ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda
Tuesday, January 29, 2018
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Room 100

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   • President Zelezny attending from 10:30 – 11:25, and the April 30 Executive Committee
     meeting from 11:30-12:30.
   • President Zelezny Senate Report on February 21 and April 4th 10:05 – 10:30 where she has
     been invited to provide her report.
   • Andrew Maiorano, General Counsel, will be attending the Senate meeting on February 21.
   • Trustee visits: Larry Norton visits on February 27 and Trustee Romey Sabalius visits on April
     23, 2019

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   January 22, 2019 Minutes

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
      ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
      iii. BPC (B. Street)
      iv. FAC (M. Rush)
   b. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
   c. Spring 2019 General Faculty Meeting - Feb 11, Stockdale 11:30-1pm. Topics:
      i. Interim Provost to address Faculty and Q&A
      1. Faculty and Administration Hiring update
      2. GI 2025 Preliminary Progress Update data
   d. Starting new programs - possible referral to AAC
   e. Workload - What constitutes workload?
      i. Data: current student, faculty, SFR, etc.
      ii. Administrative (when assigned time is awarded)
      iii. Schools have different workloads based on different criteria
      iv. What constitutes a one WTU release?
      v. Is release time consistent?
      vi. Timeline for grant writing and approval
      vii. Committee load
6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. Blackboard issues
   b. Leadership Academy
   c. Faculty Trustee Nomination Process: Campus Procedures
   d. Faculty Awards: Call for nominations clarification
   e. Financial Aid moved to BAS
   f. GRASP and AARC
   g. Development of a Continuous Enrollment Course (see previous handout)
   h. Provost J. Zorn Review
   i. WSCUC - Final draft to Senate – Resolution from Executive Committee?
   j. Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification (handout)
   k. Sustainability position

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING FEBRUARY 7, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
   - Consent Agenda
   - New Business
   - RES 181907 Academic Calendars
   - Old Business
   - RES 181905 Ombudsperson Role in Dispute Resolution* Second Reading

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

   * Changes to the University Handbook
1. CALL TO ORDER
   D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   D. Boschini welcomed the new Interim Provost and VP AA, V. Harper, to the Executive Committee. V. Harper addressed the group about the transition: Former Provost Zorn has been helpful and supportive toward maintaining continuity. She wishes the campus her very best. The EC, in discussion with the President, stated that they would support whatever candidate she selected. V. Harper will be addressing faculty at the Spring Faculty Meeting February 11, 2019.

   J. Tarjan reported 1) In response to the EO 1110, the ASCSU executives charged the Chancellor’s Office to meet with Administrators to work on an agreement. The result is suboptimal. 2) Two names from CSUB went forward for Faculty Trustee position. The Governor makes the appointment in March. 3) There is a difference between the tenure density information J. Tarjan submitted in his Campus Report last semester and the updated tenure density information. The site link directing to the information http://www.calstate.edu/hr/faculty-resources/research-analysis/documents/Tenure_Density_and_SFR_Trends_2009-18.pdf 4) The State of CSU address and the message from the CO was optimistic in the way that the institution makes a difference in society and the new Governor has approved additional funding.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   M. Rush moved to conduct approval of December 4, 2018 Minutes by email. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   A. Hegde moved to add Blackboard issues. M. Danforth moved to add SOCI issues. The modified agenda was approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth) The first meeting of the semester is January 31, 2019.
      ii. AS&SS (E. Correa) The first meeting of the semester is January 31, 2019.
      iii. BPC (B. Street) The first meeting of the semester is January 31, 2019.
      iv. FAC (M. Rush) A proposed revision of RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy to be presented at the Senate meeting, January 24, 2019.
b. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – the USPBAC meeting was cancelled just before its scheduled time of December 18. The President said that she wants to get further into the conversation before setting 2019-2020 budget priorities. The committee had been divided into two: a budget sub-group headed T. Davis, and a strategy sub-group headed by former Provost Zorn. V. Harper said that the President and Cabinet are still working on the final structure of the USPBAC. D. Boschini summarized discussion by saying that last year faculty was at the table. This year, the opportunity was cancelled. It appears that President Zelezny is sticking with her original interpretation of the memo that the $1.52 spend was discretionary whereby she could decide the number of faculty hires and make high impact practices an item. What is the balance of those resources to be used for? The $1.52 million earmarked by the CO for eleven TT hires, ended up being only six. CSUB received $1.52 million because we are so far below the rest of the campuses on tenure-density and it needs improvement. We’re still trying to have that conversation because the President didn’t agree that it was for eleven new TT hires. What is the criteria for the assigned positions? It’s needed in order to plan and develop new programs, and to go forward on commitments, etc. V. Harper will address the need for transparency on how lines are allocated, to make sure that we use the Program Review process as much it’s practical in order to provide evidence for positions to be allocated to places in need, and to make sure departments have done what they need to do to open new lines, and to open dialogue with Dr. Schecter about looking at that process. A. Hegde stated that we had the same issue with the Budget Forum. The same language is used; We don’t know what the strategic plan is, and until we have a strategic plan, we’re not going to be doing anything. We keep pushing to have something concrete to present to campus.

Every meeting with President Mitchell, he said the feasibility study would occur over fall and spring 2018. Every meeting the EC had with President Mitchell, including the one in March 2018, he was asked if the feasibility study was really something that he was going to do. His respond was, we’re going to do it over the fall. The feasibility study is like a can that keeps getting pushed down the road and we can’t do a strategic plan until the feasibility study is done. When the USPBAC meeting gets cancelled, it’s not a good sign. As faculty, we could say we’ll give you the benefit of the doubt. But there is a limit as to how many times the faculty can be put off. Twice we’ve reiterated why we need $2M. When we get $1.52 million and the Senate asked President Zelezny why only six TT hires, the answer was that some of the fund was for high impact practices. That’s not what the fund stated its use for, nor was it agreed upon. If the priority has changed, we need to know. If we’re going to have strategic plan, we need to meet. The funds from the CO states clearly that $1.52 is for eleven TT faculty hires. V. Harper agreed that we need to meet quickly to establish priorities for FY 2019-2020. D. Boschini met with the President whereby she shared recent data from CO based on info we sent to CO. K. Krishnan’s tenure density number from October is 51.9%. The January tenure-density number from the CO is 53.5%. The number for tenure-density has increased substantially for the same amount of time. D. Boschini asked the President how that
number changed from November to January when there weren’t any new hires. How can we have the conversation on tenure-density when the numbers from IRPA are different from the CO? V. Harper reviewed the number of graduates with K. Krishnan. Subsequent to the actual graduation dates, students may get a substitution, student may change their graduation date, etc. D. Boschini said its problematic that the tenure-density number increased, the timing whereby only six new hires, and the meeting to discuss the differences was cancelled. We can’t have a conversation when the information keeps shifting and the decisions are being made to make it more favorable for the administration. J. Millar reiterated that the Counselors are faculty and the BOT Chair supports mental health issues and the more TT counselors we have the more consistent the responses are for students.

