



SACRAMENTO STATE

Faculty Senate

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE 2017-18

September 15, 2017

2:00-3:30pm, Sacramento Hall 161

MEMBERS

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

NON-VOTING/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

Dennis Geyer (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)
VACANT (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 (Appendix A).**
5. **Discussion Items: (2)**

President's Advising Task Force Report & Referral (Appendix B). Documents include the referral from Exec, the task force report, and the current Undergraduate Academic Advising Policy (from the UPM). Link to the policy in the University Policy Manual (UPM): <http://csus.edu/umannual/acad/uma00050.htm>

Academic Honesty Policy and Procedures (Appendix C). Time Certain 2:45pm [Guest: Matt O'Connor]. Peterson and O'Connor draft of revisions (track changes) to the current policy (with new language and strikethroughs) attached; UPM for the Academic Honesty Policy & Procedures:



SACRAMENTO STATE

Faculty Senate

<http://www.csus.edu/um anual/student/stu-0100.htm> and EO 1098 – Student Conduct Procedures:
<http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1098.html>

6. Meeting Schedule for Fall 2017

September 4	October 20	December 1
September 15	November 3	
October 6	November 17	

7. Adjournment

**ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2017**

Approved:

CALL TO ORDER: The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:02pm.

ROLL CALL:

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

Voting Members: Caitlin, Datwyler, Escobar, Fox, Gozalez, Heinicke, Johnston, O'Malley, Sharpp, Vo, Yonemura

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

GUESTS: Academic Affairs: Chevelle Newsome, Dean of Undergraduate (Interim) and Graduate Studies
Liberal Studies Program: Kristen Anderegg, Advisor/Manager
Office of the Registrar: Kris Trigales, Associate Registrar

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Voting members approved the agenda.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: There were no meeting minutes to approve on this agenda because Sept 1st is the first meeting of the 2017/18 AY.

OPEN FORUM:

INTRODUCTIONS: Chair Escobar welcomed everyone to the meeting and to APC and asked that folks introduce themselves and state their department due to the number of new members to the committee.

APC POLICY UPDATES: Chair Escobar informed the committee that SB 412/CA Promise, or the amendments to the Priority Registration Policy, would be referred to the 2017/18 Executive Committee for placement on a Faculty Senate agenda (hopefully) this semester. Chair Escobar also shared that Exec referred the item, the Academic Advising Policy, to APC at its meeting on August 29, 2017, and that the actual referral from Senate Chair, Julian Heather, would be forthcoming.

ADVISING UPDATES: Jazzie Murphy, Advising Center Director, updated the committee on *integrated advising*, which is a new advising program on campus. The way it works is that

APPENDIX A

professional advisors from the Academic Advising Center are placed within the Colleges to work with the advisors and the students there. These advisors assist with **SmartPlanner**, helping students set up plans so they can graduate on time. Advisors can then inform Associate Deans and Deans on course demands. These are referred to as “move the needle” projects. These advisors are also assisting the Colleges set up **Student Success Centers**, as they are there in the Colleges 90-95% of their time. With respect to SmartPlanner data, the Academic Advising Center advisors are able to view Spring 2017 data. A question was asked in regards to course planning and how soon to programs/units need to know about demand. General response was to contact the Chairs of these programs/units and certainly closer to the beginning of the prior semester on which planning is centers is always best. Other SmartPlanner updates were also discussed and whether the campus ‘Graduation Czar,’ Jim Dragna, should attend APC meetings.

ACADEMIC POLICIES STANDING RULES (INFORMATION ITEM): Chair Escobar stated that the standing rules were placed on this agenda because it was the first meeting of the 2017/18 AY and that it would be a good idea to review them. Discussion centered around placing the standing rules on a future agenda for a more robust conversation, to which Chair Escobar agreed.

VICE CHAIR ELECTION: Tara Sharpp volunteered, and subsequently elected, to serve in the role of Vice Chair of APC for the 2017/18 AY.

LIAISONS TO SUBCOMMITTEES: The following individuals volunteered, and subsequently elected, to serve in the role of APC liaison to APCs subcommittees:

Academic Standards Subcommittee:	Sue Escobar (Criminal Justice, HHS)
Readmission Subcommittee:	James Fox (Library, LIB)
Student Retention & Graduation Subcommittee:	Amber Gonzalez (Child Development, EDU)

DISCUSSION ITEM - ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY: The Committee reviewed and discussed primarily a draft of the revised policy prepared in Spring 2017 by Student Conduct Officer, Matt O’Connor. Chair Escobar shared her rationale for not inviting specific guests to the first meeting of the academic year and stated that she would follow up with both Matt O’Connor and University Counsel, Jill Peterson, to invite them to the meeting on September 15, 2017 given the number of questions that arose.

DISCUSSION:

The group discussed the newly developed **website** for faculty, as well as staff, administrators and students, **to report academic dishonesty (among other kinds of student misconduct)**. K. Trigales shared that Registrar’s Office staff have had incidents of suspicious signatures on official documents/forms, such as change of grade forms, and these incidents certainly can be reported as academic dishonesty. A question was asked if this website/link can be shared with others, and

APPENDIX A

Chair Escobar stated that she would follow-up with Matt O'Connor, as he may have a specific plan to roll out the link.

K. Trigales addressed an error in the section on **'Grade Submissions for Open Cases' (of academic dishonesty)** in the O'Connor draft. Regarding cases of suspected misconduct that have not been resolved by the end of a semester, submission of an RD grade (Report Delayed) is done by the Registrar and not the instructor.

Committee members, ex-officios and guests focused most of their attention on the section, **'Instructor Response to Evidence of Academic Dishonesty'** in the O'Connor draft. One question centered on whether there was a difference between "findings of academic dishonesty" and "evidence of misconduct." Another question focused on the two proposed reporting options: Notice of Action and Disciplinary Referral. In the end, the group felt it best to seek consultation with O'Connor and Peterson.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.



