

2016-2017 FACULTY SENATE
ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
December 2, 2016
Approved: February 3, 2017

December 15, 2016

Members Present: Escobar, Evans, Fox, Irwin, Heinicke, Sharpp, Geyer, Newsome, Taylor, Trigales

Members Absent: Heather, Gonsier-Gerdin, Gonzalez, Hernandez, Li, Schmidtlein, Watson-Derbigny, Watters

Guests Present: Hunt

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

1. Open Forum:

J. Murphy (Academic Advising) shared information about the 2nd Annual Advising Summit taking place on February 24, 2017. A flyer was passed around announcing the event. She encouraged folks to spread the word and consider submitting a proposal.

2. Approval of the Agenda: Approved 2:15pm

3. Approval of the Minutes for October 7, 2016. Approved 2:15pm

4. Selection of APC liaison to the Readmission Subcommittee – D. Evans. *(Thanks, Dave!)*

5. Discussion Item: CA Promise, SB 412.

D. Hunt apprised the Committee of this new legislation, which focuses on prioritizing registration for those students (62% of freshman, or over 2,000 students) who have signed the 'CA Promise' to finish their degree in four years. This process will be implemented in phases: the first part of the legislation will be implemented in Fall 2017, and the 2 Year Promise will be implemented in Fall 2018. The VP of Student Affairs ultimately is responsible for the implementation of this new legislation and the process.

Essentially, APC is being asked about the philosophical components of this legislation: how do we prioritize students in terms of their registration and take care of them to ensure that they get enrolled in the courses they need? What does "priority" mean? The Committee discussed the fact that we may need to redefine the term.

Other campuses apparently have something like this in place and allot special sections to the "CA Promise" students to ensure that they can get enrolled in the courses they need. Some of the overarching goals and related policies in place on campus include the

Graduating Initiative and Finish in Four. “Priority,” in terms of registration, is a subcomponent of these initiatives, as well as of the CA Promise legislation.

There are some guiding criteria in the pledge, or ‘promise,’ that can assist in developing a plan for priority (e.g., progress toward degree and by group or status. In other words, if students sign the pledge and are making progress in their degree program, they can get placed at the top of their group). Folks also discussed the fact that we are going to have to address the other priority groups, or the groups of students who currently have a designated registration priority. APC felt that this issue would more than likely be brought up at the Senate so we needed to be prepared with a response. Often, the reason for requesting the “priority registration” for these certain groups is “scheduling problems;” however, apparently that reason, excuse or argument is no longer valid because of all of the support that Student Affairs provides with respect to allotting certain sections of courses for students, working with Deans and Chairs to ensure that students get enrolled in certain needed courses, etc.

Lastly, the point about getting and using data, particularly graduation rates for the current priority groups, and perhaps other types of data and groups of students, was raised as something that APC should look into obtaining. D. Evans offered to write up his notes and send them to Chair Escobar.

- 6. Discussion Item: New Grade Appeal Policy.** APC is being asked to review, make comment and make recommendations (of appropriate) on the most recent draft of the Grade Appeal Policy. We did not get a chance to discuss this item as we ran out of time. However, Chair Escobar informed the Committee that it would appear on a future agenda in the Spring 2017 semester.

Meeting Schedule for Fall 2016

~~September 2~~
~~September 16~~
~~October 7~~

~~October 21~~
~~November 4~~
~~November 18~~

~~December 2~~

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

Sue C. Escobar, Committee Chair