c. Searches- V Harper updated the EC:
   i. AVP Enrollment Management (EM) – The search will launch this semester. He has been working with K. Knudsen. She has performed a forensic analysis of this institution’s enrollment management in terms of student services and fiscal structure. Under her leadership, K. Knudsen has provided a great measure of service to this institution and has instilled a level of trust in EM. The Cabinet is looking at consultants for Academic Affairs. V. Harper commented that the people in EM work exceeding hard and he agrees that EM needs to be more student centered. D. Boschini was pleased to hear K. Knudsen say that one can be hard-working and still have a need to improve dramatically. The student point of view would be addressed, and faculty input will be considered. A. Hegde noted an improvement in EM’s website toward directing students to information on graduation on the academic calendar. V. Harper wants to reduce the cycle time between graduation evaluation and get their grad checks before registration of the student’s final semester. M. Danforth shared that from the intake side, there’s been slow processing of transfer credit reports. She ran a pre-requisite enforcement report and found an RD grade from Spring 2018. The transcript scan had been sitting there for months. It’s the final grade but it’s still not in myCSUB. D. Boschini and K. Knudsen agreed that when there is a situation, get student name, ID number, and bring it to K. Knudsen because she wants to see the pattern. M. Danforth suggested inviting K. Knudsen to the DCLC so she gets the information from the chairs. D. Boschini said if she wants to know how grad check is going, ask the right people; ask the chairs and faculty.
   ii. GE Faculty Director – L. Paris is on a one-year interim position. It’s a reassigned time. If there is reassigned time, department chairs need to be told ASAP. The call went out this morning. The announcement should include that it’s also a Grant Director. It’s not clear whether it’s always going to be full time. GECCo makes a recommendation. The Interim Provost makes the appointment. The EC is not involved in the interviews.
   iii. Director of Academic Operations – to be to be posted in 10 days.
iv. Interim Associate VP for Academic Programs – V. Harper is doing both jobs. He intends to place an interim (internal only search) and expects that person to have significant time in that position. D. Boschini and V. Harper have talked about having a Leadership Academy for campus individuals to build skill sets for future opportunities. Place “Leadership Academy” on next EC Agenda.

v. Associate Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies – search committee meets today to come up with job description. The job will be posted in February. By the end of March, the position is expected to be filled.

vi. Provost and VP Academic Affairs –Interim, V. Harper, has the appointment until June, 2020. The search committee needs to be created in the spring.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Spring 2019 General Faculty Meeting - Feb 11, Stockdale 11:30-1pm. Topics:
      i. Interim Provost to address Faculty and Q&A
         1. Faculty and Administration Search and Hiring update. No MPP positions to be created.
         2. GI 2025 Preliminary Progress Update data. Report followed by Q&A
      b. Newsletter – the chairs were asked to submit content. Statewide Senators corner.
      c. GE Faculty Director Appointment Process has been turned over to GECCo.
      d. Faculty Trustee Nomination Process: Campus Procedures
      e. President Zelezný will meet with
         i. Executive Committee - January 29 10:30-10:50; April 30 11:30 – 12:30
         ii. Academic Senate- February 21 and April 4. (Time certain 10:05 – 10:30 a.m.)
      f. Financial Aid moved to BAS
      g. Development of a Continuous Enrollment Course (handout)
      h. Article 20.37: the call for applications should go out ASAP because of the need to have subsequent reassigned time decisions made earlier in the semester. Last year, the review committee included B. Hartsell, M. Rush, and J. Millar. A. Hegde will replace B. Hartsell, and M. Rush and J. Millar agreed to serve again. M. Rush will be the contact person and in charge of the process. The amount of the award was 14 and a fraction of WTUs. It makes a lot of sense to round up to 15 WTUs so five awards of 3 WTUs can be made. V. Harper will talk to D. Schecter about how many WTUs are available. A. Hegde said it’s not up to the committee to say when the award applies.
      i. Faculty Awards: The Call for nominations is scheduled to go out the third week in semester. The language of the call is a combination of the Handbook and the best efforts to make clear in advance. There were concerns about the decision. Assignment for EC is to look at the Handbook and how we can make things more clear, such as no self-nominations and departmental review of awards for next meeting.
      j. IRB and IACUC appointment recommendations agreed unanimously by the EC.
         i. Dr. John Stark appointed to the IRB for Non-scientific Concerns member Jan 1, 2019-December 31, 2020
ii. Mr. Grant Herndon reappointed to the IRB for Community Member from December 31, 2018 – December 30, 2021

iii. Mr. Larry Saslaw reappointed to the IACUC for Community Member from Jan 1, 2019-December 31, 2021

iv. Dr. Andy Troup reappointed to the IACUC for Non-scientific Concerns member from Jan 1, 2019-December 31, 2021

k. Onboarding process for new faculty: there is a need for improvement in the contract signing, background check, HR processing, Peoplesoft registration, campus ID and getting new faculty into Blackboard. D. Boschini is working with D. Schecter on improving the on-boarding communication and process involving HR, faculty chairs, and Faculty Affairs.

