ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 17, 2017
Approved (as amended): December 1, 2017

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 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, regarding FCPs advising activities.

> [[[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/).]]]

> **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.).

* **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 the 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.