will give them the ability to enroll in the classes they need and graduate in the semester they indicated on their graduation application. Another question is how many times students should be given this type of registration priority—once? More? Currently, no more than 10% of our student population is given priority registration, but some of the groups of students who get priority registration due to a particular status are registering ahead of graduating seniors.

\* Other questions. . . . Will we need to refine our policy for how priority registration is assigned or determined? Will moving graduating seniors up to the front of the line impact other groups and, if so, in what way and to what degree?

\* **Change/Add a Major Policy:** A question was asked about this particular issue and policy, and Escobar provided a brief update from what was discussed at the end of last semester. This policy change would allow chairs, under specific conditions, to refrain from signing add/change major form.

#### **6. Meeting Schedule for Fall 2015**

<del>September 4</del>	October 16	December 4
<del>September 18</del>	November 6	
October 2	November 20	

**7. Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sue C. Escobar, Committee Chair