l. Blackboard (BB) issues - In the Fall 2018, IT sent a message that in Spring 2019 they would create a shell for each course in Blackboard and bring rosters over from Peoplesoft. The Chemistry department identified issues. F. Gorham agreed to wait until Fall 2019. However, it was rolled-out December 19, 2018. There were two course shells for every section. Lab sections got duplicate shells for every section in Peoplesoft. Most faculty add content to their course shells and make only certain content available to students at a certain time. However, content was made available to students during winter break. F. Gorham’s solution was for faculty to bring over content. From the subsequent communication between faculty and IT, F. Gorham said that still allow faculty to make new courses unavailable for students, and whatever old shell faculty is working with, they could populate themselves. There is a tool kit to populate that, but that had to be fixed. F. Gorham stated the benefits of what was created: 1) student success - It allows students to look two years after their course to look at their course, 2) students’ access to BB brings their awareness to whether they are in or out of the system due to financial aid, etc. 3) If there is any grievance, faculty can check on when the student logged in, etc. No one asked IT to do that. What problem are they trying to solve? Now there is a problem that has shifted to faculty to solve. The TLC in conjunction with IT implemented idea that all courses get a shell and it’s the faculty member’s responsibility to migrate their course material into the new shell. E. Correa had teacher who taught during Winter Session. They followed the set of migration and instructions and found that the process didn’t work. Subsequently, each of them has to go to TLC to get it fixed to be course-ready to teach. Further, when one teaches an online course using BB, if they have a number of sections the program has identified those as separate classes. It would be better if it was identified as one. There will be problems as faculty discovers that they have new shells but not the content. A. Hegde raised the issue of storage space - every course, every semester, every section has been duplicated. To solve for that, F. Gorham said that faculty could create a master course. Again, faculty did not ask for this. V. Harper will talk to F. Gorham. If there was no consultation with faculty as described, that will be addressed. D. Boschini said there were conversations in pockets, and committees that don’t meet as they should. Then there are conversations with selected people over the phone, ‘Hey what do you think
about this?’ when it’s just a portion and then when things roll out there are key differences in what was rolled out and consequences that weren’t taken into account. Faculty didn’t know that shells would be created with students in shells that faculty don’t want to use. We want to have a course to use semester to semester and the students can be deleted after certain time. IT has created an additional process that is not helpful nor necessary. M. Danforth said that the TLC staffing issue will make the problem worse. Impress that ITC is not the same as talking to faculty. D. Boschini said that the DCLC is a good place for F. Gorman to roll-out ideas. In contrast, to meet with a committee with only four faculty reps and then they don’t get looped into the implementation reality – it’s not working. V. Harper sees that the issue could have been avoided with good instruction, enough lead time, and communication [and skilled support staff]. His line of communication with F. Gorham will be 1) how do we make sure that students are in the correct classes and that content has been migrated this semester, if needed, 2) going forward, to make sure that such a significant change would be vetted with DCLC and not just the ITAC. J. Tarjan suggested if IT wants to consult faculty, that they sketch out all their reports up to the appropriate channel. In this case it’s the DCLC. Just like Block Scheduling, people generally knew what was to occur. Block Scheduling is a good model. A. Hegde added that when consulting the chairs, give them enough time to assess change because they didn’t meet with faculty every week. There may be one or two individuals who have a specific case where the feedback doesn’t apply to other things. D. Boschini spoke with a faculty member who was able to successfully migrate all her content. She said she asked for and received individual instruction on how to do that. It wasn’t that hard, yet she didn’t know she had to do it. Furthermore, the time it took to get all her course materials uploaded and downloaded-it took hours and hours whereby she had to keep it running overnight. So, for whatever work she wanted to do in the moment, couldn’t be done until all this content could be brought over. This was a task that she, as a faculty member, never had to do before. It was always done by the TLC for her. E. Correa and M. Danforth had departments members who experienced the same. D. Boschini said that clearly, faculty was unaware of the magnitude of the task as they hadn’t done this before. The agreement was that this would not create additional work and then it did at the last minute before the semester ended. It still hasn’t been resolved in some cases. The work is not something faculty should be doing. Follow-up next EC meeting.

m. SOCs - Not all have been returned and the RTP files are due next week. D. Boschini said that the dates have been set by D. Schecter in consultation with the Handbook and the contract. The way he sets the dates has been described as the contract has a certain number of days. For example, one gets a ten day rebuttal period after receiving a unit committee letter. The time one uses all those waiting periods, it backs one up to certain range dates that are actually the required range of dates. It has this other contract language pushing those dates. Currently, she has SOCs for three in her department. That’s a fraction of the people whose files are due six days from now. Classes are now starting so people are serving students. They’re going to be getting SOCI’s at the last
minute. There are going to be problems with the SOClS because there are always are (some missing or run inaccurately). People need to submit those files, we’ve created a work crunch, and it’s been poorly timed. The date could be moved. With the SOCl problem, we could perhaps move it back a week. It’s an urgent situation. If V. Harper could talk to D. Schecter and then let faculty know today. Then, for the future cycles, speed up the SOCl processing. Lecturers—even PT Lecturers that teach even one unit in the fall and one unit in the spring—some of them were hired on a year contract. Some of them were notified last fall that that their file would be due next week. People who were added fairly recently, who were asked to teach in the spring and who originally had planned to, or they were issued one semester at a time contract, they didn’t receive notification as the others did in the fall. Thus, we are just now realizing there are people who need to submit files next week. And they’re getting told the last minute that they have to prepare these files. There has been advise at different times that, if you know you’re going to use a faculty member for both semesters, sometimes we’ve been told give them a year contract, and sometimes we’re told only give them a contract by semester. But, when we only do one semester and it’s fall, then that implies that they may or may not work in the spring. And we know they are going to, but we don’t issue them a contract, then that doesn’t trigger them being notified that they have to submit a file. They don’t know. In summary: The urgent issue is that faculty has asked that the RTP due date be changed to January 28th. All first year TT, and all FT and PT Lecturers teaching both semesters, turn in a file next week. That’s a huge group of people, and we’re just seeing the SOClS trickling in. Many will not get their SOClS in time, nor will they be able to make a reflection on the SOCl feedback. D. Boschini asked V. Harper to check with D. Schecter to see if there is any way the deadline could be Friday Feb 1, noon. Otherwise we will have first year faculty and lecturers that will have no SOClS in their file.

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING JANUARY 24, 2019 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   RES 181907 Academic Calendars
   Old Business
   RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Second Reading
   RES 181905 Ombudsperson Role in Dispute Resolution* Second Reading
   That was held up by the President’s interest to read.