California State University, Sacramento

Faculty Senate

6000 J Street • Sacramento Hall 254 • Sacramento, CA 95819-6036

T (916) 278-6593 • F (916) 278-5358 • www.csus.edu/senate

APPENDIX B

September 11, 2017

To: Sue Escobar, Chair
Academic Policies Committee

Hellen Lee, Chair
Faculty Policies Committee

From: Julian Heather, Chair
Faculty Senate

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Julian Heather".

Subj: President's Advising Task Force Report, May 2017

At its meeting on August 29, 2017, the Executive Committee referred the [President's Advising Task Force Report](#) to the Academic Policies Committee, with consultation with the Faculty Policies Committee, to address workload issues.

The Executive Committee also asked that stakeholders identified in *Appendix B. Additional Academic Advising Programs* also be consulted.

The Academic Policies Committee response is due by **Thursday, March 29, 2018**, to Julian Heather, Faculty Senate Chair at senate-chair@csus.edu. Please also copy the Senate Analyst at kathy.garcia@csus.edu.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

JH/kg

California State University, Sacramento
President's Advising Task Force Report
May 2017

Members of the President's Task Force on Advising
Beth Lesen and Marya Endriga, Co-Chairs

Members of the President's Task Force on Advising

Beth Lesen, Co-Chair/Student Affairs Administration

Marya Endriga, Co-Chair/Graduate Studies

Mark Allen, Music

Kristen Anderegg, Liberal Studies

Bob Buckley, Computer Science

Adriana Cervantes del Toro, Academic Advising

Charles Cole, Admissions & Outreach

Ana Garcia-Nevarez, Education

Denise Hamilton, Academic Advising

Janet Hecsh, College of Business

Joanna Hedrick, Student Services Center/One Stop

Megan Heinicke, Psychology

Stephen Hernandez, Registrar's Office

Aja Holmes, Housing

Dianne Hyson, Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies

Jamie Jones, Services to Students with Disabilities

Tina Jordan, Student Academic Success & Educational Equity Programs

Dena Lemus, Academic Advising

Maria Lindstrom, Business Advising Center

Vivian Llamas-Green, Registrar's Office

Priscilla Llamas-McKaughan, Financial Services Administration

Brandon MacLeod, Business Advising Center

Maria Mayberry, World Languages & Literatures

Noelle McCurley, Student Affairs Administration

Jazzie Murphy, Academic Advising

Nassrine Nouredine, Nursing

Steve Perez, Provost's Office, Academic Affairs

Ken Ryan, Registrar's Office

Shawn Ryan, New Student Orientation

My Sayamnath, Academic Advising

Joel Schwartz, Office of Analytics and Institutional Effectiveness

Kevan Shafizadeh, Engineering & Computer Science

Greg Shaw, Health & Human Services

Tina Souza, Academic Advising

Heather Thompson, Communication Sciences & Disorders

Enzo Vernone, Student Services Center/One Stop

Denise Wall Parilo, Nursing

John Williams, Arts & Letters

David Zeigler, Math/Statistics

Executive Summary

President Nelsen's Advising Task Force convened in spring 2016 to examine the ways in which advising is conducted across campus and to make recommendations that would improve advising as a vital aspect of student success. Over 40 members of the campus community, representing faculty, staff, and administrators participated in this effort through monthly meetings. The strategy employed was to create ad hoc groups to undertake and report on three principal areas: (1) Inventory of Advising Programs, (2) Advising Policy and Implementation Review, and (3) Campus-wide Advising Communication and Coordination. Advising (writ large) has several foci (e.g., major, GE, general undergrad, underserved students) and takes place in multiple locations, resulting in a "silo" effect lacking in coordination and communication with other programs and, consequently, duplication of services and possible service gaps as well. Although the Senate Advising Policy developed in 2007 made explicit the responsibilities of the stakeholders (Colleges, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and the various units reporting to those programs and divisions), it was not implemented or evaluated, for a variety of reasons not addressed in this report.

As a result of its inquiries into advising at Sacramento State conducted by the various work groups, the Task Force determined that there was not a campus level, consistently applied model or conceptual framework from which to conduct and assess advising activities. This report summarizes the findings of the Task Force and offers the following three sets of recommendations:

- Recommendation 1: Develop and maintain a database of advising programs on campus to be published on the Sacramento State website and updated annually. Utilize a program survey to gather standardized information from all programs.
- Recommendation 2: Prioritize, fund, and expedite the installation of a Customer Response Management (CRM) platform for use by Academic and Student Affairs divisions (i.e., EAB), with communication and tracking functions (especially shared note-taking).
- Recommendation 3: Update, implement, and assess the current Undergraduate Academic Advising Policy in keeping with best practices and the campus strategic plan for student success including:
 1. Shared governance principles and Faculty Senate procedures, i.e., Senate APC Committee review of the policy and campus level discussions
 2. Incorporation of campus-wide integrated advising approaches
 3. Addition of assessment expectations for advising efforts
 4. Establishment of a university council on advising to aid academic units in improving delivery of their advising.

The Task Force emphasizes that there are well meaning and well developed advising initiatives in place at Sacramento State, but suggests that those may be duplicative in some instances and may require more coordination and consistency across initiatives.

The specific paradigm shifts suggested in this report are expected to improve undergraduate advising, wherever it takes place, within a framework of consistency and accountability that will positively impact student success at Sacramento State.

Introduction

In Spring 2016, President Nelsen established an Advising Task Force to examine advising efforts across campus and forward recommendations for change in keeping with the University Strategic Plan goal to Enhance Student Learning and Success. The primary charge of the Advising Task Force was to conduct an inventory of current advising efforts on our campus and to review the current University policy on Undergraduate Academic Advising. Approximately 40 administrators, staff, and faculty members participated in the Task Force efforts through monthly meetings and smaller ad hoc work groups in the following areas: (1) Inventory of Advising Programs, (2) Advising Policy and Implementation Review, and (3) Campus-wide Advising Communication and Coordination.

