

2015-16 FACULTY SENATE
ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES December 4, 2015
Approved as Amended: February 5, 2016

December 9, 2015

Members Present: Escobar, Blumberg, Schmidlein, Migliaccio, Hunt, Geyer, Trigales, Van Gaasbeck, Vogt, Hernandez, Irwin

Members Absent: Bradley, Bowie, Fields, Gonsier-Gerdin, Gonzalez, Li, Murphy, Taylor, Watson-Derbigny

Guests Present: Malrouu, Slabinski

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

1. Open Forum:

*** D. Hunt – Working on a Declaration of Major policy/process in Enrollment**

Management: The issue raised centers on how students declare a major. First, in looking at admissions, there is criteria to admit students into the CSU; however, there is nothing established to admit students into a major program. Hunt discussed two (2) gates through which students are admitted: (1) open major at the point of admission to the university; (2) once the application to the university is open, the challenge is trying to figure out what to do with these students. One tool is to wait list them and then assign them “undeclared” status. Going this route will create a larger undeclared pool of students. Therefore, Hunt stated that a policy is needed to be in place in order to know how to transition students through to the major program. One of the primary barriers/questions/concerns is how to deal with high demand majors (e.g., Sociology, Social Work, etc. These are majors that are essentially impacted but not officially labeled ‘impacted.’). By going through gate #2, it would allow the major program to have more control to determine who is where in their major (move away from Expressed Interest).

Malrouu suggested that programs use a “pre-major” status, which can be defined under a ‘Declaration of Majors’ policy/policy on Declared Majors. This could be used as a framework or starting point for directing how students declare a major. One concern with such a policy is pushback from departments and the preference for ‘home rule’ and the preference for an ‘open access’ campus. This ties in with the reality that the CSU is silent on how students can get into the major.

Other concerns center on where Academic Affairs is to put its resources. Other considerations for the university and individual major programs is growth (i.e., where do we want to grow? What would a market analysis show in terms of what careers will have more demand down the road?) Once some of these concerns are addressed, then enrollment management can address the issues here.

Another suggestion is for Enrollment Management to consult with department chairs about this issue and get their perspective and input on it. Many are very supportive of

open access and do not want to restrict student access to their programs. Other points are that this is a university issue that has been going on for years now. One question that needs to be answered is how are these changes going to affect students and departments (low and high demand).

* **D. Geyer, Registrar – Grading Memo:** An email with the information on submitting final grades will be going out on Monday/Tuesday. Geyer encouraged folks to remind colleagues about the SacCT system upgrade beginning on Sunday, December 20th. Grades are due by 11:59:59pm on January 4, 2016.

* **S. Escobar – Criminal Justice Events:** Chair Escobar shared information about a Holiday Gift Drive for Incarcerated Women and an event on Dec 9th called ‘Unlocking Potential: The Death Penalty and IQ,’ featuring a panel of 2 psychologists and 2 CrJ Division professors. The campus and local communities are welcome.

* **K. Van Gaasbeck – SRGS Task:** A suggestion was made to have the subcommittee look at general characteristics of impacted majors: time to degree, GPAs, etc under the broader issue of ‘retention/progress to degree.’ To put it another way, this could be a ‘pre- and post-impaction’ analysis on these variables (and perhaps others that SRGS or the Impaction Task Force has identified). What is the data telling us about these variables, within currently impacted programs as well as those few identified high demand majors. APC members requested that Chair Escobar contact Deidre Sessoms, Chair of SRGS, and ask her to contact the Impaction Task Force folks, of which Ted Lascher is a member and Chevelle Newsome is Chair, to find out what they are currently doing (or not doing) in order to decide what SRGS could look at and perhaps help support the Impaction Task Force. It was stated very clearly, though, that SRGS would be responding to the request from APC, as its parent committee (i.e., this would be a referral from APC).

2. **Agenda Approved:** Approved 2:45pm
3. **Minutes November 6, 2015 Reviewed.** Minutes approved as amended, 2:45pm
4. **Policy and Procedure for Student Admission into a Non-Impacted Major Without Pre-Major Criteria, Establishment of. (Appendix B).** The Committee reviewed the policy draft and recommended that we look to existing policy first to see if we can insert the language there. If not, then we could propose a new policy. It was suggested that we look at the Timely Declaration of Major policy and amend the policy to include an item in that language about how Chairs cannot deny students admission into their major if it is non-impacted and without any pre-major criteria. It was also recommended that we look at the Pre-Major and Expressed Interest Definition policy as well. Escobar will bring back a draft of the amended Timely Declaration of Major policy with the proposed language at the February 5, 2016 meeting.

5. Information & Discussion Items:

a. Todd's Ad Hoc Group Update. The ad hoc group has met and has begun discussions regarding the definition of a baccalaureate degree and what a general studies degree might look like. For starters, it is not to be structured nor considered a "finishing degree." Having academic rigor like other degree programs is essential and will be a critical component of the degree. Questions the group is considering include: Who would the University be serving? What would the policy look like? Who will be impacted by it?
T

b. Online Course Evaluations Update (Escobar). The issue of online course evaluations has been placed on the Executive Committee's agenda for December 8, 2015. Mark Rodriguez and Shawn Sumner are planning to present information and answer questions and concerns. Escobar will provide another update at the February 5, 2016 meeting.

6. Meeting Schedule for Fall 2015

September 4	October 16	December 4
September 18	November 6	
October 2	November 20	
	(canceled)	

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

Sue C. Escobar, Committee Chair