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

   * Changes to the University Handbook

Meeting adjourned at 11:55
### Academic Affairs Committee: Melissa Danforth/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Rm 328 Research Room

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/29/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 02 Change of Membership on AAC and Change in Bylaws</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>AAC Memo to Senate – AAC discussed and decided that since AVP of AP represents AA, the Director of AP need not be an ex-officio on AAC. No update to By-Laws needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/06/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 03 GITF Hold Proposal</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>AAC’s feedback was incorporated into the proposal document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 08 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>1/24/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 14 Catalog, Degree Audit, and Schedule Builder Technology and Process Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Support and Student Services: Elaine Correa/Chair, meets 10:00am in BPA 134

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 05 Canvas Pilot</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approve referral to Faculty Senate Committee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee</td>
<td>Referred to FAC</td>
<td>No further action from AS&amp;SS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 10 Service Animal and Emotional Support Animal Policy</td>
<td>Referred to FAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 11 Textbook Ordering Process</td>
<td>Referred to FAC</td>
<td>No further action from AS&amp;SS.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Budget and Planning Committee: Brian Street/Chair, meets 10:00am in Student Health Center, Conference Room (HCCR)**

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>Department Formation Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 09 University Hour</td>
<td>BPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Affairs Committee: Maureen Rush/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Rm 235 Math Library

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/28/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 01 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee</td>
<td>RES 181902 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee Second Reading 10/11/18</td>
<td>10/11/18 10/19/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 04 Ombudsperson</td>
<td>RES 181905 Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution Second Reading 11/29/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change</td>
<td>The committee for consideration of Emeritus awards contacts the Department for their feedback, the info is there, and correct. Look at whether to apply to other awards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee</td>
<td>Referred to FAC</td>
<td>Referral moved from AS&amp;SS to FAC on 10/30/18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Academic Senate Executive Committee
From: Dr. Vernon Harper, Interim Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs
Date: January 25, 2019
Re: Immediate Reinstatement after Academic Disqualification

It has come to my attention that the existing process of allowing students to petition for immediate reinstatement after academic disqualification was not vetted by the Academic Senate. Accordingly, the Office of Academic Programs intends to discontinue the practice of immediate reinstatement effective April 2, 2019 unless the Academic Senate wishes this practice to continue.

Background
During the 2009-2010 academic year, a Petition for Exception form for requesting immediate reinstatement was created. It appears that this process was developed due to the brief time period between quarters. In other words, there was insufficient time for processing academic standings and then notify and disenroll students who had been academically disqualified prior to the start of the next term.

Since then, a set of Guidelines for Immediate Reinstatement was created distinct from the Instructions for Petitions for Readmission after Dismissal for Academic Reasons. Over time, these Guidelines became the de facto policy for reinstatement. The Guidelines for Immediate Reinstatement allow students who were dismissed in the immediate preceding term to be reinstated if they have participated in the Academic Jeopardy Program and are able to convince the Academic Petitions Committee that they have remedied the conditions responsible for their poor academic performance. (The Academic Jeopardy Program was approved by the Academic Senate per 1213002, which does not reference an Immediate Reinstatement process.)

As mentioned above, the Office of Academic Programs intends to end this practice unless the Academic Senate moves that this practice should be preserved.

Kindly,

Vernon B. Harper Jr. Ph.D.
Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Attachments
- Summary of Data on Immediate Reinstatement Petitions
- Guidelines for Immediate Reinstatement
- Senate RES1213002
Attachment #1: Summary of Petitions Submitted for Immediate Reinstatement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th># petitions for IR submitted</th>
<th># petitions for IR approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for Immediate Reinstatement

Students who have not satisfied any of the conditions for Readmission outlined in the current catalog must satisfy the following in order to be considered for Immediate Reinstatement:

1. Complete a Petition for Exception. Petitions are available on the Undergraduate Studies website. There is a fill and print form at http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/_files/PetitionforExceptionFormRevisedSEMESTER.pdf

2. Petition must include a letter answering the following questions.

a. What accounted for your previous academic problems that resulted in your academic dismissal?

The APC needs to have a clear understanding of what you believe to be “responsible” for your earlier academic problems. If you are asserting that the responsible problem is illness, injury, and/or emotional duress, then you must also provide signed documentation from a licensed professional.

b. How has your situation now changed so that the university can rightfully expect you to be able to improve your academic performance sufficiently so that you can graduate in a timely manner?

In the above question (a), you provided a detailed description of what you believe accounted for your previous academic problems. In answering question (b) you need to provide the APC with a clear indication that you have managed to change your situation sufficiently so that you will be able to make rather “dramatic” improvements in your academic performance. You need to convince the APC that you are now able to earn grades of at least “B” (3.00) in your course work and can maintain that level of performance for a sustained period of time so that you can graduate. The APC will want to see that you have a detailed plan for which courses you will be taking and when you will be taking them.

3. Have participated in the Academic Jeopardy Program offered through the Academic Advising and Resource Center (AARC). For more details about the Jeopardy Program, please visit http://www.csub.edu/aarc/academic%20standing/academic%20jeopardy/

4. The APC needs to have a clear understanding of what you believe to be “responsible” for your earlier academic problems. If you are asserting that the responsible problem is illness, injury, and/or emotional duress, then you must also provide signed documentation from a licensed professional.

Please note: Our office will only prepare copies of your existing transcripts from CSUB and any other transcripts that you submitted to CSUB with your application for admission. If there are other transcripts and/or other relevant materials that you believe will be important for the APC to review in consideration of your petition, then it is your responsibility to provide copies of these other materials with your petition.

Handwritten petitions will not be accepted. The petition must contain the recommendation and signature from a faculty or advisor.
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Instructions for Petitions for Readmission after Dismissal for Academic Reasons

Handwritten petitions will not be accepted. The petition must contain the recommendation and signature from a faculty or advisor.

The petition must provide responses to the following three questions:

1. Have you satisfied one of the applicable conditions (see below) specified in the CSUB General Catalog under “Readmission of Academically Disqualified Undergraduate Students?” You must provide documentation which demonstrates that you have satisfied the conditions.

