

Academic Policies Committee
2013-2014

Friday, March 21, 2014
2-3:30pm, Sacramento Hall 275

Members

Stephen Blumberg (Music, A&L)
Anne Bradley (Library, LIB)
Sue Escobar (Criminal Justice, HHS)
Jean Gonsier-Gerdin (Special Education, EDUC)
Milica Markovic (EEE, ECS)

Jacqueline Irwin (Comm. Studies, A&L)
Todd Migliaccio, Chair (Sociology, SSIS)
Juliana Raskauskas (Child Development, EDUC)
Matt Schmidlein, Vice Chair (Geography, NSM)
Kristin Van Gaasbeck (Economics, SSIS)

Non-voting Members

David Hernandez (ASI, Inc.)
Rusty Slabinski (Academic Advising)
Dennis Geyer (University Registrar)
Ed Mills (AVP/Enrollment & Student Services)
Lakshmi Malrouth (Office Acad Affairs)

Don Taylor (Director, Academic Planning & Quality)
Janet Hecsh (Chair, Faculty Senate)
Viridiana Diaz (Director/CAMP)
Kris Trigales (Associate Registrar)
David Evans (Academic Advising)

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Open Forum

Brief period for members to raise issues related to the committee charge that are not on today's agenda.

3. Approval of the Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes from March 7, 2014 (Attachment A)

5. Election

6. Presentation: Joel Schwartz, New Student Survey, Fall 2013.

7. Change/Add Major Policy: Review the policy for consideration of outcome (150 units or 140 units) if a student changes/adds a major (Appendix B) as opposed to an established beginning point.

8. Pre-major Advising Policy: President's suggested policy (Appendix C); Biology pilot study and procedures (Appendix D and E); Information and a suggested policy draft (Appendix F)

9. Information Items

10. Meeting Schedule for Spring 2014

February 7	March 21	May 2
February 21	April 4	May 16
March 7	April 18	

11. Adjournment

**2013-14 FACULTY SENATE
ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES March 7, 2014**

Approved:

March 11, 2014

Members Present: Blumberg, Migliaccio, Schmidlein, Mills, Malroutu, Slabinski, Trigales, Irwin, Escobar, Geyer

Members Absent: Raskauskas (on leave, Spring 2014), Markovic, Bradley, Hernandez, Van Gaasbeck, Gonsier-Gerdin, Evans, D. Taylor

Guests: Anderegg, M. Villareal (for V. Diaz)

1. **Call to Order:** Called to order at 2:03 p.m.

2. **Open Forum:**

It was identified that Lisa Taylor has stepped down from the committee active immediately.

Presentation by Ed Mills: Enrollment numbers were presented and discussed. Discussion included potential changes to enrollment in future years. Also discussed potential plans for freshman scheduling.

3. **Agenda Approved:** 2:40p

4. **Minutes February 7, 2014 Approved:** 2:41p

5. **Change of Major Policy:** Policy was discussed in depth concerning impact on students and how many it impacts. It was also decided to include double major policy within the same amendment.

6. **Meeting Schedule for Spring 2014**

February 7	March 21	May 2
February 21	April 4	
March 7	April 18	May 16

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

Todd Migliaccio, Committee Chair

1 **FS 13/14-??/APC Policy for Timely Declaration of Major Amendment**
2 **of (FS 12/13-127/CPC/EX)**
3

4 The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the Timely Declaration of Major effective Fall
5 2015.

- 6 1) Add a requirement of advising and graduation plan for students changing a major who
7 have already accumulated 120 units or more.
- 8 2) Add a requirement of advising and graduation plan for students adding a major who have
9 already accumulated 120 units or more.

10

11 **Timely Declaration of Major**

12 I. ...

13 II. ...

14 III. ...

15 A. ...

16 B. ...

17 C. ...

18

19 **D. A student petitioning to change or to add a major, minor or certificate after**
20 **the accumulation of 120 units of credit towards graduation must have the**
21 **petition approved by an advisor in the program being requested. A plan to**
22 **graduate will be developed with the advisor. If the graduation plan and**
23 **petition is approved at the department level, will be submitted to the Dean of**
24 **the college (or Dean’s designee) who will review all materials for final**
25 **approval.**
26

27

28 Suggested Change:

29

30 **A student petitioning to change or to add a major, minor or certificate that will**
31 **cause their total accumulated units to exceed 150 units must have the petition**
32 **approved by an advisor in the program being requested. A plan to graduate**
33 **will be developed with the advisor. If the graduation plan and petition is**
34 **approved at the department level, will be submitted to the Dean of the**
35 **college (or Dean’s designee) who will review all materials for final approval.**