The context for our efforts can be summarized in two recent reports conducted by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). The Spring 2016 Graduating Student Survey Report showed that 63.3% of graduating students reported being satisfied with the academic advising they received at Sacramento State, a number that is two percentage points higher than it was in 2014 (61.3%). However, these numbers are low given that the satisfaction with academic advising ranked 14 out of 18 areas of campus services and facilities covered in the survey. Similarly, the spring 2016 First College Year Experience Survey indicated that 68% of first year students reported being satisfied with the academic advising they received at Sacramento State. Here, academic advising ranked 10 out of 20 areas of campus services and facilities. Interpreting these results is challenging because students define academic advising in

various ways and the specific programs with which they may have had contact are not known.

The initial meetings of the Task Force confirmed that there is no official count of the number of advising programs on campus. Although some advising programs have developed their own documents on advising resources, there is no single, centralized database of advising programs. In addition, the campus has no shared definition of what constitutes advising, nor have the distinct scope and roles of faculty, staff, and students who conduct advising and advising-related activities been established. The experience of most Task Force members was that no common training, communication, or coordination among advisors exists. This poses a risk that students may become overwhelmed and confused if they receive conflicting information or information that is unnecessarily redundant; further, students often act as the sole go-between among the various advisors with whom they meet because there is no central method of communication among advisors across campus.

Recommendation 1: Develop and maintain a database of advising programs on campus to be published on the Sacramento State website and updated annually. Utilize a program survey to gather standardized information from all programs.

The Inventory work group compiled a document of advising programs on campus that includes college-level and major advising programs, Academic Advising programs, and Equity-related advising programs. The information was gathered through websites and contacts with various program coordinators. The document contains the

program/department name, contact information, brief description, and links to other advising resources and information. To date, the group identified a variety of over 40 advising services and/or programs at Sacramento State. A summary of this information is provided in Appendices A and B.

This inventory compiles information as it currently exists, but there is no standardized format in which the information is presented on websites or resource lists. In other words, gathering even basic information about these various programs proved challenging and as such, what is represented is likely incomplete. Towards that end, the group developed an online survey which asks about the name/location/hours of the program, the mission/charge of the program (e.g., target population), advising training and leadership, funding, and software tools (Appendix D). However, sufficient resources were not available (e.g., staffing) for the work group to collect and analyze survey data of this magnitude. The group recommended that the survey project be conducted across the campus community and the results form the foundation for a centralized database of advising programs on campus that would be regularly updated, maintained, and made available on the University website. Departments and Colleges would be encouraged to provide links to the database on their own web pages. Additional questions could be added, such as a request for assessment plans and data that provide evidence for program effectiveness. Once the permanent database is installed, ongoing analysis of strategic overlap and potential service gaps are recommended. The group also recommends that an advising decision tree be integrated into the database search structure to assist students to find the resources they need.

The Task Force agreed that the number of different advising programs on campus appears excessive. While every program adds value to the University, the question becomes whether the value added is commensurate with the resources required and whether that same value can be provided in another way that does not duplicate efforts in other programs, uses fewer resources, and maximizes the number of students served. For example, some Task Force members expressed concern that some students who identify in multiple target populations are served multiple times, while others are served minimally. Data are not available on individual student contacts to address this concern. While redundancies should be addressed, some strategic overlap in services may be necessary to ensure consistency and to reinforce prior information students may have received. Strategic overlap differs from duplication of services in that the overlap is planned in collaboration and close communication with other programs.

Although the Task Force was not charged with recommending mechanisms or processes for consolidating advising services, we suggest that these discussions take place within and between Academic and Student Affairs. It may be that program reduction would occur naturally; for example, small grant-funded programs might be institutionalized and sustained by connecting them to more established advising structures. It is also necessary to put processes in place to ensure that duplicative programs do not proliferate in the future. Perhaps grant applications for new advising programs and projects could be required to show evidence that they conferred with other advising programs on campus about avoiding duplication of services and planning for strategic overlap. Proposed advising programs could also be required to provide

data to show that a service gap exists, e.g., student contact data for other campus programs.

Recommendation 2: Prioritize, fund, and expedite the installation of a Customer Response Management (CRM) platform for use by Academic and Student Affairs divisions (i.e., EAB), with communication and tracking functions (especially shared note-taking).

The *Communication and Coordination* work group of the Task Force considered technology and processes that would enhance the communication taking place within and between units on campus and the best means of delivering such communication broadly, consistently, and regularly. The work group worked on identifying ways in which the campus' advising community can improve its practices on how to stay connected, informed, and more consistent when serving students. As a result of its initial meetings, the work group aligned with the Student Service Center Committee on its recommendation for purchase of a Customer Response Management (CRM) software system using the vendor EAB (Education Advisory Board). It was agreed that expanding EAB to include all Student Affairs and Academic Affairs advisors, including major advisors and College and Department Student Service Professionals, as early as possible, would be critical to the success of improved communication and integrated advising efforts (See Recommendation 3).

The Task Force underscores the importance of shared responsibility and accountability related to costs, training, and implementation of EAB across units.

Members of the Student Affairs EAB implementation team will be an invaluable resource and support to other units as they move to integrate EAB into their advising practices.

Conversations within the work group underscored the importance of convening all campus stakeholders at regular intervals to share best practices, troubleshoot, and discuss advising-related matters across campus. This resulted in the creation of a working campus Advising Council, launched in August, 2016 through the Academic Advising Center in Student Affairs. The Advising Council has held monthly meetings including many staff and select faculty and administrators involved in student advising. The purpose of the Council is to serve as a communication vehicle for Sacramento State's advising community and to support the University's strategic goal(s) to Increase Graduation Rates, Decrease Time to Degree, and Reduce Remediation. The Council has been successful thus far, with strong attendance and a current listserv subscribership of approximately 45 members. It is recommended that the working meetings of the Advising Council continue with potential formalization related to mission, goals, and expanded membership depending on the outcome of the Task Force Report discussions.