   **Students who had completed fewer than 60 semester units (Freshmen or Sophomore Standing) before being dismissed must:** (one of the two)

   a. have completed college work elsewhere or in CSUB Extended University and brought their total college work completed to 60 or more semester units with an overall grade point average of “C” (2.00) or better and demonstrated above average achievement in recent work;
   b. attained at least a “B” (3.0) average in not less than 9 academically rigorous semester units.

   **Students who had completed 60 semester units or more (Junior or Senior Standing) before being dismissed must:** (one of the two)

   a. earned college credit in academically rigorous courses elsewhere or in CSUB Extended University and attained at least a “B” (3.0) average in not less than 6 academically rigorous semester units,
   b. remained absent from the university for at least one year, during which time they have remedied the conditions that contributed to their academic difficulty.

   **Note:** If you attended a community college and/or other university after being dismissed, you must provide transcripts for all coursework completed subsequent to your dismissal. Please note the GPA requirements for these courses. Unless you have met or exceeded the specified GPA requirements, the APC will not consider your petition favorably, regardless of the number of units you have accumulated after your dismissal.

2. What accounted for your previous academic problems that resulted in your academic dismissal?

   The APC needs to have a clear understanding of what you believe to be “responsible” for your earlier academic problems. If you are asserting that the responsible problem is illness, injury, and/or emotional duress, then you must also provide signed documentation from a licensed professional.

3. How has your situation now changed so that the university can rightfully expect you to be able to improve your academic performance sufficiently so that you can graduate in a timely manner?

   In the above question (#2), you provided a detailed description of what you believe accounted for your previous academic problems. In answering question (3) you need to provide the APC with a clear indication that you have managed to change your situation sufficiently so that you will be able to make rather “dramatic” improvements in your academic performance. Just because you have been away for more than a year does not mean that your petition will be approved. You need to convince the APC that you are now able to earn grades of at least “B” (3.00) in your course work and can maintain that level of performance for a sustained period of time so that you can graduate. The APC will want to see that you have a detailed plan for which courses you will be taking when you will be taking them.
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RESOLVED: that students who are placed on Academic Probation be required to attend an intervention program; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the category Academic Jeopardy be added to the list of academic standings using the following criterion: Students who have satisfactorily completed the intervention program while on Academic Probation will be placed into Academic Jeopardy the moment their CSUB or overall GPA falls below disqualification level; and be it further

RESOLVED: that students be placed into Academic Jeopardy only once and be required to complete an intervention program; and be it further

RESOLVED: that students who have completed the intervention program while under Academic Jeopardy be subject to existing policies regarding dismissal from the university if they fail to bring their GPA above the acceptable level.

RATIONALE: Students in academic difficulty can be offered help as soon as they are identified as being at risk rather than waiting until they are academically disqualified.

After attending the program, if a student's GPA falls below the academic disqualification limit for the first time, the student would be placed on Academic Jeopardy giving the student one final opportunity to improve his/her GPA.

After being placed on Academic Jeopardy, students will receive a registration hold on their account. The hold will prevent students from making any changes to their registration. In addition, students with the Academic Jeopardy hold will be monitored carefully for the first three weeks of the quarter to ensure that they have participated in an academic intervention program. Academic intervention programs will be coordinated between Enrollment Management and the different schools so as to serve
the student in the most complete and efficient way possible. Any student who has not enrolled in the intervention program will be immediately disqualified and be deregistered from all courses prior to census day.

The interventions will ensure that students have at least one full year of attendance at CSUB to demonstrate their academic eligibility. CSUB students are at a high risk of being academically dismissed before completing one full year at CSUB. This policy has been particularly troublesome to implement during terms where there is not enough time to communicate to students before the subsequent term (e.g. Winter to Spring). When students are notified about their academic standing, they have already pre-registered for their courses for the following quarter preventing them from adjusting their schedules accordingly. A majority of the First Time Freshmen at CSUB fall into Academic Probation during their first quarter First time freshmen who enter needing remediation generally have one course to rely on since remedial course work is not included in GPA calculation. Thus, if a student does not get a C or better in that one course, the student may be on academic probation in their first quarter.

Transfer students enrolling at CSUB face a similar situation where they may be on academic probation in their first quarter at CSUB due to numerous reasons such as challenges in transferring from a semester institution to a quarter institution. There have been numerous students who transfer in with a GPA of 2.5 or higher but end up on Academic Probation in their first quarter at CSUB.
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Academic Intervention Program – Proposal

Executive Summary

Academic Intervention Program:

- As per the current Academic Standing policy, CSUB students are at a high risk of being academically dismissed before completing one full year at CSUB. This policy has been particularly troublesome to implement during terms where there is not enough time to communicate to students before the subsequent term (e.g. Winter to Spring). Students at a semester campus have a full year to complete any necessary and or required interventions before being academically dismissed. At CSUB, due to the quarter system, students potentially have only two ten-week quarters and no required intervention program. Consequently, we have been asked to develop an intervention program that would provide students with the necessary support and resources to ensure students in academically are made aware of the academic progress policies the moment they are on academic probation increasing students’ chances to revert to good academic standing. This program is mandatory for any student who falls on academic probation.

- Transfer students enrolling at CSUB face a similar situation where they may be on academic probation in their first quarter at CSUB due to numerous reasons such as challenges in transferring from a semester institution to a quarter institution. There have been numerous students who transfer in with a GPA of 2.5 or higher but end up on Academic Probation in their first quarter at CSUB.

- To address the challenge of students being academically dismissed from CSUB without going through a formal intervention, and to proactively tackle the issue of academic standing as a whole, this program proposes the addition of a registration hold for students on academic probation and the addition of a formal Academic Jeopardy category to academic standing. The intervention program will also ensure that students have 3 full quarters of enrollment at CSUB before being dismissed provided that they follow the requirements set forth in this proposal.

- The Academic Intervention Program described in this proposal was first piloted for a group of students who were academically dismissed at the end of the summer 2011 quarter. The students were required to go through a prescribed set of activities in order to put them back towards academic success. Of the 5 students in the program, all 5 students showed tremendous improvements in their grades with 4 out of 5 students earning a term GPA of 3.0 or greater. The fifth student had a term GPA greater than 2.0.

