

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
2017-18

December 1, 2017
2:00-3:30pm, Sacramento Hall 161

MEMBERS

Jesse Catlin (Marketing & Supply Chain Management, CBA)	Jan Johnston (Theater & Dance, A&L)
Shannon Datwyler (Biological Sciences, NSM)	VACANT
Sue Escobar, Chair (Criminal Justice, HHS)	Tara Sharpp (Nursing, HHS)
James Fox (Library, LIB)	Joseph Van Vo (Management, CBA)
Amber Gonzalez (Child Development, EDU)	Ayanna Yonemura (Ethnic Studies, SSIS)
Megan Heinicke (Psychology, SSIS)	

NON-VOTING/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

Danielle Ambrose (Office of the University Registrar)	Don Hunt (Division of Student Affairs)
Julian Heather (Faculty Senate)	Jazzie Murphy (Division of Student Affairs)
Gabriel Hernandez (University Staff Assembly)	Don Taylor (Office of Academic Affairs)
Elizabeth Cortez (Associated Students, Inc.)	Marcellene Watson-Derbigny (Division of Student Affairs)

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Open Forum**
(Brief period for members to raise issues related to the committee charge that are not on the meeting's agenda.)
- 3. Approval of the Agenda**
- 4. Approval of the Minutes from the November 17th meeting (Appendix A).**
- 5. Update on the Academic Honesty Policy**
- 6. Discussion Item: Advising Issue (Appendix B)**

* Committee updates on conversations with the President's Advising Task Force Report & Referral
* Summary of issues raised in conversations within APC and with stakeholders (see attachment)
- 7. Meeting Schedule for Fall 2017**

September 4	October 20	December 1
September 15	November 3	
October 6	November 17	
- 8. Adjournment**

**ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 17, 2017**

Approved:

CALL TO ORDER: The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:04pm.

ROLL CALL:

Chair Escobar passed around a roll sheet for folks to indicate their attendance.

Voting Members: Catlin, Datwyler (absent), Escobar, Fox, Gonzalez, Heinicke (absent), Johnston, Sharpp, Van Vo, Yonemura

Non-Voting/Ex-Officio Members: Ambrose, Cortez, Heather (absent), Hernandez, Hunt (absent), Murphy (absent), Taylor, Watson-Derbigny (absent)

GUESTS: Liberal Studies Program: Kristen Anderegg, Advisor/Manager

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Voting members approved the agenda.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: The minutes of the November 3rd meeting were approved.

OPEN FORUM:

SENATE UPDATES: Chair Escobar informed the Committee that the Academic Honesty Policy revisions would be presented to the Executive Committee at its November 28th meeting.

COMMENCEMENT CONCERNS: K. Anderegg shared some concerns that she and her Liberal Studies students had regarding the decision to move to a Spring only commencement ceremony after this semester. K. Anderegg stated that students, in general, do not understand the difference between the ceremony and the degree conferral. She said that more information and notifications should be sent out to all students regarding this issue as well as graduation dates.

DISCUSSION ITEM: ADVISING POLICY & TASK FORCE: Chair Escobar began the discussion by stating that the main objective and focus of the meeting would be on reports and updates from folks regarding their conversations with academic advising stakeholders listed in Appendix B of the Task Force Report. A summary of the main points and issues that were raised are listed below:

* **Lack of clarity on campus as to what “advising” really means.** Is it solely ‘academic’ advising or does it also include career advising? Mental health counseling/advising? Mentoring? How broad should the role of ‘academic advisor’ be—limited to only GE advising or should it also include major advising as well? ** The Committee agreed that the campus needed a solid understanding of what is meant by ‘advising,’ as this understanding will help inform folks in terms of policymaking and implementation. The Committee also expressed concerns regarding discussions concerning the students’ mental/emotional health issues which

APPENDIX A

often arise during a regular ‘academic advising’ session during a faculty member’s office hours. The campus has the Red Folder (if you see something, say something); however, not all faculty may be aware of that resource; accessing it on one’s desktop or laptop computer may not be quick, especially if the faculty member does not know where to look for it. T. Sharpp mentioned that UC Davis has a permanent application or link on everyone’s computers that anyone can click on if they have concerns about the mention/emotional/physical well-being of one of their students (and perhaps employees as well, though I am not entirely sure about that). Sacramento State could consider having something similar since many of our students, and perhaps employees as well, face mental/emotional challenges.

