

**2016-2017 FACULTY SENATE
ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE**

May 5, 2017

Approved: May 12, 2017

May 6, 2017

Members Present: Escobar, Fox, Gonsier-Gerdin, Geyer, Heinicke, Hernandez, Schmidtlein, Sharpp, Taylor

Members Absent: Gonzalez, Heather, Hunt, Li, Mendoza, Murphy, Newsome, Watson-Derbigny

Guests Present: Trigales

Call to Order: Called to order at 2:09 p.m.

1. Open Forum:

* **D. Geyer** updated the Committee on final grades (Grading Memo). He stated that it would be sent out early next week to everyone. D. Geyer and **K. Trigales** pointed out a change with respect to the Change of Grade Process. Faculty can now change a grade after they submit (approve) final grades and the grades are posted up until June 15th after which time the link will no longer be live. After that date, grade changes can only be processed for administrative reasons and the paper form will need to be filled out.

* **Chair Escobar** informed the Committee that she was elected by the 2017-18 Faculty Senate to serve as APC Chair for one more year. Chair Escobar also stated that she would send out minutes for May 5th to everyone for electronic approval and will email out the final end-of-the-year report, which she had completely forgotten to place on the agenda.

2. Approval of the Agenda: Approved 2:20pm

3. Approval of the Minutes for April 21, 2017. Approved 2:20pm

4. Discussion Item: CA Promise, SB 412.

The Committee continued to discuss revisions to the amended priority registration policy that deals specifically with the CA Promise and the criteria for student participation in the program as well as the advising component, having received the feedback from FPC. **M. Schmidtlein** mentioned the updates that Ed Mills had provided to the Executive Committee on Tuesday, May 2nd regarding the CA Promise Program. Specially, **M. Schmidtlein** addressed the new legislation being discussed in committee at the state legislature that will have an impact on the CA Promise Program. The ideas being discussed concern a tuition freeze for students enrolled in the CA Promise Program and then a tuition reimbursement for students who enrolled (committed) to the CA Promise Program but who were unable to

graduate in 4 years (or two years for transfer students). The Committee discussed these issues and concluded that it would be best to focus on the task and complete the work we have been requested to do. We can deal with that issue if it comes to fruition next year.

Another item that **M. Schmittlein** raised that had been brought up in Exec on 5/2 centers on the advising verification issue. **K. Trigales** stated that there are a number of ways in which advising can be verified by the Registrar's Office for purposes of satisfying this requirement of the CA Promise Program.

- * place holds on student records and only remove them once the student has received advising from an advisor (GE/major);
- * student access of the various advising tools, such as reviewing their degree audit (e.g., Smart Planner, Keys to Degree etc.); and
- * use the new integrated advising tool (the software program EAB, which is a centralized advising database that contains advisor notes and does scheduling for students, for instance.

The Committee discussed the FPC response to the referral from APC via Exec on the advising component of the policy. Four ideas or suggestions were made; however, only one of them seemed plausible in terms of falling within the scope of APC's task with respect to this item and that involved whether or not using Smart Planner can be considered 'advising' for students in this program, thereby satisfying the requirement that students seek advising each term or semester. **K. Trigales** stated that our language in the eligibility criteria really needed to say 'advising' or include the word somewhere in the policy. Revisions were made to that section to address this concern.

Another issue the Committee discussed concerned students who lost CA Promise Program status and whether they should be able to get back into the program. The Committee felt that if someone lost CA Promise Program priority due to low GPA, or probation, etc then even if their GPA improved, they still, in all likelihood, wouldn't graduate in 4 years, which is what the Promise guarantees. Students can appeal it, if they're dropped from the program, if it's due to administrative error, a late grade posting, perhaps completion of an Incomplete. Upon further discussion, the Committee decided to take the language about appealing to get reinstated, if grades etc improved, out of the draft policy.

In sum, after working with some of the language in the eligibility criteria and the advising requirement, the member present agreed to have **Chair Escobar** forward the revised and APC-finalized draft to the Executive Committee for its review.

Discussion Item: Academic Honesty Policy.

Matt O'Connor, Student Conduct Officer, provided the Committee with a draft of the revised policy (a 'skeleton' version, as he called it), which he had emailed to Chair Escobar on May 1st. The Committee found this draft to be a useful starting point for discussions. **T. Sharpp** raised some concerns and questions in the section under 'Instructor Response to Evidence of Academic Honesty.' Specifically, she shared concerns that there wasn't any language in there about accountability and enforcement of this policy if faculty fail to report incidents of cheating and/or plagiarism by their students. She provided examples from her experiences as being only one of two faculty who proactively report these instances of

cheating and/or plagiarism and this is primarily because she and the other faculty member teach a lot of writing courses.

The Committee discussed the value of this but also addressed how challenging it was to enforce some policies on campus. In other words, there are policies on campus requiring certain things that faculty do or do not do but there is very little that can be done to enforce the policies or place sanctions on faculty who do not follow the requirements of these various policies. For example, the Last Week of Instruction Policy requires faculty to administer finals during finals week and not before, but we all know that this does not always happen and faculty do administer finals during the last week of the semester.

Other suggestions and ideas discussed included a way to incorporate standardized language in all course syllabi concerning this policy as well as include information somewhere (in the policy?) for faculty to know about the changes and the process so that realize that it is not as difficult to report these instances as they believe. For example, the revised draft includes provisions for two different reporting options: notice of action report (instructor can resolve the situation without administrative discipline) and disciplinary referral (a request is made for the Student Conduct Administrator to investigate and/or adjudicate academic misconduct).

Chair Escobar stated that this item will carry-over into next year, 2017-18, and that the Committee would begin working on it right away in the Fall '17 semester.

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