- The Academic Intervention Program will include the identification of factors that might indicate that a student is at-risk prior to the beginning of their enrollment. In addition the program will identify at-risk students during the academic quarter and provide targeted interventions. Moreover the program provides specific interventions and requirements for students on Academic Probation and Academic Jeopardy.
• The Academic Intervention Program will utilize Grades First to implement progress reports sent directly to faculty members and to track the progress of the students in the program.

• The program will be evaluated on a yearly basis based on academic performance of the students and based on qualitative surveys.

• The progress of the program will be shared with the Academic Advising Council on a quarterly basis.
Background:

According to Executive Order 1038, an undergraduate student is subject to academic probation if at any time the cumulative grade point average in all college work attempted or cumulative grade point average at the campus where enrolled falls below 2.0. Further, an undergraduate student on academic probation is subject to academic disqualification when:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>Units Determining Class Level</th>
<th>Disqualification -if GPA falls below in second quarter of probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Up to 44.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>45-89.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>90-134.5</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>135 +</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice of Disqualification (EO 1038):

Students who are disqualified at the end of an enrollment period should be notified before the beginning of the next consecutive regular enrollment period. Students disqualified at the beginning of a summer enrollment break should be notified at least one month before the start of the fall term. In cases where a student ordinarily would be disqualified at the end of a term, save for the fact that it is not possible to make timely notification, the student may be advised that the disqualification is to be effective at the end of the next term.
Students should be dismissed if they have demonstrated that they are incapable of successfully completing a degree. The demonstration of this should be evaluated: (1) over time, so that the determination is not made with respect to temporary factors such as illness, adjustments to differences in expectations or pedagogical formats and (2) over a broad range of course topics, so that the graded coursework reflects the students' overall abilities not merely their weakness in a particular subject area. Moreover, it is worth noting the difficulty of changing the second-term course registrations after 1st term standing has "rolled." The only term that students have significant freedom to change after probation has occurred is their 3rd term.

**Academic Standing at CSUB:**

The current academic standing policies and procedures at CSUB have certain provisions that create specific challenges for our student population. Some of these challenges include:

- First time freshmen who enter needing remediation generally have one course to rely on since remedial course work is not included in GPA calculation. Thus, if a student does not get a C or better in that one course, the student may be on academic probation in their first quarter. Such students can be dismissed due to their poor performance in as few as two courses. This is one example, among others, which generally affects approximately 25% of the incoming freshmen.

- Transfer students enrolling at CSUB face a similar situation where they may be on academic probation in their first quarter at CSUB due to numerous reasons such as challenges in transferring from a semester institution to a quarter institution. There have been numerous students who transfer in with a GPA of 2.5 or higher but end up on Academic Probation in their first quarter at CSUB. Again, there are numerous factors that contribute to the challenges for transfer students with the change of pace being one of them.

- Due to the fact that the Academic Standing process is run after the end of every quarter (including intersession) there are certain periods when there is no time to communicate to students:
  - Between Winter and Spring: Academic Standing is generally processed on a Friday before classes start and students have to submit their petitions to the Academic Petitions Committee (APC) by 12:00pm on the following Monday which is usually the first day of classes for Spring. This time period is when a bulk of the disqualifications for first-time freshmen occurs. Students who enroll in the fall and were put on probation at the end of fall would reach disqualification at the end of winter. This precipitous disqualification may create unanticipated hardships on students including sudden eviction from the dorms and disqualification from athletic participation.
  - Between Spring and Summer: Students generally have a couple of days to gather all necessary signatures and support letters to submit a petition for reinstatement to the APC. Academic Standing is generally processed on a Friday (June 17, 2011
last year) and students have to submit their petitions to the Academic Petitions Committee (APC) by 12:00pm on the following Tuesday (June 21, 2011 last year). The first day of summer 2011 classes was June 20, 2011.

- Between Summer and Fall: Students who reach academic disqualification status after taking courses in the summer again have a couple of days to gather all necessary signatures and support letters to submit a petition for reinstatement to the APC. Academic Standing is generally processed on a Friday (September 2, 2011 last year) and students have to submit their petitions to the Academic Petitions Committee (APC) by 12:00pm on the following Tuesday (September 6, 2011 last year). The first day of Fall 2011 classes was September 12, 2011.

- Lastly, during intersession, students have virtually no time to submit petitions to the APC.

Students who satisfy remediation within one year graduate at the same rate as students who did not need remediation upon enrollment. Student who do not complete remediation within the first year graduate at a lower rate than other students.

**Academic Standing: Academic Probation and Academic Jeopardy**

The Academic Intervention Program proposes the placement of a registration hold on students falling on Academic Probation requiring the students to attend an abbreviated intervention program. Moreover, the program proposes the addition of Academic Jeopardy to the list of academic standings using the following definition:

Students who have satisfactorily completed the abbreviated intervention while on Academic Probation will be placed on Academic Jeopardy the moment their CSUB or Overall GPA falls below disqualification level for the first time. Students will only be placed into the Academic Jeopardy category once. After being placed on Academic Jeopardy for the first time, students will be subject to following the standard academic standing policy as defined by Executive Order 1038 (EO 1038). Students on Academic Jeopardy would receive a registration hold on their account. The hold will prevent students from making any changes to their registration. In addition, students with the Academic Jeopardy hold will be monitored carefully for the first three weeks of the quarter to ensure that they have participated in an academic intervention program. Academic intervention programs will be coordinated between Enrollment Management and the different schools so as to serve the student in the most complete and efficient way possible. Any student who has not enrolled in the intervention program will be immediately disqualified and be deregistered from all courses prior to census day. The criteria and selection process for students on academic jeopardy and the academic intervention workshops are further described below in the program details.

**Executive Order 1038 (EO 1038)**

According to EO 1038, an undergraduate student is subject to academic probation if at any time the cumulative grade point average in all college work attempted or cumulative grade point
average at the campus where enrolled falls below 2.0. Moreover, an undergraduate student on academic probation is subject to academic disqualification if, while on probation: a freshman falls below a grade point average of 1.50 in all units attempted or in all units attempted at the campus where enrolled, a sophomore falls below a grade point average of 1.70 in all units attempted or in all units attempted at the campus where enrolled, a junior falls below a grade point average of 1.85 in all units attempted or in all units attempted at the campus where enrolled, or a senior falls below a grade point average of 1.95 in all units attempted or in all units attempted at the campus where enrolled.