Recommendation 3: Update, implement, and assess the current Undergraduate Academic Advising Policy in keeping with best practices and the campus strategic plan for student success including:

- 1. Shared governance principles and Faculty Senate procedures, i.e., Senate APC Committee review of the policy and campus level discussions**

- 2. Incorporation of campus-wide integrated advising approaches**
- 3. Addition of assessment expectations for advising efforts**
- 4. Establishment of a Sacramento State Council on Advising to aid academic units in improving delivery of their advising.**

First adopted in 1989 and revised in 2007, the Undergraduate Academic Advising policy sought to identify avenues of advising, identify the various units' and stakeholders' involvement in advising, and establish advising as a shared responsibility that is integral to the mission of the University. In the decade since the last revision of this policy, it has never been fully implemented or assessed. Additionally, much has changed in the advising landscape and many improvements have been made in deployment of human resources and technological interfaces that are not necessarily reflected in the current policy. The *Policy* work group's review concluded that the main goals of the current policy are mostly on point, although updates are needed to better align with the current mission, goals, and strategic plan of the University.

As a first effort, the work group provided some recommendations for updating the policy (Appendix C) that include defining the roles and professional scope of various advisors (professional advisors, major advisors, peer advisors, and peer mentors), updating responsibilities of the Academic Advising Center, adding a section on New Student Orientation, recommending that the section on Student Responsibilities be moved to the University policy on Student Rights and Responsibilities, articulating a campus advising model, and incorporating assessment expectations.

The current advising policy does not articulate a clear advising model for the campus. Rather, academic advising appears to have evolved organically in a decentralized fashion and without a clear structure. As a result, the campus has struggled institutionally with multiple issues, including but not limited to efficiently leveraging resources to meet the demands of a large student population, providing seamless communication between general education/graduation requirement advising and major advising, communicating and disseminating information effectively between advisors in different departments and divisions, avoiding service duplications and gaps, and cross-training and sharing various areas of expertise among advisors housed in different divisions.

The Task Force recommends collaborative, cross-divisional efforts to develop and formalize integrated advising approaches for Sacramento State. Integrated advising is inclusive and will help students make connections across general education, major, and University requirements towards their career goals. Such approaches should address the immediate need to increase progress to degree as well as lay a foundation for long term, sustainable, and institutionalized strategies to achieve continued student success and efficient graduation. More integrated and collaborative advising models should be considered during the policy revision process, through established principles of shared governance and with input across divisions and all campus stake-holders. Articulation of our campus approach should include minimum and desired criteria for advisor training and ongoing professional development. The consensus of the Task Force was that training, re-training (refresher), and ongoing professional development for professional, faculty, staff, and peer advisors is essential. All types of advisors

should share a common base and foundation of training that includes understanding the campus model for advising and the various roles that advisors hold, including areas of distinctness and overlap.

As a first step towards integrated advising, we propose a collaborative plan that promotes a team approach to advising at all levels, including but not limited to within the academic colleges. Possible approaches that have been discussed include increasing collaboration among professional staff advisors (SSPs) in Student Affairs and those who are located in colleges/academic departments, placing existing professional staff advisors from Student Affairs in colleges/academic departments that might not have existing professional advisors, and involving faculty through reassignment and/or compensation to work directly with professional advisors to achieve student success objectives through departmental and college efforts. It is anticipated that this approach, tailored to each college and focused initially on students who could feasibly graduate with the next year, could result in an immediate improvement in graduation rates. More importantly, the day to day communication, mutual cross-training opportunities across units, and an improved experience for students and personnel alike, will lay the foundation for a long-term sustainable model and cultural shift in the approach to advising on campus. Implementation of the proposed plan would demonstrate an ongoing campus commitment to advising as a priority practice, particularly for faculty, rather than historical practices involving mostly uncompensated time, one time efforts/compensation, or overload. The use of a collaborative approach to invest in the cross-training of faculty and academic advisors, leveraging the strengths and training resources of the Academic Advising Center and the disciplinary expertise of academic

departments, and systematizing a partnership and ongoing communication between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, allows the University to build in strategic overlap and mitigate the weaknesses of the current decentralized system.

Policy updates should include requirements for assessment of advising efforts, their effectiveness, and outcomes related to student success. While many, if not most, of the individual programs conduct assessment activities for their grantors or as required by the University, that data is not broadly shared or looked at in the aggregate. In addition, there is no standardization of assessment methodologies, outcome measures, or reporting. Independent programs cannot continue to be exclusively responsible for their own assessment and reporting. There needs to be some standardization of assessment of advising and support services to insure a consistent definition and standard of quality and efficacy as well as objective assessment approaches. Additionally, by standardizing the data collection, analysis, and reporting of program effectiveness, there is an opportunity to determine where the duplications and gaps in service may exist. Some level of standardization and data sharing would also allow us to implement best practices across programs and create strategic plans to set short- and long-term priorities for achievement of developmental and programmatic advising goals.

We recommend that the advising policy establish a council on advising under the auspices of the President or Provost with representatives from relevant divisions and other campus stakeholders who will provide consultation on advising policies and provide oversight for assessment of advising programs according to the established

standards and processes. Examples of represented areas might include Undergraduate Studies, Academic Advising, College SSPs, and students.

Conclusion

At present, there is no coherent, intentional, or strategic campus-wide advising plan. In absence of such a plan and in the face of increasing student need, individual groups have sought and secured resources to address parts of that need. This practice gave rise to many independent programs resulted in systemically patchy, inconsistent and sometimes duplicative service. Most of these programs exist disconnected from the others. There is little, if any, consistency of training, supervision, funding, communication/information sharing, assessment, and messaging to students. There have been attempts to tackle this problem in the past. The University Advising Policy adopted in 2007 documents one such attempt. While it is a thorough document, it was never implemented or updated.