1 President Suggestion of Advising Policy on Pre-Majors:

2

3 If, under the time and unit requirements listed in this policy, a Pre-Major student has not yet
4 met the requirements for entering the major, the Pre-Major may retain the Pre-Major status
5 with the recommendation of the Major Department each semester. If the Pre-Major student
6 does not receive the recommendation to retain the Pre-Major status then the student must visit
7 the Academic Advising Center to formulate an alternative major plan.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

FS-12/13-??/APC/EX

Pilot Study for Progress in the Biology Pre-Major Policy, Establishment of

The Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of a pilot study to assess the creation of a policy for evaluating Progress in the Biology pre-major that will occur immediately upon passage of this bill. The policy will be evaluated after three years to determine impact on both the department and students. Each year, the Biology department will submit to APC a summary of their use of the policy.

The Department of Biology defines progress in the major as being regularly enrolled in courses defined as part of the pre-major, as identified below:

A degree in the Biological Sciences requires the following lower division courses:

BIO 1, BIO 2, CHEM 1A, CHEM 1B, CHEM 20 (or 24), PHYS 5A, PHYS 5B, MATH 26A, and STAT 1; some concentrations have additional requirements

Students cannot readily enter all of these classes; most have a math requirement and/or a diagnostic that determines entry. The only “true” introductory course is BIO 1.

Viewing these introductory courses as “stages”, depending on student readiness, one could determine progress in the major by ensuring students are moving through the various stages of preparation, as described below.

THUS, to progress in the major, students would be expected to make minimal movement (taking one of these courses at least once a year) through the stages of the pre-major as follows (highlighted courses are part of the pre-major):

Stage 1	→ → →	Stage 2	→ → →	Stage 3	→ → →	Stage 4
BIO 1				BIO 2 (req. Chem 1A)		apply to major
		CHEM 1A (or Chem 4 if they fail diagnostic)		CHEM 1A or CHEM 1B		
Preparatory math (if needed; otherwise Stat 1 or Math 26A)		STAT 1 or MATH 26A or PHYS 5A		remaining math or PHYS 5A or 5B (both are required)		

In the above description, Stage 1 is true introduction; Stage 2 requires more math readiness; Stage 3 includes pre-requisite courses that are in the earlier stages.

1 Students who consistently do not make progress in the major (pre-major), will have their status
2 changed to “Undeclared.” To determine this, the Department of Biology will follow explicit
3 procedures before changing the status of a student (see attached [procedures](#)). A student can
4 return to the Biology pre-major after showing progress in the major.

5 **Rationale:**

6 Concerns over student graduation and retention rates have lead to questions of progress in the
7 degree in general. Progress in the major has been a part of this discussion to assist students to
8 graduate, which involves intrusive advising. This policy allows the department of Biology to give
9 more intrusive advising and guidance to students when they are not progressing in the major.

10

11 With the limitation of resources throughout the university, especially with the recent rise of
12 impacted programs, programs, in an effort to avoid impaction (or to protect the limited
13 resources they have after declaring impaction), need to be more aware of the use of the
14 resources. Students who are in a major (or pre-major) but who are not progressing in the
15 program are using resources that could be benefit students who are interested in completing a
16 program.

17

18 At present time, Biology is the department that has been most affected by this issue, but with
19 the number of impacted programs growing, this may expand to other departments. This pilot
20 policy would allow us to study the impact such a policy would have on students and
21 departments as well as how to implement the policy throughout the university, or if it is even
22 feasible to do so.

23 **Background:**

24 The development of this policy derives from two separate sources:

- 25 • The WOM (Working Group on Majors) had discussed issues related to students who
26 hide in majors, as well as the ability of departments to address students who are not
27 making progress within the major but who are still in the major and thus using resources
28 of the department.
- 29 • Also, in discussions with departments who have pre-majors, it was asked by a couple of
30 departments to help determine a policy that identifies how to deal with students who
31 have chosen the pre-major as to avoid being forced to choose another major (because
32 they desire, often, to eventually get into an impacted program).
- 33 • Discussion in APC over a university-wide policy raised questions about implementation
34 and impact. It was suggested to run a pilot policy study of the impact on the Biology
35 department and these students, who already has experience dealing with “shadow”
36 major students.

37 **Consultation:**

38 WOM group; Academic Affairs; Registrar’s Office; Academic Advising, Department of Biology

1 **Policy Effected:**

2 None at this time.

3 **Outcomes:**

4 For the university-wide policy and the specific pilot study for Biology, departments will be able
5 to better maximize their resources by identifying students who are not serious about completing
6 the major in order to remove them. It will open up seats in bottleneck courses.

7

8 It will inform and direct students who may choose a major to “hide” in that they will need to
9 progress in the major, which will potentially move them toward graduation, instead of waiting
10 to see if they can get into an impacted major, or to find a major that is more suitable to their
11 interests.