With the new policy in place the following procedures for academic standing are proposed:

I. Students on Academic Probation
   - ACS places a registration hold on the students’ account preventing the student from making any changes or registering for subsequent quarters.
   - AARC communicates to the students regarding the following requirements the students must complete in order to have their hold released:
     - Attend an abbreviated academic intervention program that includes attending the REACH** workshop and 2 additional academic fitness/skills workshops.
     - Upon completing the requirements above, meet with the major advisor at least once in the quarter to perform a transcript analysis (attached) and determine the grades and or grade points needed to be back on good standing. Through various advisor trainings, and by working in collaboration with the Academic Intervention Coordinator, the advisors will be able to perform the transcript analysis which outlines ways a student can improve his or her GPA. Students will be tracked through Grades First to ensure they have completed the aforementioned requirements. Failure to do so will result in the hold remaining on the students’ account preventing registration for subsequent quarters.

II. Students on Academic Jeopardy
   - Students who have satisfactorily completed the abbreviated intervention while on Academic Probation will be placed on Academic Jeopardy the moment their CSUB or Overall GPA falls below disqualification level for the first time. Students will only be placed into the Academic Jeopardy category once.
   - Administrative Computing Services (ACS) places a registration hold on the students’ account preventing the student from making any changes to their preceding quarter’s registration or registering for subsequent quarters. Note: students will have already registered for courses for the quarter that immediately follows their standing (ex: at the end of winter, students who may be in academic jeopardy will already have courses for spring)
• AARC communicates immediately to the students in this category regarding the following requirements the students must complete in order to have their hold released and to avoid immediate disqualification and deregistration:
  - Students must enroll in the Academic Intervention Workshops* and sign a contract provided during the first workshop that further outlines the requirements outlined below.
    - Students must meet with their major/faculty advisor during the first two weeks of the quarter
    - Students must meet with the Academic Intervention Coordinator at least once during the quarter

The moment a student is back on track in terms of academic standing, the student will be notified of their change in academic status immediately.

Students will only be placed into the Academic Jeopardy once. After being placed on Academic Jeopardy for the first time, students will be subject to following the standard academic standing policy as defined by Executive Order 1038 (EO 1038).

Academic Intervention Program

As per the current Academic Standing policy, CSUB students are at a high risk of being academically dismissed before completing one full year at CSUB. This policy has been particularly troublesome to implement during terms where there is not enough time to communicate to students before the subsequent term (e.g. Winter to Spring). Students at a semester campus have a full year to complete any necessary and or required interventions before being academically dismissed. At CSUB, due to the quarter system, students potentially have only two ten-week quarters and no required intervention program. Consequently, we have been asked to develop an intervention program that would provide students with the necessary support and resources to ensure students in academically are made aware of the academic progress policies the moment they are on academic probation increasing students’ chances to revert to good academic standing. This program is mandatory for any student who falls on academic probation.

Until now, there has not been a comprehensive intervention program for CSUB students who require additional support and tracking towards their academic success. To determine the feasibility of an intervention program and to examine the effects of certain strategies, certain interventions were piloted for a small group of students who were academically dismissed at the end of the summer 2011 quarter. The students were required to go through a prescribed set of activities in order to put them back towards academic success. Of the 5 students in the program, all 5 students showed tremendous improvements in their grades with 4 out of 5 students earning a term GPA of 3.0 or greater. The fifth student had a term GPA greater than 2.0.
In order to expand the opportunity to all students, the successful strategies were incorporated into the proposed Academic Intervention Program. The specific timeline and activities of the Academic Intervention Program are outlined below:

**Incoming Students (First Time Freshmen and Transfers)**

Prior to the beginning of each quarter, the Academic Advising and Resource Center will be responsible for identifying at-risk students based on factors such as the following:

- Students needing remedial coursework
- Special Admits
- Students enrolled in high failure courses that are used as the sole graded baccalaureate course in their first quarter
- Students coming in from the outlying areas of Kern County (transportation issues)
- Number of years at a community college (transfers)
- Combination of classes taken at a community college or other institution (transfers)
- Behavioral factors identified through the College Student Inventory (CSI) administered through the First Year Experience (FYE) program.

First time freshmen who are determined to be at-risk will be strongly encouraged to attend certain workshops in the fall through the CSUB 101 classes. CSUB 101 instructors will be provided with the information regarding these students.

For transfer students identified at-risk, we recommend the requirement of CSUB 301. However, if that is not feasible, transfer students at-risk will be communicated to and offered workshops that cater specifically to transfer issues.

**Continuing Students**

At the end of each quarter after grades roll and academic standing is completed:

I. AARC will be responsible for printing transcripts for each student on academic probation
   - The Academic Intervention Coordinator will meet with the staff advisors from each school to perform transcript analysis for each student on Academic Probation in preparation for the upcoming REACH workshops.

II. The Academic Intervention Coordinator will meet with the staff advisors from each school to identify students on the Academic Disqualification list who should be in the Academic Jeopardy category
   - A request will be placed with the Administrative Computing Services (ACS) to automate this process using PeopleSoft.
III. Academic Intervention Coordinator will identify students whose current term GPA fell below 2.0, whose cumulative or CSUB GPA is between 2.0 and 2.25, and who have not completed remediation classify them as “at-risk”

Action Items (Quarterly)

Note: the processes outlined below are designed to be in place almost simultaneously. However, due to narrow communication timelines, it is important for students on Academic Jeopardy to be identified and communicated to first. The end goal is to reduce students who fall into Academic Probation and thus further reduce the number of students reaching academic jeopardy or academic disqualification.