The recommendations contained in this report are designed to improve campus awareness of advising resources, increase communication and coordination among programs, and provide a pathway for moving forward through the shared governance process. Tangible first steps included within the Task Force recommendations are installation of an advising database and inclusive communication system, updating and implementing our campus advising policy, adoption of integrated approaches to advising, developing program and institutional assessment requirements for advising, and creation of an advising council with appointed members representing all relevant campus divisions and stakeholders.

Appendix A

Academic Advising by College and Department

College	Department	Major Advising
Arts and Letters	Art	- Faculty Major Advisor -Department Chair
	Communications Studies	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Design	-Faculty Major Advisor
	English	-Faculty Major Advisor
	History	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Humanities and Religious Studies	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Liberal Arts	-Faculty Major Advisor
	School of Music	-Faculty Major Advisor -Admission and Advising Coordinator (S)
	Philosophy	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Theatre and Dance	-Faculty Major Advisor
	World Languages and Cultures	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Film	-Faculty Major Advisor -Film Coordinator (S)
Business Administration	All Concentrations (Accountancy, Entrepreneurship, Finance, General Management, Human Resources, International Business, Management Information Systems, Marketing)	-Undergraduate Business Advising Center (S) -Graduate Business Advising Center (S)
Education	All Bachelor's degrees in: American sign language and deaf studies, child development,	-Faculty Major Advisor -PERSIST Advisor for identified at-risk students -Math Learning Skills Office (S)
	Teaching Credentials	-Advising, Equity, Recruitment, and Outreach (AERO) Advisors (S)
	Graduate and Professional Studies	AERO Advisors (S)
	Doctorate in Educational Leadership	- Faculty Major Advisor
Engineering and Computer Sciences	Civil Engineering	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Construction Management	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Computer Engineering	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Computer Science	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Mechanical Engineering	-Faculty Major Advisor
Health and Human Services	Criminal Justice	-Criminal Justice Student Service Center (S)
	Kinesiology and Health Science	-Faculty Major Advisor -Division Advisor (S)
	Nursing	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Physical Therapy	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Administration	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Social Work	-Faculty Major Advisor -Undergraduate Director -Division Advisor (S)
	Communication Sciences and Disorders	-Faculty Major Advisor
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	Biological Sciences	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Chemistry	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Geography	-Department Chair
	Geology	-Faculty Major Advisor

College Level Natural Sciences Advising Council (NSAC) (S)	Mathematics & Statistics	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Physics and Astronomy	-Faculty Major Advisor
Social Science and Interdisciplinary Studies College Level Advisor (S)	Anthropology	- Faculty Major Advisor
	Economics	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Environmental Studies	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Ethnic Studies	-Program Directors -Department Chair
	Family & Consumer Sciences	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Gerontology	-Program Advisor -Program Director
	Government	-Faculty Major Advisor -Odyssey Mentor Program (P/S)
	Liberal Studies	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Psychology	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Social Science	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Sociology	-Faculty Major Advisor
	Women's Studies	-Faculty Major Advisor

Note: 1) (S) indicates Staff; 2) (F) indicates Faculty; (P/S) indicates Peer/Student

Appendix B

Additional Academic Advising Programs

Department	Program	Type of Advising
Academic Advising Center	General Education (S)	Undergraduate General Education/Graduation Advising
	First Year Advising (S)	Undergraduate General Education Advising
	First Year Experience (S)	Undergraduate General Education Advising through Peer Mentoring
	Second Year Success (S)	Undergraduate Advising focused second year students faced with some academic challenges
	Undeclared/Express Interest (S)	Undergraduate General Advising focused on Undeclared and Expressed Interest students
SASEEP	College Assistance Migrant Program (F, P/S)	Undergraduate program that helps freshman students from migrant and seasonal farm worker background
	DEGREES (P/S)	Undergraduate program that provides peer advising for underrepresented students
	FSMP (F, P/S)	SSIS – College-based mentorship program funded by FSMP
		Education – College-based mentorship program funded by FSMP
		NSM - Commit to Study- College-based initiative funded by FSMP providing advising to underserved first generation students
		ECS - MEP – College-based program funded by FSMP providing advising to underserved first generation students
		Business – College-based peer advising for first generation Pell-eligible, expressed interest business majors funded by FSMP
	Full Circle Project (S)	Undergraduate program that provides advising for Asian/Pacific Islander students
	Peer and Academic Resource Center (S, P/S)	Offers peer advising program
	PERSIST (S)	Undergraduate Program that provides advising and assistance for second year students
	Student Academic Success/ EOP (S, P/S)	Summer Bridge - Advising for students that are incoming first time EOP-freshmen
		Sophomore Bridge - Peer Advising for students that are rising sophomores to prepare them for sophomore level courses
		Transfer Bridge - Group Peer advising for new transfer students
		Sophomore Success - Advising for students who are in their second year
		Senior Success - Advising for students who are in their senior year
Athletics	Student Athlete Resource Center (S)	Undergraduate Advising for student athletes
College Based Educational Equity Programs	College of Arts and Letters (S, F, P/S)	Supplemental Instruction Program (SI)
	College of Business (S, F, P/S)	Business Educational Equity Program (BEEP)
	College of Education (S, F, P/S)	Education Equity Program (COE)
	College of Engineering and Computer Science (S, F, P/S)	MESA/Engineering Program (MEP)
	College of Health and Human Services (S, F, P/S)	Health and Human Services Educational Equity Program
	College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (S, F, P/S)	Science Educational Equity Program (SEE)

	College of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Studies (S, F, P/S)	Cooper-Woodson College Enhancement
College of NSM	Centers for Science and Math Success (F, S)	Learning Assistant Program PASS Advising Program Peer Assisted Learning Program