* **Duplication/redundancy of advising on campus.** **A. Yonemura** reported back on her conversation with Tim Fong, who is the director of the Full Circle Project.

[[[Additional information about the Full Circle Project (FCP), taken from its website: “a project funded by the U.S. Department of Education. The Full Circle Project is a comprehensive approach by California State University, Sacramento (Sacramento State), the Department of Ethnic Studies and the Asian American Studies program to implement a strategically focused, campus-wide effort to improve retention and graduation rates of underrepresented Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) and other high-need students. The Full Circle Project aims to assist students throughout his or her entire college careers, and provide ample opportunities to engage in service both on and off campus to enhance their university experience” (<http://www.csus.edu/fcp/>).]]]

A. Yonemura learned that the students who participate in the FCP are also in EOP. Students receive advising from multiple sources: the FCP, EOP, ISAs (Instructional Student Assistants) as well as FYE (First Year Experience). The students in the FCP are in cohorts which helps them remain connected throughout their time at Sac State. This, of course, lead to questions as to whether advising efforts are being duplicated in multiple places on campus; if so, is this something we want to change? The FCP does have 2 staff members, one who does career advising and another who is the process of receiving advising training. These folks wear ‘multiple hats.’ The FCP focuses on advising mostly first year students but also has a program for sophomores who are on Academic Probation (SYS – Second Year Success). They can also receive advising via EOP. The FCP does track its students’ progress by working with OIR, though currently, there is no assessment going on. In terms of what would help the FCP, it would be great if it had a dedicated advisor for first year students and for transfer students. There were some concerns expressed regarding student advisors (peer advising). There needs to be different levels of training for student advisors as well as faculty advisors. It was also shared that the Counseling Services offered via The Well should be utilized more often by our students so that they can have their mental/emotional health needs supported.

E. Cortez, the Committee’s student representative, shared that, in her experience, she was not asked if she was on the right track in terms of her course of study. She felt that it is best to stay with one or maybe two people (advisors/offices) rather than go to multiple places for advising where one runs the risk of receiving different information or answers to the same questions.

* **Need for advising training for students and faculty.** There were some concerns expressed regarding student advisors (peer advising). There needs to be different levels of training for student advisors as well as faculty advisors. In general, folks shared that there needs to be more advising training in general (**J. Johnston** reported that her Department Chair had shared this with her.).

APPENDIX A

* **Need for comprehensive advising in/for each college on campus.** The Committee talked about how comprehensive advising could support GE advising efforts and support faculty advising in the major. For example, in the College of SSIS, there is someone who spends 50% of their time in the College doing advising and then the other 50% of their time in the Psychology Department.

* **Faculty need to have advising recognized and acknowledged in the RTP Process if the campus wants more faculty to be engaged with the advising piece of student success.** This issue, or point, came up again at this meeting. In sum, the Committee felt that there was a real need to change the culture on campus regarding the value that is placed on faculty advising by RTP Committees (their colleagues), Department/Division Chairs; College Deans; the Provost; and the President. For many faculty, advising is not valued in the RTP process at all or very little recognition is given to it.

A related issue that **A. Gonzalez** mentioned centers on the evaluative feedback faculty receive, or can receive, regarding the quality of their advising. In many ways, documenting advising efforts in one's WPAF (for RTP purposes) is challenging for a number of reasons, the primary one being confidentiality concerns under FERPA. An example of how faculty may receive feedback on the quality of their advising comes from the College of Education's Student Success Center. When students come in to the Center for advising, they are logged into a software program. Following the visit, the student is emailed a link to a survey so that they can provide feedback about their experience with their advisor.

The Committee plans to continue these discussions at our final meeting of the Fall 2017 semester on December 1st. Happy Thanksgiving wishes all around!

