

2016-2017 FACULTY SENATE
ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
February 17, 2017
Approved: March 3, 2017

February 25, 2017

Members Present: Escobar, Geyer, Gonsier-Gerdin, Gonzalez, Heinicke, Hunt, Newsome, Schmidlein, Sharpp, Taylor

Members Absent: Fox, Heather, Hernandez, Hunt, Li, Mendoza, Murphy, Watson-Derbigny

Guests Present: Trigales, Wickelgren

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

1. Time Certain Discussion Item: Grade Appeal Process (GAP) revisions.

E. Wickelgren attended the meeting in order to answer questions about the changes to the GAP. An updated Summary of Changes was provided that corresponded nicely with the current 2015 GAP, which contained highlighted text to indicate where a change is being proposed.

D. Taylor raised a question about removing “prejudice” from the 2015 GAP and subsuming it under the reason for appealing a grade, ‘Violation of University Policy.’ The Committee discussed the definition of ‘prejudice.’ Is it simply discrimination against someone who is a part of a protected class or can it expand beyond that to others? In order to address this concern, the Committee agreed that it would be a good idea to add another policy to the current list that would cover situations of prejudicial treatment of students that might not necessarily fall under the under the ‘protected class’ umbrella term. The policy to be added is: Faculty Responsibilities to Students in the Instructional Environment with a link in the footnote.

Another issue or question that arose centered on the recruitment of students for panels (i.e., going through ASI directly rather than via the Dean’s as it is currently being done). E. Wickelgren explained the reasoning for the change and that it is mainly logistical, or easier. A request was made to add in a sentence regarding the representation of students across all colleges, to which the Committee agreed.

E. Wickelgren stated that she would make these changes to the revised/proposed GAP and would send the updated file(s) back to Chair Escobar for final review and a recommendation to forward to Exec on March 3rd.

2. Open Forum:

A. Gonzalez had two items: (1) **Is there a policy that requires course electives to be fully listed in the catalog?** C. Newsome responded that she had looked into this but do not find a specific policy on this issue. (2) With respect to **Concentrations**, if you have more than a third of the students in the major in the concentration, do you need to designate the concentration as a major instead? D. Taylor clarified by saying that if more than 50% of the units are in the concentration, it really should be its own separate major.

D. Taylor provided an update on **Certificates**. Information would be sent from Academic Affairs to the Deans and Chairs on the fact that WASC is going to require that the campus go to them for substantive changes to non-degree programs (i.e., certificate programs or programs that are credit-bearing but do not lead to an actual degree). This particular issue or item will likely be, or already has been, referred to Curriculum Policies Committee (CPC). The fee established by WASC for an expedited review is \$500; review of new degree programs is much more expensive, apparently (over \$1,000).

3. **Approval of the Agenda:** Approved 2:45pm

4. **Approval of the Minutes for February 3, 2017.** Approved 2:45pm

5. **Discussion Item: CA Promise, SB 412.**

Chair Escobar updated the Committee on what Ed Mills shared via email. He was attending a meeting with other colleagues around the CSU, and the CA Promise was mentioned in conversation. E. Mills shared that: "...they are not altering their current sequence (priority reg, then graduating seniors, then juniors, etc.). But giving priority to CA promise students within their group. For instance, if we have three days for juniors, the CA promise students would be day one for juniors. Right now we arrange them by units completed. This approach would put CA promise students first, then all others in the group by units completed. A small change, but it is consistent with the regulation."

K. Trigales provided information regarding registration priority and addressed the compliance piece of the new law, as compliance with the mandates of the law informs the definition of priority and in which cases students may lose their priority status if certain conditions and criteria stipulated in the law are not met. She mentioned that the campus can track cohorts for compliance and that a formula for each group of students can be developed and implemented. To track students, the Registrar's Office can place service indicators on students at the term they enter (i.e., Freshmen or Transfer) and also have 'reason codes,' which are basically explanations or reasons for particular actions taken, such as taking a student out of a priority group if criteria or conditions are not met (e.g., not fulfilling requirements of a contract: GPA, carrying a certain number of units, too many course repeats, for example). A review can be done at the end of each semester to see if the CA Promise group of students has successfully completed 30 units (i.e., passing grades) and earned a 2.0 GPA or higher, for example. These reports can also show which students ended up on Academic Probation, and if so, they can be removed from the priority group. Being on Academic Probation would automatically do this for those students because they would then be limited to 14 units the following semester and likely

would not be able to make up the difference to remain in compliance with the requirements of the CA Promise. Likewise, if a student is having difficulties, or changes majors, adds a minor/major, etc., then it is likely that they are not going to finish their degree in 4 years.

Following this discussion, the Committee felt that it would be necessary to have in any policy revision to priority registration a clear delineation of the following:

- * if students are “in” the CA Promise priority groups, HOW is it that they are “in”
- * if students are “out,” or subsequently removed, HOW is it that they are “out” or “removed,” unless there was an error or certain circumstances (appeals process??) (that was explained, at least partially, in the paragraph above).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHAIR ESCOBAR’S REPORT TO EXEC:

1. Change the definition of “Priority Registration:”

→ current: early registration; students register on their appointment day and time

→ new: if a student signs the CA Promise, then you are given a registration day and time at the beginning of your class status or group (1st appointment within class level; e.g., if sophomores given 3 full days, CA Promise sophomores are given earliest times on day 1 of their class)

2. ESTABLISH LEVELS OF PRIORITY GROUPS (recommended changes):

1. State mandated group – veterans
2. Federal mandated group – disabled students (SSWD)
3. 9 current groups – [campus discretion]
4. CA Promise – (1st appointment day/time within class level)

3. ESTABLISH CRITERIA TO MAINTAIN CA PROMISE PRIORITY

- * Which reports will be run, when and on what criteria (e.g., repeats, drops/withdrawals, etc.)
- * Student Affairs will conduct the review at the end of each semester to see if CA Promise students are in compliance. Should they fall out of compliance, students will be notified that they no longer have CA Promise priority status and registration.

4. RECOMMENDED ACTION LANGUAGE

Regarding procedure, in terms of how this will actually be carried out, the action language should be the following:

Our partners in Student Affairs are currently working on the implementation of the revised priority registration process.

Discussion Item: Intellectual Property Policy (Appendix D): Feedback from the Senate Policy Committees has been requested by the Senate Chair. ** The Committee did not have enough time to address this item and no feedback had been provided electronically to Chair Escobar prior to the meeting. **

Meeting Schedule for Spring 2017

~~February 3~~
~~February 17~~
March 3

March 17
April 7
April 21

May 5

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

Sue C. Escobar, Committee Chair