Note: 1) (S) indicates Staff; 2) (F) indicates Faculty; (P/S) indicates Peer/Student

Appendix C

Suggestions for initial revision to the Advising Policy to be sent to Faculty Senate



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO UNIVERSITY POLICY MANUAL

Policy Title: Sac State Advising for Student Success Policy

Policy Administrator: Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
and Vice President for Student Affairs

Authority:

Effective Date:

Updated:

Index Cross-References:

Policy File Number: ACA-0100

POLICY TITLE: Advising for Student Success

Policy Statement: Robust advising is a high priority at Sacramento State and is carried out by faculty, professional advising staff, and others associated with program areas and campus organizations in a variety of settings across the campus. Given the diversity and complexity of settings and processes, this policy seeks to establish a framework within which all parties may provide high quality advising, provide accurate information and establish consistency of reporting on advising activities. Referencing nationally-recognized standards for student advising (NACADA), this policy provides general guidelines and evaluative criteria/recommendations for programs to use in providing advising services and reporting on them.

Who the Policy applies to: This policy applies to students, faculty advisors, the Academic Advising Center, academic and student affairs programs, and administration.

Why the Policy is necessary: This policy was last updated in 2007. Since that time, there have been many administrative changes, general education policy changes, technology changes, and the development of new programs necessitating a policy review and update.

Responsibilities: Advising is a shared enterprise across multiple locations. All parties are expected to provide timely and accurate information about advising requirements and resources and are expected to report on the outcomes of their endeavors as part of the budgetary process/cycle in their respective units.

Definitions:

- *Professional Advisors are found in Academic Advising and the Colleges/departments. They generally hold advanced degrees and have extensive training or coursework in student development, University policies and procedures, and academic programs. They are equipped to advise students on*

general education and graduation requirements and in the departments, they advise on major requirements.

- *Major Advisors are faculty or professional staff with extensive training in department and University general education requirements and policies.*
- *Faculty Advisors are faculty with extensive training in department program requirements. Some may serve in the Academic Advising Center to support general education advising programs.*
- *Peer Advisors are students who provide general advising to fellow students and are trained to refer complex questions and student issues to professional staff.*
- *Peer Mentors are students who act as role models for fellow students and are trained to provide information about University policies and programs. They may or may not provide advising about General Education.*
- *Other*

The Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs are responsible for:

1. Providing annual training to enable faculty and staff to effectively advise students.
2. Developing and maintaining an accurate inventory of campus advising programs and resources.
3. Assessing and reporting on the effectiveness of University advising on an annual basis (reports should be provided to the Senate's Academic Policy Committee).
4. Recognizing and rewarding exceptional advising.

The Academic Advising Center, under the direction of the Associate Vice President and Dean of Students, is responsible for:

1. Establishing advising goals which will guide the Center's advising efforts.
2. Providing annual training for advisors—professional and faculty.
3. Providing accurate information about services and resources.
4. Providing academic advising on General Education and the University's graduation requirements for all students.
5. Providing advising for all undeclared students on probation.
6. Providing advising each fall and spring for all first-time freshmen not being advised by academic departments/areas.
7. Periodically assessing the effectiveness of its academic advising plan, as it relates to its advising goals, and making improvements as needed.

New Student Orientation is responsible for:

1. Managing the University's academic-based orientation program for new students and parents.
2. Coordinating orientation and general advising with academic departments and specialized student populations (e.g., Student Athlete Resource Center (SARC), EOP, etc.).
3. Providing on-going program evaluation in order to adapt the program to meet the needs of entering new students.

College Deans are responsible for:

1. Allocating sufficient resources to support College advising initiatives.
2. Providing annual training to enable College faculty and staff to effectively advise students.

3. Assessing and reporting on the effectiveness of advising on an annual basis (reports should be provided to the College, Academic Affairs and the Senate's Academic Policies Committee).
4. Recognizing and rewarding advising as part of faculty and staff workload.

Academic departments are responsible for:

1. Developing an academic advising plan and periodically assessing its effectiveness.
2. Providing accurate information regarding admission to the program and degree planning.
3. Setting and removing advising holds for students consistent with program guidelines.
4. Recognizing and rewarding advising as part of faculty and staff workload.
5. Understanding that students may seek advice in the Academic Advising Center; all programs should coordinate their advising policies and procedures with the Academic Advising Center, including updates to their advising requirements and/or list of advisors, as well as communicating any requirements for the courses selected by students.

Faculty are responsible for:

1. Providing advising to students in the major as assigned.
2. Providing advising to students in general education (GE) as assigned.
3. Participating in activities (e.g., mentoring) consistent with student success initiatives and educational, career, and personal goals.
4. Reviewing and approving student graduation petitions.

Procedures:

1. **Each program providing advising will develop measurable goals, outcomes and benchmarks linked to the NACADA standards (website) or a similar nationally recognized academic advising organization;**
2. **The Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) and Vice President for Student Affairs will conduct an annual advising review—year end—and make public its metrics for addressing those standards (website, annual report, etc.);**
3. **The advising policy will be reviewed as needed or required by Executive Order, for example, but at a minimum every 5 years by the Academic Policy Committee to maintain currency.**

Approved by:

Robert S. Nelsen, President

Date: _____

UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC ADVISING POLICY

(eff. October 26, 1989; updated: November 26, 2007)

I. STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

Two critical factors which contribute to student success are 1) the student's successful transition to the University and 2) the student's ability to make positive connections with college personnel during their first term of enrollment and throughout their academic career. In both cases, student success can be facilitated by initial and extended orientation and advisement programs.

Members of the University community that come face-to-face with students on a regular basis provide the positive growth experiences that enable students to identify their goals and talents and to achieve their goals and utilize their talents. The caring attitude of college personnel is viewed as the most potent retention force on a campus.