III. Students on Academic Jeopardy

- Students who have satisfactorily completed the abbreviated intervention while on Academic Probation will be placed on Academic Jeopardy the moment their CSUB or Overall GPA falls below disqualification level for the first time. Students will only be placed into the Academic Jeopardy category once.
- Administrative Computing Services (ACS) places a registration hold on the students’ account preventing the student from making any changes to their preceding quarter’s registration or registering for subsequent quarters. Note: students will have already registered for courses for the quarter that immediately follows their standing (ex: at the end of winter, students who may be in academic jeopardy will already have courses for spring)
- AARC communicates immediately to the students in this category regarding the following requirements the students must complete in order to have their hold released and to avoid immediate disqualification and deregistration:
  - Students must enroll in the Academic Intervention Workshops* and sign a contract provided during the class that further outlines the requirements outline below.
    - Students must meet with their major/faculty advisor during the first two weeks of the quarter
    - Students must meet with the Academic Intervention Coordinator at least once during the quarter

IV. Students on Academic Probation

- ACS places a registration hold on the students’ account preventing the student from making any changes or registering for subsequent quarters.
- AARC communicates to the students regarding the following requirements the students must complete in order to have their hold released:
  - Attending an abbreviated academic intervention program that includes the REACH workshop and 2 additional academic fitness/skills workshops.
Upon completing the requirements above, meet with the major advisor at least once in the quarter to perform a transcript analysis (attached) and determine the grades and or grade points needed to be back on good standing. Through various advisor trainings, and by working in collaboration with the Academic Intervention Coordinator, the advisors will be able to perform the transcript analysis which outlines ways a student can improve his or her GPA. Students will be tracked through Grades First to ensure they have completed the aforementioned requirements. Failure to do so will result in the hold remaining on the students’ account preventing registration for subsequent quarters.

V. Students considered “at-risk”:

- AARC will communicate to these students to encourage them to complete the online REACH workshop developed specifically for at-risk students.

*Academic Intervention Workshops: Academic Skill and Coaching*

The class would be an extended version of the currently successful Resources for Academic Change (REACH) workshops. Students in the class will be provided with a contract at the beginning outlining the grades needed to avoid academic dismissal and to get back to good standing. Having the students enrolled in a class will allow the Academic Intervention Coordinator to set up a 10 week plan of presentations and workshops which include faculty and staff to cover a broad range of topics dealing with academic success.

**Resources for Academic Change (REACH) workshops**

Workshops designed to inform students about the academic policies and procedures at CSUB. The workshop covers the following important topics in order to help students get back on track and on to good academic standing:

- Academic Standing Policies
- Course Repeats and Withdrawals
- How to read transcripts
- GPA Analysis: a detailed analysis of each student’s situation in terms of GPA. Students receive a worksheet where they are required to calculate their own GPA needed to pull themselves out of academic probation. This gives students ownership in the process.
- Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP): students are made aware of the difference between not meeting academic standards versus academic progress. This proactively tackles situations where students may be in jeopardy of losing their financial aid.
- Academic Support Services such as advising and tutoring

**Grades First**

Grades First will be used to track the students’ progress using progress reports sent directly to faculty members.
The Academic Intervention Coordinator will work with the major advisors including faculty advisors where appropriate to track students in the Academic Intervention Program.

The Academic Intervention Coordinator from the Academic Advising and Resource Center (AARC) and the students' respective major advisor will develop progress reports to be sent directly to faculty members from their respective classes. The electronic progress report will include questions on academic performance, attendance, and the need for supplemental instruction. Faculty will not be required to log-in to a separate system and will be able to submit feedback directly from the link provided in the e-mail.

Assessment and Evaluation

This program will be evaluated on a yearly basis to determine whether the students' academic performance is improving. Improvements in GPA will be a leading determinant in the success of the program. In addition, a survey will be administered at the end of each activity and or workshop to determine the qualitative aspects of the program. Lastly, the predictive validity of each at-risk factor will be evaluated.

As we move forward with the proposed AIP, it will be important to collaborate with all areas to ensure that our efforts are complementary and not a duplication of what is already in place. For example, the NSME Student Center already utilizes some of the intervention strategies being proposed.
ACADEMIC STANDING

The students' academic standing is determined by the quality of their academic performance and progress toward their degree objective.

Dean's List. A full-time, undergraduate student, carrying at least eight (8) units of letter-graded work during the quarter, who earns a GPA of 3.25 or above in that quarter will be placed on the Dean's List.

Good Academic Standing. Good Academic Standing indicates that a student is eligible to continue in attendance at CSUB and is not on academic probation/jeopardy/disqualification or disciplinary probation/suspension/expulsion from the University.

Academic Probation. In accord with Executive Order 1038, any undergraduate student with a CSUB GPA or overall GPA falling below 2.00 shall be placed on Academic Probation. Students on Academic Probation will have a registration hold placed on their account requiring them to participate in an Academic Intervention Program. In subsequent terms, students will remain on probation so long as either the CSUB GPA or overall GPA remains below 2.00 and their CSUB GPA and overall GPA are at or above the following limits:

- **Freshman students** (44.5 or fewer quarter units) at or above 1.50.
- **Sophomore students** (45 - 89.5 quarter units) at or above 1.70.
- **Junior students** (90 - 134.5 quarter units) at or above 1.85.
- **Senior students** (135 or more quarter units) at or above 1.95.

Academic Jeopardy. Students on Academic Probation whose CSUB or overall GPA falls below these limits may be eligible for Academic Jeopardy only once during their academic career so long as they meet all of the following criteria:

a. The student has never been on Academic Jeopardy before.

b. The student has successfully completed the prescribed Academic Intervention Program while on Probation.

c. It is mathematically possible for the student's GPA to permit a return to Probation within the following term, based on current course registrations.

d. The student has signed an Academic Intervention Contract.

e. The student satisfies all of the requirements set forth in their Academic Intervention Contract, including regular meetings with an advisor.

Students on Academic Jeopardy will be subject to immediate Academic Disqualification and deregistration when they fail to meet any of these requirements.

Academic Disqualification. Students on Probation are subject to Academic Disqualification when their CSUB GPA or overall GPA drops below the following limits:

- **Freshman students** (44.5 or fewer quarter units) below 1.50.
- **Sophomore students** (45 - 89.5 quarter units) below 1.70.
- **Junior students** (90 - 134.5 quarter units) below 1.85.
- **Senior students** (135 or more quarter units) below 1.95.

Students on Academic Jeopardy shall be Academically Disqualified when their CSUB GPA or overall GPA drops below these limits. Students on Academic Jeopardy are subject to immediate Disqualification and deregistration when they fail to meet the requirements set forth in their Academic Intervention Contract.