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

APC DISCUSSION POINTS REGARDING ADVISING AT SACRAMENTO STATE

- * **ADVISING. WHAT IS IT?** There is a real lack of clarity on campus as to what “advising” really means. Is it solely ‘academic’ advising or does it also include career advising? Mental health counseling/advising? Mentoring? How broad should the role of ‘academic advisor’ be—limited to only GE advising or should it also include major advising as well? The campus needs a solid understanding of what is meant by ‘advising,’ as this understanding will help inform folks in terms of policymaking and implementation.
- * **SAC STATE NEEDS MORE ADVISORS (translation = more \$\$\$\$\$).** There is a strong need for additional advisors in order to reach more students. The need for advisors is definitely linked to the need for additional resources. If there is a push on campus for graduation at a faster rate, then the campus needs to spend more money on advising and to hire more advisors as well as provide resources to colleges/departments (units) for faculty advisors. The different centers on campus are doing great things but their reach is limited because there is no money to hire additional advisors to reach the demand of the students.
- * **CAREER ADVISING.** There is a great need for career advising on this campus. This is something that students want from their faculty, who are often unavailable because they are involved in other activities (e.g., teaching (high numbers of students), doing research, committee work, etc.). In addition, students often cannot meet with professors within a department until they are a declared major.
- * **ADVISING TRAINING.** More advising training is needed for faculty and for students as well (peer advisors). A suggestion was made regarding “tiered advising,” where faculty can seek the training they need for the level and type of advising they want to engage in with students. For example, faculty who really want to mentor students and work closely with them in terms of academic planning, they can sign up for and complete the SmartPlanner training.
- * **IS SAC STATE’S ADVISING “SILOED?”** There is a need for better communication among the different advising centers on campus in terms of what each of them is doing in terms of advising and how, perhaps, the campus can reduce duplicative advising efforts.
- * **DUPLICATION/REDUNDANCY OF ADVISING ON CAMPUS.** There seems to be a lot of duplicative advising efforts at Sac State, which can lead to problems for students where they are told one thing by one advisor and told another by someone in a different advising center. Often times, students who receive advising from one center, or organization, on campus, they are also getting advised somewhere else. Sometimes students will visit with three or more advisors in different locations (e.g., GE/Academic Advising Center; EOP; major advisor). From a student’s perspective, it is best to stay with one or maybe two people (advisors/offices) rather than go to multiple places for advising where one runs the risk of receiving different information or answers to the same questions.
- * **ACCESS TO AVAILABLE DATA.** Access to available data is very important with respect to advising and the assessment process.
- * **CHANGING CAMPUS RTP CULTURE to BEGIN VALUING ADVISING AMONG FACULTY.** There is a very strong need to change the culture on our campus with respect to advising and the role of the faculty in the advising process. While there is a lot of talk around

APPENDIX B

campus about how advising is important for students in terms of their degree progress and goal of a timely graduation (i.e., Finish in Four/Finish in Two (AKA “California Promise”), there are very few resources allocated to departments/units for faculty advisors. Over the last decade or more, there has been a cultural shift at Sacramento State, and perhaps other CSU campuses as well, towards scholarly research and creative activities in terms of the retention/tenure/promotion process. While research is obviously important and plays a critical role in faculty currency as it relates to their teaching, this strong emphasis on the requirement of research runs contrary and seems almost incongruent with many of the University’s campaigns within the Graduation Initiative.

More recognition across campus of the role that faculty play in the advising process needs to happen. More specifically, there is a real need to change the culture on campus regarding the value that is placed on faculty advising by RTP Committees (their colleagues), Department/Division Chairs; College Deans; the Provost; and the President. For many faculty, advising is not valued in the RTP process at all or very little recognition is given to it.

A related issue centers on the evaluative feedback faculty receive, or can receive, regarding the quality of their advising. In many ways, documenting advising efforts in one’s WPAF (for RTP purposes) is challenging for a number of reasons, the primary one being confidentiality concerns under FERPA. An example of how faculty may receive feedback on the quality of their advising comes from the College of Education’s Student Success Center. When students come in to the Center for advising, they are logged into a software program. Following the visit, the student is emailed a link to a survey so that they can provide feedback about their experience with their advisor.

* **STUDENTS, MENTAL/EMOTIONAL HEALTH & ADVISING.** Concerns were raised regarding students’ mental/emotional health issues which often arise during a regular ‘academic advising’ session or during a faculty member’s office hours. The campus has the Red Folder (if you see something, say something); however, not all faculty may be aware of that resource; accessing it on one’s desktop or laptop computer may not be quick, especially if the faculty member does not know where to look for it.