Academic advising is not just one of the various isolated services provided for students. Academic advisors, as indicated above, provide students with the needed connection to the various campus services and supply the essential academic connection between these services and the students. In addition, academic advisors offer students the personal connection to the institution that the research indicates is vital to student retention and student success. However, academic advising programs cannot be solely responsible for student retention. The University must provide students with an integrated network of advising resources and support so that any student that seeks advice from faculty, administrators or staff will receive advice directly or be directed to those that can provide the advice needed. Advising in all its forms should appear to be seamless and easily accessible to all students.

In this context, an effective academic advising system is essential to the realization of the University's instructional mission.¹ Effective advising should be viewed as a systematic and on-going process based on a relationship between the student and advisor intended to assist the student in achieving educational, career, and personal goals through the utilization of the full range of University resources. All students are entitled to accurate, reliable, and consistent advising by faculty advisors and Student Affairs staff complemented by advising publications. Students are encouraged and in some cases required to utilize advising services. Ultimately, responsibility for effective advising is shared by students, faculty, staff and administration.

II. GOALS. The goals of the University's advising program include, but are not limited to the following:

To assist students in understanding the broader purposes of a university education.

To assist students in planning their academic programs.

APPENDIX B

To assist students in identifying a major that aligns with their interests, strengths, and career goals.

To assist students in making appropriate course selections to successfully complete their degree.

To assist students in understanding the value of the University's General Education program and the relationship of this program to their interests and career objectives.

To assist students that are not in “good standing” to return to “good standing” and to progress to their degree.

To assist students in interpreting and applying University policies.

To acquaint students with the University's student services and resources.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDENTS

A. The responsibility for academic success rests with the student and includes but is not limited to the following:

- Reading the catalog in order to be aware of University, College, and department/area academic policies, regulations, and deadlines.
- Complying with University, College, and department/area academic policies, regulations, and deadlines.
- Meeting regularly with an advisor in their academic department/area and with a General Education advisor.
- Declaring a major officially before 60 units or, in the case of Junior and Senior transfer students, by the end of their first semester.
- Understanding academic performance standards for the University and their major.
- Understanding requirements to maintain good standing and the consequences for failure to do so.
- Retaining copies of advising materials and bringing relevant materials to their advising sessions.

B. All students on academic probation are required to meet with an academic advisor in their major program or, in the case of undeclared students, with an advisor in the Academic Advising Center to develop a plan to return to academic good standing.

C. Entering freshmen are required to meet with an advisor during orientation to plan and enroll in appropriate courses for their first semester.

D. Freshmen must meet with an advisor during their first and second semester to plan and enroll in appropriate courses for following semester.

E. After their freshmen year, all students must meet with an advisor at least once a year.

APPENDIX B

F. All students must comply with the advising policies of their major program or, in the case of undeclared students, of the Academic Advising Center.

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES OF FACULTY ADVISORS

A. General objectives of department/area advisors include but are not limited to the following:

1. To create a welcoming environment for advisees.
2. To assist students in planning their academic programs.
3. To assist students in resolving problems affecting their progress toward a degree.
4. To assist students in achieving their educational, career, and personal goals.

B. Specific responsibilities of department/area advisors include but are not limited to the following:

1. To make use of adviser training opportunities provided by the College and/or the University.
2. To be sufficiently knowledgeable to effectively assist students in making progress toward their degree/program/credential.
3. To maintain a working knowledge of current University academic policies and requirements, and the ability to connect advisees to the variety of resources and services available to students.
4. To assist students in developing their course schedules for upcoming semesters.
5. To assist students in monitoring progress toward completion of:
 - Major or program requirements.
 - General Education and Graduation requirements.
 - Other degree requirements
6. To review and approve student graduation petitions (advising students of the University requirement to get approval at least one year in advance of their expected graduation date).

V. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ACADEMIC ADVISING CENTER

A. The responsibilities of the Academic Advising Center include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Establishing advising goals which will guide the Center's advising efforts.

APPENDIX B

2. Developing an academic advising plan which specifies and informs students of their responsibilities as well as the University resources available for their use. The plan should include, but not be limited to the following:

1. Required advising meetings with program advisors.
2. Additional requirements for special student populations such as probationary students or pre-professional students (Note: Advising is mandatory for students on probation. Departments/areas are required to provide advising to these students by the end of the second week of their first semester on probationary status).
3. Consequences of failure to comply with mandatory advising requirements (e.g., setting advising holds for students who have not met with advisors).
4. Provisions that are in place for advising evening students and students studying at off-campus sites, if applicable.

1. Providing academic advising on General Education and the University's graduation requirements for all students.

2. Providing advising for all undeclared students on probation.

3. Coordinating orientation and general advising with academic departments/areas and specialized student support programs.

4. Developing and managing the University's academic-based orientation program (including mandatory freshman orientation) for new students and parents, including academic program advising.

5. Providing advising each fall and spring for all first-time freshmen not being advised by academic departments/areas. The current three-phase academic and career-advising model is designed to complement and enhance existing advising in academic departments/areas, not to replace it.

B. The Academic Advising Center shall periodically assess the effectiveness of its academic advising plan, as it relates to its advising goals, and make improvements as needed.

VI. RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

A. All programs are responsible for the following:

- Establishing advising goals which will guide the program's advising efforts.
- Developing an academic advising plan which, at a minimum, informs students of the following:

APPENDIX B

- Required advising meetings with program advisors at least once a year.
 - Additional requirements for special student populations such as probationary students, pre-professional students, or graduate students (Note: Advising is mandatory for students on probation. Departments/areas are required to provide advising to these students by the end of the second week of their first semester on probationary status).
 - Consequences of failure to comply with mandatory advising requirements (e.g., setting advising holds for students who have not met with advisors).
 - Provisions that are in place for advising evening students, graduate students, and students studying at off-campus sites, if applicable.
- Devising a means of implementing and coordinating the program's advising policy and procedures, including, but not limited to:
 - Identifying faculty and staff who will be responsible for advising students in their major/program.
 - Organizing training activities for program advisors.
 - Providing advisors with advising materials.
 - Keeping advisors apprised of changes in requirements and availability of campus resources.
 - Setting and removing advising holds for students who have not met with advisors, in programs with such a policy.
 - Recognizing and rewarding advising as part of faculty and staff workload.