12

13 It will also allow departments to identify and advise students who may be serious in the major
14 but who are not progressing in the major for other reasons.

15 **Considerations:**

16 Before implementing a policy throughout the university, we wanted to assess the impact on
17 students and departments by running a pilot study with biology department. The Registrar’s
18 office identified that we can track the students who have been removed to determine the effect
19 on their progress to degree.

20

21 The committee did not want this to be used by departments as a means for removing struggling
22 students, so the pilot is the first attempt at trying to determine the best way to limit this. The
23 intention of the program is to assist students in getting them the advising needed to progress in
24 their overall degree. Concerns over misuse of the policy lead to the pilot policy study first to
25 evaluate its impact.

26

27 The committee did not want to define how this will occur for each department, as each
28 department will define progress through the major in a different manner. We are trying it out
29 with Biology to determine if the guidelines we determined would benefit students, while still
30 allowing the department to determine progress in the major.

31

32 Students may be addressing other university requirements, which can be identified by the
33 registrar’s office, which is why it is important to consult with the registrar’s office during the
34 process. Realizing that students may have reasons for not progressing at the time they have
35 been evaluated, we felt it was important that the student be contacted and advised by the
36 department before removing them from the program.

37

38 Furthermore, removal does not mean a student will automatically be unable to be readmitted to
39 the program in the future, which is why a contract must be established with the student if they
40 have interest in doing so in the future.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

The committee realizes that on occasion, the removal of a student from a program is because they will be unable to continue in the program because of a department policy (e.g. repeat policy, grade requirement, etc.). These students then would not be able to return to the program, and therefore, no contract would need to be established. This would need to be clearly articulated/identified in the policy established by the department.

8 While advising was identified as a primary part of the intervention policy with students
9 not progressing, the department of biology established required advising for all pre-
10 majors. They confirmed how they were going to accomplish this: Currently, all freshmen
11 (first two semesters) and transfer students (first semester) are required to see an advisor in
12 our Natural Sciences Advising Center (NSAC). The remainder of the pre-major students
13 will now be required to be seen by designated faculty within the Department of
14 Biological Sciences.
15

1 If no university issues have been identified, the student will be given the options of remaining in
2 the major or the student will be referred to the Academic Advising Center. Should the student
3 choose to remain in the degree, they will be placed on “degree progress probation.”

4

5 4. Biological Science pre-majors on “degree progress probation” will be allowed one more
6 semester in which to make progress towards the degree. This means student will need
7 to enroll in the next required course in the list of lower division requirements (see
8 attachment) within the next semester. If this does not occur, the student will be
9 administratively removed from the major (into “Undeclared”), and referred to the
10 Academic Advising Center.

11

12 Students who desire to reenter into the pre-major in the future will need to complete the
13 requirement(s) outlined for them while on “degree progress probation.” Furthermore, in
14 order to rejoin the pre-major, the student will need to be able to complete the major
15 within 150% of total major units (depending on concentration that will be between 180-
16 217 total units).

1 Departments and normative time frame:

2 Biology (applying for impaction): 2-3 semesters in a perfect world; 2+ semesters added for most because
3 of difficulty getting classes. So about 2.5 years.

4 Computer Science: 2.5 years to complete pre-major, can finish the last two lower division courses while
5 taking the first two upper division courses. (only have to take 7 lower division courses before applying
6 for pre-major)

7 Construction Management: 2 years of required courses; pretty tight and heavy loads (no idea about
8 access to all courses) (No courses seem like they would be overly impacted. General ed courses. Just the
9 time frame seems limited.)

10

11 Advising Policy on Pre-Majors:

12

13 If, under the normative time and unit requirements identified by the department to complete the Pre-
14 major a Pre-Major student has not yet met the requirements for entering the major, the student may
15 retain the Pre-Major status with the recommendation of the Major department each semester. If the
16 Pre-Major student does not receive the recommendation to retain the Pre-Major status from the Major
17 department then the student must visit the Academic Advising Center to formulate an alternative major
18 plan.

19 Notes that relate to past discussions on the issue:

20 • Time and unit requirement is the criteria, so I don't see how anyone could use this as
21 determined by grades/GPA.

22 • These are identified as pre-major students only. So they can't arbitrarily determine who to
23 remove from the major itself.

24

25 WE COULD ADD:

26 If a department has not specified a normative time frame, then three semesters will be designated as
27 the normative time frame. Following the end of the third semester, if the student has not advanced to
28 the major, then they will need a recommendation from the department to remain in a Pre-major status.

29 • If we wanted, we could establish the time frame as a normative one so that all of the pre-majors
30 that already exist are covered under it.

31