B. Each academic program shall periodically assess the effectiveness of their academic advising plan, as it relates to its advising goals, and make improvements, as needed. In those cases where College advising programs are in place, the College shall periodically assess the effectiveness their academic advising plan and make improvements, as it relates to the its advising goals, and make improvements, as needed.

C. Understanding that students may seek advice in the Academic Advising Center; all programs should coordinate their advising policies and procedures with the Academic Advising Center, including updates to their advising requirements and/or list of advisors, as well as communicating any requirements for the courses selected by students.

VII. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE OFFICE OF OUTREACH, ADMISSIONS, AND RECORDS

A. The goals of the Office of Outreach, Admissions, and Records include but are not limited to the following:

1. To provide the mechanisms, such as registration holds, for enforcing required advising as defined by department/area advising policies.

APPENDIX B

2. To collaborate and consult with faculty and staff advisors in developing systems for accessing student records that ensure timely and effective advising.
3. To assist faculty and staff advisers with the processes for accessing student records.
4. To generate reports needed to support department/area and college advising efforts.
5. To complete General Education evaluations before the end of transfer students' first semester.
6. To complete graduation evaluations before students' registration for their final semester.

B. To ensure that each student's undergraduate degree requirements have been met, Degree Evaluators and Admissions' Counselors shall consult with students and, if necessary, with their academic major adviser.

C. The Office of Outreach, Admissions, and Records shall periodically assess the effectiveness of its advising services, as it relates to the goals specified above, and make improvements as necessary.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

A. The Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs are responsible for:

1. Providing sufficient resources needed to support advising at the University and college level (for example, monitoring and counseling of at risk students, expanded advising for freshmen and transfer orientations, collection and distribution of assessment data, increased offerings of Freshmen Seminar courses and Learning Communities, etc.).
2. Providing resources to ensure annual training to enable faculty and staff to effectively advise students.
3. Administering the University academic advising policy.
4. Assigning an appropriate administrator to coordinate University efforts to improve academic advising and to monitor and enhance policies and practices relating to academic advising.
5. Delegating responsibility for ensuring IT support to facilitate academic advising.
6. Communicating the University advising policy, including any changes, to colleges and department/areas.
7. Providing advisers at all levels with descriptions of the variety of services and resources available to students and contacts for student referrals.

APPENDIX B

8. Assessing and reporting on the effectiveness of the University's advising policy on an annual basis (reports should be provided to the Senate's Academic Policy Committee).
9. Recognizing and rewarding exceptional advising.

B. College Deans are responsible for:

1. Allocating sufficient resources needed to support advising at the College and/or program level.
2. Providing annual training to enable College faculty and staff to effectively advise students.
3. Monitoring the development and effectiveness of advising policies and practices within their colleges.
4. Coordinating the College's efforts and providing direction and assistance to improve advising.
5. Assessing and reporting on the effectiveness of advising on an annual basis (reports should be provided to the College, Academic Affairs and the Senate's Academic Policies Committee).
6. Recognizing and rewarding advising as part of faculty and staff workload.

IX. MONITORING ADVISING EFFECTIVENESS. The advising goals specified by each unit are to be assessed by the unit. As for student success goals, these are much broader in scope and, as indicated below, are not appropriately assessed by looking only at the unit goals.

A. Advising plans and services should be periodically assessed, as related to their respective goals, and improvements made as necessary. Each of the appropriate units should develop their own formative assessment² plan and the implementation of an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving the quality and results of advising their students.

B. The effectiveness of advising programs as it relates to student success is difficult to assess directly in that advising is only one of a number of factors influencing student success. It is necessary, however, that academic programs be attentive to signs that may suggest students are not making satisfactory progress toward achieving the goals identified above, and consider whether changes to advising programs may be necessary to address these issues.

In particular, academic units at all levels – department/area, college, and university – should identify a set of indicators that may warn of emerging problems or may alert the unit to a need for a modification to their advising policy. In addition, academic units should be alert to other indicators that, while not indicative an emerging problem, may suggest that a review of the existing advising practices is warranted. When indicators suggest, academic programs should also consider whether changes to their advising policy and practices are necessary to achieve their identified goals.

X. NECESSARY CONDITIONS FOR IMPROVING THE QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT. As suggested throughout this policy, a set of conditions must be put in place for increasing effectiveness of the University's academic advisement system in improving retention rates to be realized. These conditions include but are not limited to the following:

- A. Providing the resources necessary to encourage and maintain high quality and effective advising at all levels of the university.
- B. Providing strong incentives and rewards for advisors to engage in high-quality and effective advising.
- C. Strengthening advisor orientation, training, and development, and delivering these as essential components of the institution's faculty/staff development programs.
- D. Assessing and evaluating the quality and effectiveness of academic advisement at all levels of the university.
- E. Maintaining advisee-to-advisor ratios that are small enough to enable delivery of personalized advising.
- F. Providing strong incentives for students to meet regularly with their advisors.
- G. Providing strong and effective campus-wide administrative support for collaboration, especially between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

California State University, Sacramento Mission Statement (Approved on March 29, 2004)
<http://www.csus.edu/portfolio/mission.htm>

2 An effective continual improvement process requires the use of formative assessment, as opposed to a summative assessment process. A formative assessment process analyzes results to determine if improvement is necessary, and if so, initiates efforts to improve. Those efforts in turn are assessed to determine if the desired results were achieved. If not, modifications or new initiatives are implemented and this process continues.